COMMUNITY OF PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY: CITIZENSHIP IN SCOTTISH CLASSROOMS.

Claire Cassidy
Donald Christie
University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland

Abstract:
The context for the study is the current curriculum reform in Scotland (*Curriculum for Excellence)* which demands that teachers enable children to become 'Responsible Citizens'. Education for Citizenship, as opposed to Citizenship Education, in Scotland is not a discrete subject; the objective is that citizenship permeates everything that happens throughout school, academically and socially. It is centrally situated alongside children becoming 'effective contributors', 'successful learners' and 'confident individuals'. The aim of the present study was to evaluate the use of Community of Philosophical Inquiry (CoPI) as a pedagogical tool to enhance citizenship attributes in Scottish children in a range of educational settings. In order, first, to get an insight into the teachers' perspectives on the Education for Citizenship agenda in Scotland, the teachers were asked for their definitions of 'citizen'. Similarly, the children were also asked about their notion of 'citizen'. The children's group betrayed a more political understanding of 'citizen' than the teachers. Before and after an extended series of CoPI sessions, the 133 participating children from the ages of five to eighteen, in formal and informal educational contexts, were presented with dilemmas designed to elicit responses which indicated their ability to make, what *Curriculum for Excellence* (Scottish Executive, 2004) would describe as 'informed choices and decisions and to articulate informed, ethical views of complex issues'. The sessions were facilitated by class teachers who were trained in CoPI. The results indicate that children's reason giving was enhanced by participation in CoPI. The article uses contributions from the children to highlight areas of their lives within school and in society beyond school, where doing philosophy has had an impact. The implications both for education for citizenship and the potential of Philosophy with Children to contribute to an enhanced school curriculum will also be discussed.

Keywords: Philosophy with Children, citizenship, children's reasoning, decision making, *Curriculum for Excellence*

Comunidad de investigación filosófica: la ciudadanía en las aulas de Escocia

Resumen:
El contexto para el estudio es la actual reforma curricular en Escocia (*Curriculum for Excellence*) lo que exige a las maestras que permitan que los niños se tornen "ciudadanos responsables". Educación para la Ciudadanía, en oposición a Educación Ciudadana, no es un tema menor en Escocia; el objetivo es que la ciudadanía impregne todo lo que sucede a lo ancho y a lo largo de la escuela, académica y socialmente. Está focalizado en que los niños se conviertan en "efectivos colaboradores", "aprendices exitosos " y "personas seguras". El objetivo del presente estudio fue evaluar el uso de la comunidad de investigación filosófica (COPI) como herramienta pedagógica para mejorar atributos de ciudadanía en niños escoceses en una variedad de entornos educativos. En primer lugar, para obtener una visión

de las perspectivas de los docentes en la agenda de Educación para la Ciudadanía en Escocia, se pidió a los maestros por dieran su definición de "ciudadano". Del mismo modo, se pidió también a los niños su noción de "ciudadano". El grupo de niños desestimó una comprensión más política de "ciudadano" más que los maestros. Antes y después de una extensa serie de sesiones de COPi, se presentó a los 133 niños participantes de entre cinco y dieciocho años de edad, en contextos educativos formales e informales, dilemas diseñadas para obtener respuestas que indicaran su capacidad de hacer, lo que el *Curriculum for Excellence* (Scottish Executive, 2004) describiría como "elecciones y decisiones informadas para articular puntos de vista éticos e informados acerca de cuestiones complejas". Las sesiones fueron facilitadas por maestras de clase que fueron entrenadas en COPI. Los resultados indican que las razones de los niños mejoraron gracias a su participación en COPI. El artículo utiliza contribuciones de los niños para destacar las áreas en su vida dentro de la escuela y en la sociedad más allá de la escuela, donde hacer filosofía ha tenido un impacto. Se discutirán tanto las implicaciones para una educación para la ciudadanía cuanto la posibilidad de que Filosofía con niños contribuya a un mejor currículo.

Palabras clave: Filosofía con Niños; ciudadanía; razonamiento de los niños; toma de decisiones; currículo para la Excelencia

Comunidade de investigação filosófica: cidadania nas salas de aula da Escócia

Resumo:

O contexto para que o estudo é a atual reforma curricular na Escócia (*Curriculum for Escellence*) o que exige que os professores permitam que as crianças se tornem "cidadãos responsáveis". Educação para a cidadania, em oposição à Educação Cidadã, não é um tema menor na Escócia; O objetivo é que a cidadania impregne todo o que acontece em geral e através da escola, acadêmica e socialmente. Está focado em que as crianças se convirtam em "colaboradoras efetivas", "aprendizes exitosos" e "pessoas seguras". O objetivo do presente estudo foi avaliar o uso da comunidade de investigação filosófica (COPI) como ferramenta pedagógica para melhorar atributos de cidadania em crianças escocesas numa variedade de entornos educativos. Em primeiro lugar, para obter uma visão das perspectivas dos docentes na agenda de Educação para a Cidadania na Escócia, pediu-se aos professores que deem sua definição de "cidadão" . Do mesmo modo, pediu-se também às crianças que dessem sua noção de "cidadão". O grupo de crianças desdenhou uma compreensão mais política de "cidadão" mais do que os professores. Antes e depois de uma extensa série de sessões de COPI, foram apresentados às 133 crianças participantes, entre cinco e dezoito anos de idade, em contextos educativos formais e informais, dilemas desenhados para obter respostas que indicaram sua capacidade de fazer, o que o *Curriculum for Excellence* (Scottish Executive, 2004) descrevia como "eleições e decisões informadas para articular pontos de vista éticos e informados sobre questões complexas". As sessões foram facilitadas por professoras de classe que foram treinadas em COPI. Os resultados indicam que as razões das crianças melhoraram graças à sua participação em COPI. O artigo utiliza contribuições das crianças para destacar as áreas em suas vidas dentro da escola e na sociedade além da escola, onde fazer filosofia teve um impacto. Discutiram-se tanto as implicações para uma educação para a cidadania quanto a possibilidade de que a Filosofia com crianças contribua para um currículo melhor.

Palavras-chave: Filosofia com crianças, cidadania, raciocínio das crianças, tomada de decisões, currículo para a Excelência

Introduction

In 1999 Bernard Crick wrote

> … to put it simply, where a state does not have a tradition of active citizenship deep in its culture or cannot create in its education system a proclivity to active citizenship, that state is running great risks. Do, or you will be done by. The extreme risk, of course, lack of support in times of war or in times of economic crisis, but the more obvious risk is lawlessness within society; perhaps not general but at least the risk that sections of young people may feel alienated, disaffected, driven to or open to strong degrees of anti-social behaviour (1999, 338).

