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INTRODUCTION

I welcome the opportunity to write about the place of values in Civics and Citizenship education. Adopting a rigorous and balanced approach to the nature and teaching of values is an essential ingredient of any educational enterprise; all the more so when that enterprise focuses on fundamental questions of personal, social and cultural identity.

I was also invited to address the pedagogy of Civics and Citizenship education, in collaboration with Suzanne Mellor and Michael Elliott. While my research in this area is reflected in a separate, joint submission on pedagogy, I also take up that issue in the present paper, for the simple but fundamental reason that there is an intrinsic link between values and pedagogy. This link has two aspects:

- the teaching of values calls for a specific pedagogy which can be referred to as critical pedagogy (Ukpokodu 1994), a pedagogy of conversation (Common 1994), or the transformation of the classroom into a community of inquiry (Fields 1995; Splitter and Sharp 1995)

- our own understanding of such key concepts and values as citizenship, democracy and freedom commits educators, morally and ethically, to this same pedagogic framework

In the first part of the paper, I characterise and speak to a particular understanding of values. In the second part, I focus on the implications of this understanding for the pedagogy of civics and citizenship.

VALUES

Values as outcomes of inquiry

Based on my own work in the area (Splitter and Sharp 1995), as well as extensive reading of relevant literature, I offer the following characterisation:

Values are fundamental concepts and institutions which are judged to be both worthwhile and desirable, and which serve as guiding principles in decision-making and action. Values – whether personal, civic/societal or universal – are neither whims, impulses, tastes or subjective preferences, nor fixed rules or dogmas to be handed down from one generation to the next. They are the constructed outcomes of processes of critical reflection and self-correction

Construed in this way, values represent both content and process:

- The values we hold and cherish signal where we stand on significant – content-laden – issues. In the context of civics and citizenship, such issues include freedom, democratic participation, justice, tolerance, fairness, equality, cultural diversity, peace, ecological balance, ... They are also reflected in such life-affirming questions as “What kind of world do we want to live in?”, “How can we determine what is really worthwhile?” “How can we reconcile economic and ethical considerations?” (Nussbaum and Sen 1993; Sen 1987; Tamir 1993) and “What is it for a human being to live well?” (Nussbaum 1990).

- At the same time, values are nurtured and sustained as values by such cognitive, affective and normative processes as: reflective thinking, questioning, empathy, reasoning,
dialogue, imagination, decision-making and judgement; together with a range of dispositions including: curiosity, fair-mindedness, respect for others, care, intellectual courage, persistence, .... These processes are key determinants of pedagogy – all the more so when we are dealing with civics and citizenship – and will be discussed below. For ease of terminology, I will categorise these processes under the heading inquiry, characterised as follows (Splitter and Sharp 1995):

Inquiry is a form of self-correcting and self-conscious practice which is driven by a desire to transform that which is intriguing, contestable, confused, ambiguous or fragmentary into a unified whole which is satisfying to those involved.

In this paper, my focus is that area of inquiry which is directed toward clarifying, exploring, analysing and (as appropriate) modifying the concepts, attitudes, problems and values associated with civics and citizenship. In a broad sense, the outcomes of inquiry are judgements (including, but not only, judgements of value), which may be characterised as the settlement or determination of that which was previously unsettled, indeterminate or problematic. Judgements represent significant moments, or plateaus, in thinking, rather than final conclusions (Splitter and Sharp 1995).

Input to values

If, as I am suggesting, we think of values as judgements, and hence as the outcomes of inquiry, what are its inputs, starting-points or background elements? That is, what are the ingredients which have to be taken into account when we think about values (or, as in the case of teachers and parents, encourage others to think about them)?

These “starting points” are, at bottom, our own beliefs, attitudes and perceptions, gleaned from a combination of personal reflection, family, peer and media influences, schooling, religion, etc. In the present context, these elements – which may be no more than deeply-rooted feelings or opinions – relate to issues of individual freedom and power, the nature and role of governments, schools, religion and other institutions, the importance of economic indicators, law and order, environmental tensions, friendship, discrimination and tolerance, multiculturalism (Gutmann 1994), social responsibilities and duties, free trade versus protectionism, work leisure and unemployment, striving for self-esteem, a sense of national identity, ....

