The child, the pupil, the citizen. Outlines and perspectives of a critical theory of Citizenship education

Federico Farini
University of Northampton
federico.farini@northampton.ac.uk

Introduction
In 2014, the English National Curriculum (ENC; Department for Education 2014a) for Citizenship education in schools was criticized for failing to value pupils' expectations, understanding and experiences of rights, responsibilities and the changing nature of democracy. At the turn of the same year, the statutory framework for Early Years Education, the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS; Department for Education 2014b) introduced education to British Values (sometimes referred to as 'Fundamental British Values', see Home Department, 2011) via curricular provision: Early Years settings must now demonstrate to teach young children values such as cooperation, freedom and responsibility. However, the contribution of children's actions and experiences in shaping the meaning of values is not acknowledged in the curriculum, instead values are social skills to be learnt in preparation for life.

This chapter discusses the paradoxical status of `British Values' in the EYFS and Citizenship in the ENC. On the one hand, the semantics of British Values and Citizenship is genuinely educational: they are knowledge that creates the conditions for further learning (Baraldi and Corsi 2016). On the other hand, learners have limited opportunities to experience, test and assess the learned knowledge, due to their limited agency in the education system, related to the institutionalised distrust that structures educational interactions. The social situations in which learning on British Values and Citizenship can be recombined and applied are not provided, because children and young people are not agents in Education, and have limited opportunities to make choices according to their personal judgment. The EYFS and the ENC are documents that introduce knowledge, British Values and Citizenship, that will be experienced in the future, and outside the Education system. In this contribution, curricula have been approached and analysed using document analysis.

Methodology
Document analysis is a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents. Similarly to any other analytical methods in qualitative research, document analysis requires that data be examined and interpreted in order to elicit meaning and develop empirical knowledge (Rapley 2007).

Atkinson and Coffey (2004) refer to documents as 'social facts', which are produced, shared, and used in socially organised ways. Documents that may be used for systematic evaluation as part of a study take a variety of forms. For instance, educational documents include attendance registers, minutes of meetings; manuals; background papers; school brochures; diaries and journals; maps and charts; newspapers; organisational or institutional reports; curricula.

The analytic procedure of document analysis entails finding, selecting, appraising and synthesising data contained in documents, to be then organised into major themes and categories (Labuschagne 2003). Document analysis is deemed as particularly appropriate to approach educational curricula through a focused intensive documentary case-study (Stake 1995), aiming to produce a rich description of the semantics of education to British Values and Citizenship. Document analysis has been previously applied to educational curricula, using them as a key to decipher emerging social forms in the semantics of education, for instance regarding digital learning (Angers and Machtmes 2005) and computer mediated communication (Scollan and Gallagher 2016).

The analytical procedure of document analysis combines elements of content analysis and thematic analysis. Content analysis is the process of organising information into categories related to the central questions of the research, entailing a document review, in which meaningful and relevant passages of text are identified (Corbin and Strauss 2008). As the second stage of content analytical procedure, thematic analysis follows content analysis, being addressed to recognize emerging themes within data (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane 2006).

The reliability and validity of document analysis are secured by a circular relationship between interpretation and theory (Bowen 2008). If document analysis is driven by objectivity (seeking to represent the document fairly) and sensitivity (responding to even subtle cues to meaning), interpretation of documents is made possible by theoretical categories that pre-exist data, while theoretical categories are validated by data characteristics.

Document analysis is not a formalistic methodology: documents are understood as historical objects; for this reason, the analysis of educational curricula is introduced by a historical review of Citizenship education in the English school system.

An historical review of Citizenship education in English curricula
The quest for Political neutrality

For many decades, since its foundation and until the end of the twentieth century, English State education was reluctant to involve itself in any form of Citizenship education (Hodgson 2008). Excluded from curricula, Civic Education was left to initiatives of individual schools. A recent review of School Codes and Statutes across the first half of the twentieth century (O'Sullivan 2014), suggests that Civic Education was rarely implemented, and when provided, it was conceptualised as moral education for the individual.

Under the influence of pedagogical publications ('History as a School of Citizenship' by Madeley 1920) and teacher education pamphlets ('The Teaching of History', by the Board of Education 1923), history was recognised as the medium for the transmission of moral values, inspiring pupils with exemplary lives of British heroes and heroines.

The approach to Citizenship as moral education based on the celebration of historical examples remained largely unchallenged until the 1970s. Landmark government reports, the Spens Report (Ministry of Education 1938) and the Norwood Report (Ministry of Education 1943) supported the idea of civic education as moral education based on exemplar histories (Batho 1990). In 1949, a Ministry of Education pamphlet, 'Citizens Growing Up', defined the pedagogical guidelines for Civic Education: the development of the qualities of the democratic citizens was best served by the 'permeation approach' where civic virtues were to be passed along 'ordinary' academic subjects, rather than through specifically designed provision. Civic education was deemed as the possible vehicle of unwelcomed propaganda and biased political visions of society (Lawton et al. 2005).

Notwithstanding the persisting concern for political 'neutrality' in schools, subjects such as sociology, economics and politics became increasingly popular in schools throughout the 1970s; however, nothing moved towards the inclusion of Citizenship in the curriculum. It is believed that political disagreement regarding the concept of Citizenship was the main factor hampering a programme of study for the development of civic skills and understanding.

Citizenship and Citizenship education as an object of political struggle

Nowadays, Marshall's model (Marshall 1950) is widely acknowledge as hegemonic in the English discourse on Citizenship (Kymlicka and Norman 1994; Kymlicka 2008), also informing aims and objectives of Citizenship education (Osler 2000; Olsen 2004). However, until the 1990s the status of Marshall's model was the object of controversies, linked to political tensions surrounding not only the teaching of Citizenship, but the interpretation of Citizenship itself.

Marshall's tripartite model of Citizenship education, is based on 1) rights and responsibility; 2) political literacy; 3) community involvement. The first component, rights and responsibility, is

itself a tripartite category, collating civil rights, political rights and, most controversially, social rights.

