

Exploring the impacts of character education on developing citizenship

Jacqueline McCann
Master of Teaching

This research report is presented for the degree of Master of Teaching,
School of Education, Faculty of Arts, University of Adelaide

Research supervisor: Dr Brendan Bentley
School of Education, University of Adelaide
brendan.bentley@adelaide.edu.au

Master's Thesis in Teaching
January 2020
School of Education
University of Adelaide

DECLARATION

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I acknowledge that copyright of published works contained within this dissertation resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

I also give permission for the digital version of my dissertation to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the application of character education in a middle-years school setting using a case study approach. This research investigates whether or not the construct of character education supports students to flourish as active citizens within their school environment. A case study has been undertaken in a middle-years school that has applied a character education framework. The case study interrogates whether the application of a character education framework impacts on student behaviour. The research identifies whether characteristics related to both positive education and character education have emerged that indicate students are moving towards becoming active and informed citizens both within their school setting and beyond since research indicates that active civic participation at school is a valuable predictor of later civic behaviour. The findings are then evaluated through the critically reflective lens of Gert J.J. Biesta to assess the value of character education in the delivery of civics and citizenship education in an Australian setting. This research provides early indications that the development of a bespoke character education framework may lead to stronger overall wellbeing outcomes and, if implemented effectively, has the potential to move students towards the goal of active citizenship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude goes to Dr Brendan Bentley who dedicated his time and expertise to making my research proposal possible. Brendan went above and beyond the call of duty in order to provide accurate and timely advice and direction in the development of my research project for which I am extremely grateful. Also, I would like to thank the staff at the school case studied, who remain anonymous in accordance with the ethics approval, for the time they dedicated to my research. Without Brendan's help in obtaining ethics approval and without the school staff's time provided for interviews, my research project would have remained somewhat lifeless and one-dimensional. So, again, I am deeply thankful.

Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	8
1.1 Purpose of this study	8
1.2 Definitions of civics and citizenship	9
1.3 Civics and citizenship education in stagnation and decline	9
1.4 Emerging constructs may be part of the solution.....	10
1.4.1 The construct of positive education (PE)	10
1.4.2 The construct of character education (CE)	11
1.5 Significance of this research	11
1.6 The critical lens of Gert Biesta	12
1.7 Research Questions	13
1.8 Project scope and limitations.....	13
1.9 Ethics approval.....	13
1.10 Dissertation organisation.....	13
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	14
2.1 A potted history of civics and citizenship in Australia:	14
2.2 The cultural construction of Australian citizenship education	14
2.3 Theory not reflected through practice	16
2.4 Other relevant influences: Leaders, teachers, and the school environment	16
2.5 The current state of play in civics and citizenship education in Australia	17
2.6 The influence of Aristotle.....	18
2.7 Positive education.....	19
2.7.1 Positive education and St Peter’s College - Adelaide	20
2.8 Character education.....	20
2.8.1 The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues.....	21
2.9 Contested similarities and overlaps.....	22
2.10 The presentation of character strengths in both fields	23
2.11 The critical lens of Biesta	23
2.11.1 The philosophy of Biesta.....	23
2.12 Summary of the literature review.....	25
2.13 Gap in literature	25
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	26
3.1 Research design	26
3.2 Philosophical worldview	26
3.3 Research methods	27
3.3.1 Review of the literature:	27

3.3.2	Case study:	27
3.3.2.1	Teacher interviews.....	28
3.3.3.2	Collection of data	29
3.4	Secondary data analysis:.....	29
3.5	Critical reflective lens: applying Gert J.J. Biesta.....	29
3.5.1	The Democratic Person and subjectivity	29
3.5.3	Freedom, emancipation and subjectivity	30
3.5.4	Key risks in the delivery of CCE	30
3.6	Validity and reliability	30
3.6.1	Replicable and stable	31
3.6.2	Removing bias	31
3.6.3	Open interview style	31
3.6.4	Multi-pronged approach to validity.....	31
CHAPTER 4: CASE STUDY FINDINGS		33
4.1	Case study school: the creation of the (name of program)	33
4.1.1	Background on Case study school.....	33
4.1.2	Case study school's character education framework	33
4.1.3	The creation of (name of program)	33
4.1.4	The (name of program) program	34
4.2	Case study school: the case study.....	34
4.2.1	Case study findings	34
4.3	Conclusion.....	38
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....		39
5.1	Introduction	39
5.2	Congruence in character strengths and virtues.....	39
5.3	Applying the critical reflective lens of Gert J.J. Biesta	39
5.3.1	The Democratic Person	39
5.3.2	Freedom and emancipation.....	40
5.3.3	Subjectification and the right to be a subject.....	41
5.4	Conclusion.....	42
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....		43
6.1	Conclusions	43
6.1.1	What impact did the implementation of CE have on developing citizenship?	43
6.1.2	What impact did the implementation of CE have on the school's civics curriculum?..	43
6.1.3	What can be learned from the application of the critical reflective lens of Biesta (2016b) in moving students towards active citizenship?.....	44

6.2	Recommendations of this study	45
6.2.1	Bridging the gap between vision and practice.....	45
6.2.2	Broadening the views of citizenship	45
6.2.3	Build the student one virtue at a time	45
6.2.4	Challenge teacher perceptions on character education.....	46
6.2.5	Consider the continued separation and flip	46
6.2.6	Consider integration of the key principles of Gert J.J Biesta in practice	46
6.2.7	Continue the infiltration but evaluate	46
6.2.8	Future research.....	46
6.3	Recommendations for the future	47
6.3.1	Further promotion of character education frameworks in South Australian schools..	47
6.3.2	Integrate CCE where links are intrinsic	47
	REFERENCES.....	48
	APPENDICES	51
	APPENDIX 1:	51
	Table 1: Key civics and citizenship initiatives in Australia.....	51
	APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS.....	54
	Case study interviews: Participant 2 (Director of Boarding).....	54
	Case study interview: Participant 5 (Assistant Director of Teaching and Learning, Middle Years 7-10)	58
	Case study interviews: Participant 1 (Deputy Headmaster)	62
	Case study interviews: Participant 3 (Dean of Teaching)	68
	Teacher interviews: Participant 4, Academic Leader, Humanities	74
	APPENDIX 3: PARTICPANT INFORMATION SHEET.....	82
	APPENDIX 4: INTERVIEW CONSENT FORMS	85

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this study

This research examines the impact of character education (CE) on civics and citizenship education (CCE) within the context of the current educational landscape that includes positive education. The research interrogates CE within a middle-years setting through a case study in a middle-years school that has applied a character education framework (CEF). Within the context of CCE being in a state of stagnation and decline, this research investigates whether constructs, such as CE, support students to flourish as active citizens within their school environment. This study interrogates whether the application of a CEF impacts on student behaviour, and whether characteristics have emerged that indicate students are moving towards becoming active and informed citizens, both within their school setting and beyond. It is reasonable to infer that civic participation in schools is a positive indicator for active citizenship since findings from the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) indicates that active civic participation at school is a valuable predictor of later civic behaviour (Reichert, 2016).

Civics and citizenship education (CCE) in Australia reflects a state of decline (McGowan, 2017). There are many limitations within CCE that have been identified, including: too many objectives with many not translating into practice; an overcrowded curriculum; lack of confidence, expertise and content knowledge among teachers; and the fact that official guidance for the curricular time allocated to civics and citizenship suggests it should equate to around twenty hours per year (A. Peterson & Tudball, 2016). Peterson and Bentley in A. Peterson and Tudball (2016) have already demonstrated the potential of learning about and from religions and religious values in improving the civics and citizenship outcomes, but little research has been undertaken into how the virtues and strengths of a construct such as CE may be a lens for improving civics and citizenship knowledge and moving towards the goal of active citizenship. Given the link between increased levels of engagement at school, and increased levels of active and democratic citizenship in adult life, this study contributes to the search for solutions on how to promote more active citizenship (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2010).

Two major goals were established as a result of the Melbourne Declaration (Ministerial Council for Employment, 2008).ⁱ These are that “All young Australians become successful learners, confident and creative individuals, [and] active and informed citizens” and all “Australian schooling promotes equity and excellence”. Therefore, this chapter outlines the current state of civics and citizenship education in Australia and the contributions of this research in pursuing the goal that all young Australians become “active and informed citizens” (Ministerial Council for Employment, 2008).

ⁱ At the time of writing a new, revised agreement emerged out of Alice Springs with a slightly amended, but essentially similar, goal: All young Australians become confident and creative individuals, successful lifelong learners, and active and informed members of the community (Education Council of Australia, 2019). Although, Biesta (2011) may be critical of the shift to ‘lifelong learners’ as this is usually based on a strictly economic interpretation which requires individuals to keep upgrading their skills in order to remain employable.

1.2 Definitions of civics and citizenship

The definitions of civics and citizenship are contested and may be different in diverse cultural contexts. Across most definitions of citizenship there is a passive component that is value laden and comprises national identity, patriotism and loyalty (Reichert, 2016). Most definitions of citizens relate to democratic citizenship which is relevant in the Australian context. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) distinguishes three types of democratic citizens: the *personally responsible citizen* is an honest, law-abiding person who acts responsibly in their community and enacts civic rights and responsibilities; the *participatory citizen* is an active member of society who participates within established structures to improve society; and the *justice-oriented citizen* is concerned about social injustice and is prepared to challenge existing systems and structures to create social change.

More recent attention has focused on what is meant by active citizenship. The concept of active citizenship is linked to participation and engagement and emphasises skills development and motivated behaviour arising from participation in contexts such as schools, communities or civil organisations. It is generally accepted that schools are significant socialisation agents in the context of educating for democratic and active citizenship (Reichert, 2016). For the purposes of this study, the simple definition of an active or personally responsible citizen being a citizen who is informed, responsible, law-abiding and willing to volunteer in a crisis is referred to (A. Peterson & Bentley, 2017b).

The translation of civics into practice through CCE is equally contested. As stated previously, creating active citizens remains one of the two key National education goals detailed in the Melbourne Declaration (see Appendix 1). Goal 2: “All young Australians become successful learners, confident and creative individuals, and active and informed citizens” (Ministerial Council for Employment, 2008). CCE can cover diverse fields including social and moral considerations, active community involvement, and the acquisition of political and civic literacy. The delivery of CCE in any country is highly problematic as it is susceptible to being hijacked for political objectives by the government of the day and, given its broad scope, decisions as to objectives, content and delivery are fiercely debated by stakeholders and interested players (Tudball & Henderson, 2013).

The history of civics and citizenship education is discussed in section 2; this thesis asserts that CCE should provide students with knowledge and skills that encourage the development of critical enquiry, open-mindedness and opportunities for democratic participation through active and informed citizenship. To achieve this, CCE should frame the civil, political and social components in ways that include local, national and global understandings (Tudball & Henderson, 2013).

1.3 Civics and citizenship education in stagnation and decline

The deficiencies in civics and citizenship education in schools has been widely documented and debated in recent decades (A. Peterson & Bentley, 2017a). It is suggested that citizenship education is meant to provide students with opportunities to develop the capacity to undertake the role of active, informed and responsible citizens (A. Peterson & Tudball, 2016). Despite genuine efforts to improve the level of knowledge of Australian society, National Assessment Program (NAPLAN) scores indicate either stagnation or decline with former Minister for Education, Simon Birmingham, criticising the ‘woeful’ state of civics education in schools (Black, 2015; McGowan, 2017). A key limitation appears to be the lack of confidence in teaching to the curriculum, perhaps a direct output of the broader lack of civics knowledge in the Australian community (A. Peterson & Tudball, 2016). A. Peterson and Bentley (2017b) have suggested that another flaw in this curriculum area may be that it has far too many objectives.

Research into school leaver attitudes to civics raises several key points. Ghazarian, Laughland-Buoy and Skrbis (2017 ; accessed 14 October 2019) claim: “The thing is young people do care about politics... The information we’re getting back from our research is that they feel as though they are not fully equipped to participate in Australian democracy, and that’s going all the way back to those fundamental ideas like the vote.... Many school leavers believe more could’ve been done to address this knowledge deficit while they were in school”.

As a consequence of the ‘woeful’ teaching of civics, in part due to limited teacher knowledge and confidence, education experts have called for “policy makers, teachers, parents and students to continue to examine the role of civic education in the school curriculum so that Australia’s citizens of the future would be well prepared for their role in a democratic society” (ACER, 2001, p. accessed 7 December 2019). Perhaps this sentiment is best summarised in *The Age* article entitled ‘Democracy must be taught as well as caught’ (*The Age*, 2012).

1.4 Emerging constructs may be part of the solution

Earlier studies argue that moral motivation needs to be a more fully understood in order to successfully implement civic education, character education and other education aimed at the development of moral or pro-social characteristics. Moral motivation is defined as what psychologically comprises an individual who is both motivated and capable of acting in morally justifiable ways (Althof & Berkowitz, 2013).

While the study focuses primarily on CE, PE needs to be considered as it informs the current Australian educational landscape. The research analyses the capacity for a globally recognised construct, such as character education that aims to create that moral motivation through the promotion of virtues and character strengths, to help to improve the delivery of the Australian civics and citizenship curriculum and promote active citizenship.

Evidently, there is a gap between teaching the mechanics of citizenship and creating active citizens - the question is whether a construct such as character education can bridge this gap. As will be extrapolated in the literature review, the two relevant constructs of positive education and character education have been developed in parallel. In some ways they are aligned, in other ways, distinct. The constructs may be described as complementary but may be competing. The literature review will highlight that much of the research has been contested. While it may be argued that character education focuses on becoming virtuous and positive education focuses on well-being, both constructs aim to promote students becoming active citizens.

1.4.1 The construct of positive education (PE)

The construct of PE emerged from the field of positive psychology through the research of renowned American psychologist Martin Seligman and colleagues, in 2009 (Seligman, Ernst, Gillham, Reivich, & Linkins, 2009). PE is focused on creating well-being, which is synergistic with better learning, and has been linked to creating responsible citizens which positive psychologists refer to as ‘The Meaningful Life’: meaning is increased through our connections to others, future generations, or causes that transcend the self.

“Meaning consists in knowing what your highest strengths are, and then using them to belong to and serve something that is larger than the self” (Seligman et al., 2009, p. 296).

Further, PE has drawn on aspects of positive psychology and developed a classification of six classes of virtues and twenty-four character strengths that provide a theoretical framework for practical application (C. Peterson & Seligman, 2004; *Positive Psychology*, 2016). The six classes of virtues are: wisdom, courage, humanity, transcendence, justice and moderation. PE has emerged in

the context of declining human morale, even in the face of global economic and cultural improvements. The average Australian is no more satisfied with life than they were fifty years ago. Seligman et al (2009) conclude that well-being should be taught in schools as an antidote to depression, as a vehicle for increasing life satisfaction, and as an aid to better learning and more creative thinking.

1.4.2 The construct of character education (CE)

At the same time as PE was emerging, British academic James Arthur was leading a team on a project 'Learning for Life' which looked at the character and virtues of 3-25 year olds across different educational and professional settings. This culminated in his creation of the Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues in 2012 and the associated construct of CE arguably emanating from the field of behavioural studies (Arthur, 2012).

CE can be presented in a variety of structures. In some schools it is taught as a separate subject. In other schools CE is integrated into a school's framework or ethos (Arthur, 2012). CE is about students grasping what is ethically important to them and identifying the kind of person they want to be and developing critical thinking skills to know how to choose between alternatives. CE focuses on four types of virtues: moral virtues, intellectual virtues, civic virtues, and good sense/practical wisdom. Citizenship education is directly related to CE as it seeks to address the question of how we build a just society. Ethically good characters will be good citizens (Arthur, 2019).

It could therefore be surmised that, while PE is an approach to civics and citizenship education that embeds wellbeing in the student, CE is more focused on teaching in a way that enables a student to develop their own character and ethical behaviour (Arthur, 2019). It could be said that while PE articulated through all subjects aims to move students towards experiencing wellbeing through leading a 'Meaningful Life', CE aims to equip students with the virtues, skills, traits and capacity to choose a meaningful life.

1.5 Significance of this research

While the study primarily focuses on CE, as previously mentioned, PE needs to be considered as it informs the current Australian educational landscape. Research for this thesis is set within the context of an Australian Curriculum emanating from the construct of positive education compared to the United Kingdom Curriculum which is based on the construct of character education. Some Australian schools have adopted a PE framework or a CE framework or a bespoke mixture of both. The influence of CE in the Australian education landscape has raised important questions around the delivery of civics and citizenship curriculum and the impacts on creating active citizens.

To date, although there is some research into cross-cultural comparisons of the influence of CE in diverse cultural contexts (Lee, 2014; Neoh, 2017), there has not been a study into the relevance and links of either of these constructs in the context of creating effective and meaningful civics and citizenship education in Australia. Given the similar objectives of both constructs, it is deemed irrelevant whether character leads to wellbeing (CE) or wellbeing leads to character virtues which lead to higher levels of happiness (PE). What is more pressing is whether these types of constructs have the capacity to influence the delivery of civics and citizenship curriculum and potentially achieve more successful outcomes. There is no significant research into the characters and virtues needed to establish citizenship in the Australian context and no research into whether the existing Australian curriculum promotes these essential characters and virtues. These are the gaps this research aims to fill.

Therefore, this research examines the impacts of CE on CCE within the context of the current educational landscape that includes PE. The research interrogates CE within a middle-years setting through a case study in a middle-years school that has applied a character education framework. Within the context of CCE being in a state of stagnation and decline, this research investigates whether constructs, such as CE, support students to flourish as active citizens within their school environment.

Studies of the impacts of PE on other Australian schools have been undertaken but there has been limited studies of the impacts of CE. This study investigates a South Australian school in central Adelaide. The school has applied a CE framework. The case study will explore the relevance and potential of CE applied to the civics and citizenship curriculum as an effective way to promote active citizens.

Through a greater understanding of the potential of CE on the delivery of civics and citizenship education in the middle years teaching methods can be devised or existing approaches further adapted. The contribution to the existing body of knowledge will be:

- 1) The research will lead to a greater understanding of the potential for adopting a CE lens in the South Australian context, and
- 2) Analysis of the research findings through the lens of Biesta (see section 1.6 below) will clarify the extent to which a CE framework truly moves students towards the goal of active citizenship.

1.6 The critical lens of Gert Biesta

To further interrogate the data collected, the research will examine the findings through a critically reflective lens through the application of critical questions about learning for democracy raised by the education philosopher Gert J. J. Biesta (Biesta, 2011, 2016a, 2016b). Biesta (2016b) criticises approaches to democratic education that are focused on the production of particular identities or subjectivities or the insertion of newcomers into an existing social order. The problem of CCE as the production of the democratic person is that it entails an individualistic approach to democratic education without equipping individuals with the proper set of democratic knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and without asking questions about their relationships with others and about the social and political context in which they learn and act (Biesta, 2016b).

These approaches seek to give an answer to the question of how the democratic person can best be created or engendered, whereas Biesta (2016b) argues that an approach to education must recognise that students come into a world of plurality and difference, not identity and sameness. Biesta (2016b) acknowledges that schools can neither create nor save democracy but can only support societies in which democratic action and democratic subjectivity are real possibilities. To achieve this, rather than focus on production of democratic individuals or saving democracy, schools should perform the more realistic task of helping students to reflect on the fragile conditions under which all people can act, under which all people can be a subject (2016b).

Inherent in students achieving subjectivity is the capacity for students to experience freedom or as Biesta calls it a 'coming into presence' (Biesta, 2016a). Students are free when they are able to act with others and space is felt for unpredictable responses, when students are not forced to conform to a cultural norm. Individual freedom is interconnected with the freedom of others (Biesta, 2016a). This is relevant for analysis of civics and citizenship education based on a construct such as character education, in order to consider whether these constructs are being

adapted for political or other objectives which may limit the capacity for students to achieve subjectivity.

1.7 Research Questions

This research seeks to contribute to the understanding of how the potential for constructs such as positive education and character education applied to CCE may help students to flourish as active citizens. The study investigated the application of CE in a South Australian school setting using a case study approach. Therefore, the study used the following research questions:

1. What impact did the implementation of CE have on developing citizenship?
2. What impact did the implementation of CE have on the school's civics curriculum?
3. What can be learned from the application of the critical reflective lens of Biesta (2016b) in moving students towards active citizenship?

1.8 Project scope and limitations

One of the limitations of this research is that it appears that all major studies of character education and positive education are located in one socio-economic dynamic; that is, highly resourced, mainly fee-paying schools. Schools that have a strong culture and reputation to maintain, and a dual focus on academic achievement and the shaping of character, as is the current study. The school that was the case-study is also a single-sex (all boys) schools, thus limiting possible applicability to co-education schools.

While this study does not explore positive education in depth, both positive education and character education can be used as whole school frameworks and students may benefit from dedicated wellbeing focused lessons. Further, significant efforts have been invested in creating resources on implementing character education at the subject level. As no Australian study has yet looked at the impact that either positive education or character education may have on the delivery of civics and citizenship education this research helps to fill that gap. Essentially, it will be useful to know if there is any value in applying a broader framework to the teaching of civics and citizenship in Australia to more successfully achieve curriculum objectives.

1.9 Ethics approval

Ethics approval was obtained for this research from the University of Adelaide Ethics Committee. The ethics project title is: Exploring the connections between character education and civics and citizenship education in (name of school) and the approval number is H-2019-214. Informed consent was obtained from participants. A Memorandum of Understanding was established between the University of Adelaide and the school involved in the case study. Information sheets were provided to case study participants. All data was de-identified to enable anonymity.

1.10 Dissertation organisation

This dissertation is organised into six chapters. Following this introduction is a literature review that seeks to address several of the research questions. The literature review presents the context of both character education and positive education and discusses the relevance of specific strengths and virtues needed to create citizenship. Chapter three details the methodology from the literature review to the case study to secondary data analysis and application of a critical reflective lens. Chapter four provides the findings from the case study and what this demonstrates about implementing CCE in a middle-years setting. Chapter five applies the critical reflective lens of Biesta to the findings. Chapter six concludes this dissertation and identifies recommendations for practice.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of the literature review is to provide the necessary context for the case study and addressing the research questions through clearly identifying what is meant by CE, PE and what CCE involves. Then, the impacts and relevance on the Australian curriculum will be explored. This will be followed by some consideration of what character strengths and virtues may be needed to create active citizens and whether these are congruent with the existing curriculum.

2.1 A potted history of civics and citizenship in Australia:

As previously suggested, civics and citizenship is in a state of decline, but this is not due to a lack of effort (Reichert & Print, 2018). There has been a number of national and international efforts aimed at improving the state of civics and citizenship education in Australia. From its early beginnings as part of history and moral education in the 1890s and early 1900s, Tudball and Henderson (2013) claim civics and citizenship has morphed into a significant part of Australian education. For almost two decades, active and democratic citizenship has been a key aim of CCE in Australia (See Table 1: Appendix 1 (Reichert, 2016)).