These elements are always a matter of perception and interpretation. I am not saying that it is impossible to give a factual description of how things are. What I am alluding to is the familiar point that all so-called facts and descriptions have both a semantic and a normative dimension: they depend on how we see and interpret them, in light of our existing beliefs and attitudes. Or, to use a more familiar – albeit misleading – terminology, nothing (including education itself) we do or see is entirely “value-free”.

To claim, for example, that Australians (or the Australian media, at any rate) are obsessed with matters economic, or that our culture is becoming “Asianised”, or that our young people are largely ignorant of civic affairs, or that the question of Australia becoming a republic is important (Civics Expert Group 1994; Cox 1995; Senate 1995), is already to reflect a range of perceptions and interpretations which are morally-loaded. We are, after all, moral agents: the question to consider is not how to escape or avoid “values” in a futile drive to attain a value-free objectivity, but how to think more wisely, more judiciously, more reasonably.

Highlighting the term “values” in these paragraphs reveals a loose thread which must now be tightened. It is a cliché, particularly, in education, that everything is “value-laden”, by which it is meant, presumably, that our moral attitudes and beliefs are part and parcel of how we perceive and understand things. There are important implications here for civics and citizenship education, and in particular for the misleading idea that something called “civic knowledge” is at the heart of such an education. Like values, knowledge is also a process of
construction (Common 1994; Northfield and Symington 1991; Splitter and Sharp 1995; Young 1992), and it is through education that young people become engaged in this process. To “teach” someone civic “knowledge” is to subject them to the all-too-familiar process of absorbing and regurgitating that which has already been deemed to be true and/or important. This is not so much education as (attempted) indoctrination, which has no place in a syllabus which claims to be educating young people in, and for, a democracy (Mahood 1988).

There is, however, another step to be made here. It involves combining the point that nothing is “value-free” with my earlier claim that values, themselves, are outcomes of a constructive and deliberative process (viz inquiry), not the inputs into that process. What follows is that those beliefs, attitudes and perceptions which feed our interpretations of events and situations do not deserve to be called values unless and until they have emerged as the reflective outcomes of inquiry. Genuine values cannot be “handed down” (like heirlooms) or transmitted from one generation to the next; they must be constructed anew by every person in every generation. To be sure, the materials used in this construction will include those beliefs and attitudes held by parents, teachers and text books, but the point is that in the construction, they will be transformed into values. In the absence of a constructive process of inquiry, these beliefs and attitudes will persist as nothing more than a rag-bag of biases and prejudices.

Consider, for example, some of the “values” generally held to be at the core of any civics and citizenship syllabus. It could plausibly be argued that such concepts as democracy and citizenship will figure prominently, just because the question “What does it mean to be an educated citizen in a democratic society?” is behind the drive to improve education in this area. Further, these concepts are among those which lie at the very heart of education itself which is – or should be – concerned with the advancement of democratic citizenship (Common 1994).

The problem is that notwithstanding the widespread belief that democracy is, indeed, a core value of civics and citizenship, it cannot simply be incorporated per se into a pedagogic framework and conveyed to students as a “starting point”. The reason is that it can only attain the status of a value for students when they have internalised it via the processes of inquiry and come to their own conclusions as to its significance and application. To warrant a place in an educational framework, the concept of democracy – whose meaning, as it happens, is far from clear – must be seen as dynamic rather than static.