Civil rights, largely developed in the eighteenth century are the rights necessary for individual freedom, such as liberty, freedom of speech, justice and property rights. Political rights, which developed in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, are chiefly understood by Marshall in the framework of representative democracy, as the right to vote and to stand for political offices. Whilst civil and political rights were already included in traditional, history-based civic education, the political controversy during the 1970s concerned social rights. Social rights are defined by Marshall as:

> a range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being, according to the standards prevailing in the society (Marshall 1950, p. 149).

Marshall's view of social rights aims to 'civilise capitalism' by reducing the inequality that the economic system tends to produce. Marshall's category of social rights aligned with the post-war consensus (Kymlicka and Norman, 1994) appeasing both the social democracy of the Labour Party and the model of `managed capitalism' of post-Churchillian Conservatives (O'Sullivan 2014). However, despite such ideological consensus the traditional British reluctance towards the inclusion of Citizenship education in the curricula prevented the development of a programme of Citizenship teaching in the 1950s and 1960s. By the following decade, whilst the rise of social sciences in school curricula was reinvigorating the case for Citizenship education, the consensus around the meaning of Citizenship had left way to a polarised debate centred on the legitimacy of social rights.

Already in the mid-1970s, British political discourse was hegemonized by the emerging ideology of the New Right, that 'sought to counter and reverse the development of social Citizenship by returning to the traditional liberal idea of free markets and limited government' (Biesta and Lawy 2006, p.68), emphasising civil rights and market self-regulation rather than social rights. The vanishing of consensus on the very meaning of Citizenship prevented any further advancing of citizenship education until the late 1990s.

It was only with the 'New Labour' government (1997-2010) that some political consensus on the meaning of Citizenship was restored, enabling the relatively recent, and relatively dramatic, developments in Citizenship education to take place. In 1997 the historical momentum was created whereby the government-commissioned *Advisory Group on Citizenship* could successfully put forward the case for the compulsory teaching of citizenship in the English curriculum.

Hodgson argues that by the end of the twentieth century, citizenship education to some extent came to be a relatively safe alternative to some of the much more radical political education that was taking place in schools since the late 1970s on an *ad hoc* basis (Hodgson 2008). Biesta and Lawy (2006) demonstrate how New Labour largely accepted the individualistic interpretation of the role of the citizen that the Thatcherite programme had bequeathed them, emphasising the alliance between individual rights and a sense of responsibility and obligation. In such a favourable cultural environment, the recommendations advanced by the Advisory Group were publicised through a landmark paper, known as the Crick Report (1998, named after Bernard Crick, Chair of the Advisory Group).

The Crick Report is informed by the 'rights and responsibilities' rhetoric of New Labour, and builds upon a partial recovery of Marshall's tripartite concept of Citizenship based on rights, political literacy and community involvementwhich therefore provides the framework for the development of Citizenship education in England.

The Crick Report considers three interrelated learning outcomes for Citizenship education: 1) social and moral responsibility towards those in authority and each other; 2) community

involvement, including service to the community; 3) political literacy, that is, the knowledge, skills and values to be effective in public life.

The Crick Report is a political document, and the learning outcomes of citizenship education fits in the Communitarian agenda brought forward by New Labour, calling for morally motivated, responsible and politically engaged citizens (Etzioni 1995). Citizenship education aims to:

> make secure and to increase knowledge, skills and values relevant to the nature and practices of participative democracy; also to enhance the awareness of rights and duties, and the sense of responsibility needed for the development of pupils into active citizens; and in doing so establish the value to individuals, schools and society of involvement in the local and wider community (Crick 1998: p.40)

The Crick Report was subject to criticism for being indifferent to issues of equality and social justice (Cockburn, 2013), governmental technology applied to political socialisation (Pykett, 2007). A few months after its publication, an early review of the report argued that 'moral values' need to be balanced by guarantees of equality of rights and the absence of discrimination, not just at an interpersonal level but also in key services such as housing, health and education (Osler 2000). For Osler, values are important but inadequate response within a society characterised by diversity and deep inequalities, whereas the Crick Report does not address structural disadvantages which act as a key barrier to full and equal Citizenship.

Nevertheless, Crick's framework successfully resonated across the whole political spectrum, due to its emphasis on the duty of the citizen to participate in public affairs, to respect the rights and freedoms of the nation state and to observe its laws and fulfil the duties and obligations of Citizenship. Scholars have suggested that the success of the Crick Report is due to its ideological continuity with the New Right Agenda, for instance the emphasis on personal responsibility and individual choice (Miller 2000) and to its methodological affinity to 'safe' teacher-centred pedagogies, interested in transmitting 'good' Citizenship, rather than promoting the social and critical capabilities of young people (Tomlinson 2005).

The Crick Report became the ideological and technical imprint of compulsory citizenship education, that began in September 2002 via a curriculum described as 'light touch' by the then Secretary of State for Education David Blunkett: schools were allowed flexibility to deliver the curriculum in ways that matched the local conditions. Although based on a small case research, Burton and May (2015) discussion of qualitative interview with teachers suggests that this remains the case today; whilst there is a curricular programme to follow, topics can be covered within various aspects of school life, also as part of existing subjects.

A historical review of citizenship education in English schools introduces us to the analysis of current curricula. An analysis focused on the paradoxical status of British Values and citizenship as educational knowledge.

British Values and Citizenship as educational knowledge

The Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) and The English National Curricula (ENC) are educational curricula introducing British Values and citizenship as learning outcomes for educational planning. From a sociological perspective, educational curricula can be understood as a component of a triadic configuration that includes the curriculum, teacher and learner. The triadic configuration, teacher, student and subject matter enables more stable educational relationships than an asymmetric dyadic one between teacher and students. The focus on the subject matter, which needs to be taught and learned, create the conditions for the sequential organisation of the educational process (Weick, 1979), and for decisions about motives, themes and their timing (Vanderstraeten, 2003). Through curricula, education creates its own limits of what is possible and meaningful (Blacker, 2000). If approached from an organisational point of view, curricula are programmes for decision-making in pedagogical planning and assessment

of pupils' performances, helping to stabilise relationships between teacher and learner (Weick 1979).