The first major national effort to bring active citizenship on to the agenda was the Hobart Declaration on Schooling in 1989, which was then updated in Adelaide a decade later, and then the Melbourne Declaration in 2008 superseded all previous declarations. A decade on, a new declaration has been developed in Alice Springs (Tehan, 2018). In the years prior to the revision in Adelaide, a national program – Discovering Democracy – was introduced on the premise that in order to take their place as active citizens, students needed a thorough knowledge and understanding of Australia’s political heritage, democratic processes and government, and judicial system (Department of Education Science and Training, 1997).

‘Discovering Democracy’ provided four books on the themes of: Who Rules?; Law and Rights; The Australian Nation; and, Citizens and Public Life. A unit was developed each for middle primary; upper primary; lower secondary; and, middle secondary. ‘Discovering Democracy’ was announced by the then Minister for Schools, Vocational Education and Training in May 1997, and endorsed by the Ministerial Council for Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) in June 1997 (Department of Education Science and Training, 1997). The ‘Discovering Democracy’ program was the first major national funding and curriculum intervention in a curriculum area that was traditionally in the State/Territory’s jurisdiction. The content of the program will be examined in section 2.2 of this dissertation. ‘Discovering Democracy’ appears to have been the catalyst for a series of reports, programs and initiatives relating to the Australian civics and citizenship curriculum (see Table 1: Appendix 1).

2.2 The cultural construction of Australian citizenship education

Since ‘Discovering Democracy’ was the first major national civics and citizenship education initiative, it is relevant to explore the content and the context, and how this reflects on Australia’s cultural construction of citizenship. Authors such as Tudball and Henderson (2013) have said that the push for a national curriculum can be conceptualised as a form of cultural construction.

‘Discovering Democracy’ was an initiative of the Howard government. While an in-depth analysis of how this program came on to the policy agenda and who the main voices and stakeholders were in its construction is not the purpose of this paper, the main purpose of ‘Discovering Democracy’ was to encourage the development of skills, values and attitudes that

enable effective, informed and reflective participation in political processes and civic life (Department of Education Science and Training, 1997).

'Discovering Democracy' was not mandated for implementation in schools since under the Constitution the responsibility for education formally resides with States and Territories. However, the program was significantly resourced which helped it to become embedded in mainstream school curricula across Australia (Tudball & Henderson, 2013). As the then chair of the Civics Education Group, John Hirst, states:

"We want students to understand the way we govern ourselves and to think of themselves as active citizens" (Department of Education Science and Training, 1997 ; accessed 19 December 2019).

'Discovering Democracy' was implemented within the first term of the new Howard government. 'Discovering Democracy' emerged at a time when there was consensus that a different kind of economic future was emerging and Australian youth needed to be ready (Tudball & Henderson, 2013). However, Howard would not have been able to predict the complex events that followed that would require Australians to be active citizens aware of their civic rights and responsibilities. These events included: the failed 1999 referendum on the questions of becoming a Republic and the inclusion of a preamble to recognise First Australians; the highly publicised political controversies of both the government's response to the MV Tampa followed by the Children Overboard affair; the 2005 Cronulla riots; the contentious introduction of a Citizenship test; and the events of September 11, 2001.

Furthermore, during the Howard years, a national debate known as 'The History and Culture Wars' raged concerning the nature of Australian history and identity and how this should be transmitted to students through the curriculum. However, given the freedom around interpreting and implementing the curriculum within States and Territories in Australia, many school teachers chose to ignore the Howard agenda and this eventually faded (Tudball & Henderson, 2013). At the conclusion of 'Discovering Democracy' the Howard government moved from discovering democracy to discovering values in the launch of a *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* in 2004 (Department of Education, 2005).

Researchers including Tudball and Henderson (2013) have deeply criticised the 'Discovering Democracy' and ensuing values projects for being 'national education' – a singular notion of national identity based on Australia's British history as the foundation for civic knowledge pushing agendas such as patriotism or blind loyalty to a particular world view as part of Howard's conservative political agenda – and thus a missed opportunity to promote constructivist approaches that empower young people to be critical thinkers and informed citizens who can positively participate in active and positive ways in their diverse communities. Tudball and Henderson (2013) go on to argue that 'Discovering Democracy' demonstrates that nation states can orchestrate citizenship education in ways that promote a singular view of the world which may value the nation state whilst silencing debate and critical opinion. However, Tudball and Henderson (2013) concede that the broader view of CCE beyond national education is stronger than in the past. Tudball and Henderson (2013) consider the new curriculum emerging in the 2010s promotes a notion of citizenship beyond membership of a nation, with a strong focus on diversity, emphasis on cross-curricular teaching that promotes a set of 'general capabilities' and the promotion of citizenship throughout the entire school. Nonetheless, civics education experts such as Tudball and Henderson (2013) believe more is needed to ensure young citizens emerge informed and also critical of their world.

2.3 Theory not reflected through practice

A. Peterson and Bentley (2017b) have identified that civic education programs and initiatives that have developed in Western democracies over the past two decades have sought to instigate citizenship as practice, which incorporates four interrelated elements: citizens possess and should recognise certain civic obligations; citizens must develop an awareness of the common good beyond their own private interests; citizens must act with civic virtue; and engagement in democracy should incorporate a deliberative aspect.

Simply put, the active or personally responsible citizen is informed, responsible, law-abiding and willing to volunteer in a crisis (A. Peterson & Tudball, 2016). Recent decades have witnessed a focus on creating more active citizens with a plethora of agreements and initiatives, culminating in the oft-cited Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians (2008) and its wider goal that all young Australians become 'active and informed citizens'. However, a corpus of knowledge has emerged into the reasons why the importance attached to the concept of active citizenship has not translated into widespread practice in schools (A. Peterson & Tudball, 2016). Reasons cited for the gap between commitment and practice include: haphazard application, minimalist approaches, superficial use of materials provided which were also argued to be too narrow in focus on economic aspects of citizenship, discrepancy between Federal and State goals and insufficient, inadequate and poorly targeted teacher training leading to confused delivery (for example, active learning does not equate to active citizenship) (A. Peterson & Tudball, 2016; Tudball & Brett, 2014).

A body of evidence concludes that active citizenship cannot be achieved without educational processes that engage with the political dimensions of the curriculum (A. Peterson & Tudball, 2016). This is supported by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) who acknowledge that while the concept of the personally responsible citizen is the most popular approach, the emphasis placed on individual character and behaviour obscures the need for collective and public sector initiatives, and distracts attention from analysis of the causes of social problems and from systemic solutions. Biesta (2011) concludes that "approaches to citizenship that place a too strong emphasis on personal responsibility, on individual capacities and abilities, and on personal values, dispositions and attitudes not only runs the risk of depoliticising citizenship but seeing it mainly as a personal or social phenomenon" (Biesta, 2011, p. 31) which does little to advance democracy. This then dilutes young peoples' capacity to create real change that solves existing problems, which requires changing structures through collective and collaborative actions. Linking this to the research question of whether civics and citizenship education through a character education lens will achieve active citizenship would suggest that active citizenship cannot be achieved through character and virtues alone as students also need to meaningfully engage with the political dimensions.

2.4 Other relevant influences: Leaders, teachers, and the school environment

While Reichert (2016) argues that policy initiatives such as Discovering Democracy can support schools in the development of experiential civics and citizenship learning in school life, more may be gained through investing resources in national and state governments working in concert with teachers to achieve stronger outcomes. There is comparatively little research into education for citizenship that has employed the teacher as the subject of analysis (Black, 2015). Zyngier (2003; 2011; 2016) has explored the links between the beliefs of pre-service teachers and education for democracy in Australia. One study identified that pre-service teachers generally had a narrow view of democracy which may impact on classroom practice where they would be teaching about but not for democracy (Zyngier, 2016). In another earlier study (Zyngier, 2012), it was concluded that while pre-service teachers may have a more critical and 'thicker' understanding of democracy, mirrored in

the views of those teaching them, practicing teachers had largely adopted mainstream neo-liberal discourse with their tendency to present democracy in a narrow way potentially impacting on their classroom practice.

Zyngier (2016) concludes that the capacity of teachers, with the emphasis on passive consumption of knowledge about citizenship with a strong historical focus, may limit the student's achievement of 'active citizenship'. Affirmative of this argument is reflected in one pre-service teacher's definition of democracy – "The strongest and noblest people taking the lead for the greater good" (Zyngier, 2012, p. 7) – which could be argued is akin to dictatorship. In a related study, Black (2015) identified that even the most committed and passionate teachers may face isolation and struggle to develop students into active citizens if constrained by their school environment and the broader policy environment if civics and citizenship is viewed as a marginal pedagogy.

A. Peterson and Bentley (2017b) have contributed to the gap by researching how school leaders and teachers perceive their role in preparing students for informed, active and responsible citizenship through their study of perceptions of senior leaders and teachers in light of the introduction of the first ever Federal Australian Curriculum and the introduction of civics and citizenship as a subject from year 7. Their key finding was that perspectives matter: how school leaders and teachers understand citizenship is likely to shape the aims, purpose and form of education for citizenship, including what they choose to include or omit from their curriculum. School leaders emphasised the importance of education for citizenship in preparing students for the changing nature of Australian society. While teachers framed this as responding to a gap in students' current understanding, commitment and behaviour and the need to develop personally responsible citizenship.

Of significance to this study, respondents emphasised the role of education for citizenship in learning values, especially their school's values, indicating the potential role for translating a school's character framework through civics and citizenship education (A. Peterson & Bentley, 2017b). A risk identified is that while education for citizenship is more than a subject, schools are somewhat complacent and underestimate the curricular and pedagogical requirements of teaching Civics and Citizenship (A. Peterson & Bentley, 2017b). One limitation is that the majority of teachers in Australian schools may have received little specialist training in the field of education for citizenship, compounded by the fact that being a personally responsible citizen is not reinforced at home (A. Peterson & Bentley, 2017b).

A corpus of literature is developing that reflects these concerns. In one study, undertaken by the Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, while only 33% of teachers studied stated they had specific or additional training in moral or character education, 60% had to teach a subject, such as citizenship, relating explicitly to the development of the whole child (The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, 2015). This reinforces the need for this study into the potential for constructs of character education or positive education to strengthen teacher capacity to teach civics and citizenship and create active citizens.

2.5 The current state of play in civics and citizenship education in Australia

It remains undisputed that citizenship education provides students with opportunities to develop the capacity to undertake the role of active, informed and responsible citizens (Reichert & Print, 2018). National testing of civics and citizenship was introduced in 2004 and, in September 2015, ministers endorsed the Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship. However, the most recent report on the National Assessment Program (NAP) in 2016 is based on the pre-2015 curriculum, and

the 2019 report, assessing whether or not the new curriculum has arrested this decline (McGowan, 2017), will not be released until after the completion of this study.

The 2016 report assesses both year 6 and year 10, thus the results discussed below relate to year 10 as this aligns to the cohort being studied. Despite the fall in performance in civics and citizenship that assesses students' skills, knowledge and understandings of Australia's system of government, civic institutions and the values which underpin Australia's democracy for year 10 students, there has been an increase in the already high levels of positive attitudes among students toward participation as active citizens. This is evident through the 2019 student-led global climate strikes with more than 350,000 Australian participants (ABC News, 2019). However, it is concerning that, despite this indicating students possess characteristics reflective of active citizenship, students are participating in democratic processes that they do not fully understand (ACARA, 2016).

Of relevance to this research, which focuses on an all-boys school, is the fact that there was a significant decrease in performance for male students compared to 2013 (ACARA, 2016). Other outcomes of note were that two of the citizenship behaviours students rated as most important were personal efforts to protect natural resources and voting in elections. Taking part in activities to protect the environment and promote human rights, as well as learn about Australia's history, were also rated as important for good citizenship (ACARA, 2016). There was also a significant improvement in students viewing discussing politics as an important citizenship behaviour (ACARA, 2016). As well as promising results around expectations of active future civic engagement with about three-quarters of students stating they will find information about candidates before voting in an election; significantly more expect to join a political party or stand as a political candidate; but less than one-third would consider helping a candidate or party during an election campaign (ACARA, 2016).

A link between performance and action was also identified with students performing above the proficient standard demonstrating more intention to promote important issues, reinforcing the need to improve performance across the board (ACARA, 2016). One of the suggested activities for teachers is to identify the characteristics that would make for a 'good' representative at the local, state/territory or national level, indicating the importance of assessing the relevance of character education being used as the framework for teaching civics and citizenship (ACARA, 2016). Therefore, the current state reflects a level of hope in some aspects, despite the overall decline in knowledge that needs to be addressed.

2.6 The influence of Aristotle

The aim of our studies is not just to know what virtue is, but to become good.
Aristotle

Before moving into a discussion of positive education and character education, it is important to consider Aristotle, since both constructs emphasise his influence. Prior research indicates that to be a good citizen, being a good person is essential (Tudball & Brett, 2014). This aligns to the key Aristotelian premise that virtuous actions emanate from virtuous people and virtuous actions are a constituent of eudaimonia (Hirji, 2018). Eudaimonia is broadly defined as the pursuit, manifestation, and/or experience of virtue, personal growth, self-actualization, flourishing, excellence, and meaning distinguished from hedonia which is the pursuit and/or experience of pleasure, enjoyment, comfort, and reduced pain (Boniwell, David, & Conley Ayers, 2013).

For Aristotle, happiness is not found in pleasant amusements but in virtuous activities. Virtuous people choose virtuous actions as an end in itself – because virtuous actions are choice-

worthy – not as a means to other ends. However, Aristotelian actions are only virtuous when they express the real character that the person possesses. A virtuous person is one who performs a virtuous action with knowledge, for its own sake, and acting from a firm and unchanging state. The character of the person performing the action is built into the account of the action for the action to be fully virtuous. The best way to identify virtuous actions is to rely on the judgement of a virtuous person. To act virtuously a person can only do this when that person grasps, and is moved by, the value that the virtuous action has independent of the way it might contribute to that person's own happiness. Therefore, to act virtuously is to perform a genuinely virtuous action as an expression of a virtuous character, with knowledge, for its own sake, and from a firm and unchanging state (Hirji, 2018). It will become evident in the next sections how each construct aims to create young people of virtuous character.

2.7 Positive education

Seligman (2009) defines positive education as education both for traditional skills and for happiness. In creating positive education, the skills of positive psychology (resilience, character strengths, gratitude, positive communication and optimism), and how to apply these through the curriculum, are taught to teaching staff (Seligman et al., 2009).

As suggested by Waters and Loton (2019) positive education is growing globally and is being applied in schools across Asia, South America, USA, and importantly, Australia, including schools researched such as St Peter's College, Adelaide and Geelong Grammar School. Professor Martin Seligman was involved in developing the South Australian survey of wellbeing (South Australian Department of Education, n.d.) implemented across years 4-12 during his post as an Adelaide Thinker in Residence (Seligman, 2013).

Positive education provides for teaching both the skills of wellbeing and the skills of achievement (Seligman et al., 2009). In this context it is important to analyse the links between positive education and civics and citizenship education. The risk that the rapid growth of positive education has led to lack of a cohesive direction and failure to build the cumulative evidence needed to advance the field has been overcome by the recent development of a meta-framework which covers interventions that promote strengths, emotional management, attention and awareness, relationships and coping (Waters & Loton, 2019).

Positive psychology divides happiness into three different realms that can all be taught and measured:

1. Positive emotion (hedonic): a 'pleasant life' is one that is based on getting as much of the good stuff - love, joy, contentment – as possible.
2. State of flow: an 'engaged life' involves a loss of self-consciousness, time stopping for you, and only occurs when you deploy your highest strengths and talents to meet the challenges that come your way. It is clear that flow facilitates learning.
3. The Meaningful Life: meaning is increased through our connections to others, future generations, or causes that transcend the self. Meaning consists in knowing what your highest strengths are, and then using them to belong to and serve something that is larger than the self (Seligman et al., 2009).

Seligman et al (2009) suggested that while there are shortcuts to positive emotion, for example buying an expensive car, there are no shortcuts to flow or the meaningful life as these require significant personal effort. Therefore, positive education is focused on creating well-being, which is synergistic with better learning, and has been linked to creating responsible citizens which positive psychologists refer to as 'The Meaningful Life' (Seligman et al 2009). The direct link to civics

and citizenship is that those engaged in the Meaningful Life will be active citizens as it will be natural for them to participate in their community, connect with others, and serve causes that are meaningful to them. Further, positive psychology has developed a classification of six classes of virtues and twenty-four character strengths that provide a theoretical framework for practical application (C. Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Positive Psychology, 2016).

Positive education has emerged in the context of declining human morale, even in the face of global economic and cultural improvements. The average Australian is no more satisfied with life than he was 50 years ago. Seligman et al (2009) conclude that well-being should be taught in schools as an antidote to depression, as a vehicle for increasing life satisfaction, and as an aid to better learning and more creative thinking.

Of relevance to this study, is the most recent Global Happiness and Wellbeing Policy Report, where Seligman and Adler (2019, Chapter 4) have detailed the whole of school approaches to implementing positive education in Geelong Grammar School and the School of Education at the University of Adelaide. From this, strategies and processes are identified that may be adapted in different contexts.

2.7.1 Positive education and St Peter's College - Adelaide

St Peter's College, a school that 'has at its heart the shaping of character', has placed substantial effort into becoming a positive institution that realises the potential of positive education. The creation of positive institutions links to civics and citizenship as Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) defined positive institutions as 'institutions that move individuals toward better citizenship, responsibility, nurturance, altruism, civility, moderation, tolerance and work ethic'. Positive psychology is heralded as providing a scientific validation and unifying the previously disparate approaches to well-being (White & Murray, 2015). One of the main authors of the comprehensive publication that uses the example of St Peter's College as the basis for implementing a positive education strategic framework for wellbeing in schools was also involved in the other oft-cited example of a positive education institution - Geelong Grammar School. White and Murray (2015) highlight that one of the limitations of many school approaches to well-being is that efforts are haphazard. Instead, schools need to adopt a holistic approach to well-being by creating positive institutions. Repeatedly, the authors refer to positive education being empirically validated and scientifically informed, and therefore in the relevant chapters (2 and 7) only acknowledge the character strengths developed by C. Peterson and Seligman (2004), reflecting a broader criticism of character education not being based on a scientific framework.

2.8 Character education

Character education is based on the principle that character virtues form the basis of individual and societal flourishing and schools and teachers can play a role in developing character virtues (Arthur, 2019). Teaching about character and virtues provides the rationale, language and tools that enable students to reflect on and develop their character (Arthur, 2019). Character education is more than a subject; it is about students grasping what is ethically important to them and identifying the kind of person they want to be and developing critical thinking skills to know how to choose between alternatives. Character education focuses on four types of virtues: moral virtues, intellectual virtues, civic virtues, and good sense/practical wisdom. Pedagogically, a spiral curriculum model is used where a spiral of engagement, action, ideas, reflection and refinement enable new practices to be internalised and habituated. Citizenship education is directly related to character education as it seeks to address the question of how we build a just society. Ethically good characters will be good citizens. The Jubilee Centre provides specific examples of how character can be taught through

subjects, including the links between citizenship curriculum and character virtues including accountability, service, friendship, mutual respect, and social justice and how this might translate across the classroom, the school and the community (Arthur, 2019).

Character education has been consistently linked to citizenship education through being a specific approach to morals or values education. Character education has been used by British governments since the nineteenth century to teach virtue in schools in order to create citizens of good character. Arthur's recent global research (2016) has sought to create consensus of understanding character and virtues – a common morality – that may be promoted through education to support the recent re-emergence of character education (Arthur 2005).

Character education has been criticised for being paternalistic. Kristjánsson (2013) posits that this is a null argument. Character is gradually formed from birth through the interaction of children with others. When formal education in character does not occur, virtues and vices will still be caught even if they are not directly taught. Kristjánsson (2013) speaks of how Aristotle claims that role-models, such as teachers, teach students to be just or unjust through the actions they engage in. Kristjánsson (2013) claims that as character education will take place in schools regardless, it is better if this is done well, such as through the development of a character education framework or strategy.

2.8.1 The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues

A research paper on character education would be incomplete without a comprehensive overview of the 'Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues' (the Jubilee Centre) and the connections established between Citizenship Education and Character Education. This is especially relevant since the work of the Jubilee Centre has had a profound impact on the development of character education at the case study school.

Prior to its establishment, the founder of the Jubilee Centre, Professor James Arthur, lamented that Britain had a long history of ill-conceived and ineffective efforts at character education. Arthur considered that this was largely due to the flavour of the month varieties endlessly imposed on the education sector – a problem that the Jubilee Centre has sought to overcome (Kristjánsson, 2013).

The Jubilee Centre has benefited from significant resource funding that has enabled a highly sophisticated vast array of resources to be developed and made universally accessible via their website. The Jubilee Centre examines how character and virtues impact on individuals and society with its research supported by a team of some thirty academics from a range of disciplines such as philosophy, psychology, education, theology and sociology (The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, n.d.-a).

Underpinning the Jubilee Centre is the conviction that character virtues are the basis of individual and societal flourishing and the virtues that make up good character can be taught and caught. Character education cultivates the virtues of character associated with common morality alongside critical thinking to create a well-rounded character in students through encouraging them to identify what is ethically important and decide the kind of person they wish to become.

The Jubilee Centre makes a case for how the following four types of virtues can be taught through every subject: Moral Virtues; Intellectual Virtues; Civic Virtues; and Good Sense - Practical Wisdom. Pedagogically, the Jubilee Centre encourages the adoption of a spiral curriculum model – moving through a spiral of engagement, action, ideas, reflection and refinement.

Through their case study of Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School in Derbyshire (UK), the Jubilee Centre identified that the heart of citizenship education is answering the question 'How do we build a just society?' As well as providing the opportunity for explicit teaching of virtue knowledge, reasoning and practice, citizenship education is itself a virtue. Citizenship education reflects the Aristotelian perspective that a good society must be built on ethically good characters. Specifically, the Jubilee Centre identified that Citizenship Education can develop the intellectual virtues of mutual respect and tolerance; the moral virtues of compassion as the expression of empathy and sympathy; and, the performance virtues such as proper ambition and thrift (The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, n.d.-c).

2.9 Contested similarities and overlaps

The above discussion has made it clear that both constructs of PE and CE quote Aristotle as their key guide. Both Seligman and Arthur come from different angles in their attempt to address what they see as the deficiencies in the education system. It could therefore be surmised that, while positive education is an approach to civics and citizenship education that embeds wellbeing in the student, character education is more focused on teaching in a way that enables a student to develop their own character and ethical behaviour (Arthur, 2019). It could also be said that while positive education articulated through all subjects aims to move students towards experiencing wellbeing through leading a 'Meaningful Life', character education aims to equip students with the virtues, skills, traits and capacity to choose that meaningful life.