Fifteen years later the words of Crick now seem highly prescient.

Often, as illustrated by Crick's words, children's citizenship is viewed negatively, from a perspective of social control, in which children may be seen to pose a threat to society, as was manifest in the riots in England in 2011. It is timely, therefore, to be writing this article, that sees children's citizenship in a more positive frame, as we approach the historic Scottish independence referendum in September 2014. The agreement between the devolved Scottish Government and the UK Government includes the radical provision that children between the ages of sixteen and eighteen will have a vote; meaning that this group must be prepared to be enfranchised. Taking into account children's perceived lawlessness on the one hand, and their newly emancipated status in determining the future of Scotland, both the UK and Scottish Governments, albeit in different ways, are eager to consider young people's citizenship and the implications for education.

Education for citizenship in the Scottish context

It should be noted that the Scottish and English education systems are different, so in making calls to address citizenship in Education the UK Government has no locus in Scottish Education as they have devolved governance over this to the Scottish Parliament. Education for citizenship has always had a place in Scottish Education (Author 2013). Known as the Scottish *Emile*, the 1965 curricular document *Primary Education Scotland* (SED 1965), because of its child-centred philosophy, called for active participation on the part of children and that they be educated in what they would later need to be future citizens of Scotland and the wider world. With the advent of the consultation paper *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the 90s* issued in 1987 by the Scottish Office Education Department, came the *5-14* curriculum. This document retained an element of education for citizenship. Currently, Scotland is going through a period of curricular change. The latest iteration of curriculum guidance, *Curriculum for Excellence* (*CfE*) (Scottish Executive 2004), was introduced fully into the Scottish Education system in August 2010. Again, education for citizenship is not lost. Indeed, it is more in evidence than ever

with one of the four under-pinning purposes of *CfE* being to promote and enable children and young people to become Responsible Citizens. Much of education for citizenship in Scotland in CfE had its roots in the Learning and Teaching Scotland (LTS) paper, *Education for Citizenship in Scotland: a Paper for Discussion and Development* (LTS 2002). In many regards the Scottish Education system is different to other parts of the UK, but what is crucial to note, here, is that in the Scottish system, education for citizenship is embedded rather than set apart as a discrete subject (Author 2008; Biesta 2008; Kisby 2009). The approach to teaching and learning is one that promotes cross-curricular and integrative approaches where links are made to citizenship learning as they arise; there are no set classes in citizenship as there are in some other countries.

In light of this, it is worth considering what it is that is expected of children – and their teachers – in terms of learning and teaching about being a citizen. There is a certain philosophical confusion or tension here, however. The language of the initial documentation very clearly pointed to the child as a Responsible Citizen of the future, while the curriculum development body, *Learning and Teaching Scotland* (LTS) as it was then known, stated on their website that "Young people are citizens of today, not citizens in waiting. Education for citizenship is about developing in learners the ability to take up their place in society as responsible, successful, effective and confident citizens both now and in the future" (LTS 2011). This statement has been retained by Education Scotland (2013), the body that replaced LTS. There is little in either policy documentation or practice beyond the notion of participation in the likes of pupil councils that would suggest that children are actually perceived as citizens in the present, and even this limited participation has to be challenged (Author 2012; Biesta, Lawy and Kelly 2009). Indeed, there is no clear definition provided for either the term 'citizen' or that of 'Responsible Citizen'. Instead, teachers have to determine what they understand citizenship to be and in doing so they need not all be working towards the same goal. In her study, Akhtar (2010) surveyed a group of primary school teachers in central Scotland. None of these teachers had had an opportunity to explore collectively what the authors of the curricular documentation might mean by the term 'Responsible Citizen' or, indeed, what they themselves might mean by it – let alone the children. As a consequence, all teachers in Scotland are aiming to promote Responsible Citizens in their classes without actually knowing or agreeing on what it is they are promoting.

This is not an issue reserved for Scotland. Indeed, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) make clear the ranging notions of citizenship that pervade educational discourse without agreement or common understanding between them. They identify three types of citizen that dominate the literature: the personally responsible citizen with a focus on character and generally being a nice person; the participatory citizen who is engaged in community activity and who understands the systems that structure and govern the country; and the justice-oriented citizen who reflects and considers issues related to social justice and inequity with the goal of understanding why things are the way they are to effect change, though they have in common with the participatory citizen that community involvement is important. The justice-oriented citizen, according to Westheimer and Kahne works towards 'informed analysis and discussion regarding social, political, and economic structures' (2004

243). Buck and Geissel (2009) appear to echo the view that the notion of the citizen is somewhat nebulous when they note that the range of definitions of 'good citizenship' is wide, with political knowledge and skills at one end of the spectrum and community engagement and the socially responsible citizen at the other. Fernández and Sunsdtröm point to the problem of 'shaping and tempering children in certain ways that will turn them into good citizens' (2011, 364); they note that a shared notion of what constitutes a 'good citizen' is presupposed by education for citizenship. Indeed, it is not at all clear what citizening behaviours are to be promoted. While the likes of Osler and Starkey (2003) promote cosmopolitan citizenship that allows children to learn about the legal and constitutional structures under which they live, with the 'essential pre-condition for the renewal of democracy in a globalised world' (245) being paramount if children are to learn how to live inclusively in a diverse nation. Rapoport (2010) complains that the terms around education and citizenship are used more often at academic conferences than in the classroom. In light of *CfE* this may not be so true in Scotland, with many teachers and schools having displays dedicated to their Responsible Citizens. Rapoport would agree with the suggestion that there is no 'mutually agreed upon definition' (180) and in order that teachers do not feel undermined in their teaching of citizenship they should be given clear and explicit guidance on what is required of them and the children they teach. One word, though, that appears to be omnipresent when discussing children, their learning and citizenship is 'responsibilities'.

The Scottish curriculum quite emphatically and explicitly attaches the adjective 'responsible' to citizen, as though citizen may be something other than responsible. There is an unwritten understanding of what a citizen is in this case (Biesta 2008), but that remains unexplored. Many teachers see it as their duty to ensure that children learn to be 'good' citizens who are aware of their responsibilities. To illustrate the point, Howe and Covell (2010) report that in their research they found a preponderance of staff emphasising responsibilities over rights with one school in particular electing to teach only about responsibilities in one year before even introducing the notion of rights until the following year. The same could be said to apply to education for citizenship, in that responsibilities are placed firmly at the core and learning what it means to be a citizen means learning one's responsibilities. However, Fernández and Sundström (2011) acknowledge that there is a further problem, this being the gap between theorising about citizenship and any associated educational aims and practice. There is little to suggest how this may be achieved and Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) study that considered two differently focused citizenship education programmes recognise that this is not easily resolved. Calls are often made for more enhanced lessons relating to education for citizenship but little appears to be offered as to how this may be achieved short of discrete, didactic lessons on what is required and expected of the 'good' citizen and what might be called civic education where children learn about their country's political structures.