It is against the curriculum (and school organisation) that the history of the interactions, as well as the personal characteristics of the participants can become meaningful for the interaction. School curricula represent one of the changes encompassed by the morphogenesis of the modern educational system at the end of the nineteenth century, with the so-called discovery of the child, the universalization of classroom education and the professionalization of the teacher (Vanderstraeten 2006).

Curricula do not only reduce the complexity of the educational interaction; curricula also reduce the complexity of the internal environment of schools, limiting the possibility of choice for teachers, pedagogues and managers. As state-enhanced programmes for decision making, curricula represent an interface between education and its social environment. The state administration cannot teach but can impose curricular models and organizational structures.

The EYFS lends itself as an example, establishing curricular goals for the development of the young child, therefore simplifying decision-making for practitioners and managers in Early Years settings. Within the EYFS, age-specific activities are imposed, that must be tailored to secure development in the government-defined core areas of development, that is, 'understanding the world', 'personal, social and emotional development', 'people and communities'. The teaching of British Values is now a task for Early Years practitioners, and children's learning must be demonstrated for all core areas of development.

British Values in the EYFS: the present as preparation for the future
Since 2015 the EYFS includes British Values as a core component of Early Years settings the statutory duty to secure a positive and socially constructive development of the child. British Values are as important as any of the many facets of a well developing individual; Early Years settings must demonstrate to state-appointed inspectors to include teaching of British Values, as failing to do so would result in loosing financial support.

Probably due to some awareness of vagueness of a concept such as British Values, the EYFS presents a non-negotiable trivial list of values to be transmitted to a child: 1) Rule of law, 2) Mutual respect and tolerance, 3) Democracy and, 4) Individual liberty.

Criticism to the EYFS treatment of British Values has concerned the elusiveness of the idea of distinctive British values (Jerome and Clemitshaw 2012) and the difficulty for practitioners to avoid a language implying some form of moral supremacy to other nations and cultures (The Guardian, 2014). For instance, leading English Early Years practitioner Meleady stresses that Britain does not have a monopoly on rule of law, individual liberty, mutual respect and 'tolerance', and therefore claims to these values, should not negate the fact that other nations, cultures, civilisations, peoples claim and implement these values as their own also (Meleady, 2015).

Whilst a discussion on the ideological implication of the nationalisation of moral values and civic virtues would surely deserved further development, the focus is now moved to the semantics of education (and adult-child relationship) underpinning the EYFS approach to the development of British Values.

In the statutory guide for Early Years practice, the first two British Values, 'rules of law' and 'mutual respect and tolerance', are linked to learning about how to manage feelings and behaviour, treating others as the child wants to be treated and understanding that rules matter. The third and the fourth values, democracy and individual liberty, refer to learning about how to make decisions together, making use of self-awareness and self-confidence.

The analysis of the curriculum evidences the enduring influence on the EYFS of Marshall's model of Citizenship, in the version revived by the Crick report. Rule of law, mutual respect and tolerance, democracy and individual liberty are objects of learning, translating to pedagogical planning two of the Marshall's dimensions of Citizenship 'Rights and responsibility' and 'Community involvement'. As a political comment in the margin of the

discussion, it is possible to appreciate how the Conservative-led EYFS 2015 can be considered as a continuation and expansion of the cultural project inaugurated by the New Labour government, and evidence of a shared hegemonic semantics of Citizenship across the political spectrum.

The EYFS and the ancillary guidelines for Early Years Inspections (Department for Education 2015) demand settings to include in their planning activities that are directly relevant of the transmission of British Values.

British Values are presented as a valuable object to be 'transmitted' from a generation to another through a learning process lead and monitored by the adult practitioner, who access the role of the 'knowledgeable other' in educational interactions (Parsons and Bales 1955). Education to British Values is presented in the guidelines for Early Years Inspectors as a core resource to equip children to acquire the 'core knowledge they need to be educated citizens', to 'develop skills and understanding to play a full part in society' (Department for Education 2015). Underpinning education to British Values is the distinction between the educated citizen of the future and the child in the present, an incumbent citizen who needs protection and education, but cannot be trusted as citizen in the present. The knowledge that represents the moral foundations of Citizenship is constructed and delivered by adults. Children's epistemic authority (Baraldi, 2014), that is, children's rights and responsibilities for contributing to construct the meaning of Citizenship is not valued, and children are included in the education to British Values as object of adult practices.

Early Years settings must document and present to State Inspectors how they secure the acquisition of British Values. Evidence of carefully planned activities pictorially linked to the desired learning outcomes must be shown and will be assessed against standardised criteria. It is therefore possible to argue that it is not only children who are not giving voice, but adults educator as well are recognised low epistemic status. This resonates with a recent research commissioned by the Professional Association for Childcare and Early Years, showing that practitioners across England believe that the transformation of education to British Values into an object of a school-like inspection, based on standardised learning outcomes, may detract from the focus on care, play and children's wellbeing that constitutes the core of Early Years professional identity (PACEY, 2015).

However, pedagogical planning neither prevents practitioners to devise opportunities for children to practice British Values nor denies space for the voice of the child to be heard. Looking at the 'Characteristics of Effective Learning and Teaching', the pedagogical guidelines embedded in the EYFS, the best teaching practice consists in 'supporting children to think critically and become independent learners'. The (well) developing child makes sense of the world through 'opportunities to explore, observe and find out about people, places technology and the environment' (Department for Education 2014b).

Guidance material published by the British Association for Early Childhood Education 'Development Matters in the Early Years Foundation Stage' (2015) emphasises the influence of child-centred pedagogies, notably the works of Montessori and the Reggio Emilia Approach on the definition of the 'Characteristics of Effective Learning and Teaching' in the EYFS. In particular the semantics of child development presented by the EYFS '*development is not an automatic process, but it depends on each unique child having opportunities to interact in positive relationships and enabling environments*' (Department for Education 2014) would underpin Montessori's centrality of observation, putting the unique child at the centre, against adults' expectation and Reggio's focus on giving children the opportunity to express themselves in as many ways as possible, co-constructing enabling environments with them, rather than for them.