While character education emanates from the field of behaviourism and positive education originates in positive psychology, the overlap across both constructs is the creation of a list of characters and virtues aimed at creating students who flourish, which in turn reveals that both potentially focus on achieving well-being. Indeed, experts in both fields are involved in the team that operates the International Positive Education Network that aims to bring together teachers, parents, academics, students, schools, colleges, universities, charities companies and governments to promote positive education and whose goals are to support collaboration, change education practice and reform government policy (International Positive Education Network, n.d.).

James Arthur focused on defining character education, as character building was the explicit aim of governments until just after the Second World War, and interest in character education saw a revival in the twenty-first century (Arthur, 2005). As there was no consistent definition of what was meant by character education, Arthur sought to define this, became a global expert in this field, and created the Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues which provides a plethora of frameworks and curriculum guides for schools as mentioned earlier. Seligman, a renowned American psychologist, has focused on developing the science of positive psychology and the role of positive education across the curriculum (Seligman et al., 2009). While initially being focused on civics and citizenship education, character education has become equally focused alongside positive education, in operating across the curriculum (Arthur, 2019). Both constructs focus on developing students to become good citizens. Both constructs have developed classifications of character and virtues to inform practice based on a global search of religions, values and norms. Both aim to cultivate the character and virtues associated with common morality and common values. Both believe that wellbeing or character can be taught and caught. Both constructs aim for students to flourish.

Both constructs have also faced challenges and criticisms. Character education has been criticised for not representing the best available psychological evidence (Arthur, 2016), for being used to create heterogeneity, and for attempting to create a series of behaviour outcomes taught in a behaviourist fashion which makes character education potentially more susceptible to political

forces (Arthur, 2005). However, the development of universally accepted character virtues as the basis for character education limits the capacity for political manipulation (Arthur, Kristjansson, Walker, Sanderse, & Jones, 2015). Positive education has been criticised for its rapid growth with little evidence of the practical validity. However, this has been addressed by Waters and Loton (2019) through a recent meta-evaluation to support evidence-based decisions when designing, investigating and implementing positive education interventions.

2.10 The presentation of character strengths in both fields

Both constructs have developed classifications for character and virtue based on global research, these are presented in the table below (Arthur, 2019; C. Peterson & Seligman, 2004). The table then illustrates the connections between the General Capabilities in the Australian civics and citizenship curriculum in the middle years with comparisons made to the character strengths provided by positive education and character education (ACARA, n.d.). As can be seen, not all strengths from both constructs can be linked to the Australian curriculum.

Some argue there is more scientific evidence of the effectiveness of PE through the C. Peterson and Seligman (2004) 'Virtues in Action' (VIA) character strengths framework and the significant effects on positive well-being (White & Murray, 2015). While it is not the purpose of this research to engage in a comparison of the character strengths articulated within the two constructs, and the character education strengths listed in here are not exhaustive, it can be seen that there is some overlap. However, it could be considered that positive education, with the primary focus being on well-being and moving to higher levels of happiness through the flourishing life and a deeper state of being, has some characteristics that are more idealistic such as forgiveness and appreciation of beauty.

Table 2: Appendix 1 illustrates that many of the strengths and virtues identified in both frameworks can be captured by the General Capabilities in the Australian Curriculum. Further analysis through the case study and the application of the critical reflective lens will identify which strengths and virtues are most relevant in the delivery of CCE to more students towards becoming active citizens.

2.11 The critical lens of Biesta

2.11.1 The philosophy of Biesta

The writings of Biesta provide us with several key critiques to apply to the findings in order to identify if the application of a character education lens helps students to flourish as active democratic subjects or promotes the opposite, which is adherence to a prescribed identity and sameness.

Following on from the literature review that provided a potted history of CCE in Australia, perhaps one of the best ways to understand Biesta is to consider an example of CCE that Biesta would not support. That is, the 'Discovering Democracy' project of the late 1990s. If there ever was a time in history to prepare Australian citizens 'for a world of plurality and difference' – encouraging open mindedness, capacity to see the world through multiple and authentic lenses, build awareness of difference and diversity that builds a young person's capacity to understand alternative views of the nation and to embrace democratic participation in a global world – it was the late 1990s (Biesta, 2016a; Tudball & Henderson, 2013). Biesta argues that these deep cultural challenges impact the ideals of democratic participation. The 'Discovering Democracy' project is considered evidence that governments of the day can pursue national agendas to adapt the study of civics and citizenship for reasons of national interest, such as political or economic reasons. Biesta (2016b) is deeply critical of

such approaches to CCE as, instead of leading students into another way of being that has no part in the existing order of things, these types of approaches simply perpetuate the existing order of things and therefore do not achieve his goal of subjectification which is explored below.

2.11.1.1 The Democratic Person

Democracy and education have always been closely intertwined. Since the beginnings of democracy in Athens, political and educational thinkers have debated how education will best prepare the people for participation in the ruling of their society. Hence, schools continue to be considered to have a pivotal role in the formation of a democratic citizenry and creation of a democratic culture. Biesta (2016b) has several problems with this notion: if education is seen as an instrument for bringing about democracy then it seems to have to carry the whole responsibility for the future of democracy but in reality, it is an illusion to think that schools alone can produce democratic citizens; this approach assumes there is a predefined set of knowledge, skills and dispositions assuming democracy is about identity and sameness; and this is a very individualist approach that seems to assume a common identity whereas we live in a world of plurality and difference. In this context, Biesta (2016b) asserts that democratic education is not about the production of democratic citizens, but rather a reconfiguring of democracy and democratic education around key concepts and ideas that can enable schools to support societies in which democratic action and democratic subjectivity are real possibilities, including:

- Education is not a space for preparation but a space for action and for becoming a subject in our being with others. This requires an educational environment where students have real opportunity to begin, to take initiative.
- Education needs to allow teachers to spend time and effort on finding the delicate balance between the child and the curriculum so that there are indeed real chances for children and students to undertake something new.
- To be a democratic person in a world of plurality and difference is therefore as much about doing and saying and bringing oneself into the world as it is about listening and waiting, creating spaces for others to begin, and thus creating opportunities for others to be a subject.
- Education cannot produce the democratic individual but democratic subjectivity is something that has to be achieved again and again.

2.11.1.2 Subjectification and the right to be a subject

Biesta (2016b) builds on the work of Hannah Arendt in proposing that to be a subject means to act, and action begins with bringing one's beginnings into the world, but in order to be a subject we need others who respond to our beginnings. If an individual were to begin something and no one responded, nothing would follow from my initiative, and, as a result, my beginnings would not come into the world and that person would not become a subject. It is precisely in this moment when I begin something and others do take up my beginnings, I do come into the world, and in precisely this moment I am a subject. Associated with this is unpredictability, since we cannot predict the actions others will take in their own subjectivity. Action is not possible in isolation. We cannot control the actions or responses of others as this would deprive them of their opportunities to being, their opportunities to be a subject. Action is not possible without plurality. As soon as we deprive others of their actions and their otherness, we deprive ourselves of our possibility to act, to come into the world, and to be a subject. Individuals might have democratic knowledge, skills and dispositions, but it is only in action – taken up by others in unprecedented, unpredictable and uncontrollable ways –

that the individual can be a democratic subject. Therefore, democracy occurs when everyone has the opportunity to be a subject, to act, and through their actions, bring their beginnings into the world of plurality and difference (Biesta, 2016b).

2.11.1.3 *Emancipation*

‘...Education is a “powerful intervention” aimed at setting people free’ (Biesta, 2016a)

Many educators want their students to become independent and autonomous, to think for themselves, makes their own judgements and conclusions. Biesta (Biesta, 2016a) argues that to achieve emancipation students need to experience a “rupture in the order of things”. Emancipation is a process of subjectification compared to identification which is about taking up an existing identity. Subjectification is about dis-identification - being different from any identified part of a community – a way of being that has no place in the existing order of things. Subjectification decomposes and recomposes the ways of doing, of being and saying. Subjectification can be highly political as it intervenes and reconfigures the existing order of things.

Equality permeates emancipation. If we are emancipated, we are equal. But, emancipation is not the process of moving from inequality to equality as this assumes the existence of power and dependency between educators and students. A trajectory that commences with the assumption of inequality will never be able to reach equality. Rather, emancipation is something students do for themselves. Emancipation means to act on the basis of equality. Emancipation, and therefore freedom and equality, needs to be claimed through the actions of those wishing to be emancipated. The role of the educator is to summon students to use their own intelligence and to find their own way to emancipation. The educator leads students to see and think for themselves and not be dependent on others to see and think for them. Therefore, emancipation requires each student to use their own intelligence under the assumption of the equality of intelligence, thrust along the path to equality by their emancipated educator. What matters from the perspective of educators is not that they are committed to equality, democracy and emancipation, but how they are committed to it and how this commitment is expressed and articulated (Biesta, 2016a).

2.12 *Summary of the literature review*

The literature review has journeyed from the revival of CCE in Australia in the late 1980s to the present day. In doing this, the most relevant initiatives and agreements have been discussed and the relevant NAPLAN results explored. The broader literature on the limitations of delivering CCE have been examined. Then, the two constructs that are relevant to this research – positive education and character education – have been outlined in detail as well as their key guide – Aristotle. This led to a discussion on the contested similarities and overlaps and how they apply and compare to the national curriculum. Finally, Biesta is presented as the critical lens that will be applied to the research findings.

2.13 *Gap in literature*

The literature review has demonstrated that there is a gap in the Australian literature on the potential for the construct of character education, applied as a lens for the delivery of the civics and citizenship curriculum, to help students flourish as active citizens at school. This study seeks to contribute to the understanding of whether the delivery of the national CCE curriculum through a character education lens can move students into the realm of active and engaged citizenship, a far cry from a national education approach of the past.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This section describes the key methodological approaches applied in this research. Planning and conducting educational research is a complex, deliberative and iterative process (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018). The main component of this research was a case study that considered the influence and impacts of character education in the context of middle-year 7-10 students in a South Australian school. The research has not sought to prove anything, but instead add to the body of understanding on what may make civics and citizenship education more effective in creating active citizens at school and beyond (Cohen et al., 2018). The research provided insight into the implementation of a character education framework in the Australian context. The research was subjective, not objective, as it searched for meaningful relationships between framework and practice and the consequences that might be used as the basis for comparison. The research involved a degree of triangulation through secondary data analysis.

3.1 Research design

The research was primarily qualitative, with use of supporting data. Qualitative research enables an approach that seeks to explore and understand the meaning individuals or groups assign to a social or human problem. The problem that is at the heart of this research is a lack of understanding around the potential for constructs such as positive education or character education to help students flourish as active citizens at school. This qualitative approach enabled the consideration of a number of questions emerging out of the existing research and the collection of data within a school setting as part of the case study. Qualitative research enables the researcher to create meaning out of complex situations. Analysis of the case study data and the secondary data enabled the researcher to move from specific to general themes and broader application (Cohen et al., 2018).

3.2 Philosophical worldview

Aligned to a post-modernist perspective, constructivism, and more specifically social constructivism, was the worldview that informed this research. As a social constructivist, the researcher sought to understand and create meaning around the experiences of teachers involved in the delivery of civics and citizenship education through the lens of character education. The researcher searched for complexity and diversity of views and ideas rather than narrow meanings in order to rely as much as possible on the participant's views in constructing meaningful answers to the research questions. A constructivist approach meant that the research questions used were more open-ended; that the research was conducted in the school setting; and meaning was generated from the data collected in the field (Cohen et al., 2018).

Linked to constructivism is an interpretive paradigm as the research is ultimately concerned for individuals and the longer term objective of creating active citizens. This is where the application of the critical lens of Gert J.J. Biesta is adopted. Biesta (2011) has developed a framework on how CCE can create active citizen subjects. An interpretive paradigm asserts that the social world can only be understood from the standpoint of the individuals who are part of the ongoing action being investigated. In interpretive research, theory is emergent and grounded in data generated by the research, through the case study (Cohen et al., 2018).

Complementary to constructivism was pragmatism since the research was concerned with applications – what works - and solutions to the problem of the gap between theory and practice when it comes to the delivery of civics and citizenship education in Australia meeting the goal that all young Australians become “active and informed citizens” (Ministerial Council for Employment, 2008). With a pragmatic approach, pluralistic approaches, from the literature review to the case

study to the reflective lens of Biesta, were implemented to derive knowledge about the problem within the given context (Cohen et al., 2018).

3.3 Research methods

This section outlines the research methods used in this study.

3.3.1 Review of the literature:

To identify the most relevant sources out of the thousands of peer-reviewed journal articles on civics and citizenship education, the following searches were undertaken of both the ERIC and A+ Education databases. The time period began with 2009 as this is when positive education emerged as an outcome of positive psychology coinciding with when Arthur (2005) began significant research into character education:

Search 1:

AU: Seligman
AND: positive
AND: Educat*

Search 2:

Civic*
AND: citizen*
AND: Austral*

Search 3:

Charact*
AND: civic*
AND: citizen*
AND: Austral*

To supplement this, the reference lists of key peer-reviewed articles and academic books were scanned for relevance, and new sources were identified and sourced.

The following websites of the two key experts were also searched for relevant research, reports and frameworks:

- Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues (Professor James Arthur)
- The pursuit of happiness (Professor Martin Seligman)
- The publications lists on each of their university profiles were also scanned for relevant sources

3.3.2 Case study:

The purpose of the case study was to answer the research questions by determining the influence of character education in the execution of the civics and citizenship curriculum and the associated character strengths and virtues within a middle-years school setting.

The dominant method used to illustrate whether or not the constructs of character education may impact on the Australian civics and citizenship curriculum within a middle-years school setting was a case study of a South Australian secondary school that has applied a character education framework across its curriculum.

Case studies follow the interpretative tradition of research as they enable the researcher to see the situation through the eyes of the participant. A case study was chosen to provide the

opportunity to explore the constructs of positive education and character education in more depth in a real situation. Through investigating the complexity of a real-life case study this can help to establish cause and effect in a real-life context. A case study enables in-depth exploration of real people in real situations in order to understand concepts more clearly than simply presenting these as abstract theories or principles. The case study enabled the researcher to develop a rich, thick and vivid description of relevant events; to provide a chronological narrative; to understand the perceptions of key individuals involved; and to provide the basis for in-depth analysis. A case study seeks to understand and interpret the world and illustrate a more general principle – in this case the potential impacts of moving students further towards active citizenship through teaching CCE through a character education or positive education lens (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000).

Care was taken around consideration of the context, appropriate collection and use of data to ensure it was systematic and rigorous, and ensuring the case study design added depth in addressing the research questions (Cohen et al., 2018). Case study data was gathered systematically and rigorously through the use of a common set of interview questions which are outlined in the next section. Interviews were recorded and transcribed so that a full data set could be drawn on in the establishment of themes and findings in latter chapters (Cohen et al., 2000). As well as contributing to the narrative around addressing the research question, the case study was used in a comparative structure, examining the case through the theoretical lens of character education and explaining the outcomes, keeping context and potential rival explanations in mind (Cohen et al., 2018).

3.3.2.1 Teacher interviews

The aim of the teacher interviews was, as per the research sub-question, to gain an in-depth understanding of how the theoretical framework of character education may influence the implementation of civics and citizenship in a year 7-10 setting.

The case study methodology to collect data on the teaching of civics and citizenship in a year 7-10 setting involved a two-staged interview using the following questions:

3.3.2.1.1 *Interview 1 - Implementation of character education across the school:*

1. Can you please explain why you think (CASE STUDY SCHOOL) introduced a character education framework?
2. Can you please describe how well you think the character education framework has been adopted by the teaching staff and provide examples to illustrate?
3. Can you please describe the impacts or changes you have seen since (CASE STUDY SCHOOL) implemented a character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum?
4. Do you think the impacts or changes have been a direct result of the implementation of the character education framework or are there any other reasons or influences?
5. Can you please describe whether or not you believe applying the character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum makes a difference in creating students with the desired characteristics? Please explain why.

3.3.2.1.2 *Interview 2 – Extent to which character education has influenced the Civics and Citizenship curriculum at (case study school):*

1. Can you please describe how the teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since the introduction of the character education framework at (CASE STUDY SCHOOL)?

- a. Please provide specific examples if possible.
2. In your opinion, which of the characters and virtues outlined in the (CASE STUDY SCHOOL) character education framework are necessary to create active citizens?
3. Do you believe that using the character education framework as a lens through which to teach civics and citizenship helps create students with the necessary character traits to become active citizens?
 - a. Please provide specific examples if possible.
4. Can you please describe how your teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since (CASE STUDY SCHOOL) introduced a character education framework?
5. Do you think other schools should use character education as a framework for teaching of civics and citizenship in order to create students with the needed characteristics to become active citizens? Please explain why or why not.

3.3.3.2 Collection of data

Interviews were recorded and transcribed to ensure transparency and clarity. This also avoided the possibility of misquoting an interviewee. Data was stored in accordance with ethic approval (H-2019-214).

3.4 Secondary data analysis:

As this research is mainly based on existing data and documents, the focus will be on careful analysis, interpretation and application of existing research. The links between research and practice will be identified through the application to the Australian curriculum. Where the documents are not peer reviewed, these will be analysed for context, relevance and reliability in relation to competently addressing the research questions (Cohen et al., 2018).

A secondary source analysis of:

- How characteristics inform the Australian civics and citizenship curriculum
- Evaluation of the links between positive education and character education and the Australian curriculum on civics and citizenship
- Assess whether the above analysis provides evidence that positive education and character education can help students flourish and become active citizens

3.5 Critical reflective lens: applying Gert J.J. Biesta

The philosophy of Gert J. J. Biesta was discussed in more detail in the literature review. The collected data is analysed using Biesta's key notions of: the democratic person; freedom and emancipation; and subjectification and the right to be a subject.

3.5.1 The Democratic Person and subjectivity

Biesta (2016b), criticises approaches to democratic education that are focused on the production of particular identities or subjectivities or the insertion of newcomers into an existing social order. Others agree that the pedagogical approach affects the outcome of citizenship education and the type of citizen that emerges (Reichert, 2016). Biesta posits that the problem of education as the production of the democratic person is that it entails an individualistic approach to democratic education without equipping individuals with the proper set of democratic knowledge, skills, and

dispositions, without asking questions about their relationships with others and about the social and political context in which they learn and act (Biesta, 2016b).

Biesta considers these approaches seek to give an answer to the question of how the democratic person can best be created or engendered, whereas Biesta (2016b) argues that an approach to education must recognise that students come into a world of plurality and difference, not identity and sameness. Biesta (2016b) acknowledges that schools can neither create nor save democracy but can only support societies in which democratic action and democratic subjectivity are real possibilities. Biesta theorises that to achieve this, rather than focus on production of democratic individuals or saving democracy, schools should perform the more realistic task of helping students to reflect on the fragile conditions under which all people can act, under which all people can be a subject (2016b).

3.5.3 Freedom, emancipation and subjectivity

Inherent in students achieving subjectivity is the capacity for students to experience freedom or emancipation as Biesta calls it a 'coming into presence' (Biesta, 2016a). Students are free when they are able to act with others and space is felt for unpredictable responses, when students are not forced to conform to a cultural norm. Individual freedom is interconnected with the freedom of others (Biesta, 2016a). This is relevant for analysis of civics and citizenship education based on a construct, such as positive education or character education, in order to consider whether these constructs are being adapted for political or other objectives which may limit the capacity for students to achieve subjectivity.

3.5.4 Key risks in the delivery of CCE

Biesta and others (Zyngier, 2012) have identified a number of key risks that relate to the delivery of civics and citizenship education. These include:

- **Thin democracy:** which involves teachers engaging students in the processes or acts of democracy without letting go of any power over the processes or acts. This is a particular problem if a school has exemplary curricula for the teaching of democracy and citizenship but the internal organisation of the school is undemocratic, as this will undoubtedly have a negative impact on students' attitudes and dispositions toward democracy. Schooling through democracy may indeed result in schooling for democracy. However, Biesta's understanding of democracy – action in plurality – goes beyond schools that are democratic in more formal senses, such as with a student parliament or based on the idea of democratic deliberation (Biesta, 2016b).
- **Civics education for political objectives:** much civics education focuses on forcing students into a cultural norm through creating students with the 'right' set of skills, knowledge and character traits to become a certain type of democratic personality, rather than the right to be a subject (Biesta, 2016b).
- **No freedom:** To avoid this, space must be created for students to act, for unpredictable responses to occur, and for students to understand that their own freedom is interconnected with the freedom of others (Biesta, 2016b).

3.6 Validity and reliability

In order for research to be valid, research must be reliable (Cohen et al., 2000). In a qualitative study such as this one, reliability and validity can be addressed through the honesty, depth, richness and scope of the data received from the participants, which is achieved through the researcher

remaining objective through the data collection process (Cohen et al., 2000). Reliability and validity can be obtained through in-depth responses from individuals involved in the case study.

3.6.1 Replicable and stable

The research has also been constructed so that it is replicable. The same case study questions could be applied in other schools that have adapted a character education framework. The case study could also be applied consistently over time, for example the researcher could return to the school again in the future and ask the same questions to see if the results deepen or change over time (Cohen et al., 2000). The case study is also set up to be stable. If the case study was used in other schools, or the same school over time, it has been established to yield similar data from similar respondents over time. The use of the same questions across every interview improves the stability of the results.

3.6.2 Removing bias

Care was taken to ensure validity and reliability in interviews through the researcher being aware of potential interviewer bias and keeping this in check. Strategies employed to remove interviewer bias included: not interrupting interviewees; not influencing the interviewee answers by leading them in any particular direction; the interviewer removing any pre-conceived notions from the interview process and being open and listening to their responses; and making sure the interviewee understood each question and providing clarification as required. The interviewer was not known to the interviewees so there was no pre-existing influences or power structure. This also meant there was no halo or Hawthorne effects as the researcher had no prior knowledge of the staff or their work and the research did not involve any observation. Lastly, bias was limited by completing full transcripts of interviews to ensure no interviewee was misquoted or misinterpreted (Cohen et al., 2000).

3.6.3 Open interview style

The interview questions were open and designed to elicit diversity in responses. The researcher completed the interviews face-to-face which can lead to more open exploration of the questions. Different perspectives were sought by interviewing staff from different positions, which also sought to achieve fairness by representing all voices of interviewees (Cohen et al., 2000).

3.6.4 Multi-pronged approach to validity

To understand how the implementation of a character education framework has impacted the school, validity was approached through multiple angles:

3.6.4.1 Descriptive validity

The case study sought to obtain data that was objectively factual.

3.6.4.2 Interpretive validity

The research was undertaken in order to capture meaning, interpretations, terms, intentions of situations and events from the perspective of those involved in the process of developing and implementing a character education framework in a school.