Philosophy with Children in Scotland

Philosophy with Children (PwC), in its variety of approaches or practices in evidence in Scottish schools, would lay claim to being a bridging tool; one where notions of citizenship are discussed by participants, while also being an approach to learning that allows children to practise the skills necessary for their engagement in society in the present and the future. It is important to note that the Scottish curricular context is not prescriptive, affording teachers great autonomy in relation to curriculum design, content and modes of implementation. This, therefore, means that PwC is not mandatory in Scottish schools, although many teachers employ a range of philosophical practices in their classrooms, including both academic qualifications to those in the later stages of secondary school and practical philosophical approaches throughout the age range 3-18, encompassed by the *Curriculum for Excellence* (Scottish Executive 2004). The various practices, for example, Philosophy for Children (Lipman 2003) and Community of Philosophical Inquiry (McCall 2009) practised in Scottish schools would claim to be inherently democratic in approach. However, there is explicit discussion of how the practices pertain to engendering citizenship. McCall (1991) is clear that citizenship entails one in actively participating in our immediate and wider communities by engaging with the decisions that are made in those communities. She is clear about the dispositions required in order that one may engage in the role of citizen, as one who participates in the life of the community. She states that

> To be an effective citizen a person needs to be able to make reasoned judgments concerning the views of others, and needs to be able to modify his or her view if necessary. This requires comprehension skills, which in turn requires skill in analogical reasoning as well as in recognising and evaluating analogies; identifying assumptions; recognising fallacies; being careful about jumping to conclusions; recognising part/whole relationships; always being aware of alternatives; seeking out consistencies and inconsistencies in every sphere of life (McCall 1991, 1).

This is in accord with Gregory who asserts that what occurs in PwC is that children have to engage in

> creating hypotheses, clarifying their terms, giving and evaluating reasons, offering examples and counter examples, questioning assumptions, and drawing inferences, as well as social practices like sharing perspectives, listening attentively, helping others make their point, and challenging and building on other people's ideas (2008, 8).

These are the facets of what McCall requires for effective citizenship. Author (2007; 2008) would agree with McCall that PwC is one approach that may be successful in enhancing children's citizenship skills. The claim is not that in doing PwC one becomes a citizen, but that one acquires the citizenship skills, like those listed by McCall and Gregory, that facilitate engagement in and with the community at a local, national or global level. In his study of Scottish children engaging in Cleghorn's *Thinking Through Philosophy* programme (2002), Trickey (2008) writes that while there were cognitive gains for children in participating in PwC, there were

other, affective, benefits too. While it is appropriate that citizens engage intellectually with the world around them, they must also be able to engage at a certain emotional level; that while being able to reason, they need also to be able to empathise with others. The potential for PwC to influence internal behaviour as well as the external was recognised by Rondhuis and Van der Leeuw (2000). Internal effects, according to them, relate to progress in philosophy but that this change in thinking has the potential to alter participants' actions. Annette (2009) also highlights the requirement for critical thinking and empathy in order that engagement with society and one's citizenship might be promoted; making it clear that skills must be acquired to enable this to happen.

The study

The present study aimed to explore the idea that PwC might support the generation of the skills proposed by McCall and Gregory as necessary for citizenship in a democratic society. The study was also designed to examine whether these skills, in conjunction with pro-social skills relating to discussion, for example, empathic perspective taking, might support Scottish teachers in their work with children in relation to *Curriculum for Excellence's* aim of attaining Responsible Citizens. The skills that were the focus of the present study were in line with the vision articulated by the body responsible for the curriculum in Scotland in the following terms:

> Curriculum for Excellence is underpinned by the values of wisdom, compassion, integrity and justice. Within this, education for citizenship provides learners with the opportunity to develop an understanding of fairness and justice, equips them with skills of critical evaluation and encourages the expression of attitudes and beliefs to respond to the challenges we face as global citizens in a constructive and positive manner (Education Scotland 2013).

The study is important because the curriculum guidance fails to provide any discussion of how these values or opportunities might be explored or attained, nor does it explain how the activities they offer as exemplars might actually promote citizenship. The central research question, therefore, driving the study was: In what ways might undertaking a programme of Community of Philosophical Inquiry support children in meeting the requirements of 'Responsible Citizenship' in the school context? This was further refined to focus on key components of 'Responsible Citizenship', namely, informed decision-making and the children's ability to articulate views in relation to complex issues. A second research question was: What do teachers and children understand by the term 'Responsible Citizen'?

This second research question addresses the problem stated earlier, that if there is no clear working definition or statement of what citizenship or responsible citizenship is, then teachers will struggle to be certain that they are doing the right thing. Indeed, due to the autonomous nature of *CfE* for teachers, there is the great risk that because the topic is so woolly in definition and, as the expectation is that it

permeates all aspects of the curriculum, then no-one actually takes responsibility for it or, according to Biesta, it fails to take account of the political dimension of citizenship and that this leads teachers to overlook that

> the very purpose of politics, and more specifically democratic politics, is to deal in one way or another with the fact of plurality, with the fact that individuals within society have different conceptions of the good life, different values, and different ideas about what matters to them (2008, 47).

The initial outline, and this does not appear to have been much developed since its inception, relating to 'Responsible Citizens', is that they will 'have respect for others [and will have] a commitment to participate responsibly in political, economic, social and cultural life' (Scottish Executive 2004, 12). In being thus equipped they will be able to 'Develop knowledge and understanding of the world and Scotland's place in it; understand different beliefs and cultures; make informed choices and decisions; evaluate environmental, scientific and technological issues [and] develop informed, ethical views of complex issues' (Scottish Executive 2004, 12). For the purpose of the present study, the scope of this aspect of the curriculum was narrowed to focus on informed decision-making and the children's ability to articulate views in relation to complex issues.

Methodology

A total of 133 children and young people aged between 5 and 18 years participated in this study. They were located in eight different educational contexts across educational sectors, including four primary school classes (age range 5 to 12 years), three secondary school classes (14 to 18 years) and one community-based youth club associated with a charitable body working with children who are socially disadvantaged (also with age range 14 to 18 years). The study also involved the eight teachers responsible for these groups/classes, both as research participants and as co-researchers. All of the teachers had received training in CoPI through a university postgraduate certificate course and worked across a range of educational sectors.

