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Abstract

This study is a critique of the students' understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship' at the Junior College of the University of Malta. The research also investigates whether the students at the Junior College possess the skills to translate the content learned during lectures which focussed on the two concepts cited above, into their everyday life as democratic citizens.

When presenting a theoretical and conceptual framework, the researcher analysed the ongoing international debate about democracy and citizenship in education, with special emphasis on the debate in the United Kingdom. The Maltese education system has been, and is still, to a certain extent, influenced by the changes in the education system in the UK.

The aims and objectives of this study are outlined in the research design and methodology. The researcher analysed the paradigmatic position of the study and justified the use of the three research instruments: that is a qualitative method, the content analysis of twenty examination scripts in Systems of Knowledge, the subject through which the concepts of democracy and citizenship, amongst other issues, are imparted. The categories that emerged from this study supported the development of a research hypothesis. The categories also served as guidelines for the drafting of the questionnaire schedule (administered to five hundred College students) and the semi-structured interview schedule (carried out with eight College lecturers) undertaken for triangulation purposes and to confirm the validity and reliability of the first two research instruments and their findings.

The findings show that most students grasped the content taught during lectures, but they were unable to translate that content into everyday life. Also, the pedagogic implications that arise from the findings, when discussed with reference to the research questions, show the pressing need to amend the 1997 syllabus for Systems of Knowledge. There is the need to reduce and update the content, and to time table time for discussion and other activities that stimulate the acquisition of skills, and that help students make the leap to live as active democratic citizens.

Through the conclusions and recommendations that emerge from the study, and within the theoretical framework presented earlier in the research, it is argued that if citizenship education is implemented in a strategic and holistic manner at post-secondary level and better still as part of the overall Maltese education system, it would prove to be one of the means to safeguard democracy.

Keywords: Democracy, citizenship, education, identity, shared-fate, multiculturalism, interculturalism, globalisation.
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## Glossary and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>Bachelor in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfEE</td>
<td>Department of Education and Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC</td>
<td>Education for Democratic Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et al.</td>
<td>and other authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRE</td>
<td>Human Rights Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibid</td>
<td>same reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>that is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Intermediate Matriculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter alia:</td>
<td>Among other things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laissez faire</td>
<td>a carefree attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsec</td>
<td>Matriculation and Secondary Education Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAST</td>
<td>Malta College of Arts Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP</td>
<td>Member of the European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>National Curriculum Council (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEC</td>
<td>National Citizenship Education Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-government organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non chalance</td>
<td>carefree attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerus clausus</td>
<td>a clause that restricts the number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFI</td>
<td>Private Finance Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>Post Graduate Course in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>Personal and Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSHE</td>
<td>Personal Social and Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Refer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status quo</td>
<td>leave everything as it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TES:</td>
<td>Times Education Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Introduction

Perhaps the motivation and thrust for this research can best be described by quoting the following statement by Meira Levinson (1999):

An apathetic, ill-educated, and non-participatory citizenry can allow shocking violations of democracy or infringements of liberal rights to take place, even if liberal democratic structures are formally in place. [...] if too many people take a passive or anti-democratic stance toward politics or even toward their fellow citizens, then the social order may quickly become illiberal and the political order become dominated by an unrepresentative, often fanatical few who compete to shape the state to their own, illiberal ends. In such a case, the stability and sustainability of the liberal state will be threatened (p. 102).

These grave concerns reflect the researcher's own views and preoccupations and have been behind the drive to follow the international debate about the role of citizenship education in a democracy over the past years. Additionally, working closely with a section of Malta's youths through the role of educator in a subject which would have a direct influence in the formation and future of these young citizens living in a democracy, have led the researcher to take a more active and determined role in formally researching the issues which were before merely observed and generally commented upon.

This study will therefore investigate the extent to which the students at the Junior College of the University of Malta are prepared to participate fully as democratic citizens. For this purpose, the study will explore the College students' understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship' and also whether they are equipped with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and understanding to help them in this role. One of the subjects that help students acquire this understanding is Systems of Knowledge. This study will further investigate whether the 1997 syllabus for
Systems of Knowledge through the teaching of a small part in Module 1, about democracy, is in fact supporting students to put into practice the content they learn during lectures to enable them to become active and participate fully as democratic citizens.

1.1 Background to the study

Systems of Knowledge has been a compulsory subject for students seeking admission into the University of Malta as from 1st October 1989. When it was introduced it originally met with a lot of opposition, mainly because it was and still is a compulsory subject, and many students, parents and politicians considered the subject as a form of numerus clausus that would be used as a selection device, and therefore as a form of discrimination. Nowadays, although it is still not popular with the students themselves, it is more accepted by most of the students and they tend to appreciate its value further when they move on to tertiary education or to the world of work. Although there is no research about this, personal experience, when the researcher meets students later on in life, would suggest that students appreciate its value.

The first Systems of Knowledge syllabus for all post-secondary schools in Malta (i.e. government, private and church schools) was drawn up on the assumption that focusing only on the special fields covered by the Advanced Level subjects promoted certain habits of mind to the exclusion of others, and as Heywood & Serracino Inglott (1987) argue,

*If the School was to foster in our students a greater flexibility in adapting to changing patterns of work and life in a post-industrial age, it should afford*
them opportunities of going beyond the traditional limits of particular disciplines and gaining insight into different systems of knowledge. (p. 181)

The main challenge in translating this concept into a syllabus for teaching and also examination, lay in offering areas of study which would develop the candidate’s ability to view ideas, skills and situations from a broader perspective than that of a single discipline; and, at the same time limiting such areas so that formal testing of attainment in them becomes possible and meaningful. Elsewhere, Serracino Inglott (1995) argues that the examination in Systems of Knowledge was introduced to give the Matriculation Examination

[a] more holistic character [...] Its main aims were to ensure that at post-secondary and pre-tertiary phase, there would not be a total divide between science and arts studies and there would be scope for creative, critical and operative thinking. (p. i)

Furthermore in 1995, the Junior College of the University of Malta was specifically set up to initiate students upon completion of the secondary schooling, in methods of study appropriate to tertiary education. The College was born out of a generally recognised need to reform the local pre-university sector. Apart from the setting up of the Junior College, a new Systems of Knowledge syllabus was drafted which aimed at preventing the subject as much as possible from becoming stereotyped and consequently inept for its initial purposes. The changes in the syllabus were therefore of deeper and structural character.