3.6.4.3 Theoretical validity

The research seeks to provide a real-life explanation of the impacts of the implementation of a character education framework in a school.

3.6.4.4 Generalizability

The research is limited in its claims and has been clear on these limits. There is limited generalisability of the findings beyond the case study school context. The study presents general

findings about the implementation of a character education framework in schools but may have limited comparability and transferability (Cohen et al., 2000).

3.6.4.5 Evaluative validity

The application of an evaluative framework judgemental of that being researched adds to the validity of the study. In this case, the application of the critical lens of Biesta contributes to the validity of the research. Credibility has also been improved through triangulation and respondent validation as explained elsewhere (Cohen et al., 2000).

3.6.4.6 Content validity

The case study achieves content validity as it comprehensively covers the topic from a number of angles, enabling breadth and depth (Cohen et al., 2000).

3.6.4.7 Construct validity

Construct validity was addressed as the terms positive education and character education were carefully defined and their meaning established through the literature review.

3.6.4.8 Ecological validity

Ecological validity was achieved by the researcher remaining neutral, with no intervention or manipulation of the variables or conditions. Other factors and alternative explanations were considered and articulated in the process (Cohen et al., 2000).

3.6.4.6 Triangulation

Triangulation can be achieved by attempting to map out and explain more fully the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one standpoint and using both qualitative and quantitative data (Cohen et al., 2000). Methodological triangulation was achieved by examining the research question from different perspectives and using different techniques and this overcomes the issue of method-boundedness. Triangulation was achieved in this study through the literature review, case study, secondary source analysis and application of the critical reflective lens of Biesta (Cohen et al., 2000).

CHAPTER 4: CASE STUDY FINDINGS

This section focuses on addressing the research questions through identifying the relevance and the potential for applying a character education framework (CEF) in a middle-years setting.

Character education isn't something else on educator's plates; it is the plate. (The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, 2015)

4.1 Case study school: the creation of the (name of program)

"I fundamentally believe that a child's education should focus on developing the holistic needs of the individual and the skills that they need to thrive, and ultimately be successful in life... A core underpinning of a boy's education at (case study school) is therefore to focus on the development of character and this is reflected in our core beliefs that guide our actions as a school". Participant 1, Head of Secondary School and Deputy Headmaster (Kinniburgh, 2017, p. accessed 25 November 2019).

4.1.1 Background on Case study school

The case study school is an independent boys' school for day students and boarders located near the centre of Adelaide, South Australia. The case study school was established by the Methodist Church in 1869 and is affiliated with the Uniting Church in Australia. The case study school is an International Baccalaureate Organisation with more than one thousand boys between 5 and 18 across their Preparatory, Middle and Senior schools. Students attending (case study school) are predominantly from high socio-economic backgrounds (Case study school, n.d.-a).

4.1.2 Case study school's character education framework

At a glance, as the explanation of the character education framework refers to the Values in Action (VIA) tool developed by Seligman, the framework appears to be a melange of Arthur and Seligman. However, upon further investigation it was discovered that the character education framework (CEF) is their own bespoke model that is delivered as part of their pastoral care / wellbeing program, focuses on developing the virtues of good character and which also equips students to be able to lead healthy, happy and fulfilling lives. The creator and visionary for the CEF articulated a clear preference for the work of James Arthur, although the VIA is considered a useful tool to introduce the language and concepts of character and virtues to students (Participant 1, personal communication, November 26, 2019). The focus is on the schools core beliefs that provide a mechanism for students to learn to act ethically and that doing so for the right reasons is essential if they are to become independent, resilient and successful (Kinniburgh, 2017). Regular masterclasses are also held to educate parents around pastoral care and wellbeing issues (Case study school, n.d.-b).

"By focusing on the College core beliefs and the notion of character in all aspects of school life, we can help our young (name of program) to be more attuned to what it takes to truly flourish in life". (Participant 1, Head of Secondary School and Deputy Headmaster (Participant 1, 2017, p. accessed 25 November 2019).

4.1.3 The creation of (name of program)

As explained in a recent blog by Participant 1, the desire of (case study school) is to create '(name of program)': men of character who know how to act ethically as part of becoming autonomous and successful. By developing character through all aspects of school life, (name of program) will be more aware of what it takes to flourish in life and how to regulate their own wellbeing. At (case study school), character is both caught through the interactions of staff with all students, and taught through the '(name of program) Program' which is an explicitly delivered wellbeing course that all students in years 7 to 12 undertake during timetabled lessons, an approach also supported by

Seligman et al (2009) as a primary prevention that can help prevent mental illness (overview at Appendix A). The (name of program) program focuses on the explicit teaching of virtues; virtues that help young men be of 'good character'. As part of the broader pastoral care program, each year level spends one lesson per week that covers four wellbeing themes, one of which is 'character and manhood'.

4.1.4 The (name of program) program

In an effort to encourage students to move beyond hedonism into eudaimonism, the College places strong emphasis on teaching boys about the virtues of good character, based on the work of the Jubilee Centre. In the beginning stages, the school used the virtues advocated by the Jubilee Centre: civic, spiritual, moral, performance and intellectual virtues. However, as part of their process of developing a bespoke model, the school identified their own four key virtues of: integrity; wisdom; courage and gratitude supported by seven character traits. While the development of the (name of program) has been a focus over the school's 150 year history, today the focus is on actively teaching boys about how to be men of 'good character' with the qualities to accept challenges in life, perform at their best, and contribute to something bigger than themselves (Participant 1, 2019).

4.2 Case study school: the case study

In order to illustrate more clearly whether or not the constructs of character education may impact on the Australian civics and citizenship curriculum, a case study was undertaken. The case study was drawn on to both create a narrative around the research questions, and was also explanatory as it seeks to identify or explain causal links between Case study school's chosen framework of character education impacts on the delivery of civics and citizenship education. Therefore identifying if the framework of character education can help to create active citizens.

4.2.1 Case study findings

This section outlines the key themes and findings arising from the interviews, relating to the extent to which the implementation of a character education framework has been successful in the school studied.

4.2.1.1 *Delivery through the pastoral curriculum program*

In diagrammatic form, the CEF has three key streams: pastoral, academic and co-curricular. However, one of the key findings was that, to date, the CEF has only been implemented in the pastoral care program as this program lacked structure and coherence and therefore the adoption of the CEF into the development and delivery of the pastoral care program filled a gap. The pastoral care program involves a teacher meeting with a group of no more than 16 boys every week day. Previously this timeslot was unstructured pastoral care time, so teacher embraced the opportunity to follow a framework and use the resources developed. Although, as several interviewees admitted some staff implement it better than others, 'we are not getting a hugely consistent approach... it needs money spent on professional development' (Participant 2, personal communication, November 14, 2019). But, as one interviewee said '...very little has changed in the classroom' (Participant 5, personal communication, November 19, 2019). However, perhaps this approach aligns with the findings of A. Peterson and Bentley in A. Peterson and Tudball (2016) where the link is established between promoting deeper religious values and improving CCE outcomes.

4.2.1.2 *No established link between character education and the delivery of civics and citizenship*

As described in section 4.2.1.1, the most relevant finding was that the introduction of the character education framework has had no impact on the delivery of civics and citizenship education and no changes have been made to the delivery of civics and citizenship education since the implementation of the character education framework. To summarise, for teaching staff it is not so

much a question of ‘Can the implementation of character education influence the execution of civics and citizenship curriculums and the associated character strengths and skills within a school?’ but should it? Further, it was not ‘How does the theoretical framework of character education influence the implementing of civics and citizenship in a year 7-10 setting?’ but it does not. While there were mixed responses to the question of whether the CEF has impacted on the curriculum more broadly, the majority of teaching staff interviewed were resistant to the integration of the CEF into the delivery of the curriculum, no matter what the subject. Indeed, there was a level of skepticism bordering on cynicism, as reflected in the following quotes:

“These virtues need to be developed intrinsically. We don’t need to mention them every day. This can lead to indoctrination... boys start to believe they are something they are not, which becomes an issue.” (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019)

There was also a perception that integration of the CEF into the academic curriculum would come at cost or distract from more concrete academic outcomes. There was a sense that to integrate the CEF into the curriculum required a truly nuanced approach by an educator and, for others less capable, this could erode teaching outcomes. This was reflected in the comment ‘If you have a teacher who is not curriculum strong then the teacher may take the path of least resistance... I have seen it happen where a teacher focuses on delivering content that is superfluous to the curriculum and the curriculum outcomes are poor’ (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019). When interrogated further as to whether the teaching staff believed that using the CEF as a lens in CCE to create the necessary traits to become active citizens, caution was reiterated based on previous experiences ‘what you would find is teachers would integrate ‘kindness’ etc. in their delivery and it did not improve outcomes or developments – all it would do is distract... it (CEF) is not central and shouldn’t be’ (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019).

Perhaps one of the reasons why there has been limited voluntary integration of the CEF into the curriculum is reflected in the response from one member of the leadership team that ‘the process, like all new implementations, has been on teaching faculty’ (Participant 2, personal communication, November 14, 2019) and this has applied to those involved in the pastoral care program where delivery was mandatory, so would likely emanate across all teaching staff.

However, this is not disheartening as there were some other findings related to the delivery of the civics and citizenship curriculum that are worth repeating in here:

- **Civics and citizenship should drive the virtues of the CEF:** when asked if the CEF could work as a lens through which to teach CCE, teaching staff flipped this in the opposite direction, claiming that it should go the other way. That is, that CCE should inform and drive the development of the CEF. This is reflected in the following response:

“Using the CCE program as the driver of CEF to develop students to be the person you want them to be. 70% of CCE fits what you want a student to be... You don’t start with virtues – you have a good idea of what they are – you start with CCE as the baseline to develop some virtues... Use the CCE to guide or lead part of the pastoral program for CEF. Start with something more concrete than virtues. Start with the concept of right or wrong – from the CCE – and use that to develop a more genuine delivery of the pastoral care program... otherwise the purpose can be lost”. (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019)

- **Civics and citizenship should be integrated into the pastoral care program:** following on from the above suggestion, there was general agreement among the teaching staff that CCE

could be integrated into the pastoral care program. CCE was seen as a natural, intrinsic fit for the pastoral care curriculum. This was indicated in the following comment:

“Why doesn’t the pastoral curriculum teach civics and citizenship? They could teach character education and link this to CCE. Then, keep purely discrete academic ideas to the academic classroom. I would be more willing to consider this” (Participant 5, personal communication, December 5, 2019).

- **Civics and citizenship is more meaningful if not taught as a standalone topic:**

During a recent curriculum review, it was decided to integrate CCE where there were natural, intrinsic links within other subjects. This approach was decided on rather than teach a tokenistic two week subject on CCE at the end of the year with a huge redundancy effect. It was considered there were natural links with geography and history. When considering the development of countries, the development of politics, the development of laws and rights such as the Magna Carta, the development of people, the shift away from feudalism, the spread of cultures, and so on. In studying these events and developments, natural, intrinsic links can be made to the content of the CCE curriculum with conceivably more lasting impacts. However, the risk of achieving active learning but not active citizenship still remains with this approach (A. Peterson & Bentley, 2017b).

“Most schools treat CCE as a tick box – do it for two weeks tacked on to the end of teaching... We have integrated CCE where the links are natural and coherent... there is no point teaching something if it is not linked to real life” (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019).

4.2.1.3 Gap between vision and practice

One of the glaring findings was that the CEF is viewed differently by leadership than teaching staff. The creator and instigator of the CEF, who had benefited from meeting with James Arthur and worked in English schools where CE had been integrated, has a deep and inspiring vision for developing strong character of students in his school. This vision includes incorporating the CEF into the curriculum.

“My vision is to incorporate into class curriculum... Next year zeroing in on key virtues that we will be developing throughout the year. Align to chapel services and develop as part of academic services... this is a eudonimist approach where wellbeing is a lifelong journey and the final outcome is that you will have achieved the state of wellbeing... we equip young men with the skills to flourish in life... life is tough, it is a challenge, let’s not gloss it up. We want boys to be independent, resilient and respond well to challenge. Regulate emotions and behavior. If we can do that and interact with others really well. I would say they are well on their way to attaining a sense of wellbeing” (Participant 1, personal communication, November 26, 2019).

This contrasted deeply with the views of teaching staff, who were open to the students themselves making connections between the CE implemented in the pastoral care program but reticent to embrace the CEF and integrate into their curriculum, reflected in comments including:

“It is hard because, as a lens, there is something to be said for overstating something... There may be inconsistencies in the teaching and learning depending on the skills of the teachers... There is something to be said about the separation of the pastoral and academic... the pastoral curriculum could teach CE and link this to civics and citizenship... Everything that happens in the classroom comes at a cost” (Participant 5, personal communication, December 5, 2019)

“I need to be careful not to force links that are not there... as it can become disingenuous and it does become quite a drain on teaching time... to make it work you need a small school and a staff who are particularly capable and working at the same level” (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019).

This is despite the intermediary between the creator of the CEF and the teaching staff believing that substantial progress had been made in aligning the CEF with the curriculum. This member of the leadership team had presented the neo-Aristotelian model to staff and was under the impression that teaching staff understood, and were committed to, getting students on to the 'high road' where they could take ownership of their actions and flourish. Although, the focus appears to presently be in the pastoral and co-curricular (sporting) streams. This interviewee was also involved in teaching and was actively incorporating character virtues into his own lessons, so believed this should be done across the board. "There is a lot of scope to explore virtues through subjects... these are other perspectives we need to explore... enables students to be humble and not be so presumptuous of their own understanding of things" (Participant 3, personal communication, December 5, 2019). Perhaps this resistance is based on criticisms of character education that have now become outdated. As articulated in the literature review, perhaps the views of teaching staff reflect the initial criticisms of CE, for example that it does not represent the best available evidence, that have since been overcome through further research and development (Arthur, 2019). This demonstrates further time investment in bringing all staff on board needs to be made if the vision of the CEF is to be implemented across the board: pastoral, co-curricular and academic streams.

4.2.1.4 Resistance to adopt CEF in the classroom

While teaching staff seem willing to accept the benefits of boys developing virtues through the pastoral program, there is resistance to integrating the CEF into the classroom. One teacher spoke of the need to rely on the success of the CEF through the pastoral curriculum in order for a week-long civics excursion to succeed. It 'relies on the teaching of the CEF as if we have students of good character the excursion is very successful... boys need to be unselfish... act in a way that doesn't disrespect the school' (Participant 5, personal communication, November 19, 2019). This very teacher was unwilling to consider integrating the CEF into teaching 'There's something to be said about the separation of the pastoral and academic... There isn't a mix or a blend as there is the risk of diluting...everything that happens in the classroom comes at a cost... better to do something well once than do it poorly multiple times' (Participant 5, personal communication, November 19, 2019).

The supremacy of 'creating inquisitive and knowledgeable people' over integration of virtues into lesson plans were echoed by others interviewed 'You cannot show virtues if you don't know anything. If you can't understand and know about the Westminster systems then you can't act. If you can't understand why we have continuous debates about Indigenous rights then you can't participate' (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019). Having considered what the Jubilee Centre provides in lesson plans, there were some glimmers of hope that integration might be possible, such as "I could see the value of it (CEF) being subtle as long as the essential knowledge that students need was not compromised" (Participant 5, personal communication, November 19, 2019). Perhaps the integration of virtues into teaching is not paramount. Indeed, if we return to Kristjansson (2013) and the views of Aristotle, the necessity of teacher behavior in role-modelling appropriate character development may be more important.

4.2.1.5 Difficult to prove causation and measure

While leadership spoke of the emergence of the language of virtues, teaching staff put the changes down to other factors. While one leader perceived there had been increased participation in co-curricular activities and improved student behavior (Participant 2, personal communication, November 14, 2019), this was not supported by teaching staff who said 'it's as good as it's always been' (Participant 5, personal communication, November 19, 2019). While this leader was also convinced the CEF was a reference point for sustainable cultural change, teaching staff put this down to the development of the new curriculum model and stronger staff directives supported from the

top - resulting in a shift in teachers expecting more of students inside and outside the classroom. The change in the curriculum has meant the school now knows 'what our product is and parents accept it or not. The school has found out who we are, rather than being dictated to by parents' ... With the commencement of new senior staff, this has lifted the expectations in students and now 'Teachers feel more supported in behavior management. Staff expecting more of the lads and knowing they have the support of leadership... teachers being more cohesive in their expectations can have a massive impact on how the boys behave' (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019). Concerns were also raised about measurement 'I don't know if it has made a big change as we don't have a good measure' (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019).

However, there is anecdotal evidence that the CEF has already effected some change, even for students who were already in year 10 when it was introduced. For example, the 2019 year 12s made a leaving video where they filmed themselves walking around the school grounds, shaking each other's hands. Each time a student would shake another's hand, the student would show his hand and it had a character trait written on it that best described that student. Duty. Honour. Kindness. This, and the anecdote that the year 12s were also using virtue language in their valedictory speeches, and boys are using the language of virtues during behavior management discussions, demonstrates that the character education message is already resonating with students (Participant 3, personal communication, December 5, 2019).

4.2.1.6 Building on the past

A key theme arising from all interviews was that the character education framework was building on what was already a concept at the school – the (name of program) – which had been in existence throughout the life of the school. The difference with the introduction of the character education framework was that now all staff, students and families now knew what was meant by a '(name of program)'. That is, there was now a common understanding and common language – the language of virtues - that could be used when discussing what was meant by a (name of program) (Participant 1, personal communication, November 26, 2019). Even so, it was obvious that significant resourcing and effort has been invested, and continues to be invested, in the school's CEF as the school is focused on the long game. This demonstrates it would be very difficult to implement a CEF if starting from scratch or if there was a 'blank slate' as this would involve even greater levels of resources and effort.

4.2.1.7 Congruence with the Australian curriculum

In relation to the character strengths relevant to the Australian curriculum, the character strength held to be the most relevant was *integrity*. One interviewee commented 'Integrity is right up there. That one seems to be the anchor for the others. If there is integrity then courage and wisdom come after that' (Participant 5, personal communication, November 19, 2019).

4.3 Conclusion

This chapter has challenged the original assumptions of this research and provided insights into potential alternatives that may be more relevant in arresting the decline in civics and citizenship knowledge evident in the NAP-CC tests. This chapter has shown that there is a link between CCE and the Australian Curriculum but, as there may be more natural and intrinsic links between CCE and existing subjects, it may not be necessary for CCE to be delivered as a standalone topic. However, there are early indications that implementation of a CEF more broadly may lead to students with greater skills for active citizenship. Thus, this research illustrates that, if the will to improve CCE outcomes is present, creative solutions can be found.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on addressing the third research question in identifying what can be learned from the application of the critically reflective lens of Biesta to the collective data and what might be the implications for practice.

It could be argued there has never been a better time for the education of civics and citizenship in Australian schools. While preparing young people for informed, responsible and active citizenship has long been a goal of education and schooling in Australia, the new Australian curriculum provides for the development of a specific curriculum subject for Civics and Citizenship from year 7 (A. Peterson & Bentley, 2017b).

5.2 Congruence in character strengths and virtues

Of the four virtues developed by (CASE STUDY SCHOOL), the key virtue relating to the creation of active citizens was considered to be integrity. A definition of integrity might be 'the quality of being honest and having strong moral principles that you refuse to change' (Cambridge Dictionary, 2019). This character trait could be considered to have strong links to the Australian curriculum. A person of integrity has ethical understanding, demonstrates personal and social capability and is capable of critical and creative thinking. From the foundation of acting with integrity, other capabilities such as intercultural understanding could be established (ACARA, n.d.). Therefore, there is congruence between a CEF and achieving the general capabilities in the Australian curriculum. It is not unreasonable to assert that an individual acting with integrity may engage in citizenship as practice through acting with civic virtue, recognising their civic obligations and have an awareness of the common good (A. Peterson & Bentley, 2017a). But, it is not entirely clear whether integrity will move an individual into the realm of deliberative engagement in democracy or active citizenship that engages with the political dimensions (A. Peterson & Tudball, 2016; Tudball & Henderson, 2013).

5.3 Applying the critical reflective lens of Gert J.J. Biesta

As outlined in depth previously, the work of Biesta on the relationships between education, lifelong learning, citizenship and democracy provides us with a critical lens to apply to the findings of this research. Biesta (2011, 2016a, 2016b) provides us with a number of points to consider in evaluating the impacts of a character education framework in the delivery of civics and citizenship education.

5.3.1 The Democratic Person

5.3.1.1 *Individualistic versus interconnectivity*

Following on from the discussion of NAPLAN results in the literature review and presentation of other research into attitudes towards civics (Ghazarian et al., 2017). It is clear there has been a decline in knowledge of civics and citizenship students. Despite this, students are more interested than ever before to participate as active citizens. This is evident through the 2019 student-led global climate strikes with more than 350,000 Australian participants (ABC News, 2019). However, it is concerning that, despite this indicating students possess characteristics reflective of active citizenship, students are participating in democratic processes that they do not fully understand (ACARA, 2016).

Discussion of this predicament arose during an interview with a senior member of teaching staff. The example given in response – that students were not interested in participating in these global protests as the students viewed these as tokenistic given they are part of a more enlightened

demographic that is involved in individual actions such as recycling – reflects more the view of developing personally responsible citizens than participatory or justice-oriented citizens (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) and Biesta (2016b) would be critical of this as an individualistic approach and insertion into an existing order rather than equipping students to create a new order which would involve promoting systemic change and interconnectivity (Biesta, 2011).

As noted in the literature review (A. Peterson & Bentley, 2015) and chapter 5, to achieve active citizenship that is reflective of participatory or justice-oriented citizenship, there needs to be some engagement with political dimensions. However, care must be taken to ensure that teaching about political dimensions does not cross over into manipulating for political objectives as this may also limit a student's democratic subjectivity (Biesta, 2016b). The literature also argued the risk may be overcome through character education which posits that the development of universally accepted character virtues limits the capacity for political manipulation (Arthur et al., 2015).

5.3.1.2 Identity and sameness versus plurality and difference

There is some evidence of flexibility within the CEF in that students are being called to be kind to others, do the right thing, express and explore characteristics and traits beyond what comes naturally. But, there are also parameters as there are expectations and cultural norms that have shaped the students at this school for over a century and a half. This is evident in the comment:

“We have always had really nice boys who are privileged due to our demographic... Boys because of their background are really balanced and actually know who they are” (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019).

Perhaps the best outcome that can be hoped for within this context of aligning to a pre-defined culture and identity is students that develop strong character virtues that give them the capacity to connect with others and flourish in a world of plurality and difference (Biesta, 2016b). This is also reflected from leadership who spoke of the flourish/languish model being applied to encourage students to take ownership of their actions and seek to change or improve when needed in order to flourish in life (Participant 3, personal communication, December 5, 2019).