The intervention

The PwC practice chosen for use with the children was McCall's Community of Philosophical Inquiry (CoPI) (McCall 1991, 2009; Author 2007), this grew out of McCall's work with Lipman and Sharp in relation to Lipman's Philosophy for Children (P4C) (McCall, 2009). Briefly, McCall's CoPI differs from other PwC practices in that its structure is consistent and does not vary according to the age or composition of the group participating. The facilitator presents a stimulus in response to which participants generate questions. The facilitator selects the question to initiate the dialogue. The structure of CoPI demands that participants make connections with previous contributions by agreeing or disagreeing with

previous speakers while also providing reasons for that agreement or disagreement before expanding with their own contribution. The emphasis is on the dialogue as opposed to the need to reach a conclusion or consensus, thus allowing further consideration of the topic beyond the time of a single CoPI session, while also promoting the notion that one needs to question continually and challenge ideas and assumptions within one's life and the wider world (Author 2007; McCall 2009). The inclusiveness of the structure aims to engender respect for others' views, an appreciation of ideas and meanings as well as the need to be reflective in one's life.

There is no search for conclusions or consensus, as in some other practices. Also, participants, unlike in other approaches, need not give their own opinions. Technical language or jargon may not be used; participants must use everyday language to say what they mean in order that others can understand their contribution. In addition, participants are not permitted to refer to authorities, for instance, television documentaries, books or grannies, in providing reasons for their agreement or disagreement.

The teachers were asked to implement at least one session of CoPI per week over a period of eight to ten weeks. Each CoPI session entailed the provision of a stimulus which could take the form of: a text, such as a passage of prose, a piece of poetry or a newspaper article; a pictorial image or video extract; or a piece of music. The children and young people were then asked to generate questions that occurred to them arising from the stimulus. The teacher then selected a question to be discussed by the group. The teacher's role thereafter was to facilitate the dialogue by asking for clarification, exemplification or expansion. Importantly, the teachers were not co-enquirers as in other forms of PwC: their role was not to make contributions to the dialogue itself.

Children's decision making and explanations in response to dilemmas

Before and after their involvement in the CoPI intervention the children were presented with a series of age-appropriate vignettes containing dilemmas designed to assess their ability to make and explain decisions. Due to staff changes the children in the community group were unable to complete the second vignette exercise. The sample, therefore, for this part of the study comprises four primary school classes and three secondary school classes. The children and their class teachers gave their informed consent to be part of the study and the children were then presented with the vignettes in written form to children individually by the teachers as part of normal classroom activity both before and after the series of CoPI sessions that took place over the intervention period. Parallel forms of each vignette were prepared in order to avoid repetition in the pre- and post-test sequence. The children responded to the vignettes, by answering a series of written questions, which followed the same pattern for each of the vignettes:

- What do you think X would do, where X represents the key character(s) in the vignette?
- Why?
- Would you do the same as X?

- Why?

We were particularly interested in the quality of the explanations offered in response to the "Why" questions. Individual written responses to each were scored by the researchers using a four-point scale, as follows:

 0 – no response or mere restatement of the question;

 1 – a basic explanation with minimal or no justification;

 2 – an explanation with some justification, a degree of elaboration and some evidence of empathy or alternative perspective taking;

 3 – a considered and elaborate explanation with justification and evidence of empathy and alternative perspective taking.

Broadly speaking, both cognitive aspects, namely, complexity, degree of elaboration (Daniel, 2008) and affective aspects, namely, degree of empathy, social perspective taking and prosocial moral reasoning (e.g. Eisenberg and Miller 1987) of decision making were amalgamated in this composite measure.

Each child received a score of between 0 and 3 for each of the three dilemmas presented both before (Time 1) and after (Time 2) the intervention. Scoring was carried out by the two researchers acting as judges who discussed and agreed the score for each individual response. The three scores were aggregated to provide an overall score for quality of explanation in the range 0 to 9 for each child at Time 1 and at Time 2.

An example of a child's explanation which scored '1' would be as in the following illustration. In response to being asked (at Time 1) why, from several alternatives, he would choose a charity which helps families whose homes have been destroyed by floods in other parts of the world to benefit from a school fundraising activity, an eleven year-old child in one school simply wrote, "because I want most people who can get a home to live in one but their homes are demolished".

By contrast, the same child in response to a parallel vignette (presented at Time 2), wrote that he would wish his class to take part in donating toys to send to families in countries where there have been serious earthquakes and provided the following explanation: 'because the sick children will probably get cards off their family, old folks will get schools to come and sing for them, so to donate toys would be good. Nobody gives them toys, they only worry about giving them food'. This response was given a score of "3" because it was more elaborate, considered the problem more widely and demonstrated an awareness of the needs of others.

The vignettes exercise was seen as a convenient task to provide a simple assessment of the quality of the reasons and explanations children provide when asked to make decisions on how to act in described situations. It is acknowledged that the written nature of the task may be seen as a limitation on the younger children, but the measures adopted emphasised the quality of the reasons given rather than the children's aptitude in writing. For the very youngest children, the teacher read the vignettes and scribed the children's response.

Interviews with children

After completing the final vignette activity a sample of children were interviewed in order to elicit their reflections on their own learning and the degree to which they felt they had developed self-efficacy, personal agency and the capability to engage as a citizen. A boy and a girl were selected at random from each participating primary class and interviewed individually (N=8); the secondary school-aged children were interviewed in four focus groups with between six and eight members. All interviews were recorded and fully transcribed for content analysis.

Findings

Teachers' definitions

While it is acknowledged that there is no clear definition of citizenship in relation to *CfE* amongst Scottish teachers (Akhtar 2010), it was considered worthwhile to explore with the teachers in the study what they understood citizenship to mean and the skills or attributes they consider children need to acquire to be citizens under the definition they provided.

All of the teachers, except one, talked in their definition of the importance of being a part of a community or society and that this was not simply society at its most immediate. Comments such as citizenship involves a 'Sense of duty to work together for the common good' (Karen) were common with the teachers highlighting actions for the benefit of society and a focus away from the individual. This particular teacher also highlighted that there would be "a strong sense of belonging" in such a community. This idea of community is further emphasised by the use of the terms 'responsibility' and 'duty'. With the exception of one teacher, all definitions considered the role of responsibilities and/or duties to work with others or to respect and tolerate others. Moral behaviour is mentioned by several of the teachers, some referring to being a citizen being "Similar to what I think is a 'good' person" (Louise) and others drawing upon the 'Golden Rule'. Indeed, the idea of respect and tolerance is recorded by more than half of the teachers with two of them introducing the idea of respect for the environment and/or property. While seven of the eight teachers mentioned participation in some form or other, such as 'Play active and responsible role by voicing and expressing own opinions and ideas by appropriate means and actively challenging injustices and inequalities', only one teacher restricted his comments to the political sphere, in line with that argued by Biesta (2008). This teacher provided an extended definition and described the ideal state as 'egalitarian and democratic' and that citizenship involved 'political awareness with the aim of influencing or rejecting social policy meaningfully in thoughtful ways' (Scott). This very much resonates with the issues raised by Westheimer and Kahne (2004), that the notion of the justice-oriented citizen was not pervasive amongst teachers, though many acknowledge community and elements of participation. No distinction, however, could be made between those teachers that worked in different settings in terms of their definitions. Only one teacher offered a definition specifically focused on children and adopted the deficit model of children

in a state of becoming by suggesting that citizenship was about 'Pupils developing skills that will prepare them for adulthood' (Chloe).