The 1995 syllabus included three modules, representing three phases in history, each reflecting a number of basic values i.e. Antiquity and Early Middle Ages; Middle Ages and Renaissance and Modern and Contemporary. Without going into detail (Appendix 1 p. 248) of the aims of the various module sections, it is correct
to state that the syllabus aimed at inter-disciplinarity. However, one main criticism could be that it is too extensive a subject. Furthermore, one could argue that although this subject was introduced by the syllabus planners because of their over-enthusiasm in favour of the dissemination of knowledge, and with all the best of intentions towards the students, it is in reality very difficult for the students to actually focus on one topic. Instead, they may fall into the trap of simply skimming through the topic to ensure that they complete the syllabus and in so doing, the means (the transfer of knowledge) becomes the end, rather than achieving the objective of preparing students to participate more fully in society as democratic citizens. These reasons, apart from the fact that during the past seven years, the focus of education has changed considerably all over the world, have necessitated a more proactive approach in the review of the current approach of the Systems of Knowledge syllabus.

In the 1995 Systems of Knowledge syllabus (in Giordmaina 1995 p.5), values education emphasised the moral, religious, aesthetic, civic, democratic, national, personal and social dimensions. In August 2002, citizenship became a statutory subject in key stages in the primary and the secondary curriculum in the U.K. In Europe and even in other parts of the world, this focus on citizenship had already been established as such. With these developments in mind, as well as the faster part of change it is understandable that one should also consider international developments while conducting this study within the Maltese context.

1.2 The Research Significant Issues, Challenges and Ideas

In the light of the global changes in the field of citizenship education and especially changes in the same field that have occurred in the UK over the last three
decades, this study aims to study the extent to which the students at the Junior College
of the University of Malta are prepared to participate fully as democratic citizens. For
this reason the study will explore what understanding the students have of the
meaning and responsibilities acquired with citizenship and of living in a democracy,
as the literature review will show. Maltese citizens, including the College students,
are still striving to define a Maltese National Identity, having gained independence
only forty years ago despite a rich cultural heritage that dates back seven thousand
years. Yet they now also have to get accustomed to the idea of being European
citizens. A challenge emerges from this situation that makes one embrace the need to
explore whether Maltese students at the Junior College have the ‘right’ understanding
of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’, and further to explore the
effectiveness and shortcomings of this understanding. In other words, this study will
explore whether the Maltese students at the Junior College are equipped with the
knowledge, skills, attitudes and understanding that help them to fulfil their role as
active Maltese and European democratic citizens.

The research also aims to support the development of a consciousness about
the ongoing change in Maltese values and culture through influencing agents that has
already started to take place in the attitudes and beliefs of young Maltese students.
With this aim in mind the research will strive to recommend actions that may support
Maltese youngsters to participate more fully in a democratic society and to safeguard
the social and political order so that “violations of democracy and infringements of
liberal rights” (Levinson 1999: 102) are less likely to take place.
1.3 The Research Problem to be Addressed

The research problem emerged first, in the context of the increasing threats to democracy in the international political arena, and secondly in the context of the increasing debate in the EU and more emphatically in the Council of Europe, about the role of citizenship education as a means to prepare European citizens to become and to live as democratic citizens who are able to safeguard and nurture democracy.

For this reason the researcher felt the need, having had the experience of teaching Systems of Knowledge for nearly a decade, to investigate whether what the researcher and colleagues at the same College felt about the syllabus for Systems of Knowledge, as well as about the methods used and the attainment on the part of the students, were true or false. It is also with this aim in mind that the researcher undertakes this study, and explores the students’ understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ whilst at the same time investigating whether students are able to transform content (regarding the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’) discussed and acquired during lectures into knowledge that they can apply in their own lives. This in itself raises concern because students might be studying only for examination purposes and hence do not fully absorb the understanding that what they learn is intended to be practised in life as democratic citizens.
1.4 Aims and Objectives of the Research

The main pedagogic aim of this research is to forward the conclusions and recommendations of the research to the Matsec Syllabus Panel for consideration as feedback as well as for the purpose of ongoing revision of the Systems of Knowledge syllabus. As stated above, if it is found from the research findings that the students are not absorbing the understanding that they have certain responsibilities towards their community and towards Malta as a democratic nation, then the aim of this study is to go beyond the immediate importance of theory to further pragmatic considerations which can, in time, also make a real difference to people's lives and society in general.

This research also aims to explore whether the general 'laissez faire' attitude (as discussed in Chapter 2) experienced by young citizens in Europe about local and international issues, especially political issues, and shown by low turnouts at elections and the general disenchantment, is also experienced by Malta's younger society. Malta is a full member of the EU and also an ex-British colony. The Maltese education system has been influenced for the last century (and even today to a certain extent) by the changes in the education system in the UK, and it is for this reason that the researcher aims to undertake a critique of the ongoing debate about citizenship in the UK and internationally, prior to as well as after the implementation of citizenship education in the UK. This critique will provide the theoretical and conceptual background that a researcher requires before embarking on any qualitative or quantitative research.
As a result of this literature review, this study aspires to create further understanding of the situation locally and globally, and hence to argue whether there is an immediate need for a new approach in preparing and educating young people to live as democratic citizens in the Maltese context. Through the use of different research methodologies, the study proposes to study the existing situation with respect to the College students' understanding of the concepts mentioned above. The synthesis of the literature review and the research findings will lead to a number of general conclusions and recommendations to be used as feedback for immediate and continuous research, publications, and further debate regarding the introduction of citizenship as a subject in the Maltese education system.