5.3.2 Freedom and emancipation

5.3.2.1 Freedom

There was some evidence in the descriptions of some activities undertaken in classes, and the opportunities provided to students to reflect on these, of students being allowed freedom in being given the space to act, for unpredictable responses to occur and to understand their own freedom is interconnected with the freedom of others (Participant 3, personal communication, December 5, 2019). But, there is scope for more freedom to be exercised in the development of virtues indicated in the comment ‘give the student the opportunity to try, fail and succeed’ (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019). An individual student's freedom, as developed through the CEF, may also be limited by staff who perceive the value of the CEF is in how it serves them not the student as discussed previously (Participant 5, personal communication, November 19, 2019).

Perhaps the extent to which students experience freedom may be limited by the students themselves who view teaching and pastoral care staff as ‘a parent’ (Participant 3, personal communication, December 5, 2019) and emancipation may be linked to the capacity of individual teachers as this came up repeatedly in interviews. Another factor may be the freedom and permission teachers experience in enabling emancipation in students which is also impacted by the school environment, the culture emanating from a sesquicentenary history, compounded by the expectations of parents (Biesta, 2011).

5.3.2.1 *Emancipation*

For Biesta (2016a), equality permeates emancipation and emancipation is something students do for themselves. Emancipation means to act on the basis of equality. Given the privilege experienced by students, any sense of equality may be impossible beyond the school's borders, unless students are equipped to claim it (Biesta, 2016b). As Biesta (2016a) explains, it is how educators express their commitment to equality, democracy and emancipation that is more important than whether they are committed to it. Commitment to emancipation and students experiencing freedom and equality, despite the barriers explored on chapter 4, is articulated in the comments from leadership:

"I have an issue with the fact that we just focus on individual character strengths. I think that approach is inherently selfish. Whereas I believe acting in the right way no matter what the circumstances is a precursor to obtain a state of wellbeing and fundamentally flourish in real life... Happiness trap is a problem as we cannot be happy all the time... develop skills for when boys are up and down. Showing gratitude and understanding what that means... Having compassion towards others. Being present in the moment".

"We expect all our boys to be leaders, not necessarily by appointment or title, but to serve others and that is fundamentally aligned with being a good citizen" (Participant 1, personal communication, November 26, 2019).

This reflects a desire from leadership for students to act, to take up their own beginnings, and to ultimately move towards subjectivity through engaging successfully with the actions or responses from others (Biesta, 2016b).

5.3.3 *Subjectification and the right to be a subject*

5.3.3.1 *Thick or thin democracy*

When discussing action and service the students were involved in, references were made to what Biesta would consider acts of thin democracy (Biesta, 2016b), such as the Duke of Edinburgh program, student-led committees, history and science journal committees and other student-led clubs (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019). However, there were also examples provided that challenged the student's perceptions and views, such as the week long intensive outreach program where the students would give up a week of their school holidays to spend it with disabled students providing mentoring, caring and buddying students. However, this still reflects participation only by a minority (Participant 2, personal communication, November 14, 2019).

One interviewee noted that the school was looking to expand its role in the community as this is not done particularly well unless followed through by individual teachers (Participant 3, personal communication, December 5, 2019). While knowledge retention may be stronger as the CCE content has been integrated into existing subjects, it is unlikely that students have the opportunity to explore what it means to be a democratic subject unless they participate in the extra-curricular activities and, more specifically, the activities that challenge their perceptions and capacity to act as subjects in a world of plurality and difference (Biesta, 2016b).

5.3.3.2 *Promotes insertion into an existing order or creation of a new order*

There was a strong sense of deontology, and that the CEF was the right path to developing active citizens, emanating from the interviews with leadership staff:

"The right approach to teach someone who is a good citizen who serves others. Contributes to others. Contributes to the world. Not through any sense of self gain but because it is fundamentally the right thing to do. A student who goes on to make the world a better place because it is the right thing to do." (Participant 1, personal communication, November 26, 2019)

This demonstrates that leadership would like students to move towards subjectification and freedom, beyond the democratic citizen inserted into an existing order, but this may require insurmountable cultural change. While the voice of leadership points in the direction of subjectification, a desire for students 'coming into presence' and ultimately emancipation (Biesta, 2011), there are doubters on the inside.

'The upper echelons convince the students they are something when in actual fact they are not simply because of a marketing plan' (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019).

Moving in the direction of subjectification and emancipation may also be inhibited by the established norms and expectations emanating from a school that is more than 150 years old. Staff spoke of the high standards for behavior and alignment to the school's established cultural norms (Participant 3, personal communication, December 5, 2019). The school case studied also has the largest old scholar network in the Southern Hemisphere thus reinforcing established norms and expectations. However, the vision of leadership reflects hope that the CEF sets a strong and new direction that may generate cultural change and greater freedoms to express character and greater levels of subjectivity in the longer term.

"Teaching them [the students] the skills to navigate a moral landscape/ the human landscape is important and requires a strong moral obligation to act with good character. It is a decent thing to do. This generation is too hedonistic... I believe we can add value when we focus on developing virtues in young men. Act well. Act for the right reasons. Act in a way that helps regulate themselves... We equip young men with the skills to flourish in life." (Participant 1, personal communication, November 26, 2019)

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter demonstrates clear congruence between the development of character virtues and good, if not politically active, citizenship. But, the chapter illustrates there is an inconsistency between commentators in the data collected. This inconsistency appears in the school's current environment, current practices, and what is required by teaching staff to execute the vision of leadership. It is believed that there is scope for change so that students can experience greater levels of freedom, subjectivity and emancipation through the development and delivery of the CEF and CCE. In applying the critical lens of Biesta, the actions of the school suggest the school errs more on the side of producing particular identities or subjectivities or the insertion of newcomers into an existing social order, rather than promoting or enabling a student's subjectivity. However, the vision of leadership indicates a preference for more subjectivity. Consequently a number of improvements may be made. There could be a concerted effort towards thick democracy across the school. There needs to be a greater focus on active citizenship that engages with the political dimensions and greater interconnectivity with the outside world. Specific recommendations are provided in chapter 6.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusions

This research has sought to contribute to the understanding of how constructs, such as character education or positive education, may help students flourish as active citizens. After identifying both constructs, and where they emanate from, the study has sought to identify connections with and relevance to the curriculum. This was followed by an in depth case study of a school that has applied a CEF and the findings were critically evaluated using the framework provided by Biesta.

While the results of this study are somewhat inconclusive as to the true value of a CEF in schools, this may be because it is simply too early to tell. Notwithstanding, this research provides early indications that the development of a bespoke character education framework may lead to stronger overall wellbeing outcomes and has the potential to move students towards the goal of active citizenship. While the study has focused on application of CE through the case study, given the similarities between PE and CE identified in the literature review, it is reasonable to infer that similar results may be achieved through the application of either construct.

6.1.1 What impact did the implementation of CE have on developing citizenship?

In answer to research question 1, no clear links were established between implementation of CE and developing citizenship. However, there are early indications that implementation of a CEF more broadly may lead to students with greater skills for active citizenship and the school may be heading in the right direction with the key virtues of integrity, wisdom, courage and gratitude to guide them. One interviewee highlighted that kindness was a priority character strength for students (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019). This assertion may be challenged by the Jubilee Centre as their research indicates that, in the context of citizenship education, the moral virtue of kindness might be deepened into compassion, and specifically the expression of empathy and sympathy (The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, n.d.-c). This would also be supported by Biesta (2016b) who promotes a deepening of knowledge, skills and virtues in order for students to enter the world as democratic subjects capable of listening and waiting, creating spaces for others to begin and also join them as subjects. Perhaps the broader development of character traits needed for active citizenship, together with deeper and stronger levels of action across the school mentioned as a gap by interviewees (Participant 3, personal communication, December 5, 2019), are what is needed to contribute to what Biesta (2016a) calls for when saying schools can support societies in which democratic action and democratic subjectivity become real possibilities.

6.1.2 What impact did the implementation of CE have on the school's civics curriculum?

It was initially hoped that this research would aid in the search for solutions to arrest the decline in CCE in Australia. As stated in the introduction, this research hoped to identify if there was any value in applying a broader framework to the teaching of CCE in achieving curriculum objectives. While this research has not established any links between application of a CE lens to CCE and improved outcomes, it has indicated there may be strength in schools identifying more robust ways of delivering the CCE curriculum, such as through integration into existing subjects.

This finding that creative and bespoke approaches to CCE may be more appropriate is supported by the literature review. It was asserted that at the heart of citizenship education is addressing the question 'How do we build a just society?' (The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, n.d.-b). This is supported by the Jubilee Centre's assertion that citizenship education reflects the Aristotelian perspective that a good society must be built on ethically good characters. ACARA

(n.d.) also identified the relevance of character in relation to the characteristics of good leadership, as part of CCE. This is supported by the case study which has demonstrated the potential of CE to generate the traits needed for active citizenship.

The integration of CCE into existing subjects where there are intrinsic links may also overcome some of the limitations of CCE outlined in the literature review, such as CCE objectives not translating into practice or lack of confidence in CCE delivery (A. Peterson & Tudball, 2016). Further, integration of CCE into existing subjects may overcome the isolation and struggle faced by teachers when CCE is viewed as a marginal pedagogy (Black, 2015). Referring back to the literature review: It is also possible that, with careful delivery, this approach may move students towards participatory or justice-oriented citizens if the civil, political and social components of CCE are delivered in ways that include local, national and global understandings which was also identified as a weakness of current approaches. Further, Biesta (2016a) may be supportive of more intrinsic and creative approaches to democratic education provided that any approach involves students asking questions about their relationships with others and the social and political context in which they learn and act (Tudball & Henderson, 2013; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

The capacity of teachers to deliver CCE was identified as a major barrier to successful outcomes (Zyngier, 2016). Likewise, teacher capacity was identified as a major inhibitor to the success of the school's CEF (Participant 2, personal communication, November 14, 2019). These views are supported by Biesta (2016a) who emphasizes the need for not only competent teachers in the delivery of the CCE curriculum but those that are prepared to work outside their comfort zone and take risks. Therefore, it is necessary for the school to implement their plan to mentor and develop teachers in order to improve the implementation and outcomes of the CEF and help move students towards citizenship (Participant 2, personal communication, November 14, 2019).

The case study also presented a number of interesting findings. There is congruence between developing character traits and the General Capabilities in the Australian Curriculum. A CEF needs to be bespoke, nuanced and carefully crafted to align with the school's strategic plan, values and core beliefs to ensure it is relevant to a school's context. While CE may be key to improving active citizenship both in school and beyond, as mentioned above, it may not be critical for CE to be used as a lens for teaching CCE if relevant traits for active citizenship are being taught in other parts of the curriculum.

Thus, this research illustrates that, if the will to improve CCE outcomes is present, creative solutions can be found. The integration of CCE into existing subjects, or a pastoral care program, where there are natural, intrinsic links and greater likelihood of knowledge retention, may be more successful in improving NAP-CC results and ultimately creating active and informed citizens of the future. However, further longitudinal research to determine the relevance of this claim.

6.1.3 What can be learned from the application of the critical reflective lens of Biesta (2016b) in moving students towards active citizenship?

Application of Biesta's critical lens has illustrated that, in order to move students towards greater subjectivity, there needs to be more freedom in the classroom, more opportunities and encouragement for students to engage in thick democracy, and more focus on students engaging in a world of plurality and difference. This may involve a shift away from the identity and sameness that may exist with the focus on perpetuating the school's existing order towards deeper student engagement and reflection on the fragile conditions of Australia's democracy and global environment. The study found that, while the school has implemented some positive changes, the

school could focus more on supporting students to further engage in democratic action and democratic subjectivity.

6.2 Recommendations of this study

The school is already implementing necessary future developments of their CEF, such as establishing a mentoring program for less-capable teachers to ensure more consistent capacity and delivery, and developing an evaluation framework. However, the following recommendations are also proposed.

6.2.1 Bridging the gap between vision and practice

The creator and instigator of the CEF has a strong vision for the CEF in saying that ‘the next phase is to really have it (CE) in all that we do’ (Participant 1, personal communication, November 26, 2019). However, the discussion above has illustrated that teaching staff have concerns and reservations, such as in the comment ‘We need to approach this with a sense of trepidation and I am not a fan of pushing this too much’ (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019).

Thus, to see this vision come to life, constant and consistent actions are required to bring teaching staff on board with this vision and working in collaboration with leadership to witness this infiltration. It is recommended the school identifies in detail and implements actions aimed at bridging this gap.

6.2.2 Broadening the views of citizenship

As indicated in the analysis, there appears to be a stronger focus on promoting the personally responsible citizen, rather than the participatory or justice-oriented citizen among staff involved in teaching civics and citizenship.

Therefore, it is recommended that staff involved in teaching elements of civics and citizenship identify, incorporate and evaluate the integration of elements of the political dimensions of the curriculum into their delivery of civics and citizenship to move students into the realms of participatory and justice-oriented citizenship (A. Peterson & Bentley, 2017a).

6.2.3 Build the student one virtue at a time

The school has four key character strengths underpinned by seven virtues. Teaching staff spoke of the dangers of trying to do too much as this being a trap teachers can easily fall into. This related to trying to make progress against every character virtue in every year level. Instead, the suggestion was made to focus on an individual virtue each year and give students the opportunity to engage with this virtue in more depth – apply it, fail at it, correct it – then build on this with focusing on a single virtue each year.

It is subsequently recommended that further research be undertaken by school staff and a plan to effectively implement one virtue at each year be developed and implemented. The virtue to start in year 7 with could be kindness, followed by other virtues in the years that followed, creating a five year plan that creates strong future foundations (Participant 4, personal communication, December 13, 2019).

It is believed this recommendation will find support with leadership as other changes are also under consideration, such as creating more consistency with year level coordinators moving through three year cycles with the same class of students in order to more clearly intertwine CEF outcomes into each class (Participant 1, personal communication, November 26, 2019).

6.2.4 Challenge teacher perceptions on character education

As indicated in previous discussion, it is evident there is some resistance and scepticism amongst teaching staff to the relevance of the CEF. This is concerning given that research shows that students will develop character at school regardless and therefore it is wiser to establish and implement a well-thought through and strongly developed character education framework (Kristjansson, 2013).

For this reason, it is recommended that the school invests time, research and effort into interrogating and challenging the perceptions amongst teaching staff on the role and significance of a CEF to pave the way for future success.

6.2.5 Consider the continued separation and flip

Given the gap between vision and practice and the views of teaching staff. Perhaps it would be sensible, rather than try to force reluctant teachers to see the light, to continue to deliver the CEF separately through the pastoral care stream and make every effort to develop this into a world-class program that leads to students with highly developed traits to become active citizens. Part of developing this into a world-class program could involve a flip, meaning using the virtues articulated in CCE to drive the CEF, which may involve some re-thinking and re-development.

Ultimately, the development of a world class pastoral care program based on both practice and research - with a number of staff already undertaking PhDs and potential for more, could potentially be exported and adapted by other similar schools. This is also reflective in the comment made by one interviewee that CE 'largely replaces a decaying religious fabric' (Participant 3, personal communication, December 5, 2019) and the fact that character education has its origins in CCE (Arthur, 2005).

Hence, it is recommended that the school focuses on making a key contribution to the development of global character education through developing a world-class pastoral care program informed by the characters and virtues articulated in CCE in order to create virtuous students who become active citizens.

6.2.6 Consider integration of the key principles of Gert J.J Biesta in practice

It is recommended that the school identify strategies to integrate the principles of Biesta, especially the goals of democratic subjectivity, freedom and emancipation, into teaching practice and delivery to promote greater democratic subjectivity among future generations.

This research did not involve any classroom observations, which may be incorporated into future research to further identify the relevance and potential of Biesta's principles.

6.2.7 Continue the infiltration but evaluate

There was broad recognition that the CEF had started with the pastoral care program with the vision to infiltrate across the three streams. This paper has highlighted the challenges of the proposed infiltration. But, perhaps there will be greater acceptance across the school if there are effective measures and evaluation in place.

Consequently it is recommended the development of a robust evaluation process needs to be prioritised.

6.2.8 Future research

Given the CEF is in its infancy, further research should be undertaken at the school in 3-5 years' time to identify the impacts on students who have participated in the CEF throughout their entire secondary school years.

6.3 Recommendations for the future

This study provides scope for broader recommendations, including:

6.3.1 Further promotion of character education frameworks in South Australian schools

On the basis that character education will take place in schools regardless (Kristjansson, 2013) and the links established between development of good character and the flourishing life (Arthur, 2019).

It is recommended that Minister Gardner, Minister for Education, consider the potential for the development of character education frameworks that can be bespoke and adapted to the context of individual schools in South Australia.

6.3.2 Integrate CCE where links are intrinsic

Other South Australian schools could learn from the approach taken by the school case studied in adapting the CCE curriculum into existing subjects where the links are intrinsic, such as geography and history, to ensure greater knowledge retention and potential improvements in the NAP-CC as a result. However, perhaps there needs to be a number of fertile questions that are integrated into these bespoke approaches, such as 'How do we build a just society?' to ensure the links to CCE are coherent (Harpaz, 2014; The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, n.d.-b).

Therefore, it is recommended that the Department of Education (SA) promote and further evaluate creative approaches to the delivery of CCE aimed at improving knowledge retention. It is also recommended that, for this to be effective, this is accompanied by appropriate teacher training that enables teachers to develop a more critical and thicker understanding of democracy (Zyngier, 2012).

REFERENCES

Uncategorized References

- ABC News. (2019). Global climate strike sees 'hundreds of thousands' of Australians rally across the country. *ABC News*.
- ACARA. (2010). My School Website launched today [Press release]. Retrieved from https://docs.acara.edu.au/resources/ACARA_press_release_Final.pdf
- ACARA. (2016). *NAP Sample Assessment: Civics and Citizenship Report Years 6 and 10*. Retrieved from Australia: www.nap.edu.au/nap-sample-assessments/civics-and-citizenship
- ACARA. (n.d.). *The Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship (Years 7-10)*. Retrieved from www.australiancurriculum.edu.au
- ACER. (2001). Civic education a must for Australian schools. Retrieved from <https://www.acer.org/au/about-us/media/media-releases/civic-education-a-must-for-australian-schools>
- Althof, W., & Berkowitz, M. W. (2013). *Character and Civic Education as a Source of Moral Motivation*. In F. Oser (Ed.).
- Arthur, J. (2005). The Re-Emergence of Character Education in British Education Policy *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(3), 239-254.
- Arthur, J. (2012). Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues. Retrieved from www.jubileecentre.ac.uk
- Arthur, J. (2016). Convergence on policy goals: Character education in East Asia and England. *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 5(2), 59-71. doi:10.14425/jice.2016.5.2.59
- Arthur, J. (2019). *Teaching Character Through the Curriculum: A guide to educating the virtues through and within 14 secondary school subjects*. Retrieved from <https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/userfiles/jubileecentre/pdf/TeachingCharacterThroughtheCurriculum.pdf>
- Arthur, J., Kristjansson, K., Walker, D., Sanderse, W., & Jones, C. (2015). *Character Education in UK Schools: Research Report*. Retrieved from England: www.jubileecentrre.ac.uk
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2011). *Learning Democracy in School and Society: Education, Lifelong Learning, and the Politics of Citizenship*. The Netherlands: Sense Publisher.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2016a). *The beautiful risk of education*. London: Routledge.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2016b). *Beyond learning: a democratic education for a human future*. . London: Routledge.
- Black, R. (2015). Between policy and a hard pedagogical place: the emotional geographies of teaching for citizenship in low socio-economic schools. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 23(3), 369-388. doi:10.1080/14681366.2014.994664
- Boniwell, I., David, S. A., & Conley Ayers, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Oxford Handbook of Happiness* Cambridge Dictionary. (2019). Integrity. Retrieved from www.dictionary.cambridge.org
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education* (5th edition ed.): Routledge Falmer.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8th edition ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Curzer, H. J. (2012). *Aristotle and the Virtues*. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199693726.001.0001
- Department of Education, S. a. T. (2005). *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*. Retrieved from Australia: www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/framework_pdf_version_for_the_web.pdf
- Department of Education Science and Training. (1997). Discovering Democracy Units. Retrieved from www1.curriculum.edu.au/ddunits/about/about.htm
- Education Council of Australia. (2019). Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration. Retrieved from <http://www.educationcouncil.edu.au>

- Ghazarian, Z., Laughland-Buoy, J., & Skrbis, Z. (2017, 28 September). Young Australians are engaged in political issues, but unsure how democracy works, online journal. *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/young-australians-are-engaged-in-political-issues-but-unsure-how-democracy-works-84360>
- Harpaz, Y. (2014). *Teaching and Learning in a Community of Thinking: The Third Model*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Hirji, S. (2018). Acting virtuously as an end in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, 26, 1006-1026. doi:10.1080/09608788.2018.1454296
- International Positive Education Network. (n.d.). Retrieved from www.ipen-network.com
- Participant 1 (2017). The (name of program) Program: a virtues-based approach to the development of character and wellbeing. . Retrieved from <https://casestudy.school.edu.au/2017/06/28/princes-man-program-virtues-based-approach-development-character-wellbeing/>
- Participant 1 (2019). Character and well-being development at (case study school). Retrieved from <https://casestudy.school.edu.au/2019/04/18/character-and-well-being-development-at-prince-alfred-college>
- Kristjansson, K. (2013). Ten Myths About Character, Virtue and Virtue Education - Plus Three Well-Founded Misgivings. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 269-287. doi:10.1080/00071005.2013.778386
- Lee, J. (2014). Moral and Character Education in Korea. In *Handbook of Moral and Character Education* (pp. 326-343): Routledge.
- McGowan, M. (2017, 13 December 2017). NAPLAN scores: Australia's civics education 'woeful' minister says *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2017/dec/13/naplan-scores-australias-civics-education-woeful-minister-says>
- Ministerial Council for Employment, E., Training and Youth Affairs,. (2008). *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*. Canberra, ACT: MCEETYA
- Neoh, J. Y. (2017). Neoliberal education? comparing "character" and citizenship education in Singapore and "civics" and citizenship education in Australia. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 16(3), 29-39.
- Peterson, A., & Bentley, B. (2015). Exploring the connections between Philosophy for Children and character education: Some implications for moral education? *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 2(2), 48-70. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.21913/JPS.v2i2.1271>
- Peterson, A., & Bentley, B. (2017a). A case for cautious optimism? active citizenship and the Australian civics and citizenship curriculum. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 37(1), 42-52. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.adelaide.edu.au/10.1080/02188791.2016.1142424>
- Peterson, A., & Bentley, B. (2017b). Education for citizenship in south Australian public schools: A pilot study of senior leader and teacher perceptions. *Curriculum Journal*, 28(1), 105-122. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.adelaide.edu.au/10.1080/09585176.2016.1184579>
- Peterson, A., & Tudball, L. (Eds.). (2016). *Civics and Citizenship Education in Australia*: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues : A handbook and classification*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Positive Psychology. (2016). The Classification of Character Strengths and Virtues. Retrieved from <https://positivepsychology.com/classification-character-strengths-virtues/>
- Case study school. (n.d.-a). Retrieved from [www.\(case study school\).edu.au](http://www.(case study school).edu.au)
- Case study school. (n.d.-b). Pastoral Care in the Secondary School. Retrieved from [www.\(case study school\).edu.au/pastoral-care-wellbeing](http://www.(case study school).edu.au/pastoral-care-wellbeing)
- Reichert, F. (2016). Learning for active citizenship: Are Australian youths *Discovering Democracy* at school? *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 11, 130-144. doi:10.1177/1746197915626090