In relation to the skills or attributes that the teachers thought would equip children to be citizens there was again, much accord. Of course, this may be because they were a self-selecting group in under-taking the PwC post-graduate course but this does not necessitate that they share the same values, although it is clear that they all value developing children's thinking. The majority of the teachers elaborated on the need for being able to think with comments such as "ability to communicate their own opinions and ideas with considered reasons; ability to evaluate information and ideas and to think critically and creatively". Indeed, all of the teachers stressed the need for justification in asserting views or opinions and that it was equally important to listen to the views of others and to treat these views with respect. Two of the teachers suggested that creativity would be an important area to be developed in children and young people and this creativity related to being creative in thought as well as in the more traditional realms. It is perhaps possible that since the teachers were all PwC practitioners and valued thinking that they may tend more toward the justice-oriented citizen, but there was no clear evidence that situated the perspectives of any of the teachers in alignment with just one of Westheimer and Kuhne's (2004) models.

The affective dimension of citizenship was clear in the definitions, with teachers talking about behaviour towards others in terms of having 'good manners [and being] caring and helpful' (Melissa) or demonstrating 'kindness, sincerity and compassion towards others' (Scott). The political dimension, evident in only one of the definitions explicitly, was more in evidence in the comments pertaining to skills and attributes that children need to acquire. Six of the teachers elaborated on skills or attributes that would go some way towards making children more politically literate and engaged. Some mentioned active participation while others suggested that there needed to be an 'awareness of the bigger picture' (Karen) or, put another way, 'awareness of community, local and international issues' (Kimberley) with the added dimension, mentioned more than once, that children should be taught to 'work together to establish a fair and just community' (Melissa). The teacher who had initially recorded the most overtly political definition of citizenship shared much of the other teachers' views, but he went further in proposing that it was important that children 'resolve to treat authority with cooperation but with respectful lack of veneration' (Scott). He further stressed that children should be taught to have 'open minds' and that 'anyone (including self) can be wrong or uncertain with no fear of that' but that children should be encouraged to 'persevere with good moral arguments over all influences'. This was perhaps the most emancipatory approach to education for citizenship of those briefly articulated by the teachers. This teacher teaches in a secondary school, but those in the primary and informal education sector also spoke about the political dimensions of citizenship.

It can clearly be seen that the teachers share many aspects of their definitions as well as the skills and attributes they consider necessary in relation to citizenship. Other than the comment recorded above that set children apart from adults, there were no contributions that were in complete discord. In light of the literature

suggesting that teachers have failed to come to an agreed definition or understanding of what is meant by citizenship and, even, 'responsible citizenship', this evident degree of agreement is perhaps encouraging as CfE continues to be rolled out across the age range 3-18. Granted the number of teachers is small and these individuals probably share some of the same values in terms of education and working with children and, perhaps, of their own role in society, it is hard to make great claims about the wider teaching population in Scotland.

Children and what is a responsible citizen?

At the beginning of each interview, both when these were conducted as a focus group or as a whole class, the children were asked what they thought the teacher meant when s/he used the phrase 'responsible citizen'. Given that all schools, and in many individual classes, there are signs and displays entitled 'Responsible Citizens' or children wear stickers that they have been awarded saying things like 'I am a responsible citizen', it would seem appropriate to gauge children's understanding of the phrase that is repeated as a mantra.

In the first instance, many of those interviewed – no matter their age – were unclear what the term meant. Some of the very young children specifically said they didn't know. When the classroom signage was pointed out to them and they were asked what it meant some children talked about good behaviour or doing the right thing. Children across the age ranges talked about being kind and trustworthy or helping or thinking about others. One child in a primary three class (aged seven) suggested that it meant one was important and his reason for this was that a responsible citizen in school was someone who represented the views of others such as two of the children in his class who were on the eco-committee in the school. This was similar in type to Stuart's, one of the children's, definitions who talked about teaching others, giving an example of older children working with children in the nursery within the school to teach them about caring for their environment. Interestingly, there were more comments from the children about citizenship in terms of environmental protection than from their teachers. Perhaps, then, it might be suggested that the children have worked out their own definitions of responsible citizenship from the information gleaned from what their teachers say and do. However, the two children in these examples were in the classes of the two teachers that specifically highlighted caring for the environment as part of their citizenship definition, so these teachers may have been more explicit in their work with the children about citizenship and the environment. Having said this, however, the environment was the context provided by the two children in the examples and their notion of citizenship related more to representation of others' views and teaching others about things considered important. These children seem to have been able to contextualise citizenship in some way in their everyday lives.

While many of the children's comments were similar to those of their teachers, they were, in the main, more explicit about political and social matters than the teachers, in the sense that they addressed wider concerns about participation, representation and the voice of others in society as well as issues around the role of the individual in making a community a worthwhile place in which to live. Comments about social responsibility were strongly in evidence with much

emphasis being placed on community work and volunteering; for example: 'Being helpful in your community' (Colin); 'a person who doesn't drop litter or vandalism, helps the community… does volunteer work' (Jason); 'raising a lot of money for her sister's charity' (Caitlin) were typical comments. Theirs was a more positive, participatory and active approach to citizenship with fewer comments about appropriate behaviour or good manners although one of the older children talked about good citizens being law-abiding. Overall, there was a strong sense of community and consideration of others in the responses although none of the children, unlike the teachers, talked explicitly about making decisions or informed choices. Consideration of others was evident in all the interviews, with Jason suggesting that people who are responsible citizens are 'not thinking of themselves – they're thinking of other people'. The younger children made similar comments such as 'they would make sure people are safe' (Ahmed) or 'if someone is off [school] and they are the group leader and the person sitting beside them would take on the group leader's job – they would be a responsible citizen' (Frances). It might be suggested that the children were more sympathetic, in their articulation around the political, to being justice-oriented than their teachers.