1.5 An Overview of the Research

This research commences with this introduction where the background to the work is outlined. This study will be administered among students studying Systems of Knowledge as a compulsory subject at post-secondary level at the Junior College of the University of Malta. In Chapter 1, the researcher also undertakes to explain in a preliminary manner the significant concepts, issues, and challenges related to the research. The research problem to be addressed, as well as the aims and objectives of the research are identified.

In Chapter 2 in order to create a theoretical and conceptual framework, the researcher will first refer to the different definitions of 'democracy' and 'citizenship', and will seek to demonstrate why it is important to define concepts. This chapter will also include a brief evolution of the liberal and communitarian definition of
citizenship. This is followed by an analysis of the criticisms that were addressed at the Crick Report (1998), with the aim of showing the positive and negative points raised in the Report and also to go beyond it. The final part of Chapter 2 is a concise outline and analysis of four theories of citizenship, i.e. citizenship as national identity, citizenship as shared fate, intercultural citizenship and global citizenship. The outline and analysis of the four theories is intended to serve as a source of reference to help in the identification of the relevant points that might be considered for a model of citizenship education by policy makers that is appropriate for the Maltese context.

The research design and methodology will be discussed in Chapter 3, following a discussion of the aims and objectives of the research and the identification of the research questions of the same research. The research design will provide the paradigmatic background to the research and the methodology will refer to the research instruments that will be used to undertake the research. In this study, the researcher will use a qualitative research instrument, i.e. content analysis; a quantitative research instrument, i.e. a questionnaire administered to five hundred College students as respondents; and finally, the researcher will administer another qualitative research instrument, i.e. semi-structured interviews with lecturers of Systems of Knowledge for triangulation purposes.

In Chapter 4 the researcher will present the findings of the research undertaken at the Junior College, with an analysis for the findings emerging from the content analysis and the statistics that emerge from the questionnaire. This will be followed by the presentation and a more in-depth analysis of the semi-structured interviews.
This will bring together the information gathered about the original issues outlined in the research questions.

The actual analysis, synthesis and discussion of findings is then undertaken in Chapter 5, where the researcher will scrutinise the findings to explore more deeply the meaning behind the findings. Furthermore, the findings will be compared with the views and other research presented in the literature review. This will be followed by a discussion of the theories, issues and challenges and an attempt to ‘make sense’ of the findings by considering their implications on the questions raised.

Chapter 6 will conclude by showing how the researcher responded to the research objectives and questions. It will also outline a number of general conclusions that emerge from the study. At this point, the researcher evaluates the research and reflects critically on its limitations, and identifies new directions for further research. This chapter ends with a number of recommendations that aim to enhance the local (Maltese) situation, and humbly, that might also serve to act as guidelines for further research.
2.0 The Concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship: documenting and critically evaluating the debate

2.1 An Introduction

As has been pointed out in the previous section, this study focuses on the students’ understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’, with particular reference to the 1997 syllabus for Systems of Knowledge. The aims and objectives of the Systems syllabus were discussed in section 1.1 ‘Background to the Study’ (p. 2). Systems of Knowledge aims to develop critical and creative skills across the curriculum as well as the development of communicative skills in both Maltese and English. Furthermore, the syllabus also covers three modules: Module One: Antiquity and Early Middle Ages; Module Two: Middle Ages and the Renaissance and Module Three: Modern and Contemporary World, all of which provide for substantial amount of content which needs to be undertaken with the students.

In the section ‘Note to Teachers’ included in the same syllabus (Appendix 1 p.248) there is an emphasis on the importance of the acquisition of knowledge and experience and the undertaking of research in order to transform information into knowledge. This note also emphasises the importance of learning how to learn. Furthermore, the introduction of the three modules aims to provide students with a level of interdisciplinarity, i.e. a coordination across subjects and fields so that the students would be in a better position to understand the relevance of one subject to another and hopefully obtain a more integrated understanding.
Since the Systems of Knowledge course is loaded with content, it is not unusual for lecturers to deliver lectures and content. Furthermore, since every academic year is pressed for time, less time is allotted to seminars and therefore students have less time for discussion and the acquisition of skills. In this way, one could argue that the lecturers are not giving sufficient opportunity to involve students in modern methods of teaching and that the students are not given the appropriate opportunities to discuss and acquire skills. Furthermore, it is argued, that students only use the content acquired during lectures in everyday life in a limited manner.

The main theme of every one of the three modules is values, different types of values which are studied chronologically from antiquity to modern times. It is with the above in mind that the researcher aims to focus on one part of Module One, referring to values in politics, specifically the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’. It is for this reason that the researcher will undertake a literature review of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ in the UK and internationally.

This chapter will start by stating why it is important to define ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’. These two concepts have been at the centre of many educational debates during the twentieth century. The debate has intensified in the last decades of the twentieth century and has continued during this first decade of the twenty-first century, influenced by the international events that took place and others that are still unfolding. These include the threat of terrorism, which goes against the main aims of democracy, the Iraq conflict that is supposed to institute a democratic government instead of an authoritarian one, and major environmental crises where the
responsibilities lie with governments and also with individuals. Third World countries are still ravaged by AIDS and there seems to be no immediate easily available medication for this virus even though we are living in the great age of developments in information technology and continuous technological, medical and scientific progress.