- Reichert, F., & Print, M. (2018). Civic participation of high school students: the effect of civic learning in school. *Educational Review*, 70(3), 318-341. doi:10.1080/00131911.2017.1316239
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., & Fraillon, J. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic Knowledge, Attitudes, and Engagement among Lower-Secondary School Students in 38 Countries*. Retrieved from Amsterdam:
- Seligman, M. (2013). *Building the State of Wellbeing: A Strategy for South Australia*. Adelaide
Retrieved from
<https://www.wellbeingandresilience.com/sites/swrc5/media/pdf/martinseligionreportadelaidethinkersinresidence2012-2013.pdf>
- Seligman, M., Ernst, R. M., Gillham, J., Reivich, K., & Linkins, M. (2009). Positive education: positive psychology and classroom interventions. *Oxford Review of Education*, 35(3), 293-311. doi:10.1080/03054980902934563
- South Australian Department of Education. (n.d.). The wellbeing and engagement collection. Retrieved from <https://www.education.sa.gov.au/department/research-and-data/wellbeing-and-engagement-collection/about-wellbeing-and-engagement-collection>
- Tehan, D. (2018). Updating the Melbourne Declaration [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://ministers.education.gov.au/tehan/updating-melbourne-declaration>
- The Age. (2012, 12 June 2012). Democracy must be taught as well as caught. *The Age*. Retrieved from <https://www.theage.com.au/politics/federal/democracy-must-be-taught-as-well-as-caught-20120611-205rr.html>
- The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues. (2015). Character Education in UK Schools: Research Report. Retrieved from <https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/1606/character-education/publications>
- The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues. (n.d.-a).
- The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues. (n.d.-b). Teaching Character Through Subjects: Citizenship (Enfield Grammar School). Retrieved from <https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/1606/character-education/publications>
- The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues. (n.d.-c). Teaching Character Through the Curriculum. Retrieved from Retrieved from <https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/1606/character-education/publications>
- Tudball, L., & Brett, P. (2014). What matters and what's next for civics and citizenship education in Australia? *The Social Educator*, 32(2), 4-15.
- Tudball, L., & Henderson, D. (2013). A New Civics Curriculum for Australian Schools - is it National Education? *Centre for Governance and Citizenship: The Hong Kong Institute of Education*(CGC Working Paper Series No. 2013/001).
- Waters, L., & Loton, D. (2019). "SEARCH: A Meta-Framework and Review of the Field of Positive Education." *International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology Online First Publication*. Retrieved from <https://link-springer-com.ezproxy.flinders.edu.au/article/10.1007/s41042-019-00017-4>. *International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology, Online First Publication*. doi:10.1007/s41042-019-00017-4
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. E. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269.
- White, M. A., & Murray, A. S. (Eds.). (2015). *Evidence-Based Approaches in Positive Education: Implementing a Strategic Framework for Well-Being in Schools*. Dordrecht Heidelberg New York London: Springer.
- Zyngier, D. (2012). Rethinking the Thinking on Democracy in Education: What are educators thinking (and doing) about democracy? *Education*, 2, 1-21. doi:10.3390/educ2010001
- Zyngier, D. (2016). What future teachers believe about democracy and why it is important. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 22(7), 782-804. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1185817>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1:

Table 1 below provides an outline of the relevant initiatives undertaken in recent decades and the attention focused on the perceived ‘civic deficit’ since the 1980s (Tudball & Henderson, 2013).

Table 1: Key civics and citizenship initiatives in Australia

Year	Type of initiative	Details	Relevant goals
1989	National Agreement	Hobart Declaration on Schooling	Goal 7: To develop knowledge, skills, attitudes and values which will enable students to participate as active and informed citizens in our democratic Australian society within an international context.
1998-2004	Discovering Democracy	Discovering Democracy Curriculum Resources	The Discovering Democracy program was premised on the conviction that civics and citizenship education is central to Australian education and the maintenance of a strong and vital citizenship. To be able to participate as active citizens throughout their lives, students need a thorough knowledge and understanding of Australia’s political heritage, democratic processes and government, and judicial system.
1999	National Agreement superseding the Hobart Declaration	Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century	Goal 1.4: be active and informed citizens with an understanding and appreciation of Australia's system of government and civic life
2001	International Report	Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries : civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen	Surveyed nearly 90,000 14 year olds in 28 countries to examine how prepared young people were for their rights and responsibilities of citizenship in societies undergoing rapid change.
2002	National Report	Citizenship and democracy: Australian students’ knowledge and beliefs: the IEA Civic Education Study of fourteen year olds	It found that of 28 countries involved in the study, Australia was placed 11th, at a level comparable to Hungary, Slovenia, Denmark, Germany, Russian Federation, England, Sweden, Switzerland and Bulgaria. Australia was placed behind Poland, Finland, Cyprus, Greece, Hong Kong, USA, Italy, Slovak Republic, Norway and Czech Republic. The study found that students in most countries have an understanding of fundamental democratic values and institutions – but depth of understanding is a problem.
2004	National test across schools	Naplan civics and citizenship test introduced	NAP-CC assessments have been held every three years since 2004.

2007	Implementation of the National Citizenship test	Australian Citizenship test	In December 2006, it was announced that applicants for Australian citizenship who are over 18 and under 60 years old will need to pass an Australian citizenship test to prove their grasp of the English language and understanding of Australia's "values", history, traditional and national symbols. The test was first implemented on 1 October 2007.
2008	National declaration superseding the Adelaide Declaration	Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians	Goal 2: All young Australians become successful learners, confident and creative individuals, and active and informed citizens.
2010	My School website	My School website	The My School website was launched on 28 January 2010 and provides searchable comparable data on almost 10,000 schools on NAPLAN performance in years 3, 5, 7 and 9(ACARA, 2010).
2010	National Curriculum Board	Australian Curriculum and Reporting Authority (ACARA) Board	Creation of a National Curriculum Board to secure federal authority for schooling.
2012-13	Update to Australian curriculum	Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship	The National Assessment Program for Civics and Citizenship (NAP-CC) is undertaken by a sample group of Year 6 and Year 10 students.
2019	NAPLAN testing- civics and citizenship – October and November	Naplan civics and citizenship test introduced	The assessment will be delivered online to a stratified random sample of schools. Approximately 339 Year 6 classes and 324 Year 10 classes, drawn from schools across Australia, will participate. In total, approximately 13,250 students will sit the assessments.
2019	Update of the National Melbourne Declaration	Updating the Melbourne Declaration	A review is in process given the declaration is now a decade old.
2019	National declaration superseding the Melbourne Declaration	Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration	Goal 2: All young Australians become confident and creative individuals, successful lifelong learners, and active and informed members of the community.

Table 2 illustrates how many of the strengths and virtues identified in both positive education and character education can be captured by the General Capabilities in the Australian Curriculum.

Table 2: Comparison of character strengths and virtues against the Australian Curriculum

Aristotle's moral virtues (Curzer, 2012)	Positive education Virtues	Positive education Strengths	Character education Virtues	Character education Strengths	General Capabilities (Australian Curriculum)
Liberality and Benevolence Wit and Wounding	Wisdom	Creativity Curiosity Judgement Love of learning Perspective (The virtue of 'wisdom')	Moral Virtues	Courage Self-discipline Compassion Gratitude Justice Humility Honesty	Ethical Understanding Personal and social capability Critical and creative thinking
Courage and Continenence	Courage	Bravery Persistence Honesty Zest	Intellectual Virtues	Resilience Confidence Determination Creativity Teamwork (The 'Intellectual virtues')	Critical and creative thinking
Friendliness and Civility	Humanity	Love Kindness Social intelligence (The virtue of 'humanity')	Civics Virtues	Service Citizenship	Intercultural understanding Personal and social capability
Magnificence and Heroic Virtue	Transcendence	Appreciation of beauty Gratitude Hope Humour Spirituality	Good Sense / Practical Wisdom	Good sense Practical wisdom	Personal and social capability
General, Particular and Poetic Justice Justice in Friendship	Justice	Teamwork Fairness Leadership			Intercultural understanding Ethical understanding
Temperance and Incontinence Good temper and Forgiveness Megalopsychia and Appropriate Ambition	Moderation	Forgiveness Modesty Prudence Self-control			Personal and social capability Ethical understanding Intercultural understanding
Strengths not directly related or with weak connections to the General Capabilities		Bravery Appreciation of beauty Hope Humour Spirituality Forgiveness Modesty Prudence Self-control			Literacy Numeracy Information and Communication Technology (ICT) capability

APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

Exploring the connections between character education and civics and citizenship education in Case study school

The aim of the teacher interviews is, as per the research sub-questions below, to gain an in-depth understanding of how the theoretical framework of character education may influence the implementation of civics and citizenship in a year 7-10 setting.

The relevant research sub-questions are:

- Can the implementation of character education influence the execution of civics and citizenship curriculums and the associated character strengths and skills within a school?
- How does the theoretical framework of character education influence the implementing of civics and citizenship in a year 7-10 setting? (case study)

The case study methodology to collect data on the teaching of civics and citizenship in a year 7-10 setting involves a two-staged interview using the following questions.

Case study interviews: Participant 2 (Director of Boarding)

Interview 1 - Implementation of character education across Case study school:

1. Can you please describe how well you think the character education framework has been adopted by the teaching staff and provide examples to illustrate?

We had a (name of program) program or version of prior to 2017 which we reviewed in 2017 and coincided with appointment of Participant 1. John K presented as an option/ideas as part of his new appointment.

It was embraced and aligned to what we were doing previously and needed refinement and John's review offered some inputs from other programs. John had come from Wellington College and lots of principles from there.

I think we liked the idea as a college executive and college to look at CE and how to match it into our (name of program) journey through the college. We're quite proud of the idea we are developing a (name of program) so fair bit of work has gone into how to develop a (name of program). A lot of thinking has gone into what are the values and virtues demonstrated by a (name of program). This has gone all the way back to reception boys.

It becomes this constant important reference point all the way back to the year ones.

The (name of program) program was an existing idea that needed more academic rigour. The (name of program) is an important part of the school.

How do we develop it with our teaching faculty? Previously pastoral care was too open. Arguments for and against making it more prescriptive but we saw it as an opportunity. (name of program) is

part of the pastoral care – made a conscious decision to create a pastoral care curriculum as part of the CEF and (name of program) program.

2. Can you please describe the impacts or changes you have seen since (case study school) implemented a character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum?

Process like all new implementations ON teaching faculty. The implementation 'on' teachers requires teaching faculty to take ownership of time and space.

It requires teaching faculty to take on a framework. It requires more from them. Cultural resistance at the start, like all change. Provided the equipment and scaffold.

Not all teachers have pastoral care as a strength. Therefore, some deliver it better than others. It's a personality thing.

Tried to upskill those who need help. Providing rigorous teaching points for teachers to work to.

What's highlighted is that we have people that do it really well. I will be working on creating mentors to provide training.

Less capable teachers were being put in other areas as year level teachers cherry-picked teachers they wanted in their 'team'. Instead of letting it go, we are going to start mentoring. Teachers are fairly open as they know they have to do it. We've broken the back of the attitude that 'its another thing we have to do' and can now see some changes.

3. Do you think the impacts or changes have been a direct result of the implementation of the character education framework or are there any other reasons or influences?

Common language used around character education. Continuous reference point. Greater focus now on virtuous old scholars who become inducted into (name of program) gallery and they talk about their life. Shows examples of what can happen.

We have virtuous old scholars who come in and are inducted into the (name of program) Gallery. The old scholars then talk at assembly. Provides an example to the boys of how to be a (name of program). Not every (name of program) turns out to be the same man – they are artists, wine makers, astro physicists. We judge them all to be ethical and virtuous. It is inspirational and aspirational.

Both direct and indirect results of saying this is a core part of our philosophy and covers the academic and the pastoral.

Any other major changes that may have impacted on the changes – CEF has become a strong reference point for other things – leadership development, awards for different virtues and character traits. Leadership and service. More directly resulted – 2017 becomes a reference point – it aligns things in the college.

4. Can you please describe whether or not you believe applying the character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum makes a difference in creating students with the desired characteristics? Please explain why.

It is separate – pastoral care. Jacqui asked: Does it infiltrate the rest of the curriculum?

Yes, I think so. It relates to how we treat things like academic plagiarism. There are some philosophical links in our academic extension program, which is aligned with philosophy. There are other academic programs that are being influenced by this.

Jacqui referred to James Arthur's lesson plans developed by the Jubilee Centre – we are not there yet – it is not fully infiltrated yet. But maybe the year 8 discovery program may have more influence such as introducing boys to old scholars etc. Participant 2 said to ask John.

Interview 2 – Extent to which character education has influenced the Civics and Citizenship curriculum at Case study school:

6. Can you please describe how the teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since the introduction of the character education framework at (case study school)?
 - a. Please provide specific examples if possible.

The strong influence would be in the middle-years program. The idea that the very crowded national curriculum has meant we need to look at how to deliver in a timetable that is very crowded.

The year 8 out of school discover Adelaide program – whole week of integrating aspects of C&C curriculum.

There's a real focus on virtues and strengths.

The fact that we now have a taught pastoral care program that now has a more conscious curriculum being taught. The boys are being encouraged to engage with virtues and traits more through the dedicated pastoral care program.

7. In your opinion, which of the characters and virtues outlined in the (case study school) character education framework are necessary to create active citizens?

Community service.

Community engagement.

We don't have time within a school curriculum to have community service so it has to be private time.

Overseas – Cambodia trip works with orphanages. Year 10 and over. Annual trip together with St Peter's girls. Work with Habitat for Humanity to build housing.

Outreach program working with disabled students – both in the holidays. Run on (case study school's) Scott's Creek campus – full immersion program – live there for the week with the disabled boys. (case study school) boys provide mentoring, caring and a buddy. Evaluated? Boys are

debriefed. Boys are in year 10 going into 11. Indicator in terms of college leadership applications going forward.

Take up is strong.

Early days so no real evidence of impacts of CEF beyond school.

Darren said he is not a big fan of overseas trips as it is disconnected and fly in and fly out. Some boys and their families have made strong connections and been back once or more times.

Darren identified the following (case study school) characters and virtues that relate to creating active citizens:

- Civic virtues
- Moral Virtues
- Spiritual virtues

8. Do you believe that using the character education framework as a lens through which to teach civics and citizenship helps create students with the necessary character traits to become active citizens?
 - a. Please provide specific examples if possible.

I think they do. It gives the ability for teachers to reference the traits and identify them for students who do not see them.

Boys that volunteer for outreach are more in it for good purpose and learning rather than applying for leadership. We use this to coach them with the virtues and traits.

Darren said there may be outreach or overseas trip reports in publications (Chronicle).

A lot of the boys do outreach because it is a good thing to do.

Public speaking and debating courses branch off this. Philosphon – high participation in this – Canberra school wide competition. This represents the academic side of the CEF.

Public speaking and debating has increased and this is relevant to civics and citizenship. No sure if it is linked or strong recruitment program. Even if it is due to marketing it can be referenced back too (name of program) program.

9. Can you please describe how your teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since (case study school) introduced a character education framework?

N/A

10. Do you think other schools should use character education as a framework for teaching of civics and citizenship in order to create students with the needed characteristics to become active citizens? Please explain why or why not.

I think they should. I think the fact that we do have a framework around the (name of program) that links consciously and sub-consciously to other programs and we have encouraged greater active citizenship represented as part of increased applications on outreach program.

The academic extension programs – debating, Philosophon, public speaking – attributed to a greater awareness of civics and citizenship.

We are encouraging boys. We have a reading program outside of English curriculum – mandated reading time outside of pastoral care – philosophical influence on their education, including the selection of their novels. Teachers are reading with them and have discussions with the boys.

What might have been key things to make character education work – key thing for us and the strength was the ideal of what does it mean to be a (name of program) – this goes way back beyond CE, it pre-dates formal acknowledgement of character education. Strongest old-scholar's network in the Southern hemisphere.

Case study interview: Participant 5 (Assistant Director of Teaching and Learning, Middle Years 7-10)

1. Can you please explain why you think (case study school) introduced a character education framework?

It is in our strategic plan / goal of the strategic plan to be active members of the community and community minded.

The character education framework tidied up what was previously adhoc. It created continuity.

Previously changed from year level of year level. There was no continuity. It came from a space of needing to meet at strategic goal and also tidied up what previously existed.

2. Can you please describe the impacts or changes you have seen since (case study school) implemented a character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum?

The delivery/teaching of the CEF is led by tutors. A tutor is a teacher in charge of a group of boys in one year level. Tutors meet with their group of students 5 times a week for 40 minutes – one lesson a day at different times of the day. A group of no more than 16 boys and they meet every day/ 5 x a week. It was a time that needed to be filled so teachers embraced a framework that had to be followed.

This timeslot existed prior to the CEF but was unstructured pastoral care time – the CEF was embraced because it filled a need. The Year Level Coordinators in charge of the tutors – the contact point for all the tutors in each level- embraced the opportunity to follow a framework / the (name of program) program.

The CEF enacted the (name of program) program and met the need for something to fill the allocated time – which was also extended from 20 minutes to 40 minutes/day.

The CEF has been embraced well in order to fill the time and because of the (name of program) program.

The timeslot changes each day.

The time with the tutors has definitely changed but very little has changed in the classroom.

More subtly if I was to try and find a way that it has changed maybe at year 10 when students are learning masculinity the boys are enabled with what they have learned in the curriculum.

There is a bit of hesitation to draw too many forced connections because the relationship and dynamic in the tutor group is very different to the classroom which is much more formal. The distinction is there but the boys bring it into the classroom itself.

3. Do you think the impacts or changes have been a direct result of the implementation of the character education framework or are there any other reasons or influences?

Other things that have happened within the timeframe or around:

- Restructure – Dean of Students (Participant 3) commenced in 2018 to design and implement the CEF.
- Curriculum was changed in 2016 – this is separate to pastoral.
- Timetable was changed in 2017 – tutor groups increased to 40 minutes a day.

There has been a little bit of curriculum since 2016 when we aligned more to the Australian curriculum. That is an external factor that has sharpened up the academic curriculum.

Restructure – position of Dean of Students – Participant 3 – his role is also to design and implement the character education framework. He came in in 2018 to design the CEF.

The timetable changed – for 2017 the sessions for tutor group were 20 minutes every morning. Timetable restructure means they can have 40 minutes every day.

4. Can you please describe whether or not you believe applying the character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum makes a difference in creating students with the desired characteristics? Please explain why.

Very little has changed in the classroom. So the connection is not really there.

Occasionally students are demonstrating their virtues in the classroom in the comments they make or input into discussions. For example, in a year 10 class when they discuss 'masculinity' their versions of manhood demonstrate some understanding of virtues.

The dynamic of the tutor group is different to the classroom.

Interviewee viewed the pastoral curriculum where the CEF was clearly being implemented as distinctly separate to the academic curriculum where the interviewee believed there was limited if any integration of the CEF.

Interviewee said there was no visible difference in the behavior of students since the introduction of the CEF. 'It's as good as it's always been'.

Communal spaces are no more or less tidy than they were before. No obvious changes in student behavior.

Pastoral curriculum is the tutor group part and the academic curriculum is separate.

Speak about the pastoral curriculum which is discrete to the academic curriculum.

Not confident to speculate on this as the two- pastoral and academic - are discrete.

Does the application of the CEF through the pastoral curriculum make a difference?

Can't think of any measures. We still have the problems we've always had. Can't see any difference in take up of co-curriculum or any other obvious changes.

Interview 2

5. Can you please describe how the teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since the introduction of the character education framework at (case study school)?

a. Please provide specific examples if possible.

Interviewee was in charge of taking groups of year 8 students on a week-long excursion of local institutions relating to civics and citizenship e.g. parliament house, courts, local government, town hall, botanic gardens, sporting oval etc.

Take students out of the college and into the streets to go to place and experience the history.

Town Hall, Parliament House – two locations that address civics and citizenship.

War Memorial, State Library, Botanic Gardens – some implied understanding is what is needed.

Participant 4 is in charge of civics and citizenship.

The teaching/experience has only started in 2019. It has come from a need where students do not know enough about places close to us. We talk about Parliament etc. but little understanding of these institutions.

In a way, I have had to rely on elements of CEF to conduct this. Students need character traits for this to succeed.

Relies on the teaching of the CEF as if we have students of good character the excursion is very successful.

So much of Adelaide week is that you're on show. Students go in casuals. There's a lot of pressure being a (CASE STUDY SCHOOL) person in Adelaide. The boys just need to look the wrong way and someone responds. Casual enables them to go unnoticed but representing themselves is just as important. Boys need to be unselfish.

6. In your opinion, which of the characters and virtues outlined in the (case study school) character education framework are necessary to create active citizens?

Integrity is right up there. That one seems to be the anchor for the others. If there is integrity then courage and wisdom come after that. All boys much act with integrity.

If for example they are proud of being (case study school) students they need to show it. Act in a way that doesn't disrespect the school.

Courage – boys can say that they are willing to take risks and do the right thing even when it is not popular. They need integrity. They need to be able to follow through.

7. Do you believe that using the character education framework as a lens through which to teach civics and citizenship helps create students with the necessary character traits to become active citizens?

a. Please provide specific examples if possible.

I think it could. Those connections can be made. It is hard because, as a lens, there is something to be said for overstating something. Character traits – there's only limited ways to promote/develop character traits. It would be really beneficial if all the boys had taken in all the elements of the CEF before they come on board for Adelaide Week.

There may be inconsistencies in the teaching and learning depending on the skills of the tutors. This creates too much variation so challenging to make connections/links for all individuals due to the variation in the delivery. There's a lot of variables there.

8. Can you please describe how your teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since (case study school) introduced a character education framework?

No changes in the teaching of AW as came in afterwards.

No change in the teaching of English (Participant 5's subject).

Participant 5 suspects no change in the curriculum.

9. Do you think other schools should use character education as a framework for teaching of civics and citizenship in order to create students with the needed characteristics to become active citizens? Please explain why or why not.

Well if we're not doing it I am not sure why I would say other schools should. Very reluctant to recommend to other schools.