Quality of children's explanations before and after involvement in CoPI

A total of 96 children were present at both Time 1 and Time 2 to take part in the written vignettes exercise, which was designed to assess their ability to explain the reasons for the decisions they made in response to the dilemmas portrayed. Since there were no discernible differences between the three different vignettes used in terms of the scores they yielded, the children's scores for the quality of their explanations for the three scenarios at Time 1 were aggregated on a scale from 0 to 9 and compared with aggregate scores for Time 2. The mean scores for the quality of children's explanations at Time 1 and Time 2 for each of the seven participating classes, four (Class 'A', 'B', 'C' and 'D') in primary schools and three ('E', 'F' and 'G') in secondary schools, are shown in Table 1. ANCOVA with quality of explanation score at Time 1 and Time 2 as within-subjects factor, school stage as between-subjects factor and sex as covariate, showed that there was a significant difference in the quality of explanations between Time 1 and Time 2, $F(1, 93) = 28.03$, $p<.001$. There was also a main effect for School Stage, with children in secondary schools scoring higher than primary school children, $F(1, 93) = 20.51$, $p<.001$. There was no interaction between these factors, $F(1,93) = 0.32$, $p=0.575$. Nor was there any significant interaction with sex, Inspection of means for girls and boys in both primary and secondary stages indicated a pattern suggesting girls overall received higher quality of explanation scores than boys, but ANCOVA with sex as between subjects variable and stage as covariate showed that this failed to reach significance, $F(1,93) =3.18$, ns.

Table 1. The quality of children's explanations before (Time 1) and after (Time 2) their involvement in a programme of Community of Philosophical Inquiry in Primary School Classes (age range 5 to 12) and Secondary School Classes (age range 12 to 16).

Class and School Stage	N	Time 1 (Mean)	(s.d)	Time 2 (Mean)	(s.d.)
Primary Schools					
Class 'A'	10	3.80		4.80	
Class 'B'	18	3.33		3.77	
Class 'C'	12	3.33		3.67	
Class 'D'	13	3.15		3.95	
Overall Primary	53	3.38	(0.71)	3.98	(1.01)
Secondary Schools					
Class 'E'	15	3.86		4.67	
Class 'F'	15	3.40		4.80	
Class 'G'	13	4.30		5.00	
Overall Secondary	43	4.07	(1.08)	4.81	(1.07)
Overall	96	3.69	(0.95)	4.35	(1.11)

The findings showed there was a significant improvement in the quality of explanations children gave to justify their decisions in response to social dilemmas when their scores were from before were compared with those following their involvement in the programme of CoPI. While the scale of difference was not great in absolute terms (around one scale point on the nine-point scale), it was encouraging that significant improvement was shown across both primary and secondary school sectors and that the pattern of improvement was consistent across seven diverse classroom settings.

Children's evaluations of their learning in CoPI

Perhaps the richest data came from the discussions with the children in relation to their views about doing CoPI. Children were asked for their views about doing philosophy in the interviews as well as at the end of all the observed sessions with all the children in the group being invited for their views about doing philosophy – both positive and negative views were invited. All children participated in this and none of the children volunteered negative perspectives, despite assurances that these would also be helpful to the study.

All of the children talked about the philosophy sessions making them think harder or deeper with Susan suggesting that 'you need to think like you've never thinked before'. When asked what it meant to think hard or deeply, the children struggled to put this into words but they all expressed it physically with clenched fists or screwed up facial expressions as they tried to articulate what they meant. Many children enjoyed the topics discussed in the sessions and seemed to relish the opportunity to think about things they don't normally get to think about: 'it makes

you think about things that you might not have thought about before now' (Kathryn); 'it gives you the opportunity to think about stuff you wouldn't normally think about with other people' (Jason); 'exploring something that I've not thought about before' (Tony); 'it actually allows me to *think* a lot more than normal… and the ideas that I can bring up, can really help other people, as well as they can come up with ideas from what *I* say, and it'll help me think more. Thus stimulating the brain' (David). Several of the children shared that they carried on the discussions in their own time either with friends or members of their family: 'I use it outside; like Ethan and I and a few friends we also do philosophy. We have philosophical discussions outside of school just for the sake of doing it' (Alex); '…when we are walking home on a Wednesday we all end up discussing something that's been brought up previously and we just discuss it more' (Eddie). The structure of the sessions was important for the children. All made reference to the agree/disagree element of CoPI and liked that they were able to make links to others but that they could discuss things without getting into an argument, shouting or tempers being lost: 'I know now how to argue without like shouting and stuff and just say I disagree with you because…' (Joanne). They suggested that they were *learning* how to agree or disagree. This involved, reported the children, more careful listening, with one child specifically stating that 'During conversations, I sometimes black out and miss half the thing, but in this I listen to *everything*' (John). Listening skills were highlighted across the age range and the children seem to think that this skill is transferable, that listening in CoPI makes one a better listener generally: 'It's made me listen better' (Sophie); '…now I'm listening better and I'm not just butting in; I'm letting people finish what they're saying and instead of, if we're outside [the classroom] just saying what I want to say, I'll wait until the other people say what they want to say and then I'll say it' (Susan); 'Listening to people's ideas and thinking about what you're going to say' (Elspeth). A couple of children suggested that their writing had improved because they were able to think more clearly about what they wanted to write, for example, Patrick said that 'you learn more words and you understand a bit more about what you are going to write'; 'in English we were doing this essay… I ended up getting a one for it, but I would never have written something or anything like that if I hadn't started this [CoPI]' (Patricia).

All of the children reported enjoying hearing others' views. Indeed, many spoke at length about how important they thought it was to hear other perspectives and to try out their own thinking and ideas: 'I like that fact that you can, *get* your own opinions across and *hear* everyone else's opinions' (Davina); 'if you're in here then you've got opinions that people can give you feedback on' (John); 'you can debate stuff and you can have a wee argument but share your thoughts with people and they can listen to you and you can listen to them' (Stuart); 'it's fun to share ideas, or look at people, but share ideas' (Elspeth). They thought it important that they hear alternative viewpoints or opinions and that this helped to create more of an 'open mind' with David suggesting that 'it makes you think, in more that one way, which will open your mind a bit wider, and eventually you will come up with a *really* good argument'. The children made comments that demonstrated an appreciation of the range of responses offered and enjoyed that there were no conclusions to the questions under discussion. Some children really relished that the philosophy sessions created doubt and this facilitated a more questioning or

challenging approach to things generally, with Jason suggesting that 'you tend to think about yourself, what other people's points of view are and ... you question yourself'. Indeed, the idea was presented that the children felt that they were thinking about things rather than simply raising questions and that it was this challenging of ideas that was important: 'when you're thinking about your beliefs and then you hear what other people have to think, and you can take that into consideration, it can maybe even change the way *you* think' (Malcolm); 'if I read that [the session's stimulus] and I hadn't done CoPI, I wouldn't think anything about it, but now you think about it and you question stuff and wonder *why* you do stuff but I wouldn't usually do that. I would have just read something and just, read it and not have bothered with it' (Helen). It was important to the children that, while challenging views counter to their own, they were accepting of difference and that this helped in understanding other people: 'it helps you get to know people a lot more and what they think' (Carole). The children all seemed to be fully aware that reasons were important in presenting one's views; this is promoted in the structure of CoPI where participants must provide reasons for their agreement or disagreement. Further, as seen in Malcolm's example above, this also meant, according to the children, that this often led to them questioning themselves and having the opportunity to change their minds.