The EYFS would appear to acknowledge the child as an agent who makes choices relevant for its own education (for a curricular perspective on the Reggio Approach see Siraj-Blatchford 2008; for a sociologically informed analysis see Baraldi 2015). This would suggest that Early

Years settings in England represent a favourable environment for children's experience of British Values in their everyday life, enhancing the use of educational learning to learn.

However, the EYFS is a complex document, at the intersection of contrasting agendas, where the child-initiated pedagogy and the acknowledgment of the child as an agent in the present are accompanied by the indication that education to British Values is to be given to the child, as preparation to future stages of life. The future citizen, not the present child is the reference of educational planning and practice.

If the focus is enlarged from British Value to the general position of Early Years education and care, it is possible to observe that the preparatory nature of education to British Values and the precedence of the future adult against the present child align with a trend towards the reconceptualization of Early Years education and care as preparation for the following stage of life or, to use the language of policy making, as a resource to achieve 'School Readiness' (Office for Standard in Education 2014; for critical voices see Bingham and Whitebread 2012 and O'Connor and Angus 2013).

Under the umbrella of 'school readiness', education to British Values, and all aspect of Early Years provision, are colonised by the culture of schooling, based on standardised expectations and generalised learning outcomes. Within this cultural framework, it is not surprising that in the EYFS, British Values are largely provided to practitioners as a body of recommendations. This implies a top-down implementation model in which practitioners are perceived as the *implementers* (Jerome, 2016) of state-administered decision-making programmes, while their voice, as the voice of the child, is noticeable for its absence.

Government's guidelines for Education to British Values for young children dictate educational planning, for instance expecting settings to 'support children with material on the strengths, advantages and disadvantages of democracy, and how democracy and the law works in Britain' (Department for Education 2014c). British Values are a core component of the 'knowledge, skills and understanding which young children of different abilities and maturities are expected to have' (Department for Education 2014b). The EYFS provides references to literature listing the social skills that provisions must impart to children (for instance Heckman and Kautz 2012): Motivation, Sociability, Attention, Self-regulation, Self-esteem, Time preference. They are evidently skills for a successful participation in school education; British Value are understood and presented as an additional skill to the list. British Values are therefore included in a discourse of expectations, performances, measurability and assessment, and Early Years provisions must secure that British Values support children in being 'developed enough' for the next stage of their life, which coincides with school education.

Another important piece in this picture of a government-led, teachers-implemented, future-centred pedagogy consists in the effects of the marketisation of Early Years provision. Lloyd (2015) argues that the 'school colonisation' of Early Years provision is further enhanced by its marketization in the aftermath of the 2006 Childcare Act. Measured by tables reporting the success of pupils in subsequent primary education, the effectiveness of Early Years provision in secure school readiness shows their 'quality' to families and funding bodies, within a market-driven competition for accessing scarce resources (Moss 2009). In the framework of the 'educationalization' of Early Years Provisions, marketisation further reduces the space for children's agency, favouring the implementation of knowledge-based predetermined learning objectives.

What is missing from the picture, however, is children's experience of their social contexts in the here and now. Early Years provision is expected to develop children's 'skill and attitudes that *will* allow them to participate fully in and contribute positively to society' (Department for Education, 2014c). British Values are future-oriented, foundations of a process of learning Citizenship which is projected in the future. Early Years Inspectors must assess the social development of young children, measuring their 'acceptance and engagement with the British Values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect' (Department for Education 2015). It this therefore the duty of practitioners to 'ensure that children understand

their own and others' behaviour and its consequences, and learn to distinguish right from wrong', 'learn to take turns and share, and challenging negative attitudes and stereotypes', to 'develop the skills that *will* enable them to positively contribute to their communities' (Department for Education, 2014c).

Moving from pre-schools contexts to primary e secondary education, the next section will argue that, similarly to British Values in early education, the status of Citizenship as educational knowledge in primary and secondary schools is caught between promotion of civic virtues and the impossibility to experiment with them. The analysis will focus on eh ENC for key stage 3 and key stage 4 that organise objectives and assessment for secondary education in the English education system.

Such analytical choice is motivated by two concurring aspects: 1) citizenship education in key stage 1 and key stage 2 (primary education) is not a statutory subject and, 2) key stage 3 and key stage 4 represent the last opportunity for the education system to provide citizenship education to all in a situation of compulsory comprehensive education, before more specialised and/or vocational studies.

Citizenship Education in the ENC: a matter of trust

Although a review of the National Curriculum supported by the Coalition government suggested that Citizenship should not retain its status as a foundation subject (Department for Education 2011), Citizenship remains a programme of study at key stages 3 and 4 for the current curriculum (age 11-14 and 14-16).

Citizenship education is a statutory subject in the early years curriculum (ENC), therefore schools must demonstrate that they provide pupils with the knowledge, skills and understanding prescribed by the curriculum, either through a discrete subject or through a range of subjects and curricular activities. An interesting point to be discussed is that Citizenship education is not implemented in the primary phase (key stages 1 and 2, age 5-7 and 7-11). For these stages, a traditional permeation model, inherited from pre-2000s civic education is still considered more appropriate. Within the framework of the permeation model, civic virtues should be passed along 'ordinary' academic subjects, rather than through specifically designed provision. In the initial stages of primary education, teachers' role modelling through class management is considered the most efficient medium for civic values (Lawton et al. 2005).

Non-statutory guidelines for Citizenship in key stage 1 and key stage 2, published in 2015 (Department for Education 2015), indicates that the primary phase is still considered a transitional phase regarding the development of the child into the citizen. Primary citizenship provision, similarly to the teaching of British Values at an earlier age, is a form of moral education, combined with a gradual approach to the theme of children's rights and their involvement in the life of the school through learning activities such as discussions of children's books or videos (ACT 2016).