There is something to be said about the separation of the pastoral and academic. There's value in the subject experts being allowed to teach academic content freely and engagingly so that students learn the most in their subject. There isn't a mix or a blend as there is the risk of diluting.

C&C may lend itself to CEF. Why doesn't the pastoral curriculum teach C&C – they could teach CE and link this to civics and citizenship. Then, keeping purely discrete academic ideas to the academic classroom. I would be more willing to consider this.

Everything that happens in a classroom comes at a cost. Especially in the upper levels – need to impart subject expertise to students. Using time to talk about character during an academic subject comes at a cost.

In the sphere of pastoral care there is scope to integrate ideas of C&C.

Better to do something well once rather than do it poorly multiple times.

Participant 5 and Jacqui discussed that the Jubilee Centre does the opposite. People in the faculty try to teach inter-disciplinary. But there's something to be said for teaching purely.

Participant 5 said she could see the value of it being subtle as long as the essential knowledge that students need was not compromised.

It could come at the cost of a thematic, conceptual or technical lens that already lend themselves to the teaching of English.

Participant 5 said to follow up with Shaun who works very closely with Participant 1. Participant 3 has had a lot to do with the writing of the program.

Case study interviews: Participant 1 (Deputy Headmaster)

Interview 1 - Implementation of character education across Case study school:

1. Can you please describe how well you think the character education framework has been adopted by the teaching staff and provide examples to illustrate?

Lifelong wellbeing and flourishing.

More Arthur than Seligman – more selfish to be focused on character strengths. Principles of Martin are clearly outstanding but more critical of the way it has transferred into practice.

Have an issue with the fact that we just focus on character strengths. I think that approach can be inherently selfish. Whereas I believe acting in the right way no matter what the circumstances is a precursor to obtain a state of wellbeing and fundamentally flourish in real life

Element of happiness trap that is a concern. Constantly focusing on the things that make us happy is a concern. See a generation too focused on hedonistic. Teaching them the skills to navigate a moral landscape/ the human landscape is important and feel a strong moral obligation to act with good character. This generation is too hedonistic.

Teaching students to act morally and with character is a strong moral obligation. It is a decent thing to do.

VIA – bespoke in what we do. Take aspects of what others might look like. Introduce what values are and open to what we do. As long as not sitting within a positive education framework. VIA largely because we are bespoke. We look at what others might look at. A great way to introduce what values are and talk about them. The positive education is not us- we are firm in that.

Scratch below the surface of positive education and not much content.

Has not looked much in depth at other schools but see a lot of schools take the off the shelf positive education and apply them because it feels like ‘this is what we need to be doing’. For us, it is about developing what we already have. What we do. Our core beliefs. The behaviours we expect of a boy at Princes that has been with us for 150 years. The notion of a (name of program) who acts to serve others.

Many schools adopting an off the shelf approach. For us, it is centring our character education framework around our core beliefs. Goes back to strong Methodist roots. The notion of the (name of program) acting in the way that serves others.

Arrived mid 2016 – approach was ad hoc. No clear delineation from year 7-12. Pastoral care was thrown into one pot. Character education is one key aspect of a pastoral care program. I believe we can add value when we focus on develop virtues in young men. Act well. Act for the right reasons. Act in a way that helps regulate themselves.

John K saw there was a gap. Been talking about the (name of program) for 150 years.

Foundations were there – able to bring my philosophy of education and what we should be doing within a school and develop young men who can make a difference beyond school. The framework of developing virtues based character education – Aristolean – can do this. The culture of (case study school) has enabled us to tap back into virtues. It has taken a couple of years to get it to where we want it but we’ve made progress.

We’re seeing boys now use the language of virtue literacy. Year 12 valedictory dinner – numerous boys talk about the character program and using the literacy of character education. We have had numerous boys talk about the (name of program) program and use the vocabulary. Quite pronounced this year.

Met James a couple of times in the UK. Invited by James to attend a Chatham house discussion around character education at Windsor Castle. Talked about the role of character education in developing new teachers. Impressed by James.

More focused on Aristotlean.

Pastoral care and curriculum very separate.

Vision is to incorporate into class curriculum. Modeling the behaviours we expect of our boys is key. Over the next couple of years our desire is to develop strong literacy in academic environments. Pastoral Care was the overall starting point and this has worked well. Taught wellbeing curriculum and that is the foundations – years 7-12 – one lesson a week. Very clear framework. Taught wellbeing curriculum that has the foundations of character education. One lesson on wellbeing and character. Taught lessons. Structural material. Some staff who are absolutely on board, others less so. Majority to deliver well. Regularly write about it. Focus on key themes. Next year zeroing in on

key virtues that we will be developing throughout the year. Align to chapel services and develop as part of academic services.

Next phase is to really have it in all that we do.

Dealing with boys who have not come in at the start. Real opportunity is to develop year 7, 8, 9 students who were right there at the start.

Certainly notice this year's year 12s reflected very positively about it.

Both Seligman and Arthur focus on Aristotle.

Very careful not to say this is only Arthur – this is a eudamonic approach is one where wellbeing is a lifelong journey and the final outcome is that you will have achieved the state of wellbeing. Under that framework the purpose of living is to flourish. We equip young men with the skills to flourish in life. Rather than - Happiness trap is a problem as we cannot be happy all the time – life is not always that – if we're constantly telling them to be happy then they are not equipped to manage the time when they are less able. Develop skills for when boys are up and down. Showing gratitude and understanding what that means. Having compassion towards others. Being present in the moment. What you see in social media is not real life – life is tough, it is a challenge, let's not gloss it up. We want boys to be independent, resilient and respond well to challenge. Regulate emotions and behaviour. If they can do that and interact with others really well. I would say they are well on their way to attaining a sense of wellbeing.

Adverse to saying to a young man – here's your character strengths and trait and let's focus on that – there are other things that need to be a priority to avoid failure. This is inherently selfish and misses other aspects of that young man that need far greater attention. If someone is lacking resilience then that needs attention and focus.

2. Can you please describe the impacts or changes you have seen since (case study school) implemented a character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum?

Helped us to just have a framework that is consistent. It is one that has been helpful as schools constantly change and can find themselves not having a sense of purpose or direction. Take stock of who we are and how we want to shape our boys moving forward. When we talk about values, virtues, and stories that go around that - everyone has them. It is really easy to tap into what others have done. Guest speakers. Teachers sharing their experiences. The only way for boys to verbalise their feelings and situations they have been through can go some way in helping that. Natural fit for who we are. This has been built bespoke from within.

CE is a wonderful lens from which you can frame things and explore different approaches.

I struggle to understand any better framework. Countless cases in industry and business practice where there is amoral behaviours and misconduct etc. We have a strong obligation to help boys understand that making a contribution to others and in doing so you gain a great sense of satisfaction and wellbeing. Showing love and kindness for others.

John K interest started to shape in his mind formally and officially when I was at Wellington- one of the world's great independent boarding schools. Under Sir Anthony Seldon – Master. He introduced many of the principles of Seligman including wellbeing lessons. Largely delivered by Ian Morris – learning to ride elephants – extraordinary man. He frames the nature of eudomism and Aristotle. Whilst the school promoted positive psychology what we were doing practically was more aligned to

Jubilee – I fundamentally believed in what he did. The real clarity was obvious when. The timing was perfect and the clarity he helped me glean enabled me to move into this setting. First thing to sort out was their pastoral care program – it was more than chats in the corridor.

3. Do you think the impacts or changes have been a direct result of the implementation of the character education framework or are there any other reasons or influences?

Several things going on – it is not possible to say it is a direct result. It is a combination of things. Really clear direction on pastoral care.

CEF is one of several things we do as part of the pastoral care. That has meant consistently within the year levels. Restructure allowed more effective implementation of CEF. Appointed new staff into new roles.

Year level coordinators looping through with year levels to enable more consistently. All intertwined with the CEF. Moving through 3 years.

4. Can you please describe whether or not you believe applying the character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum makes a difference in creating students with the desired characteristics? Please explain why.

We have a taught wellbeing curriculum that is being taught - One aspect of the pastoral care is wellbeing.

The extent to which we will extend into broader academic curriculum- there are indirect aspects but no real coordinated delivery yet. It is the next stage. To be in a situation where staff are modelling the behaviour of the (name of program) but using the language as part of the delivery of their lessons.

Participant 3, Dean of Students, is responsible for the practical elements that enable us to achieve our strategic aims. Shaun is now looking into the implementation of our strategies and practical elements that allow implementation of strategic change. He oversees and has now done a full audit.

Not sure it is front of centre to incorporate into curriculum but incorporation into the curriculum is a couple of years away. It may take a mind shift for staff so getting the right staff is critical.

Interview 2 – Extent to which character education has influenced the Civics and Citizenship curriculum at Case study school:

5. Can you please describe how the teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since the introduction of the character education framework at (case study school)?

a. Please provide specific examples if possible.

Andrew Peterson and I connected before he left for England- he always advocated for character to be a great mechanism through which civics and citizenship can be explored.

6. In your opinion, which of the characters and virtues outlined in the (case study school) character education framework are necessary to create active citizens?

We simplified from the Arthur categories as it is important for boys to have common language. We were finding that was becoming harder to do so have simplified some of the language we use – see diagram.

Wellbeing class once a week. 40 minutes dedicated daily session to implementing the CEF through the pastoral care session.

We started with great ambition. We chose not to focus on any specific virtue itself but rather domains. Moral, Spiritual, Intellectual, etc. General elements. We tried to explore big themes but bit off more than we could chew in the first instance. We have now ended up very succinctly with the virtues of gratitude, integrity, etc. This was 12 months ago and each unit of work sit within this.

Over the next 12 months we will be valuing the effectiveness of what we do. Priority but next phase to gather some clear evidence. Perhaps some surveys.

VIA is a very useful tool to introduce to boys and students – low level psychometric test that gives you a sense of who you are – but don't then focus on/highlight individual strengths. Give them a sense of who they are, contextualise that, and what they need to do to become good character.

The diagram does reflect a desire to move beyond pastoral to all other areas as well. T&L core business. Feeling well they perform much better. PC is the oil of the learning.

We know that when boys are feeling well and good about themselves they perform better. It all works together. We are an all-round school we believe in academic excellence but also becoming men of good character.

Comfortable with the revisions done. In 12 months we will be able to evaluate more clearly. Vision is that in the future by the end of year 12 want an academic transcript that indicates what we have done in this space.

Feeds into other projects happening in the school.

7. Do you believe that using the character education framework as a lens through which to teach civics and citizenship helps create students with the necessary character traits to become active citizens?

a. Please provide specific examples if possible.

We expect all our boys to be leaders, not necessarily by appointment or title, but to serve others and that is fundamentally aligned with being a good citizen. Passionate it is the right approach to teach someone who is a good citizen who serves others.

Contributes to others

Contributes to the world

Not through any sense of self gain but because it is fundamentally the right thing to do.

Makes the world a better place because it is the right thing to do.

We know that with boys the pre frontal cortex develops much later. Once that matures in the future we hope that they will reflect on these things.

Our real measure of success will be when they are 25 years or older and we can reflect what they have done.

What they are doing later in life – measure of success.

- 8. Can you please describe how your teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since (case study school) introduced a character education framework?**

N/A

- 9. Do you think other schools should use character education as a framework for teaching of civics and citizenship in order to create students with the needed characteristics to become active citizens? Please explain why or why not.**

Has to be bespoke. Every school has to focus on developing good people and equipping them with the skills to function in life.

But can't take off the shelf.

Taking the principles. Having a clear education philosophy that sits with the school's strategic plan, values and core beliefs and can be developed bespoke etc. You need good people around you as well.

Interview 1 - Implementation of character education across Case study school:

1. Can you please describe how well you think the character education framework has been adopted by the teaching staff and provide examples to illustrate?

We have worked quite hard over the past few years to do exactly that. We have a taught course and this is where our CEF comes through. Character, manhood and virtues topic that students are exposed to.

The other method is through our year level chapel services; through our year level meetings. They may typically pick up a theme on a particular virtue – presentations around courage, for example, delivered by the year level coordinator or the students. We are still very much developing a tighter program where we will seek to align our chapel services with our curriculum. We are also introducing our new diary which has virtue themes printed within it.

This year we focused on getting the language consistent and reducing down what we were doing so it wasn't getting lost.

We produced our (name of program) graphic which looks at 4 virtues. We believe these have historical content in the college. 4 easy virtues that the boys can easily remember. We talk about these virtues time and time over. The significant work in talking about virtue families, which helps as well.

The downside with the model is that we are perhaps not getting a hugely consistent approach. Some tutors do it well, others do not.

Historically a lot of character education is aligned to religious frameworks. Catholic is different from the Anglican to the Methodist etc. Drawing on different sources for character education. So many different ways of putting together a character education program. It is interesting to see what has gone into it – a collection of ideas from staff or a cultural or historical influence.

We worked quite hard over the last couple of years to address exactly that - taught course delivered by the tutors.

Wellbeing themes – aligned to CE – manhood and character – manhood and virtues.

Typically exposed to once or twice a year.

Chapel services.

Year level meetings.

Year level coordinator will address student body.

Pick up a theme on particular virtues. May be driven by year level coordinator or delivered by the students.

We are still very much developing a tighter program for chapel services – seek to align even more with our curriculum.

Introducing a new diary which has virtue themes and daily quotes to support students and tutors with their taught time for the course.

Focused on getting the language consistent and reducing it down so that it would not be diluted. Wisdom, gratitude, integrity and courage.

Historical importance to the college and the alumni.

4 easy virtues each boy can remember which can be reinforced across the school. The boys will strive to model their best behavior and their practice to reflect the virtues.

Virtues that go well with courage, gratitude etc.

The downside of the model is that we are not getting a hugely successful approach. Some tutors do it really well, some not so well. Do we muddle through or seek to give professional development to staff to bring the level to a better standard or bring in a new department specialized to provide a more consistent program thereby embracing those staff that have significant buy in to develop a more consistent program..

Participant 3's role – talk strategy with Participant 1 who will pass ideas through Shaun in conversation. Another avenue is the pastoral strategy committee. Director of student leadership – we have particular things to discuss, strategic ideas and direction. We garner opinion through that process. Shaun to implement programs and adjustments to programs decided by the pastoral strategy committee.

Big emphasis on transition program – new students looked after and guided by more senior students. Enable those new to our community, whether they have been with the school since prep or they have come from interstate, to feel like the community cares about them. Program put in place now that mentors students. This also gives older students a sense of purpose and underpins our CE approach.

When I first came 2 years ago, Participant 1 had already started the process where he wanted to follow the Jubilee Centre approach. Character education as being taught and caught. What I found was that whilst we had a framework in place, the content was very cluttered, we had a lot of stuff, we also had content that was being repeated to different year levels. Materials, which were decent, but were being passed between year level coordinators which led to repetition and disengagement from students. Too many worksheets and paperwork. YLC were emailing content each week which was aligned to topic but there was no theme or structure, there was no sense of progression over the years. So it needed time as a team to tidy up and make this a meaningful journey for our students going through from year 7 to 12. How is our middle school different from our senior school. How are we looking at CE and matching it to the ways we know how boys develop over the years. Once we had the structure there we were being too ambitious in what we hoped to get through in the time we had so we streamlined and drilled down.

We moved from a content driven course to an outcomes driven program. We have key questions and key milestones we want to reach. This creates a more meaningful experience for our boys. Every part of our (name of program) program we have core information and experience we want to occur. As part of our (name of program) program we have key outcomes we seek to achieve. The whole thing is not rigid but has flexibility that allows adapting by the tutors based on student interest and the current events.

2. Can you please describe the impacts or changes you have seen since (case study school) implemented a character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum?

At the moment CE is delivered through the PC curriculum.

We do have tutors that have a lot of buy in and some subjects lend themselves to integrating CE into their taught course. I think that occurs in English.

I incorporate character virtues into my geography lessons – we look at ethical decision making, ethical considerations, whether decisions are made that might affect a particular environment. E.g. the oil company that wants to develop a large part of Alaska. You look at the ethics of those decisions made. Do these big companies have influence with government, do they have the right to make those decisions over the heads of local people in remote areas who may not have full knowledge of how this will impact on their environment. Points of discussion that you can tie back to virtues such as courage, behaving with honesty and integrity. I think the students are able to pick up a lot of those virtues through the humanities quite well.

History – past decisions made in the build up to war and conflict and whether war could have been avoided if different decisions had been made. There is a lot of scope and a lot of things that go one. You do need the teacher to make that connection to the CEF.

There is a lot of scope to explore virtues through subjects – theory of knowledge for IB – basic philosophy course – look at things like ethics, ways of knowing, memory, bias of history, limitations of science. Taught to think outside the box, which very much aligns with character education. If we are the best scientists but have arrogance and think we know it all we will miss things because we think we know everything but do not recognise our own limitations and capacity to observe. These are other perspectives we need to explore. Enables students to think they need to be humble and not be so presumptuous of my own understanding of things.

Probably a lot more examples that are not being connected or documented.

3. Do you think the impacts or changes have been a direct result of the implementation of the character education framework or are there any other reasons or influences?

I've managed to bring in with my own (Shaun) studies. Blank canvas as no previous Dean of students. Through my own reading I have been able to bring in some kind of educational philosophy behind what we are doing and putting it into plain speak for staff.

At the beginning of 2019 I put forward the neo-Aristotelian model by James Arthur on a slide and talked through how that would work here at (case study school). The model looks at in an ideal world you want to get your student to a point of a nexus where they understand and are practicing their virtues because it is the right thing to do and not for any gain or reward. The goal for teachers is to get students to the point that they should be seeking that goal. There is an upper road to that – there are students who are always on that road but as they mature this develops. It begins with the knowledge – they know what is right but not so good at putting it into action. Others know the virtues and what is right but are not so good at putting it into action. Then you have the practice and they now know why it is important to be kind and are putting it into practice and after practicing they understand that they gain good feelings from action so they start to act with kindness more. On the low road the students get lost but they are seeking it for reward which limits integrity. Next stage, after practicing it a few times they get that feeling of being kind and that is enough reward to do it and then they begin to actively seek it. That is the taught element.

Students are watching other students who are role models and mentors. Through that good modelling and through maturity they seek to do right.

The low road is where students get lost. They don't necessarily seek to be virtuous. Electric shock treatment. Something comes to a head and they behave in a poor way and there is a sanction so they then search for the upper road. They reflect on what they have done and then start again and do better.

Scott Parker – flourish/language model – 0-10 scale with a mid-point. Words or phrases that summarise a student who might be languishing and who has a flourishing side as well. If a boy is not owning a decision they have made and blaming others rather than taking responsibility they may be on the languishing side. If a boy has taken ownership of his actions, is seeking to change and improve, then they are more on the side of flourishing. We can sit down with some of our students and explain the model. The boys can self-assess and develop a series of goals to work on. If they decide from that model they are always blaming other people, they need to think about not doing that, and address the underlining problem and take action.

The neo-Aristotelian model talks about getting boys back on the high road but not how to do that. So we really tried to look at that and how to get boys from the low road to the high road. This was the gap we filled. Tutors understood how to adapt. This is followed through to our co-curricular program.

Sports coaches understood this as this is competitive and puts boys against boys so this is hyper-masculine and hyper-competitive which can lead to toxicity so have been looking at this and how to deflate. Challenge of the school as we are very strong in our sports. Win at all costs type attitude can be a negative. It is something we recognise here and are trying really hard to fix that. New coach came in for rowing and teaching and was interested in the character education program. New director of boarding coming in next year but we are already started to meet to tap into the character education framework.

The presentation was to tutors and other teaching staff. Most of the general teaching staff are also tutors. Beyond tutors, mostly middle management. Team of 57 tutors who do pastoral care plus their own classes.

Mixed response but working on this as part of the next phase of the CE strategy.

Logistical problem of getting CEF out to everybody. Tutor system a good one but needs money spent on professional development. Teachers are specialised but falls to the school to provide professional development for pastoral care. PC is different to teaching. First cab off the rank for students – they look at you like you're a parent but not necessarily a huge amount of training in that area which is where the school comes in. It is really important to give that training to those staff. Mental health first aid. Coaching – chat to the student and get them to identify their strengths and weaknesses and how to address these themselves through a process of self-discovery.

The problem of a specialised model is that it is difficult to get it out to everybody. The tutor system is a good one but it needs money spent on professional development. A lot of schools do subject training but then get to a school and have to do pastoral care as well.

- 4. Can you please describe whether or not you believe applying the character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum makes a difference in creating students with the desired characteristics? Please explain why.**

It is probably a bit early to say as only 3 years in and we're starting to see some movement.

This year's (2019) year 12s made a leaving video and used Bittersweet Symphony from the Verve and filmed themselves walking around the school shaking hands. He would look at his hand and have a word on his hand. Duty. Honour. 20 or so words each matched to that boy and what his strength or character virtue was. Not seen that before. It was quite a nice touch. Starting to see a change coming from the boys. Still get 'it's a waste of time' sometimes but boys are able to say what has been really good and starting to see that language.

The character education message is starting to get through.

Even in our behavioural management – boys sitting opposite my desk – if you could reverse your time what would you do differently – starting to see the language used by the boys. Language starting to permeate which has been the goal of 2019. Less is more. Stripped it down to what is really important and get the message out there.

Interview 2 – Extent to which character education has influenced the Civics and Citizenship curriculum at Case study school:

5. Can you please describe how the teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since the introduction of the character education framework at (case study school)?

a. Please provide specific examples if possible.

I know we are looking to expand our role in the community. It is not done particularly well but when it is done well it tends to rely on the good ideas of tutors working towards individual projects and following through.

We would like to see more alignment to seeing greater involvement in the community which reflects greater civics and citizenship. We don't have a particular plan yet but Participant 1 is feeling his way through the ideas and the response is from the leadership. Until that occurs, I won't have a part in implementing it. Ideas take time to develop and take form.

6. In your opinion, which of the characters and virtues outlined in the (case study school) character education framework are necessary to create active citizens?

All four are relevant. Integrity springs to mind. Wisdom to know what you are doing, how and why.

7. Do you believe that using the character education framework as a lens through which to teach civics and citizenship helps create students with the necessary character traits to become active citizens?

a. Please provide specific examples if possible.

Has to be some thought going into defining what it is to be a citizen and the scale in which that operates from local to global. Not too many students in SA regard themselves as global citizens. The concept of the global citizen was much more widely understood and practiced in Europe. Very much tied back to the virtues. What they have and why they value them. Recognition of the importance of helping others and the benefit to a community that that has. Not just about launching into something without thinking. Understanding is not just about launching into something without thinking but stopping to think about the impact your help might have, whether it is imposing ideas they might now want, recognising a big part of being a good citizen is just listening and listening to

others, finding out what help is required and how to help. You need a positive, open mindset. Being able to get the message across.