Immersed in this scenario, citizens around the world are still getting to grips with the concept of ‘democracy’, others are acquiring a first taste of democracy; others are trying to safeguard a type of democracy that seems to be fading relatively fast. The events that surround the above-mentioned debate are evidence that it is an on-going debate. It is for this reason, and due to the fact that Malta is an ex-British colony, a member of the Commonwealth, and now an EU member (since May 2004), that the researcher felt the need to document and critically evaluate the evolution of the liberal and the communitarian theory of citizenship, and a new theory of citizenship, influenced by a political agenda in the UK, which towards the end of the twentieth century came to be known as the ‘Third Way’.

The Crick Report (1998) referred to some proposals relevant to this research, as well as ensuing criticisms. The analysis of these criticisms can be seen as a way forward in the continuous unfolding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’.

This chapter will further document and critically analyse contemporary theories of ‘citizenship’ that are influencing important decisions in education in the European Union and worldwide. The point of departure is that proposed by the Crick Report (1998) and the proposal of the theory of citizenship that promotes ‘national
identity’. In reaction to this theory this chapter will discuss another three important theories. The first theory is, citizenship as a ‘community of shared fate’. The second theory is one of ‘intercultural citizenship’, stimulated by the increased diversity of societies in the world, and the various multicultural characteristics, partly a result of the increased movements of people from one country to another. The third and last theory to be proposed focuses on the promotion of ‘global citizenship’, stimulated by the effects of globalisation on the economic, political and cultural spheres. While discussing the different theories, the study will also present different theories of education proposed by international theorists of education, which might prove to be the ‘best’ medium to promote the different theories.

The debate will also focus on changes implemented in the Maltese Education System especially in the last decade, showing that Maltese society is continuously being influenced by the same trends and issues influencing ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ worldwide. The researcher is proposing a conceptual and theoretical framework that will serve as a foundation for the discussion that will follow in Chapter 5, where the qualitative and quantitative research findings will be analysed in the context of the discussion of the literature available to date. The study further proposes to show that the concepts and theories documented and analysed in Chapter 2, give rise to particular issues, ideas and challenges. These, the current qualitative and quantitative research addresses and will serve to prepare the ground for future research about the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ in education.
2.2 Why define ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ in education?

When one tries to define ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ one tends to get carried away with the amount of literature available. However, this study will be limited to giving a concise reference of the two concepts, democracy and citizenship in relation to education, mainly referring to citizenship education, as a means of preparing young people for democratic citizenship.

When reflecting about the different governments of the world, one is likely to conclude that most people in the world favour democracy over other types of government. Democracy is widely considered as the best system of government available, but at the same time one has to remember its fragility and the defects that undoubtedly exist. Democracy is a system where people generally experience a ‘feel good’ factor. Crick (1999) points out that “in Western traditions citizenship is part of the good life, but can never be enforced on people” (p. 337). Citizens tend to forget that democracy, like so many other things in life, has to be nurtured. To illustrate the nature of democracy one may compare it to a raft which never sinks but where one’s feet are always in the water. Interestingly, although the image has been credited to at least two different authors. Mosher et al (1994) attributes it to the English historian, D. W. Brogan while Crick (2002) attributes it to Fisher Ames. It is for this reason that in some countries citizens are trying to consolidate or improve democracy, while others aspire to achieve it (and some leaders try to suppress it!). In this process one cannot but affirm the importance of education, an education of the people in principles, practices and commitments of democracy. If citizens are responsible for the retention of democracy, they should be taught the major values of the system. At the same time citizens should know about the shortcomings and the dangers that face
democracy, first and foremost that of living in a democracy when it is not really a
democracy, but a dictatorship of the majority in parliament. Since democracy is
upheld by many countries in the world, one should emphasise the importance of
preparing citizens to live in a democracy. Crick (1999) gives a word of warning that
"the case for active adult citizenship should not be overstated. It cannot be made
universal by persuasion nor compulsory by law. [...]Where a state does not have a
tradition of active citizenship deep in its culture or cannot create in its educational
system a proclivity to active citizenship, that state is running great risks"(p.338). In
an authoritarian society, the people may be kept ignorant, but in a democracy, it is
actually important for citizens to understand what democracy is all about in order for
it to work.

The concept of 'democracy' has, in fact, changed through the ages, from the
'direct' or 'classical' type, to the modern 'representative' type of democracy.
However some of the main aims for which democracy was created still remain. They
are the foundations of the political system. One of the fundamental ideals of
democracy has always been one of active citizen participation in public affairs, and
the state was structured in a manner that maximized this participation for every
citizen. But one has to point out that in ancient Greece, and in many other countries
only men could vote and participate in politics and normal decision-making. True
democracy has been hard won. Today, although we witness more representative
democracy, there is still the need to make every citizen feel the urge to be duty bound
to participate in public affairs. However, participation has to be voluntary and not
compulsory by law, as is the case for example, in Singapore. What comes to mind at
this point is the fact that in Malta, as stated elsewhere in this study, there is a very
high turnout in national elections, but one should also ask whether those who participate are able to cast their vote properly and for the common good. This is one of the issues that will be studied in this research.

The difference is that now the citizen has to work harder to achieve a level of participation, especially where demagogues are involved. According to Wain (1992):

[people] can and do form pressure groups and other associations, trade unions and consumers’ groups and movements of different kinds to guard the mutual interests of their members and of society in general. In certain countries there is a powerful mass media which plays the role of a powerful watchdog (p. 285).