However, when it comes to key stages 3 and 4, Citizenship education becomes a specific subject, that should foster pupils' 'keen awareness and understanding of democracy, government and how laws are made and upheld' (Department for Education 2014a). The areas of learning underpinning Citizenship education concern: 1) the development of the political system of democratic government in the United Kingdom; 2) the nature of rules and laws and the justice system; 3) the roles played by public institutions and voluntary groups in society and the ways in which citizens work together to improve their communities.

Even more clearly than education to British Values in the EYFS, Citizenship education therefore fits into the classic Marshallian tripartite model of Citizenship. Its three areas of learning reproduce Marshall's categories of political literacy, rights and responsibility and community involvement.

As it is the case for British Values in the EYFS, the ENC presents Citizenship as the outcome of teacher-led learning process. Citizenship is 'knowledge that pupils need to be educated citizens, providing them with skills and understanding to play a full part in society' (Department

of Education 2014a). Whilst schools must transmit knowledge about 'liberties enjoyed by citizens of the United Kingdom', equipping pupils with 'the skills and knowledge to explore political and social issues critically', no reference is made to consideration for pupils' expectations and understanding of concepts such as rights, responsibilities, identity, community cohesion. Stating that Citizenship education should 'prepare pupils to take their place in society as responsible citizens', the ENC moves within the framework of 'Citizenship-as-achievement' (Lawy and Biesta 2006), the outcome of a successful curricula. Citizenship must be learnt and understood, echoing the Crick report:

> Democratic institutions, practices and purposes must be understood (…) showing how formal political activity relates to civil society in the context of the United Kingdom and Europe, and to cultivate awareness and concern for world affairs and global issues (Crick 1998, p. 40).

In line with a genuinely educational approach, Citizenship is to be cultivated through study. The lived experiences of young people in society, what Lawy and Biesta (2006) define Citizenship-as-practice' are marginalised from a prescriptive concept of Citizenship as young people become 'pupils' in the educational system.

It is possible to argue that the transformation of Citizenship into educational knowledge via the ENC introduces a distinction between valued and not-valued knowledge, marginalising everything that falls in the latter category, including lifestyles (Hebdige 1979, 1988) and the participation in activities and practices through which young people achieve their Citizenship. It should be reminded that the ENC for key stage 3 and key stage 4 is designed for learners who, probably more intensively than younger children, experience complex networks of relationships, playing an active and visible role in many social contexts outside the classroom. As suggested by France (1998, 2000) and Hall and Williamson (1999), young people's practiced Citizenship is often misunderstood and perceived as a community threat, leading to increased surveillance and mutual distrusts. This point substantiates Smith's argument that the assumption that young people need education to develop their Citizenship, is not based on concepts of Citizenship, but on how youth is perceived (Smith et al. 2005)

In the ENC, Citizenship is understood as a desirable 'outcome', and Schools are *manufactures of citizens*. As Bernard Crick put it: 'the aim of Citizenship education is to create active and responsible citizens' (Crick, 2000 p. 67): Citizenship is presented (and assessed) a status to be achieved. In this way, Citizenship becomes the object of educational planning, teaching and assessment; however, and for the same reason, Citizenship is knowledge that cannot be used for further learning, because young people have limited agency in the education system.

Evidence offered by a long tradition of sociological research on education suggests that children and young people experience a situation of limited agency in the education system, because education is interested in standardised role performances, rather than agency (Parsons and Bales 1955; Sinclair and Coulthard 1975; Mehan 1979; Vanderstraeten 2004; Farini 2011; Walsh 2011).

However, the concept of agency can enhance an understanding of the paradoxical semantics of education underpinning the ENC. Agency can be observed in the availability of choices of action and the agent's possibility to exercise a personal judgement and to choose according to it (James and James 2008; James 2009; Percy-Smith 2011; Bjerke, 2011; Baraldi 2014; 2015). Whilst Marshallian concepts of Citizenship based on literacy, engagement and responsibility links Citizenship to agency, the curricular language of Citizenship education in the ENC indicates that agency, in terms of full active citizenship, is awarded on successful participation in education, which implies a situation of limited agency. It seems clear that the intention is to develop a curriculum based on historical knowledge on law, representation, democracy and Citizenship (Larkin 2001); however, how can pupil learn to be active citizens in a context where they are recognised limited agency is rather unclear.

Tilly's idea that inequality becomes embedded in any organizational structure (Tilly 1998) can help the discussion the relationship between education to Citizenship in the ENC and limited agency of the learners in the Education system.

Tilly argues that certain kinds of social structural relations are solutions to problems generated within social systems, for instance the problem of trust. Educational interaction creates categorical forms of inequality, among pupils and between pupils and teachers. Such inequalities are both a structural feature of the educational relationships and an expected output of the system. Organizationally installed categorical inequality support the decision-maker in the risky choice between according trust or not. Here, Tilly advances a claim on the effects of categorical inequality on the stability of organizational relationships: the former stabilizes the latter. Institutional distrust may be understood as consequence of the operations through which educational organization reproduce themselves. For educational organisations, institutional distrust in the pupils frees resources for the attainment of pre-determined curricular goals, for instance by excluding pupils-led activities, or by marginalizing non-curricular knowledge and skills. However, the construction of categorical inequalities in education activates a vicious circle between institutionalised distrust and marginalisation (Luhmann 1988). Whilst trust enlarges the range of possible actions in a social system, distrust restricts this range, in that it requires additional premises for social relationships, which protect interactants from a disappointment that is considered highly probable. When distrust in pupils is established as a structure of the education system, their possibility to practice Citizenship is limited, and marginalisation can be understood as limitation of children and young people's agency in the education system, mirroring their status of 'not yet-citizen' in society.

Taylor's historical account of the conceptualisations of human value (Taylor 1989) can further enrich the argument. According to Taylor, the transition from feudal societies to modernity is characterised by a transformation in the semantics of human value, which becomes linked not to honour but to dignity. Differently from honour, dignity is taken to be both the possession of, and what it is owed to, each and every individual, regardless of the conditions of their birth.

However, human value as a structural form does not disappear with modernity. Taylor observes that to differentiate grades of human value, the universal and inclusive principle of dignity is coupled with the selective and exclusive principle of 'level of development', which is measured according to criteria such as separateness from others, self-governance and independence from the claims, wishes and command of others.