It is for this reason that we should view with considerable scepticism any attempt to identify the “core values” of civics and citizenship as the focal point of an educational program (as in, for example, Clark 1996; Hill 1966; Patrick 1987). It is entirely legitimate to present teachers and students with various interpretations of key terms, in so far as these represent considered and respected views of what is judged to be important. But we want both teachers and students to examine, and enlarge upon (Matthews 1987) the concepts beliefs, attitudes, perceptions) which they regard as most central, and not merely to accept someone else’s view of things. To put this in other words: we should encourage students to explore various perspectives and belief systems as to what is at the core of civics and citizenship. But we should also encourage them to determine and examine what they themselves believe and feel about these and other concepts; that is, to understand that their interpretation is something to be arrived at by a process of reflective judgement.

It is important to understand what I am not saying here. I am not saying that teachers and students should rest content with an expression of their own beliefs and attitudes, seeking at most to articulate these. This is reminiscent of the pedagogy known as “values clarification” which stands condemned on two connected grounds: (i) if all we do is clarify what we think and feel, then we should not dignify the outcomes with the term “values”; and (ii) articulation and clarification are merely the tip of the iceberg when it comes to identifying the rich array of procedures which constitute values inquiry or ethical education (Weinstein 1991). Furthermore, any syllabus which does not seek maximum input from all those
involved reflects both a lack of respect to those students who do have views of their own, and considerable naivety on the part of those who think that they can change deep-rooted beliefs and attitudes without taking these same elements into account (Patt 1987; Splitter and Sharp 1995; Whitehead 1929).

I am also not saying that there should be no restrictions or safeguards on what is presented to students as input to the process of inquiry. It is surely offensive to find misrepresentations and distortions of history being fed to students in the expectation that they will carry such myths into their own belief systems. Conley and Osborne cite texts which would have Canadian students believe that the history of civic and political life is one of “consensus and beneficence rather than conflict and cleavage” (Conley and Osborne 1983). The offence is clear to those who value truth-telling over lying. Moreover, as Conley and Osborne aptly point out, the expectation is likely to backfire when students – already inclined to take a cynical approach to their schooling – discover that the reality is, in fact, quite different.

Values as contestable

This example points to a key aspect of civics and citizenship education which bears both on the nature of values and on pedagogy. Writers have emphasised the importance of representing to students the role of difference and conflict in shaping the social framework (Common 1994; Conley and Osborne 1983; Osborne 1982). They point out that teachers tend to avoid controversy, focusing instead on those things for which there is agreement or consensus. But students must understand the nature of difference if they are to transform conflict and tension into something which is both dynamic and creative (Sharp 1991). In this regard, personal, social and national understanding may be more important than complete unity and agreement (Hodgetts 1968).

The relevance to values is that, like all interesting and worthwhile concepts, they are inevitably contestable; there just is no clearly agreed-upon set of meanings for such terms as freedom, democracy, human rights, social justice and ecological sustainability. No one has the right to fix the sense of these terms in advance of inviting students to reflect upon their meanings in the context of their own lives (although we do have a right and, perhaps, an obligation, to offer particular definitions and interpretations as part of the input to inquiry).

The relevance to pedagogy is that we need to encourage students to experience the creative tension that comes from examining problematic concepts and engaging conflicting perspectives, while maintaining respect for those who own them. Teaching can be seen as “an honourable form of essential negotiation between generations in a world where ambiguity and choice have to be faced honestly” (Gammage 1996).

As an educator, what I would bring to the study of the core concepts in a civics and citizenship syllabus can be divided into two categories:

1. A rich and broad variety of experiences and perceptions relating to how the concepts are understood and applied. I should call upon the students themselves for input, in addition to inviting them to consider prominent opinions and texts from times ancient (eg Classical Greece) to modern (eg Australia in the 1990s). It would be appropriate, for example, to cite for discussion the three “principles” of democracy, as outlined in the SOSE profile (viz. social justice, democratic process and ecologically sustainable development); but no less so to introduce students to some of the ideas in Plato’s Republic, “still the classic text of political education” (Osborne 1982). The latter is, perhaps, more likely to draw attention to the nexus between democracy, questioning, and thinking for oneself (Splitter and Sharp 1995).