It was the manipulation of the people’s will by demagogues that caused Plato to consider democracy a sham, and to define democracy as the rule of the masses. It was for this reason that political theorists through the ages shed doubts on whether it is true that democracy is power in the hands of the people, or whether democracy is always used for the benefit of the ‘common good’. Others in the twentieth century emphasised the importance of continuous readjustment for the ongoing evolution of a democracy and hence the ability of meeting the new situations that emerge in the life of a country. This shows that the concept of democracy is not only a living debate, but also a very complex one.

The debate highlights the fact that education can make a difference in a democracy. It focuses on the need of society to have more rational and educated persons for democracy to function smoothly. Society cannot be happy with an educated leadership, but democratic ambition must aim for a mass educated citizenry. Wain (1992) argues that “everything is bound to be permanently in a fluid state, as Dewey observed, individuals must be prepared to choose against a background of
knowledge, opinions and values that are constantly changing and being challenged” (p. 288). Society should try to control the ethic of egoism and selfishness generated by capitalism and the free market economy, and should be urged to rediscover a sense of community, which existed before the industrial revolution. There should be an appreciation for the value of solidarity and mutual cooperation, a willingness to communicate and exchange ideas rather than by working for one’s own profit alone.

It was for these reasons as well as others that in the past two decades there was a revived interest in education for citizenship globally, and even to a certain extent in Malta. Words like ‘citizen’ and ‘democracy’ have been introduced in the Maltese National Minimum Curriculum (1999: 48-49). The Times (of Malta) on Saturday, January 22, 2005, reported the Minister of Education as stating, that the Ministry of Education “will shortly be launching a campaign to put into practice education for democratic citizenship policies and programmes developed within the Council of Europe” (p. 4). And further down

Dr Galea [Education Minister] referred to the low election turnout among young people and their decreasing participation in public and political life in Europe. Although this was not so much the case locally, the issue of education for democratic citizenship, which should be seen as a long-term investment to promote the democratic values of human rights, tolerance and cultural pluralism, was important and urgent in order to ensure that Maltese youth remained part of the democratic process (p. 4).

Bernard Crick (1999) had argued on the same lines some years back that “in every country in the European Community, the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand – some historically contingent sense of crisis has been the trigger, not a reflection that knowledge of the political and social institutions of a country should be a normal entitlement of children growing towards an all too adult world” (p. 338).
However, Miller (2000) argues that “we cannot any longer assume that citizenship is something that people learn to do spontaneously, like eating and sleeping” (p. 26). This is no subject like any other. Citizens should acquire knowledge, skills and understanding, knowledge of what they possess as citizens and then skills and understanding to perform their role in the best possible way as democratic citizens. In the *Education for Citizenship in Scotland* paper the authors argue that

*citizenship is about making informed choices and decisions, and about taking action, individually and as part of collective processes.*[...] *education for citizenship should aim to develop capability for thoughtful and responsible participation in political, economic, social and cultural life. This capability is rooted in knowledge and understanding, in a range of generic skills and competences, including core skills, and in a variety of personal qualities and dispositions* (p. 4).

When devising a new syllabus for democratic citizenship, one should ask questions like ‘what are the basic concepts that citizens must acquire and use to know what democracy is, how to make it work, and why is it desirable?’ Citizens should be able to distinguish democracy from other types of government. In order to do this, citizens should be able to think critically and evaluate the extent to which their government and other governments of the world do or do not function authentically (i.e. as close as possible to the basic norms and values) as democracies. It is especially important in a democracy (as opposed to other forms of government) for people to understand what a democracy is, so they can play a proper part in it as democratic citizens.

The focus on Education for Citizenship is further affirmed in the final report *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* and hereafter
referred to as the Crick Report (1998) which states that for education for citizenship to be effective one should consider three things:

Firstly, children learning from the very beginning self-confidence and socially and morally responsible behaviour both in and beyond the classroom, both towards those in authority and towards each other (p. 11).

Secondly, learning about and becoming helpfully involved in the life and concerns of their communities, including learning through community involvement and service to the community (p. 12).

Thirdly, pupils learning about and how to make themselves effective in public life through knowledge, skills and values [...] political literacy (p. 13).

Osler (2000b: 12) in her ‘The Citizenship Agenda: human rights and political literacy’ argues that although the Crick Report (1998) sets out to make recommendations on citizenship education which will support the development of a healthy democracy, it does not consider how citizenship education might support antiracism in education, and thus challenge a force which has the potential to undermine democracy and democratic citizenship. And further down,

We need to develop a new concept and vision of multiculturalism which is itself founded on human rights and is inclusive of all citizens, including majority white populations as well as minorities. [...] We need to acknowledge that racism and discrimination in British society are not confined to ‘visible’ and established minorities, but that other individuals and communities [...] may currently experience racism, prejudice disadvantage, harassment and violence (p. 13)

Having said that, Osler and Starkey (1999) in (Osler (2000b)) argue that “the emphasis on political literacy in the Crick Report opens up a new opportunity to develop a more rounded curriculum, where questions of identity and cultural development are balanced with a knowledge and understanding of human rights and democratic practice” (p. 13). Crick (1999) had envisaged this type of criticism and had stated that
Definitions do not settle arguments and important concepts cannot be defined too precisely. [...] But theories are built out of concepts. Concepts are our primary perceptions of a field of cognate problems" (p.341). [...] "It is indeed, by the working of concepts that one understands a society; thus we need to start with explicating meanings of such concepts as 'power' and 'authority', inter alia, not to show their true meaning, but the role the terms play in, for instance, different political doctrines (conservative, liberal and socialist theories of each) and in different kinds of social or professional groups. [...] Concepts are not true or false, they are simply public and useful. The concepts of political and social life need simplifying for pupils, not complicating (p. 342).

Audigier (1998) argues that “it is essential to reaffirm what constitutes the essentials of a conception of citizenship in a democratic society. Citizenship is a multiform concept” [and the meanings of the term ‘citizenship’] “are open to the new experiences that life constantly leads us to invent, to the new forms that citizenship and democratic political life will take in the future; it is therefore normal or even desirable that all this should change” (p. 7).