Such coupling becomes the catalyst for a semantics of categorical distinctions: development is associated with general historical movement (savages against civilised), gender (female against male), ethnicity (black people against white people, white people of the South against white people of the North) and age (child against adult). The coupling between the inclusive principle of dignity and the exclusive principle of development is still accepted in the public discourse only regarding generational order, generating social semantics. An example consists in the coupling between dignity and children's unpreparedness for Citizenship (Herrlitz and Maier 2005; Grant and Portera 2011). Dignity generates the inclusion of children in universal rights connected to the condition of human beings. Citizenship generates exclusive and conditional rights that depend on the status of Citizen, which is an attribute of adulthood (Mattheis 2012). Children and young people are positioned at the centre of the paradoxical coupling between dignity and Citizenship.

Conclusion

The overarching argument of this contribution is that British Values in the EYFS and Citizenship in the ENC are paradoxical forms of educational knowledge. As educational knowledge, British Values and Citizenship are expected to create the conditions for further learning (Baraldi and Corsi 2016). However, whilst young children learn about British values, and older children learn about citizenship, they have limited opportunities to experience, test and assess the learned knowledge, due to limited agency in the education system.

Learning from learning is prevented because British Values and Citizenship cannot be applied and experienced: children's expectations base on knowledge acquired cannot be verified and reflection upon what has been done to gauge what else could be done is not possible (Baraldi and Corsi 2016).

The EYFS expects young children to receive from adults the knowledge that fundamental Values of British identity include democracy and individual liberty and to learn that democracy and liberty need participation and involvement in the life of the community (the Value 'democracy, for instance, is eloquently qualified as 'making decisions together'). The ENC expects adolescents in secondary schools to receive from adults the knowledge that Citizenship is weakened and democracy deteriorates if citizens do not participate actively taking responsibility for decisions that affect the community. However, it can be argued that an active and responsible contribution to the life of the community, including the school communities, is possible only in situations of trust, whereas young children and young people in the education system are considered citizens-in-progress, lacking the maturity needed to be trusted as responsible participants in the education system itself.

The paradoxical condition of British Values and Citizenship is solved in the EYFS and the ENC by conceptualizing British Values and Citizenship as knowledge to be learned in the present, but experienced in the future, and outside the Educatin system.

What this contribution does not contest is that educational curricula have the potential to values and include young children and young people's experience of Citizenship-as-practice. The key is a pedagogy allowing young children and young people to develop the skills needed to apply educational knowledge. This would require children's agency to be produced in the education system from a young age, and trust to replace distrust as a structural component of communication.

From their initial steps in the educational system, young children are introduced by the EYFS to the moral contract between the individual and the British nation State. British Values can be considered as the moral foundations of such contractual obligations, that will be further articulated through subsequent Citizenship education. However, the same British Values cannot be applied and experienced, as children are not considered too immature, and naïve to make responsible decisions.

A theoretical framework for a citizenship pedagogy combining transmission of knowledge and creation of the conditions for the application of knowledge to education for Citizenship is perhaps offered by studies in the area of *Cosmopolitan Citizenship* (Osler and Starkey 2006; Osler 2011). *Cosmopolitan Citizenship* is underpinned by the idea that young children, as much as young people, are citizens not moving *to*, but *through* Citizenship. Indeed, this approach makes no distinction between what might otherwise be regarded as a differential status between adults as citizens and children as not-yet-citizen, whose agency is limited by institutionalised distrust, in the education system as well as in other social contexts.

Conceptualizing Citizenship as an ongoing practice involves a fundamental change in the way Citizenship education is conceived and articulated, transferring emphasis from questions about manufacturing citizens through educational technologies to the investigation of the complexity of children and young people's experiences of Citizenship, and how they perceived themselves as citizens in the present.

References:

Advisory Group on Citizenship (1998). *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools (The Crick Report)*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority

Angers, J., Machtmes, K.L. (2005). An Ethnographic-Case Study of Beliefs, Context Factors, and Practices of Teachers Integrating Technology. *The Qualitative Report*, *10*(4): 771-794. Available at: http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol10/iss4/8 (Accessed 12 February 2017)

Atkinson, P. A. & Coffey, A. (2004). Analysing documentary realities. In D. Silverman (Ed*.), Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. London: Sage, 56–75, doi: 10.4135/9781446282243.n25

Baraldi, C. (2014). Children's participation in communication systems: A theoretical perspective to shape research. *Soul of Society: A Focus on the Lives of Children and Youth*, 18, 18: 63-92, doi: 10.1108/S1537-466120140000018014

Baraldi, C. (2015). Promotion of Migrant Children's Epistemic Status and Authority in Early School Life. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 47 (1): 5-25, doi: 10.1007/s13158-014-0116-7

Baraldi, C., Corsi, G. (2016). *Niklas Luhmann. Education as a Social System*. London: Springer, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-49975-8_3

Batho, G. (1990). 'The History of the Teaching of Civics and Citizenship in English Schools'. *Curriculum Journal,* 1(1), pp. 91 – 100, doi: 10.1080/0958517900010110

Biesta, G., Lawy, R. (2006). 'From Teaching Citizenship to Learning Democracy: Overcoming Individualism in Research, Policy and Practice'. *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 36(1), pp. 63-79, doi: 10.1007/978-94-6091-512-3_1

Bingham, S., Whitebread, D. (2012). *School Readiness. A critical review of perspectives and evidence*. London: TACTYC

Bjerke, H. (2011). It's the way to do it. Expressions of agency in child-adult relations at home and school. *Children & Society*, 25(2): 93–103, doi: 10.1111/j.1099-0860.2009.00266.x

Blacker, D. (2000) The Institutional Autonomy of Education, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 34 (2): 229–246, doi: 10.1111/1467-9752.00170

Board of Education (1923). *Report on the Teaching of History*. London: H.M. Stationery Office.