6 Throughout this paper, my own value stance is either stated or implied. This is entirely consistent with the position for which I am arguing here, as long as (i) I arrived at these values via inquiry, and (ii) I remain committed to the idea that they might need refinement through further inquiry.
2. A pedagogic structure which urges students to build upon this rich, but potentially confusing, array of perspectives with a view to constructing their own reasoned judgements of the significance of specific values and concepts.

**A democratic environment?**

Against this somewhat ideal picture is the reality that for many young people, their most striking experience of democracy – or, rather, of the absence of democracy – takes place in the home (a topic beyond the immediate scope of this paper) and at school. Neither we nor they are entirely ignorant of what democratic institutions might be like, and a school/classroom which operates along strongly authoritarian and competitive lines is hardly likely to succeed in conveying a democratic ethos (Common 1994). Even more seriously, such an environment will not empower students with the skills they need in order to become, and behave as, democratic citizens.

Two pieces of research can be cited here. The first sought responses to a range of social and civic issues from two groups of English students: those at a “traditional” school and those at a more “democratic” school (John and Osborn 1992). Notwithstanding some interesting differences between the two groups of responses – particularly with respect to attitudes towards democracy (stronger in the second group) – John and Osborn report that “all the sample saw the ideal citizen as being conservative, passive and private... Even voting at a general election was ranked below obedience to the law, working hard and paying taxes regularly” (John and Osborn 1992). They go on, pessimistically, to support the claim that “Given the nature of our political system, a political education .... is likely to be education for quiescence.” Those who believe that this characterisation of good citizenship is, at best, narrow, and at worst, at odds with a more dynamic conception of democratic citizenship, face the challenge of acknowledging and valuing the views offered by students, while at the same time provoking them to think that there may be alternative ways of defining their place in society.

The second piece of research puts a somewhat different slant on the way young people think about citizenship. Dynneson proposes a list of ten characteristics associated with good citizenship, and reports on a survey involving more than seven hundred senior high school (US) students (Dynneson 1992). The picture here is rather more encouraging, for it reveals that while knowledge of government and participation in school and community affairs are not regarded as prerequisites of good citizenship, possessing an ability to make wise decisions and being concerned for the welfare of others – are considered of paramount importance. As the author states, “the responses seem to indicate that students relate good citizenship to social education to a greater extent than to political education.” Dynneson’s conclusion provide convenient gate-way in to the notion of pedagogy which must take seriously the task of teaching for wise decision-making and good judgement.

**PEDAGOGY**

**Teaching and respecting values**

Along with many other writers, I have defended the idea that education for democratic citizenship requires the transformation of classrooms into communities of inquiry. Given the specific focus of this paper, I shall speak to this issue in relation to the question of how educators should both teach and respect the values associated with civics and citizenship.

---

7 The concept of community of inquiry is at the heart of Philosophy for Children. Journals such as *Thinking: The Journal of Philosophy for Children*, *Analytic Teaching and Critical and Creative Thinking: The Australasian Journal of Philosophy for Children* contain numerous papers dealing with this idea. See also Sharp 1991, Lipman 1988, 1991 and, especially, Splitter and Sharp 1995. Expressions such as “community of concern” (Darling 1994) and “community of investigation” can be taken as expressing a similar concept.
As explained above, I reject the view that as a key step in specifying an appropriate framework for the teaching of values, we need to provide a list – hierarchical, tabular or otherwise – of “core values”. To reiterate, any such list will, at best, constitute one form of input into a constructive process whose output might be expected to yield genuine values.

For similar reasons, I would urge a cautious response to the prevailing idea (Civics Expert Group 1994) that education in civics and citizenship consists, above all, in specifying, writing and utilising appropriate curriculum materials. In the absence of an appropriate pedagogy, no materials can do the job.

On the other hand, given the overwhelming temptation to draw a connection between citizenship and democracy (in particular, democratic process), identifying the first step in the argument for an appropriate pedagogy seems straightforward, viz. define and give substance to the idea of a democratic pedagogy: “the democratisation of the classroom was the essential precursor to the fostering of particular attitudes and values consistent with a mature democracy” (John and Osborn 1992) p 155. (See also Ukpong 1994).