Audigier, continues to, highlights the importance and the urgent need to teach education for citizenship in the light of what lies ahead, with all the rapid changes occurring in different societies. Similarly, Miller (2000) points out that citizenship is about values, but it is also “a good thing to be active citizens; that it is important to be informed, critical and responsible; that we have duties; that we should respect other people’s identities, and that it is a good thing to be reflective” (p. 69). Miller continues that young people should learn to be able to make sense of and to begin to shape their own identities, “to find our own way through this moral and cultural maze young people need a range of knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that schools, parents and the wider community all have a crucial role in providing” (p. 70). So, although the school has a very important responsibility, other agents of socialisation share in this responsibility. Parents (at times more than the community) should be
guided to understand this responsibility. Students should be taught not only to identify their immediate responsibility but also their future responsibilities, if and when they become parents.

The growing need to define and reflect on what we mean by these concepts in the light of rapidly changing events, is often triggered by crises in society at large. When things are going well, or when those who are in power feel that there is a relative cohesion in society and that they have a relative hold over that same society, the authorities let changes in culture, (defined as a way of life) occur without taking too much notice. This does not imply that changes in society can be controlled but those who are in power, or who have certain responsibility will always try to guide change around their aims and visions which, in their opinions, are the best for their country. There has always been change, but in the modern world, change is very rapid. The twentieth century saw great changes taking place in societies that had been conservative for many centuries. The changes took place especially after the Second World War, and then after the Cold War, and now after the 9/11 and 7/7 Syndromes. Citizens who have been through these major changes know that things will never be the same as they were previously.

Kerr (2003) points out that towards the end of the twentieth century academics and commentators started arguing whether “a watershed has been reached, namely the end of modern, liberal democratic society and the onset of a less certain post modern world. They have begun to redefine the concept of citizenship in this post modern world (Kymlicka 1995a; Callan 1997; Giddens 1998; Crick 2000a; Beck 2000)” (p. 2). This task of redefinition creates challenges, as Kerr continues, that are associated
with diversity, location, social rights and participation. This study argues that participation was and continues to be critical. As society has evolved, it requires every citizen to be responsible. Citizens should be encouraged not to leave everything to the government to decide and carry out. Every citizen should feel morally responsible for his or her actions, at the same time being aware of the needs and views of others and motivated to contribute positively to the wider community. However, in many societies, including Maltese society, one is likely to detect what Kerr (2003) calls “the worrying signs of alienation and cynicism among young people about public life and participation, leading to their possible disconnection and disengagement with it” (p. 3). Evans (1998) argues that

young adults are experiencing uncertain status and are dependent upon state and parental support for longer periods than would have been the case a generation ago [...] people have to find their own ways of reconciling personal aspirations with available opportunities and their own values in the domains of education, consumption, politics, work and family life (p. 105). [...] This uncertainty is not the result of knowledge itself – it is ‘manufactured uncertainty’ (p. 126).

There does appear to be some form of crisis here. Parsons (1999: 158) while trying to analyse the causes of this crisis, points out that the U.K. has a divisive and competitive school system. Goals articulated for it were increasingly narrowed up to the end of 1997 when there was a change in government. At that time, standards and school improvement mainly emphasised external tests and examinations. Parsons’ observations may reflect the present situation of the school in Malta and also, to a certain extent, to the Maltese Education System. Parsons (1999) further points out that

The education systems in both the UK and United States appear to have gone down narrow, prescriptive routes where atomised, measurable achievements have become the set goals. Wider societal goals or a focus on the full, learning person, appear to have been relegated (p. 159).
Attempts to show how education should meet the needs of industry have been poorly founded on data, practically simplistic and intellectually flawed. This is no surprise when employment opportunities for young people have been structurally limited yet it is young people's deficiencies which are blamed for their unemployment (p. 160).

[...] parental choice is the force identified to produce 'the schools of tomorrow'. Therefore completing the loop means that the responsibility for producing the schooling system, its content, processes and purposes, is best left to parents exerting their wishes through the market mechanism (p. 160).

Parsons (1999: 164) affirms that young people in the late twentieth century and the first years of the 21st century faced an ever-lengthening period of insecurity and dependence. Children are seen as hedonistic consumers and targeted aggressively through advertising. With divorce or separation, and the increase of single parent families the family is seen less as a source of stability and guidance. The school has become narrowed and competitive and diminished over the period as a focus for leisure activities as extracurricular activities. Although Parsons' observations refer to the situation in the UK, it might be the case that the same situation exists in many societies in the West, and in Malta.

Parsons (1999: 166) further calls citizenship "a safety net", a way of redistributing resources generally, a matter of universal membership transcending class, gender and ethnicity divisions within a country. As Turner (1993: xii) states, citizenship is a big problem now, because nation state sovereignty and civil solidarity have been profoundly challenged by globalisation, economic restructuring and value secularisation. Similarly, Parsons (1999: 166) argues that there are four particular challenges that undermine the effectiveness of citizenship as a unifying rhetoric. Parsons lists them as follows: a) unemployment, b) greater emphasis on duties, c) the
market economy and finally d) inequality and the increased numbers living in poverty which is a result of unemployment and reduced welfare support.

These are all big issues that are also easily detected in Maltese society: unemployment is rising considerably, and is here to stay, notwithstanding the continuous efforts of different governments to control it. With regard to rights and duties, a greater emphasis by citizens on rights rather than duties is more damaging in the long run. In a globalized society, the market economy is taking precedence over the human element, and decisions are at times taken in the name of profit and progress at all cost. And with different governments reducing the cost of welfare support, indirectly affect the life of normal citizens, especially the unemployed. This is creating new types of inequalities and increasing the number of citizens living in poverty not only in the Third World countries, but all over the world.