It is one thing to have the knowledge about virtues but you need to be able to practice this in the right way.

Great example – students in Geography were doing a Kahoot quiz – on the whole course as a way of revising. Had to devise a Kahoot and had given them specific guidance. This went across the course. They had to come up with 20 questions in pairs. We then talked about ethical behaviour in Kahoot. What can we do to respect others – use our real name, not call out answers, not pick up on students with wrong answers, not call a question dumb etc. They demonstrated really good knowledge about ethical behaviours.

Did the 1st one – out of 22 students 3 didn't use their real name and one used a racist symbol. A student did then try and do the right thing but ran out of time. The whole exercise showed they had great knowledge in theory but when it came to practice there was another hurdle.

Through communications to parents we might ask parents to do some things to support the character education framework. Publishing in e-news. Continually communicating to parents and sharing points of wisdom etc. Invite parents to reinforce at home but need to be careful not to be too didactic.

8. Can you please describe how your teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since (case study school) introduced a character education framework?

No noticeable difference in co-curricular since the introduction of the CEF.

9. Do you think other schools should use character education as a framework for teaching of civics and citizenship in order to create students with the needed characteristics to become active citizens? Please explain why or why not.

CE has a role to play. It is a nice way of getting across a set of guidelines with which to be a good, decent person. I think it works in schools as it largely replaces a decaying religious fabric. Christianity or faith based schools had a framework that was widely supported by the wider community that is no longer there. Modern parents like the idea of Christian values that character education gives. CE is kind of parents having the cake and eat it too – can have the Christian values without having to commit to religion or what they see as an out-of-date establishment. The other thing is for us that we can interpret and develop character education and make it bespoke. We are not taking it off the shelf, like positive education or some other kind of framework, we can make it our own.

Positive education is good too but assumes things about the way the school is run which may limit productivity. Positive education can be guilty of looking at happiness through rose coloured spectacles.

CE is a tool, not necessarily the only one, and doesn't necessarily replace faith based programs in faith based schools.

Harrow in the UK and Wellington are very strong CE.

In the school where Shaun taught in the UK there was a program that was applied called Ad Vitum – learning for life – which was quite aligned to civics and citizenship. Looked at everything from health to community based work. Largely written by one teacher but delivered by year level coordinators. Worked well. Timetabled once or twice a week. Strong assembly program 2-3 times a week so there was a strong framework coming through that. We (in the UK) were a Christian principled school but not overwhelmingly.

Teacher interviews: Participant 4, Academic Leader, Humanities

Interview 1 - Implementation of character education across Case study school:

1. Can you please describe how well you think the character education framework has been adopted by the teaching staff and provide examples to illustrate?

I think the CEF has been adopted well in some regards. I think so far as the pastoral care program it is the framework of what we deliver and how we deliver it. However, I do think there is a disconnect between the general subjects and the CEF. I think they are treated as 2 discrete areas rather than a symbiotic program that infiltrates I suppose and I think the boys also see it that way. Probably because of the way it is delivered but also I think that is also okay in some regard as the role of the curriculum is to deliver the curriculum and I think that delivering that with a strong message of the what that subject is about is paramount.

Could the CEF be more integrated? When I talk about the character virtues I see the (case study school) virtues and there are elements of that but need to be careful not to force the links that are not there. If there is a natural character virtue that is mentioned. Need to be careful not to force it as it can become disingenuous. And it does become quite a drain on teaching time. Need to focus on curriculum but demonstrate character virtues in the classroom. Be careful not to digress into particular virtues is not an effective use of time nor would it lead to an outcome of a virtue. Should be intrinsic.

2. Can you please describe the impacts or changes you have seen since (case study school) implemented a character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum?

I think it has tightened up our delivery of some of the pastoral components. Gives purpose to what we deliver and why we deliver it through the pastoral framework. I think you need the virtues to underpin something and you need something to refer back to. The challenge with a lot of the pastoral care components is that there isn't a set framework. There isn't a universally recognised model as the best.

Having a set of characteristics of what we expect the end boy to be provides a guide for the end product. Build the boy pastorally, academically and sporting. Having those 3 components working together to create a good outcome.

Made a difference by providing a framework and a purpose to what we do. It can be refined further. Generally I think it has made a difference.

I think sometimes we try to do too much. We overestimate the amount of progress we can make against an individual virtue. It is generally too much to develop character if trying to do all 7 in a single year. Give them a chance to apply it, fail at it, correct it. Focus on one particular virtue per year then focusing on building on another in the next year. Hierarchical structure of what virtue we want to build – kindness is the starting point – the one virtue we value the most - so delivering kindness in year 7 and give them the opportunity to try, fail, correct, succeed. This would then give the framework for the year 8 where you might start to look at another element of service which might be service. Look at it as a 5 year plan rather than a single 12 month fix. It is a challenge as which character virtue is more important.

It is one of those things where as educators we try to do too much. We want everyone to be like us, which will take years. Even as adults we don't have all the virtues you want until around 24 years old.

To develop a year 7 boy to develop great attributes is unrealistic.

We got to play the long game. Boys are developmentally behind girls. Building a strong foundation that can be developed further rather than little bits often. A whole year that builds on one virtue may go deeper and be more effective. We develop kindness in year 7 and build it by the end of the year then build on it with service element in year 8. Going deeper into their thinking and their doing. Might see a small loss the following year. You need to know where the boys are at and given them a variety of strategies to demonstrate that particular virtue and follow this through each year. This would avoid becoming tokenistic and redundant as boys may forget.

Year 7 kindness – then can refer back to the previous year and then see less of a reduction in those virtues the following year. By year 12 we might not have seen a difference unless we go deeper. Going deeper, discussing it, looking at the psyche. Thinking about it more as a curriculum than doing too much.

We have seen that in the past. For a variety of reasons the boys may be resistant. Providing really clear examples of what it looks like and how it can influence a boy's decision making.

3. Do you think the impacts or changes have been a direct result of the implementation of the character education framework or are there any other reasons or influences?

It is a tough question actually as what is our measure. I think we kind of had a baseline. Look, I don't know whether it has.

I don't know if it has made a big change as we don't have a good measure. We have always had really nice boys who are privileged due to our socio-demographic and have had that privilege showing through in their behaviour in a negative way. Boys because of their background are very balanced and actually know who they are. Have the virtues made a difference? I am not sure. I am not sure how to measure. I am not sure how to account. Not sure if there has been a behavioural shift in my time. Most of the behavioural shifts have been a result of teacher cohesion rather than virtues. I am not sure if the boys have changed that much but there has been more cohesion among the management and staff. Teachers have become more cohesive in their expectations and management of what the boys do.

More of a mgmt. influence than CEF. Teachers have become more cohesive as the curriculum has been tightened up, parents now more involved and more supportive and their fees no longer give them a bargaining chip but gives them a right to be at the school, this is a big shift.

Parents have changed their attitude. Their \$25,000 no longer buys them a bargaining chip but gives them a right to be at the school and buy into what we deliver. Because of curriculum leadership we are stronger in what we deliver.

Addition of the deputy head and the shifts there.

Directive to the staff is clearer. Shift is due to the teachers expecting more of the boys inside and outside of the classroom and expecting parents to do more and having support from staff to take action.

Teachers holding the boys to account more and knowing the boys will have consequences of their poor behaviour.

The clear expectations from teachers has led to a shift in some of the boy's behaviour.

I don't think this is linked to the virtue language. I don't think so. Words are words. The program is still quite fresh to actually make a difference. The semantics of language is very important. But, it is more that day to day interaction has made the changes than certain catch phrases that have been used.

Change in Curriculum - Moved over to the Australian curriculum. Increasing rigour and changing assessment model. The demands of a school like ours the parents expect a lot – in the past they have expected a lot, said what they want, and school accepted and responded without question. Now, we know what our product is and parents accept it or not. The school has found out who we are, rather than being dictated to by parents.

Parents are buying into the new assertive model. We have the confidence to say now 'this is what we do'. This has created our own direction and parents have filled in the gaps with what they think is best.

Started with Participant 1 and another – Director of Teaching and Learning – Staff member and Participant 1 have created the new curriculum model. Participant 1 has lifted the expectation in our boys and driven the changes in terms of how the boys look, how the boys behave in class. Participant 1 has been very supportive with the behaviour management. Teachers feel very supported with behaviour mgmt. It has been less intrinsic and more extrinsic with the staff expecting more of the lads.

Teachers feel more supported in behaviour mgmt. Staff expecting more of the lads and knowing they have the support of leadership.

Teachers are in charge of what happens in school and staff being more cohesive in their expectations can have a massive impact on how the boys behaviour.

There is now a clarity of messages.

Those little points of cohesion between staff can have a massive impact on how the boys behave generally and that there will be follow through for boys behaviour.

4. Can you please describe whether or not you believe applying the character education framework through the delivery of the curriculum makes a difference in creating students with the desired characteristics? Please explain why.

It is mostly the PC.

Not a whole lot.

If we focus on seven virtues and seven characteristics. These virtues need to be developed intrinsically. We don't need to mention them every day. This can lead to indoctrination rather than developing these intrinsically. If we keep mentioning the virtues then boys start to believe they are something they are not which becomes an issue.

Indoctrination is very different to application and boys actually becoming those virtues.

Upper echelons convince the students they are something when in actual fact they are not simply because of a marketing plan.

The genuine teaching of it is really important but you don't need to keep referring to it.

Development can be more intrinsic.

Interview 2 – Extent to which character education has influenced the Civics and Citizenship curriculum at Case study school:

5. Can you please describe how the teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since the introduction of the character education framework at (case study school)?

a. Please provide specific examples if possible.

No, not at all.

The civics unit that currently exists is intrinsic in what we do. It is integrated into geography and history. Within those 2 units we integrate the elements of civics. Rather than teach civics separately we have made the decision to not waste curriculum time teaching a discrete CCE topic. We have made the intrinsic natural links rather than teach a tokenistic one off unit that boys forget easily.

There is overlap as what they talk about in civics is the development of a country.

Geography – overlap of CCE – development of a country, development of politics. Talk about the Romans, development of the Magna Carta etc. This automatically becomes a civics and citizenship discussion. The development of people, the shift away from feudalism. These are the natural links that exist and can be linked back to the current politics. Where have we come from? How have we developed? If we didn't have the Magna Carta then the spread of Britain would not have occurred and we would not be here today etc. This is more of a natural connection rather than teaching a separate link.

There is no point teaching something if it is not linked to real life. It becomes a tick box exercise rather than genuine.

The idea of teaching a two week subject on CCE this becomes a tokenistic subject with little effect.

The Adelaide Week is a separate activity.

AW is integral to building CCE.

CCE is not taught as a two week standalone because it is redundant.

NAP-CC – it would be interest to see but Participant 4 said he is not interested in these. They are not readily available but wonder if it would make (case study school) change a whole lot and at this stage it would not. NAP-CC not readily available but it would not make him change a whole lot. CCE delivery is a little component that is very tokenistic. For a lot of CCE the delivery point in year 10.

Tokenistic units and delivery point is Year 10-11. Development of house of parliament, Courts. At year 7 better talking about the Romans and those historical events – how can you know and understand the Westminster system and politics of the world in order to understand voting etc. which needs to come later. Why we vote, the process that we go through is better taught after year 10.

Let's play the long game and build up to the bigger concepts such as voting etc. when they are year 10 or older when they are more likely to understand how we got the vote and how meaningful this is.

Legal studies focuses very much on civics and has a huge Indigenous component.

Year 10 – quite a bit of communist systems and the political balances and shifts there. Obviously, the CCE at the end is the idea of looking at the Indigenous rights movement and African American Civil Rights movement when the boys can conceptually understand within the context of history.

Should be integrated not a tack on at the end of teaching. Links must be natural.

Most schools treat CCE as a tick box – do it for two weeks. The links must be natural and coherent.

6. In your opinion, which of the characters and virtues outlined in the (case study school) character education framework are necessary to create active citizens?

I think integrity is really important for CCE. If we talk about a student finished, 2 years into their career, the idea of integrity is really important as citizens will always be questioned on what they stand for. For that student to then know what they stand for and have integrity. This is an important characteristic. Encourage the boys to have a level of humility and level of balance in their decision making to not be particularly self-centred. Integrity is important in standing up for what's right – assuming they know what is right. For me, integrity is one of the more important ones.

Cannot expect this from a year 7 but at the end of the day integrity is important for men to know good morals and hold their ground. Maybe it is something I value.

7. Do you believe that using the character education framework as a lens through which to teach civics and citizenship helps create students with the necessary character traits to become active citizens?

a. Please provide specific examples if possible.

No, I think we need to be careful.

Slightly different model. But I think back to the MYP and the IB have virtues that hang off their curriculum. The ATL skills. The learner profile. What you would find is teachers would integrate 'kindness' etc. in their delivery and it did not improve outcomes or developments – all it would do is distract. Curriculum needs to be clear and not crowded with a whole adding too much – not serve too many masters. Curriculum needs to be taught. Development of knowledge. Not sure it should play a role. It is not central and shouldn't be.

It should go the other way. The curriculum should encourage civics and citizenship.

Curriculum should encourage virtues as part of that – integrate into geography etc. Curriculum should be central and should then encourage boys to go and explore other avenues as a component of that.

Too often we think of it the other way.

Not sure.

Jubilee Centre – lesson plans – it can become a distraction and then for a teacher to be able to do that is truly nuanced in an educator. If your main focus is to develop a curriculum then 100% effort needs to go into that. If you bring in these distractors then this may erode the teaching this can go the other way.

If you have a teacher who is not curriculum strong then the teacher may take the path of least resistance.

I have seen this happen where the teaching of something might be difficult and teacher takes the easier route. I have seen it happen where a teacher focuses on delivering content that is superfluous to the curriculum and the curriculum outcomes are poor. I suppose I am a little bit cynical that it could work.

To make it work you need a small school and a staff who are particularly capable and working at the same level.

A school like (case study school) integration of CEF into the curriculum becomes high risk – sheer number of teachers and sheer number of competing factors.

Small school more scope to deliver, monitor and achieve curriculum outcomes.

Approach with a sense of trepidation and not a fan of pushing it too much.

Examples of the UN – framework that develops awareness of CCE etc. As a program it develops all of these virtues but it isn't taking time out of the curriculum but is feeding from the curriculum.

We need to approach with a sense of trepidation and I am not a fan of pushing this too much.

It is about building inquisitive and knowledgeable people.

You cannot show virtues if you don't know anything. If you can't understand and know about Westminster systems then you can't act. If you can't understand why we have continuous debates about Indigenous rights then you can't participate.

The delivery of soft skills, such as character, must come secondary to knowledge.

Climate strikes are a really good example – boys have a broad sense of what’s going on, but see action as tokenistic. Strikes are a fad. I like the idea of activism as a geographer but the idea of striking for climate is ineffectual and a waste of time.

The challenge is the measurable are tricky. Higher socio-economics.

Awareness of students and parents is high so undertaking actions at home any way. They are in that bracket that are climate aware and taking action. We are taking individual action linked to the socio-economic status.

8. Can you please describe how your teaching of the civics and citizenship curriculum has changed since (case study school) introduced a character education framework?

Integrated into geography and history.

Within the previous MYP – CCE wasn’t really taught within it.

We looked at the curriculum review – we looked at CCE and how it would fit – the first approach that we looked at would be to add it on at the end as a tick box – this is the worst way to deliver CCE within the curriculum. What are the intrinsic links, if we’re skipping some of the specifics, I question whether there would be any long-term retention of this anyway in a 2 week program, but the redundancy effect would be massive with a 2 week tokenistic course. Integration – what do we deliver, what do we do, find the intrinsic links that helps to develop this further.

Geography a good example – global inequalities that we look at - so becomes intrinsic.

Curriculum review was about 4 years ago.

9. Do you think other schools should use character education as a framework for teaching of civics and citizenship in order to create students with the needed characteristics to become active citizens? Please explain why or why not.

I disagree – CCE should drive the virtues of the CEF.

You can add in different models e.g. using the Duke of Edinburgh program as an added factor.

Using the CCE program as the driver of CEF to develop students to be the person you want them to be. 70% of CCE fits what you want a student to be. Empathy, understanding legal systems etc. drives what you want a student to be.

You don’t start with virtues – you have a good idea of what they are – you start with the CCE as a baseline to develop some virtues. I think the CCE has exceptional components in there that you can use to extend draw out into the curriculum.

The idea of global understanding and politics.

The difference between right and wrong fits with what a good pastoral program.

50-70% of the CCE components that you can integrate into an effective Character Education program.

Using the CCE to guide or lead part of the pastoral program for CEF. Starting with something more concrete than virtues.

Start with the concept of right and wrong – from the CCE - and using that to develop a more genuine delivery of the pastoral care program. Do 3-4 scenarios – this incident happens and what would be right or wrong.

This turns it on its head.

Whereas pastoral care has started with virtues and developed a curriculum but the purpose can be lost.

CCE through pastoral care might create stronger outcomes.

There are different frameworks we could use. You could integrate the civics in there. Duke of Edinburgh program – ways in which that develops character – construct components, use the CCE as the baseline rather than trying to fit the virtues into the program.

Other components – student led committees – history and science journals – good example of service. Curriculum knowledge together with service. The student led clubs lead to significant outcomes for the curriculum and develops virtues such as empathy, courage, service.

We need to be careful not to go with the latest fad.

We probably had it right 6-8 years ago where we would deliver pastoral care through discussions/stories.

Videos and powerpoint can lead to downgrading of messaging.

I am not sure it has made a difference. Perhaps this is due to no evaluation. The boys are no different. Home life is a key influencing factor.

APPENDIX 3: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET



PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

PROJECT TITLE: Exploring the connections between character education and civics and citizenship education in Case study school

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL NUMBER: H-2019-214

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dr Brendan Bentley

STUDENT RESEARCHER: Mrs Jacqui McCann

STUDENT'S DEGREE: Master of Teaching

Dear Participant,

You are invited, but under no obligation, to participate in the research project described below.

What is the project about?

This research project is about identifying if the construct of character education is relevant in creating meaningful and effective civics and citizenship education in Australia. Research suggests an active or personally responsible citizen is informed, responsible, law-abiding and willing to volunteer in a crisis (Peterson and Bentley, 2016). Recent decades have focused on creating more active citizens, with a wide range of agreements and initiatives, including the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians (2008) and its wider goal that all young Australians become 'active and informed citizens'. However, there is a gap between commitment to active citizenship and practice, which is widely acknowledged. It is suggested that to be a good citizen, being a good person is essential (Tudball and Brett, 2014). Therefore this research contributes to the emerging body of knowledge on whether constructs, such as character education, are a missing link between commitment and practice when it comes to effective and meaningful civics and citizenship education. To explore the connections between character education and the civics and citizenship curriculum, a case study of Case study school will be undertaken.

Who is undertaking the project?

This project is being conducted by Dr Brendan Bentley and Mrs Jacqui McCann. This research will form the basis for the degree of Master of Teaching under the supervision of Dr Brendan Bentley.

Why am I being invited to participate?

You are being invited as you are involved in the implementation of the character education framework at Case study school and/or the delivery of civics and citizenship education.

What am I being invited to do?

You are being invited to participate in two interviews: the first interview will explore the implementation of character education across Case study school, and the second interview will explore the extent to which character education has influenced the civics and citizenship curriculum at Case study school. Interviews will be conducted on campus at Case study school and may be

recorded and transcribed. You will be provided the opportunity to check your transcription for accuracy before the contents is used in the research outputs.

How much time will my involvement in the project take?

It is anticipated each interview will take up to 45 minutes. Interviews will take place during November 2019.

Are there any risks associated with participating in this project?

There are no foreseeable risks associated with your participation in this research.

What are the potential benefits of the research project?

Previous research into civics and citizenship has involved other schools, including St Peter's College and Geelong Grammar School. The benefits of this research is the opportunity to explore potential connections between character education and civics and citizenship in a new school environment.

It is anticipated the findings will be published in 2020-21, in collaboration with Professor Andrew Peterson from the University of Birmingham, enabling a global audience to understand the links between character education and civics and citizenship identified through the case study of Case study school.

Can I withdraw from the project?

Participation in this project is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate, you can withdraw from the study at any time before 29 November 2019 when the findings will be written up.

What will happen to my information?

Confidentiality and privacy: Due to the small number of participants, fewer than 10, participants will be provided with the option to adopt a pseudonyms if they prefer. However, even if identifiers are removed, as the sample of participants is small and from a discrete population, there may be the potential that individuals could be identifiable. While all efforts will be made to remove any information that might identify you, as the sample size is small, complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed. However, the utmost care will be taken to ensure that no personally identifying details are revealed.

Storage: *The information and project records will be securely stored, accessible by Dr Brendan Bentley and Mrs Jacqui McCann, for a period of five years.*

Publishing: The information will be used and the results reported, publicised and presented in a research dissertation and submitted to a relevant journal for publication. As outlined under 'confidentiality and privacy' efforts will be made to ensure confidentiality and privacy of participants. The privacy of participants wishing to maintain anonymity will be protected.

Sharing: You will be provided with a copy of you interview transcript before it is finalised and used in the research. You will be provided with a copy of any research outputs. The data collected may be used in the future by the same or other researchers in the field for research purposes. Those wishing to maintain anonymity will only have their de-identified data used in the future.

Your information will only be used as described in this participant information sheet and it will only be disclosed according to the consent provided, except as required by law.

Who do I contact if I have questions about the project?

The research team can be contacted on the following phone numbers:

Dr Brendan Bentley, Chief Investigator

Phone:

Email: Brendan.bentley@adelaide.edu.au

Mrs Jacqui McCann, student researcher

Phone:

Email: Jacqueline.mccann@student.adelaide.edu.au

What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

The study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of Adelaide (approval number H-2019-214). This research project will be conducted according to the NHMRC National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007 (Updated 2018). If you have questions or problems associated with the practical aspects of your participation in the project, or wish to raise a concern or complaint about the project, then you should consult the Principal Investigator. If you wish to speak with an independent person regarding concerns or a complaint, the University's policy on research involving human participants, or your rights as a participant, please contact the Human Research Ethics Committee's Secretariat on:

Phone: +61 8 8313 6028

Email: hrec@adelaide.edu.au

Post: Level 4, Rundle Mall Plaza, 50 Rundle Mall, ADELAIDE SA 5000

Any complaint or concern will be treated in confidence and fully investigated. You will be informed of the outcome.

If I want to participate, what do I do?

Please contact the researchers – Jacqui McCann (0450 394 991) or Brendan Bentley (0468 367 363) – to participate in this research.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Brendan Bentley FACEL

Director of Partnerships and Engagement

Program Director Master of Teaching

Mrs Jacqui McCann LLB (Hons) GDLP BAppEc (Hons) MPP

Master of Teaching student

APPENDIX 4: INTERVIEW CONSENT FORMS