Towards a democratic pedagogy

Accordingly, our task becomes one of spelling out (some of) the ingredients for the democratisation of the classroom. However, this task is not as simple as it first appears for several reasons:

- acquiescence in the notion that since we live in a democratic society based on notions of tolerance and a “fair go”, our schools and classrooms must thereby be democratic and so not in need of real change

- disagreement and uncertainty about the meaning of terms like democracy, equality, justice, freedom and respect

- a reluctance, on the part of teachers and curriculum writers, to “rock the boat” by appearing to stir up controversy in the classroom

- a failure to understand that the democratisation of the classroom goes beyond issues of organisation to the very heart of the pedagogic processes which are in place (Common 1994)

The remarks which follow are intended to signal how educators can work to overcome these difficulties.

I have remarked that “democracy”, like many of the concepts which spring most naturally to mind in the context of civics and citizenship, are essentially contestable. They have been the subject of philosophical debate and reflection for hundreds, if not thousands, of years. At the same time, these concepts occupy a central place in our attempts to make sense of personal and social experience: how we interpret them has a great deal to do with how we treat others and, hence, how we are regarded by others and how we regard ourselves (self-esteem). I have also maintained that if these concepts are to attain the status of values, they must be subject continually to the process of inquiry. In other words, for someone reasonably to claim that such concepts as social justice, care for others, freedom in this or that domain, and so on, serve to guide the way they live their lives (and would have others live them), they must see themselves as participants in an open inquiry as to the meaning, and the value, of these crucial terms. In pedagogic terms, this commits teachers and students to participating in programs of semantics (meaning) and ethics (value).8

---

8 Underlying my thinking in this paragraph is a deep commitment to, and experience of, doing philosophy with children. While this paper does not directly address the issue of incorporating philosophy into the curriculum, it does signal the need to own up to the latter’s semantic, ethical,
Citizenship and thinking

The crucial connection between educating for better thinking (also known as critical pedagogy) and citizenship is prominent in the philosophical, psychological and educational literature. Swarts, quoting Sumner, maintains that “Education in the critical faculty is the only education of which it can be truly said that it makes good citizens” (Swarts 1992). Ukpokodu, in a familiar but still-necessary critique of traditional education (characterised by Freire as the “banking model” and by Dewey as the “pouring in” model), endorses the constructivist theories of Dewey, Bruner and Giroux who “advocate active, experiential, meaningful, inquiry-oriented, and equitable education fostering the development of participatory skills necessary to function in a democracy” (Ukpokodu 1994). She also sees critical pedagogy involving “practices that will best develop citizens who are not only reflective, respectful, responsible, empathetic, and knowledgeable about their civic rights and responsibilities, but are able to stand up for themselves and others in the face of injustice.”

Weinstein cites contemporary educational philosophers R. S. Peters and Israel Scheffler who “see rational deliberation as a prerequisite for effective citizenry” (Weinstein 1991; Guyton 1984). Weinstein’s paper bridges several philosophical traditions, calling upon the views of Habermas, Gadamer, Derrida, and Rorty, as well as contemporary critical thinking theorists such as Siegel and Paul. He proposes as the “most useful characterisation” of critical thinking, that offered by Matthew Lipman, creator of Philosophy for Children. Lipman has identified the following elements as central: skilful thinking, responsible thinking, thinking that facilitates good judgement, thinking that relies on criteria, is self-correcting and is sensitive to context. Significantly, Weinstein also endorses Lipman’s emphasis on thinking which is both dialogical in structure and finds expression within a community of inquiry.

In his critique of the “values clarification” pedagogy, Weinstein asserts that this pedagogy, like cooperative learning, “does not furnish the necessary conceptual apparatus to support rational deliberation in respect of the values appealed to and in light of competing points of view. [It] fails to furnish criteria for judgement, and omits the central concern of rational self-correction” (Weinstein 1991). It is this “necessary conceptual” apparatus which is provided, through a combination of direct instruction, modelling and reflective practice, in the “community of inquiry” classroom.