After focussing on the main reasons why one should seek to define or redefine the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’, and also to recognise their complex nature, this study will proceed to explore the ongoing debate in education about these important concepts. The study will further explore the emerging schools of thought, and then the different ways of defining the concepts, keeping in mind the continuously changing multicultural and global dimensions of societies in the world at the beginning of the 21st century.
2.3 The concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ in education: broadening the debate

As has been argued above, there are numerous definitions that one might refer to when exploring these concepts. It is for this reason that this study will refer to definitions that are most popular in the west. It is well recognised that the European states, individually or as a European Union (Malta became a full member of the EU in May 2004), have in these past years intensified their concern and effort to devise curricula that would be best suited to promote values within their societies, and to promote societal cohesion where the main features of the day are federalism (e.g. Italy) or the dismemberment of nations (e.g. the Balkans), as we have known them during the past century. This now has become even more of an urgent issue after the ratification of the new European Constitution approved in the European parliament in 2005.

The last decade of the twentieth century has seen atrocities committed in the Balkan conflict in Europe that remind many of the Holocaust of the Second World War. All this had obvious repercussions on the international community, and democracy has become even more a main focus of discussion and study. Therefore, the need arises to redefine what has been taken for granted for many years. It is this same attitude, of “taking things for granted” that makes democracy so vulnerable, and in danger of changing from a positive system to a negative one.

Patrick (2000) argues that any debate about democracy should start with “minimal democracy” where one goes back to the roots of democracy, to Athens where it all started, studying what makes Direct Democracy, the positive and the
negative aspects, and then to move forward historically until our times, where today's Representative Democracies "are inclusive; [and where] most inhabitants of the realm may possess or acquire the rights and privileges of citizenship" (p. 4). Huntington (1991: 7) in Patrick (2000) defines minimal democracy as a political system "democratic to the extent that its most powerful collective decision makers are selected through fair, honest and periodic elections in which candidates freely compete for votes and in which virtually all the adult population is eligible to vote" (p. 4). The definition implies an emphasis on popular sovereignty, or government by the consent of the governed, where the government is directly or indirectly accountable to the people.

With all the positive connotations of the above statement, one should point out therefore, how important it is to prepare the citizens for democratic citizenship. A government should strive to move democracy away from what Plato, as referred to in Melling (1987) describes as a "'democratic' system whose highest offices were allocated by lottery, and which had shown itself in the later stages of the war disquietingly vulnerable to the persuasive voices of irresponsible demagogues" (p.6); where the uneducated masses have the control, or where the government is Machiavellian, (calling the masses "the vulgar") and would cherish this political ignorance as a breeding ground for more acquisition of power.

To emphasise this argument, it is worth noting that this study found that a significant 10.8% of these respondents who, in fact, had studied democracy in the course of their studies, still think that the Maltese system is a Direct Democracy. This goes to show that even students who were taught the basic content on democracy had
not grasped its main features, let alone all those same age students in Malta who had no teaching about the subject at all.

With respect to the accountability factor, recent events in international politics, such as the Iraq War, have yet again shown that those who are in power many times try to give the impression that they are acting in the interest of the people of their country, who elected them to power. These latest events such as the British and American involvement in the Iraq War have shown on the other hand that the electorate is likely to forfeit its powers once a government is elected. Although there were a number of demonstrations by people all over the world showing disagreement with Western involvement, some governments still sent their troops to Iraq for the conflict. Furthermore, there are still political leaders who think that there is one type of democracy, and that this type can be exported to other nations through military intervention (i.e. very undemocratically) without even passing through the normal channels agreed upon by the United Nations. Democracy survives when the people choose it as their system of government, and it is always given a different moulding, depending on many aspects including the culture of the country where it is put into practice.

Notwithstanding this, it seems that many democracies in the world meet what Patrick (2000: 7) calls the “minimal standard” i.e. the basic requirements that are needed for a country to be truly a democracy. In a liberal democracy, protection for individual rights extends beyond political rights to fundamental personal rights, such as freedom of conscience and free exercise of religion, to mention a few. In liberal democracy the government is empowered by the people and limited by the supreme
law of the people's constitution (the same can be said for the new EU constitution), for the ultimate purpose of protecting equally the autonomy and rights of everyone in the country. Furthermore, in a liberal democracy there is majority rule with extensive protection of minority rights. According to Plattner (1997: 180) a necessary transition from minimal democracy to liberal democracy is constitutionalism.

In fact, Patrick (2000) concisely points out what Zakaria (1997) argues that

an unrestricted or illiberal democracy is likely to become a tyranny of the majority in which the rights of popular individuals or minorities are insecure. And unrestricted liberty will lead to licentious disorder in which the rights of individuals and groups are always at risk from uncontrolled predators. So security for rights depends upon political order anchored in a constitution of the people, which simultaneously empowers [positive] and limits [negative] a government consent of the governed (p. 7).

Constitutionalism is rooted in the use of a constitution, usually a written document, which Patrick (2000) adds "legitimates, limits and empowers the government, which if democratic, is based on periodic election of representatives by virtually all the adult population" (p. 7). The danger of liberal democracy lies in the fact that the representatives may become tyrannical for five years, as has been pointed above. This is the worst thing that can happen in a democracy, that is, for one to think that one is living in a democracy when in actual fact one is not. All this places a lot of responsibility on the electorate, the importance of choice and therefore the role and responsibility of citizens and the preparation of citizens through citizenship education, or education for democratic citizenship. It is no use giving rights of participation to citizens if one does not equip citizens with the necessary knowledge, skills and understanding to be able to use those rights. It is true that constitutionalism provides for the creation of institutions such as trade unions and NGOs, but one must also be
aware of what could happen if institutions become satellites, with leaders and directors being appointed by the representatives in power. In this situation Herman Schwartz (1993) affirms, “whatever chance these [East European] countries have to continue developing into constitutional democracies depends on strong, independent courts that can reel legislative and executive encroachments on their constitutions” (p. 194).