Bowen, G.A. (2009). 'Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2): 27 – 40, doi: 10.3316/QRJ0902027

Burton, D. and May, S. (2015) Citizenship Education in Secondary Schools in England. *Educationalfutures*, 1(7). Available at: http://educationstudies.org.uk/?p=3690 (Last accessed 27 August 2017)

British Association for Early Childhood (2015). *Fundamental British Values in the EYFS*. Available at: http://www.foundationyears.org.uk/files/2015/03/Fundamental_British_Values.pdf (Last accessed on 24 June 2017)

Cockburn, T. (2013). *Rethinking Children's Citizenship*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, doi: 10.1057/9781137292070

Corbin, J., Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, doi: 10.4135/9781452230153

Crick, B. (2000). 'The Citizenship Order for Schools', in Pearce, N. and Hallogarten, J. (Eds.) *Tomorrow's Citizens. Critical Debates in Citizenship and Education*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research, pp. 77-83, doi: 10.1093/parlij/55.3.488

Department for Education (2011). *The Framework for the National Curriculum. A report by the Expert Panel for the National Curriculum Review.* London: Department for Education.

Department for Education (2014a). *The National Curriculum in England: Key Stages 3 and 4 framework document.* Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-secondary-curriculum (Accessed: 12 February 2017)

Department for Education (2014b). *Statutory Framework for the Early Years Foundation Stage: setting the standards for learning, development and care for children from birth to five.* Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/early-years-foundation-stage-framework--2 (Accessed: 12 February 2017)

Department for Education (2014c). *Promoting British Values as part of SMSC.* Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/380595/SMSC _Guidance_Maintained_Schools.pdf (accessed: 12 February 2017)

Department for Education (2015). *Inspecting registered early years providers: guidance for inspectors.* Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/early-years-inspection-handbook-from-september-2015 (Accessed: 12 February 2017)

Etzioni, A. (Ed.) (1995). *New communitarian thinking: persons, virtues, institutions, and communities*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Fereday, J., Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1): 80–92, doi: 10.1177/160940690600500107

Farini, F. (2011). Cultures of education in action: Research on the relationship between interaction and cultural presuppositions regarding education in an international educational setting. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43: 2176–2186, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2011.02.001

France, A. (1998). 'Why should we care?': Young people, Citizenship and questions of social responsibility. *Journal of Youth Studies* 1(1): 97-111, doi: 10.1080/13676261.1998.10592997

France, A. (2000). Towards a sociological understanding of youth and their risk-taking. *Journal of youth studies* 3(3): 317-331, doi: 10.1080/713684380

The Guardian (2014). *Childcare experts dismayed by plans to cut funding for childcare that does not promote "British Values"*, 8 August 2014. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/aug/08/childcare-funding-british-values-early-years-education (accessed 12 February 2017)

Grant, C.A., Portera, A. (Eds.). (2011). *Intercultural and multicultural education. Enhancing global interconnectedness*. London/New York: Routledge, doi: 10.4324/9780203848586

Hall, T. and Williamson, H. (1999). *Citizenship   and   Community*, Leicester: Youth   Work Press.

Hebdige, D. (1979). *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Routledge, doi: 10.4324/9780203139943.

Hebdige, D. (1988). *Hiding in the Light: On Images and Things*. New York: Routledge, doi: 10.4324/9780203358863

Heckman, J.J.. Kautz, T. (2012). Hard evidence on soft skills. *Labour Economics*, 19(4): 451-464, doi: 10.1016/j.labeco.2012.05.014

Herrlitz, W., Maier, R. (Eds.). (2005). *Dialogue in and around multicultural schools*. Tubingen: Niemeyer, doi: 10.1515/9783110933215

Hodgson, N. (2008). Citizenship Education, Policy, and the Educationalization of Educational Research. *Educational Theory,* 58(4), pp. 417-434, doi: 10.1111/j.1741-5446.2008.00297.x

Home Office (2011). *Prevent Strategy Review*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97976/prevent-strategy-review.pdf (Accessed on 23 June 2017)

James, A. (2009). 'Agency'. In J. Qvortrup, G. Valentine, W. Corsaro, & M. S. Honig (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of Childhood Studies* (pp. 34–45). Basingstoke: Palgrave, doi: 10.1007/978-0-230-27468-6

James, A., & James, A. (2008). *Key concepts in Childhood Studies*. London: Sage, dopi: 0.4135/9781446211922

Jerome, L. (*2016)*. Interpreting Children's Rights Education (CRE): three perspectives and three roles for teachers. *Citizenship, Social and Economic Education*, 15 (2): 143-156, doi: 10.1177/2047173416683425

Jerome, L., Clemitshaw, G (2012). Teaching (about) Britishness? An investigation into trainee teachers' understanding of Britishness in relation to Citizenship and the discourse of civic nationalism. *The Curriculum Journal* 23(1): 19-41, doi: 10.1080/09585176.2012.650468

Kymlicka, W. (2008). 'Education for Citizenship', in Arthur, J. and Davies, I. (eds.) *Citizenship Education*. London: Sage, pp. 128-150, doi: 0.4135/9781849200486

Kymlicka, W., Norman, W. (1994) 'Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory'. *Ethics,* 104(2), pp. 352-381, doi: 10.1086/293605

Labuschagne, A. (2003). Qualitative Research. Airy Fairy or Fundamental? *The Qualitative Report*, 8(1), 100-103. Available at: http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol8/iss1/7 (Accessed on 23 June 2017)

Larkin, C. (2001) *Citizenship Education or Crowd Control? The Crick Report and the Role of Peace Education and Conflict Resolution in the New Citizenship Curriculum*. University of Bradford, Working paper. Available at: http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/confres/assets/ccr9.pdf (Accessed 12 February 2017)

Lawy, R.., Biesta, G. (2006). 'Citizenship-as-practice: the educational implications of an inclusive and relational understanding of Citizenship'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54(1): 34-50, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8527.2006.00335.x

Lawton, D., Cairns, J. and Gardner, R. (2005). *Education For Citizenship.* London: Continuum, doi: 10.1177/1746197911432594