A pedagogy of conversation

Common places civics and citizenship issues at the forefront of educational concern, highlighting the “ability of the schools to prepare our students for the most significant role of all, democratic citizenship.” (Common 1994) She gives pedagogy top priority in the process of democratising the schools, maintaining that “the reform of schooling must begin with and be subsequently defined by democratic pedagogical practice. The new organisational design must emerge from pedagogy, the essence of schooling...” She then calls for attention to be placed on the development of a pedagogy of conversation (in the sense of discussion or, better, dialogue) as a key intellectual, epistemic and social event in the classroom, the crucial point of which is “the continuing construction of democratic community in our public schools”. Dialogue is the medium which weaves together disparate elements – that of the text, the views of the students and the teacher – and makes possible the collaborative construction of that which we call understanding and knowledge.

---

9 I have argued elsewhere that “critical thinking”, along with “higher-order thinking”, are really alternative formulations of what educators should mean by “good thinking” (Splitter 1991; Splitter 1995).
Citizenship and community

Common’s use of the term “community” is deliberate: she endorses the notion of the classroom as a community of (dialogical) inquiry (Sharp 1991; Splitter and Sharp 1995). The task of educating for democratic citizenship requires giving every child the opportunity to be part of a genuine community of learners, irrespective of the subject area being treated. “From the beginning and in the end, good teaching and good learning are intimately intertwined with good constructive talk – construction, of course, that implies the development of knowledge within democratic community.” (Common 1994)

A pedagogy for civics and citizenship

Given the limited space that remains, I outline the following activities and characteristics as being at the heart of a pedagogy for civics and citizenship:

- Seeking input and participation from all members of the class in a way which they themselves would describe as fair and equitable

- Engaging in a collaborative exploration of the meaning, significance (relevance) and value of such key concepts relating to civics and citizenship as are identified by the students themselves, with a view to forming, and reforming, a dynamic system of values 10

- Students bringing together, reflecting critically upon, and examining collaboratively, a broad range of views and perspectives, including their own and those of their peers, as well as those presented as part of an Australian and global historico-cultural perspective

- The process of “bringing together, reflecting critically upon and examining collaboratively” calls, in turn, upon a structure which is at once open and rigorous. This structure is characterised, inter alia, by: an egalitarian environment, open (“Socratic”) questioning, critical thinking and reasoning, conceptual analysis and synthesis, considering multiple perspectives, empathising with others, exercising “moral imagination”....11

- Valuing diversity and differences of opinion and perspective as an inevitable and enriching aspect of contemporary life; together with cultivating such dispositions as mutual respect and a willingness to self-correct, which encourage students to build upon and modify their ideas in a collaborative environment 12

- Nurturing and sustaining a classroom environment (“community of inquiry”) which is driven by a shared desire to come to terms with, or resolve, a problem or puzzle; and thereby affording every student an experience of communal involvement and mutual concern (care) through participation in an inquiring community

- Giving prominence to dialogue (“structured conversation”: Splitter and Sharp 1995) as the most direct means for authentic (Drisko 1993; Thomson 1996) and democratic

---

10 As with values and knowledge, meaning can also be thought of in constructivist terms. It refers to a process in which items initially beyond our understanding or knowledge are brought into relation with items within the framework of our experience, and thereby made intelligible. See Splitter and Sharp 1995.

11 Fields 1995; Paul 1990; Splitter and Sharp 1995. Producing such a bare and incomplete list does little justice to the structure I have in mind. A more detailed list – but still just a list – is provided in Table 1 at the end of this paper.