Many of the children talked about the structure and learning how to argue helped them avoid conflict, that they would be able to structure an argument but also that considered that they were more likely now than before participating in CoPI to think about consequences more carefully before acting. This meant, they said, that they were analysing problems more carefully, having patience to think things through, and trying to make sound decisions based on this analysis and deliberation: '...analysing a problem if it comes and thinking of all the different possibilities if it would happen and what I was going to do if it did happen' (Eric). Indeed, several children discussed the dilemmas or decisions in their lives that their philosophical experiences had helped them to make, for example, one boy in third year at secondary school illustrated this view clearly when he explained the career choice he was wrestling with that presented him with a real moral dilemma of leaving home with the possibility of never returning and causing his family worry, and potentially grief. Others talked about similar situations with even the primary aged children suggesting that having done philosophy they would be better able to consider their subject choices when they go to secondary school. A common response was that the children thought that having done CoPI they were more likely to deliberate before they acted: 'instead of just jumping to a conclusion and giving an answer straight away it helps you think through it and actually take into account what the consequences are and what could happen' (Davina); '...in the way I answer questions now I think on the philosophy side of answering questions instead of just saying a simple answer' (Monica) or when Stuart talked about finding himself in a difficult situation, '...when you go to secondary school you will have harder choices and bigger choices to make, because people can push you into stuff, like peer pressure, and you can just think about it and stand up for yourself and say no, I'm not going to do that because I've thought about it and I know the consequences of it'.

Discussion and Conclusions

Responsible, philosophical citizens?

Certainly, if we are to consider the curricular strand of 'Responsible Citizen', then there is much to be drawn from the children's comments that might lead us to suggest that CoPI supports citizenship. Certainly, according to their own definitions and the examples provided by the children, they see themselves as citizens with none of the children suggesting that they were not engaged in the life of their community, at a local or wider level. Indeed, there was much discussion around engagement and participation with others and for the benefit of others. The youngest children were surprised at the suggestion that older children or adults might think that they weren't able to do philosophy, with Elspeth exclaiming, 'Watch and see!' Some children, particularly the older children, thought that some adults might have a problem with 'their kid questioning their authority in thinking they know something and they can prove it better than they can' (Alex). Indeed, another boy in the class suggested that 'it's not just simply asking the question that makes you rebellious' (Eric) with another of the class positing that 'questioning something all the time could be a form of rebellion' (Eddie). Even this brief exchange indicates that the children are aware of the political problem of being a child and the ways in which they are permitted to engage in their society.

All of the children, from their discussions, appeared to be well aware of the wider world and the implications and consequences of their decisions and behaviour. Many of the vignettes also suggest an awareness and understanding of issues beyond the immediate scope of the children in the study. Certainly the children saw a link between their participation in CoPI and their ability to make decisions. For some, the decisions were complicated in themselves, but the philosophy helped them 'think things through before acting'. They appreciated the opportunity to hear a range of perspectives and even enjoyed being disagreed with and disagreeing with others; there was no expression of the view that everyone should agree all the time or that only agreement was good 'I've learned quite a lot because disagreeing and agreeing is kind of important in life' (Amanda).

Doing philosophy may not make children – or adults, for that matter – responsible citizens. It may, however, help children to 'make informed choices and decisions'; aiding them, further, to 'develop informed, ethical views of complex issues' (Scottish Executive, 2004). It may help in both these aspects of responsible citizenship because it furnishes the children with the cognitive skills identified by McCall (1991) and Gregory (2008).

Additionally, while the children are supported, through their participation in CoPI, in developing their cognitive skills, it is important not to lose sight of elements of citizenship that demand other skills than the purely cognitive. Gregory (2008) pointed to the affective dimension of citizenship. Clearly, in discussion with the children themselves, and from the vignettes, it can be seen that the children were aware of the cognitive elements of being a citizen but they were equally assured of the emotional and empathetic nature of citizenship. Further, they asserted strongly, in all interviews and in the more open discussions, that doing philosophy –

practising CoPI – helped them in the cognitive and affective domains. It must be stated that cognitive skills are necessary in promoting citizenship but these are not sufficient conditions if schools are to promote 'responsible' citizenship. The affective domain, or emotion, cannot be ignored. Children live in a society and as present citizens their emotional skills must also be nurtured. What this study has shown is that the children participating in CoPI had a notion of what they understood citizenship to be and that the skills acquired through CoPI would help them be responsible citizens.

The data collected in the interviews, which clearly indicates that children considered they had learned a lot through participation in CoPI, is, therefore, consistent with the results of the vignette tasks, namely, that the children made significant cognitive gains in terms of improvement in the quality of explanations they provided when asked to make decisions on how to act in described situations before and after a period of eight to ten weeks of involvement in CoPI in their classrooms. Since the measure adopted combined cognitive and affective aspects of informed decision-making and the articulation of views in relation to complex issues, this finding is consistent both with the view of Lipman (2003) who demands what he describes as 'caring thinking' and with the findings of Topping and Trickey (2007) whose study demonstrated the cognitive benefits of children's engagement in philosophical dialogue.

Biesta's (2008) concern is that the notion of responsible citizenship as outlined in *CfE* is dominated by individualism and the social dimensions of citizenship and 'runs the danger that the political dimensions of citizenship, including an awareness of the limitations of personal responsibility for effective political action and change, remain invisible and unattainable for children and young people' (45). A view that may be shared by Westheimer and Kahne when they suggest that when teachers focus only on 'personal responsibility (and if discussions of personal responsibility are disconnected from analysis of the social, economic, and political context), we may well be reinforcing a conservative and often individualistic notion of citizenship' (2004 264). This may be addressed by aspects of CoPI. Children need to acquire the skills necessary for political engagement but through philosophical dialogue children are able to answer Biesta's (2008) accusation that children do not, through *CfE*, or schooling more generally, have opportunities to engage with the plurality of views and values inherent in living in society. This notion of the political in the Scottish curriculum does not pertain to the likes of participation in political parties and structural decision-making, though it might provide information about such structures and processes. Instead, political, for children in Scotland, means engagement with a range of perspectives and having the opportunity to interrogate contrasting value positions. Indeed, given the limited opportunities afforded to children in Scottish schools and wider society the structure of CoPI permits just such dialogue. Indeed, one of the observed sessions for this study recorded children discussing the question raised by them: *Can you ever really be free?* This dialogue was very political in terms of content with free speech, laws and legal restrictions, rights, religion and the freedom of nations being considered.