Lloyd, E. (2015). Early childhood education and care policy in England under the Coalition Government. *London Review of Education*, 13 (2): 144-156, doi: 10.18546/LRE.13.2.12

Luhmann, N. (1988). Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives. In D. Gambetta (ed.) *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. Oxford: University of Oxford, 94-107

Madeley, H.M. (1920). *History as a School of Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mattheis, C. (2012). The System Theory of Niklas Luhmann and the Constitutionalization of the World Society. *Goettingen Journal of International La*w, 4(2): 625-647, doi: 10.3249/1868-1581-4-2-mattheis

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, doi: 10.4159/harvard.9780674420106

Meleady, C. (2015). The EYFS paves the way for British Values. *Nursery World.* Available at: http://www.nurseryworld.co.uk/nursery-world/opinion/1147445/eyfs-paves-british-values (Accessed on 23.6.2017)

Miller, D. (2000). 'Citizenship: What Does It Mean and Why Is It Important?', in Pearce, N. and Hallgarten, J. (Eds.) *Tomorrow's Citizens. Critical Debates in Citizenship and Education*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research, pp. 26-35.

Ministry of Education (1938). *Secondary Education with Special* Reference *to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools (The Spens Report)*. London: HM Stationery Office

Ministry of Education (1943). *Educational Reconstruction (The Norwood Report).* London: HM Stationary Office.

Ministry of Education (1949). *Citizens Growing Up: at Home, in School and After.* London: HM Stationary Office.

Moss, P. (2009). *There are alternatives! Markets and democratic experimentalism in early childhood education and care*. The Hague: Bernard Van Leer Foundation. Available at: http://eprints.ioe.ac.uk/5608/1/There_are_alternatives_Markets_and_democratic_experimenta lism_in_early_childhood_education_and_care.pdf (accessed on 23 Jube 2017)

O'Connor, D., Angus, J. (2013): Give Them Time – an analysis of school readiness in Ireland's early education system. *Education 3-13: International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education*: 1-10, doi: 10.1080/03004279.2012.723726

O'Sullivan, F.W. (2014). *Citizenship Education: an Investigation of Crick's Model and Citizenship Coordinators' Perceptions of the Subject's Purpose*. Worcester: The University of Worcester.   Available   at:

http://eprints.glos.ac.uk/2130/1/O%27Sullivan_William%20Fergus_PhD%202015.pdf
(Accessed: 01 September 2017)

Office for Standard in Education (2014). *Are you Ready? Good Practices in School Readiness*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/418819/Are_y ou_ready_Good_practice_in_school_readiness.pdf (Accessed on 12 February 2017)

Olssen, M. (2004). 'From the Crick Report to the Parekh Report: Multiculturalism, Cultural Difference, and Democracy - The Re-visioning of Citizenship Education', *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 25(2), pp. 179-192, doi: 10.1080/0142569042000205127

Osler, A. (2000). 'The Crick Report: Difference, Equality and Racial Justice', *Curriculum Journal,* 11(1), pp. 25-37, doi: 10.1080/095851700361375

Osler, A. (2011). Teacher Interpretations of Citizenship Education: National Identity, Cosmopolitan Ideals, and Political Realities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43 (1): 1- 24, 10.1080/00220272.2010.503245

Osler, O. and Starkey, H. (2006) 'Education for Democratic Citizenship: A Review of Research, Policy and Practice During 1995-2005', *Research Papers in Education,* 21(4), pp. 433-466, 10.1080/02671520600942438

PACEY (Professional Association for Childcare and Early Years). (2015). Better inspections for all
Available at:
https://www.pacey.org.uk/Pacey/media/ImportedFiles/pdf/Better%20inspection%20for%20all %20-%20PACEY%20consultation%20response%20FINAL.pdf (Accessed on 24 June 2017)

Parsons, T., Bales, R. F. (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Glencoe: Free Press, dio: 10.4324/9781315824307

Percy-Smith, B. (2010). Councils, consultation and community: Rethinking the spaces for children and young people's participation. *Children's Geographies*, 8(2): 107–122, doi: 10.1080/14733281003691368

Pykett, J. (2007). Making citizens governable? The Crick Report as governmental technology. *Journal of Education Policy*, 22 (3): 301-319, doi: 10.1080/02680930701269202

Rapley, T. (2007). *Doing conversation, discourse and document analysis*. London: Sage, doi: 10.4135/9781849208901

Scollan, A., Gallagher, B. (2016). Personal and socio-emotional development and technology. In: Kaye, L. (Ed.). *Young Children in a Digital Age*, pp. 113-133

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse. The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Siraj-Blatchford, I. (2008). 'Understanding the relationship between curriculum, pedagogy and progression in learning in early childhood'. *Hong Kong Journal of Early Childhood Education*, 7(2):3–13.

Available at:
http://libdr1.ied.edu.hk/pubdata/img00/arch00/link/archive/1/instarh/2051_image_vol7_no2_p1_68.pdf (Accessed on 1 September 2017)

Smith, N., Lister, R., Middleton, S. and L. Cox (2005). Young People as Real Citizens: Towards an Inclusionary Understanding of Citizenship. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 8(4): 425-443, doi: 10.1080/13676260500431743

Stake, R.E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Taylor, C. (1989) *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Tilly, C. (1998). *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Tomlinson, S. (2005). Race, ethnicity and education under New Labour. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(1): 153-171, doi: 10.1080/0305498042000337246

Vanderstraeten, R. (2003). Education and Society: a Plea for a Historicized Approach. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 38 (2): 195-206, doi: 10.1111/j.0309-8249.2004.00375.x

Vanderstraeten, R. (2004). The social differentiation of the educational system. *Sociology*, 38(2): 255–272, doi: 10.1177/0038038504040863

Vanderstraeten, R. (2006). The Historical Triangulation of Education, Politics and Economy. *Sociology,* 40(1): 125-142, doi: 10.1177/0038038506058432

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. New York/London: Routledge, doi: 10.4324/9780203827826

Weick, K.E. (1979). *The Social Psychology of Organizing.* New York: McGraw Hill.