12 Self-correction in a democratic environment extends to the procedures, and not just the content, of student activity (Conley and Osborne 1983; Splitter and Sharp 1995).
participation in the construction of meaningful concepts and values. Dialogue represents the “thinking of the inquiring community”

- Paying (over-) due attention to the teaching of good thinking and reasoning. Such teaching embraces the cognitive (critical thinking), but also the aesthetic (creative thinking) and the normative/affective (caring thinking) domains (Lipman 1991; Lipman 1995a; Weinstein 1991)

- Preparing and utilising stimulus materials which engage student interest in a broad range of value-related questions, concepts and issues, and which model the procedures of “ethical inquiry”

- As and when appropriate, extending the notion of the community of inquiry to every facet of learning and thinking, both within, and beyond, the school walls (Common 1994)

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP

Lack of space prevents me from any serious consideration of this topic here. I would simply point out that while the pedagogy for dealing with global issues relating to citizenship is adequately reflected in the analysis offered above, teachers and students should be urged to take up these issues within the context of a civics and citizenship syllabus (Darling 1994; Kniep 1987; Reardon 1988). Such concepts as peace and violence (Lipman 1995b), nationalism, global community, xenophobia, foreign aid, world order and global ecology (Reardon 1988), have ethical and semantic dimensions which need to be considered. Once again, educators need to be careful – and to teach their students to be careful – to identify and question assumptions that are often taken for granted. For example, as one writer has pointed out (Mochelle 1995), the illustration on the front cover of the Report of the Civics Expert Group depicts Australia, enclosed in a box, cut off from the rest of the world (Civics Expert Group 199; Tamir 1992). Clearly, a conception of what it means to be Australian is implied by such an image. Equally clearly, it is a conception which deserves to be questioned, rather than simply accepted.

CONCLUDING COMMENT: IMAGINATION AND THE “BIG” QUESTIONS

Young people yearn for opportunities to ask, and consider, the “big” questions, including those which I identified at the start of this paper as “life-affirming”. We can assist them in their quest by teaching them how to make good judgements and to think well. This is, in part, a cognitive task, but not entirely so:

It is by the better world that we can imagine that we judge the world that we have. If we cease to judge the world, we may find ourselves, very quickly, in one that is infinitely worse.

(Thomson 1996)

I am heartened by the finding, reported above, that at least for some students, possessing the ability to make wise decisions (ie judgements) and being concerned for the welfare of others are matters of importance which they regard as intrinsically tied to notions of civics and citizenship (Dyneson 1992). Educators dare not take these matters for granted, and yet they remain unsure as to how to construct a pedagogy which adequately, albeit reflectively, embraces them.

In this paper, I have offered some proposals which may help us to move forward.

---

13 I have not attempted to deal with the crucial issue of curriculum materials in this paper. This is an area of priority in Philosophy for Children (Splitter 1996). An excellent example, from the UK, of narrative materials dealing with civics and citizenship issues, and accompanied by substantial teacher notes, is (Rowe and Newton 1994).
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Table 1: Thinking strategies (Splitter and Sharp 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giving reasons and distinguishing good reasons from bad ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing distinctions and connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding relationships: part/ whole, means/end, cause/effect, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using analogies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and evaluating arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying, questioning and justifying assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striving for consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classifying and categorising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating and using criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting one’s own thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for evidence and probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making (and, where appropriate, withholding) value judgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking all relevant considerations into account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing sensitivity to context (being able to identify specific characteristics which make a difference in judgement formation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming committed to the value of truth and inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting persons and their points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying meanings and reading for meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining and analysing concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking confidently and fluently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing inferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalising from particular instances and experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding examples and counter-examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing sentences and statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipating, predicting and exploring consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising contradictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detecting fallacious reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating and testing hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaying open-mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detecting vagueness and ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring alternatives and possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sticking to the point (being relevant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being aware of complexity: seeing the “grey” between the black and the white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledging different perspectives and viewpoints; being imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing dispositions of intellectual courage, humility, tolerance, integrity, perseverance and fairmindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the importance of being reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for the procedures of inquiry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>