The issue perhaps remains that, while children can be taught the tools required for citizenship and engagement in society, and although they are able to explore questions that allow them to examine a range of issues related to citizenship and to experience and engage with a wide range of perspectives, there is the fundamental problem of their being children. As children, their status is such that they are not sufficiently empowered (Qvortrup 2006, 2007; Author 2007, 2011; Roose and Bouverne-de-Bie 2007; James 2008;). This, however, is a larger problem that cannot be solved by education for citizenship or CoPI alone. What we can say for now, concurs with Nussbaum's view that 'Democracies all over the world are undervaluing, and consequently neglecting skills that we all badly need to keep democracies vital, respectful and accountable' (2010, 77) and that 'within the reach of any community that respects the minds of children and the needs of a developing democracy' (76) lies the likes of CoPI that may go some way to developing these skills.

It is an interesting time in Scotland. There is an impending referendum on Scottish independence in 2014. This brings with it greater opportunities for children to participate politically, in the sense that Biesta (2008) suggests is missing; the radical decision has been adopted that children of sixteen and seventeen years of age will be included in the electorate for the first time and will truly have a say in Scotland's future. Scottish education must, therefore, address ways in which the citizens of Scotland are educated. If teachers' views of citizenship and the skills associated with it are divergent, then we should not be surprised by the apparent lack of consistency in delivery of this part of the curriculum identified as a problem by Biesta (2008). However, the common theme underlying the teachers' definitions in this study was the need for citizens to be able to think for themselves, critically and creatively. This aligns with the proposition that there is a role for Philosophy with Children in the Scottish curriculum.

References

Akhtar, S. 2010. The Understanding, Perspectives and Attitudes of Scottish Primary School Teachers Towards Education for Citizenship. Ed.D. thesis. University of Strathclyde.

Annette, J. 2009. 'Active learning for active citizenship': democratic citizenship and lifelong learning. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 4(2), 149-160.
Author. 2007. *Thinking Children*. London: Continuum.

Author. 2008. Philosophical citizens – a contradiction in terms? *Critical & Creative Thinking*, 16 (2), 5-21.

Author 2012. Children's status, children's rights and 'dealing with' children. *International Journal of Children's Rights* 20(1), 57-71.

Author. 2013. "Scottish Primary Education: Philosophy and Practice." In *Scottish Education 4th Edition: Referendum*, edited by T.G.K. Bryce, W.M. Humes, D. Gillies & A. Kennedy, 39-49. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Biesta, G. 2008. What kind of citizen? What kind of democracy? Citizenship education and the Scottish Curriculum for Excellence. *Scottish Educational Review* 40(2), 38-52.

Biesta, G., R. Lawy and N. Kelly. 2009. Understanding young people's citizenship learning in everyday life: the role of contexts, relationships and dispositions. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 4(1), 5-24.

Buck, A. and B. Geissel. 2009. The education ideal of the democratic citizen in Germany: challenges and changing trends. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 4(3), 225-243.

Cleghorn, P. 2002. *Thinking Through Philosophy.* Blackburn: Educational Printing Services.

Crick, B. 1999. The presuppositions of citizenship education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 33(3), 337-352.

Daniel, M-F. 2008. Learning to philosophize: positive impacts and conditions for implementation a synthesis of 10 years of research (1995 - 2005). *Thinking* 18(4), 36-48.

Education Scotland. 2013. *Education for Citizenship*. Glasgow: Learning and Teaching Scotland. Accessed at http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/learningteachingandassessment/learningacrossthecurriculum/themesacrosslearning/globalcitizenship/educationforcitizenship/index.asp

Eisenberg, N. and P. Miller. 1987. The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin* 101(1), 91-119.

Fernández, C. and M. Sundström. 2011. Citizenship education and liberalism: a state of the debate analysis 1990-2010. *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 30, 363-384.

Gregory, M. 2008. Philosophy in schools: ideals, challenges and opportunities. *Critical and Creative Thinking* 16(1), 5-22.

Howe, R.B. and K. Covell. 2010. Miseducating children about their rights. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 5(2), 91-102.

James, A. L. 2008. Children, the UNCRC, and Family Law in England and Wales. *Family Court Review* 46(1), 53-64.

Kisby, B. 2009. Social capital and citizenship lessons in England: Analysing the presuppositions of citizenship education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 4(1), 41-62.

Learning and Teaching Scotland. 2002. *Education for Citizenship in Scotland: a Paper for Discussion and Development*. Dundee: Learning and Teaching Scotland.

Learning and Teaching Scotland (Now Education Scotland). 2011. *Education for Citizenship*. Glasgow: Learning and Teaching Scotland. Accessed at http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/learningteachingandassessment/learningacross thecurriculum/themesacrosslearning/globalcitizenship/about/educationforcit izenship/index.asp)

Lipman, M. 2003. *Thinking in Education (2nd edition)*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCall, C. 1991. *Stevenson Lectures on Citizenship*. (Glasgow, University of Glasgow).

Osler, A. and H. Starkey. 2003. Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review* 55(3), 243-254.

Nussbaum, M. 2010. *Not for Profit. Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Qvortrup , J. 2006. Editorial: Are children subjects or a liability? *Childhood* 13(4), 435-439.

Qvortrup , J. 2007. Editorial: A reminder *Childhood* 14(4), 395-400.

Rapoport, A. 2010. We cannot teach what we don't know: Indiana teachers talk about global citizenship education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 5(3), 179-190.

Rondhuis, T. and K. van der Leeuw. 2000. Performance and progress in philosophy: an attempt at operationalisation of criteria. *Teaching Philosophy* 23(1), 23-42.

Roose , R. and M. Bouverne-de-Bie. 2007. Do children have rights or do their rights have to be realised? The UNCRC as a frame of reference for pedagogical action. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 41(3), 431-443.

Scottish Education Department. 1965. *Primary Education in Scotland*. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Scottish Executive. 2004. *A Curriculum for Excellence*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Office Education Department. 1987. *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the 90s*. Edinburgh: SOED.

Topping, K.J. and S. Trickey. 2007. Collaborative philosophical enquiry for school children: cognitive effects at 10-12 years. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 77(2), 271-288.

Trickey, S. 2008. 'More than cognitive': reflections on the components of the Clackmannanshire Thinking Project. *Critical & Creative Thinking* 16(1), 23-43.

Westheimer,J. and J. Kahne. 2004. What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal* 41(2), 237-269.