It is for reasons like the one quoted above that Kerr (2003) argues that “it is essential that citizenship education becomes a strong, evolving and lasting feature of the curriculum experience of all pupils in the 21st century” (p. 7). And Evans (1998) refers to “the new forms of active citizenship” that is, “to promote the highest forms of learning with understanding, critical skills, and above all, lifelong learning and inquiry centre stage. Knowing how is not the same as knowing why, and the social dynamics of the time demand that we know ‘why’ as well as ‘how’” (p. 131). Patrick (2004) further emphasises that

in the 21st century, by contrast with the past, we may reasonably speculate that education for citizenship in a democracy will, with each decade, become everywhere more global, international, and comparative in curricular content and processes of teaching and learning. And we ought to think now about how to improve our current curricular frameworks and standards for a world transformed by globally accepted and internationally transcendent principles and processes of democracy (p. 22).

Enslin et al. (2001) point out that “citizens have to be taught to be democrats. How do people learn to be democrats in circumstances of diversity and plurality?” (p. 115). To answer this question, Enslin et al. propose three models of deliberative democracy: a) public reason (as exemplified by Rawls (1989)), b) discursive
democracy (as exemplified by Benhabib (1996)), and c) communicative democracy (as exemplified by Young (1996)). These theories promote "the ability to make a reasoned argument, written or oral, as well as the abilities to cooperate with others, to appreciate their perspectives and experiences and to tolerate other points of view. Talk is obviously fundamental to active citizenship" (p. 116).

The three models of deliberative democracy are proposed within the current philosophical debates on citizenship education observed by Kymlicka (1995b) in Enslin et al. (2001) a decade ago, a growing debate about whether "the fundamental value with liberal theory is autonomy or tolerance. [...] While tolerance is commonly recognised as an important virtue for citizens in a pluralist democracy, and while education is recognised as having a crucial role in inculcating tolerance, what this requires more specifically is in dispute, as are its relations to other citizenship virtues, especially autonomy" (p. 116). The debate about whether one should inculcate tolerance or emphasise the importance of autonomy will be critically discussed in the next part of the chapter.

With all this in mind the evaluation of the debate moves on to identify other fundamental issues, before passing on to different theories of citizenship and how one should tackle the teaching of citizenship. All theories consider the effectiveness and shortcomings of their proposed pedagogy, but all have a common aim, that is, that of preparing citizens in the 21st century to become democratic citizens.
2.4 The evolution of the liberal and the communitarian definition of citizenship, and the 'Third Way'

When one analyses the debate about a definition for citizenship one is faced with a number of models and theories that dominated the educational arena in the twentieth century. Academics and different education policy makers chosen by different political parties came up with different definitions influenced by their academic background or by political ideologies that were those of the party in power at the time. Some acknowledged what came before and improved on it; others criticised the previous definitions, and proposed their own definition. All this, as one can imagine, has created a complicated situation for researchers focussing on the debate about a workable definition of citizenship. Much contemporary debate about citizenship is linked to the ideas of Marshall (1963), but this should not be taken to mean that there is a single and straightforward characterisation. Part of the difficulty of discussing citizenship, Heater (1999) points out, is that it needs to be “understood and studied as a mosaic of identities, duties and rights rather than a unitary concept” (p. 114).

Tate (2000: 67) states that citizenship education tells one something about what a society feels it stands for, so in a way it defines society, and in a way everyone wants to know what type of society one forms part of. Furthermore, the definition of society describes indirectly what it wants to transmit through its educational system, i.e. what type of citizens that same society aspires to have in the future. Tate identifies a sense of urgency worldwide, in many societies, in trying to answer questions that would give a tentative definition of the said society, since one cannot give the ultimate definition because societies are changing at such a rapid pace that at
times one feels helpless and questions whether one should try to search for definitions at all. From the above discussion it seems that it is perhaps not possible to come up with the definition of democracy. What we can do is to recognise the complexities and the need to be flexible. Also with all issues with moral content, it is probably relativistic. Tate (2000) gives a number of reasons for this urgency and at the same time why there are so many difficulties in defining citizenship. Tate's list includes

*the impact of economic globalisation [...] of a largely US-based mass culture; the development of regional structures such as the European Union [especially now with the recent enlargement (May 2004) to twenty five members, and other enlargements are envisaged in the near future]; internal pressures for devolution and autonomy; concerns within democracies about growing civic disengagement (p. 67).*

Miller (2000) points out that "people do not have a clear idea of what it means to be a citizen [...] we are still inclined to see citizenship as slightly foreign" (p. 26). Miller identifies three models of citizenship, and argues that although they are not mutually exclusive in practice, they rest upon underlying philosophies. The first model, promotes "citizenship understood as a set of rights and obligations that gives every citizen an equal status in the political community" (p. 27). The second model "see[s] the citizen as a consumer of public services who therefore has consumers' rights" (p. 28) and the third model describes the citizen "not only as a rights-holder and a claimant, but someone who is actively involved in shaping the way that his or her community functions" (p. 28). The first model depicts citizenship as a status that gives citizens equal rights and obligations in a political community, who can decide and choose. The second model shows citizens as consumers and receiving a service. The third model moves a step further, and emphasises active citizenship involved in shaping life in society. This model is the type in line with the main arguments of this
study. While being conscious of the importance of preparation and the responsibility
to withhold and fulfil such an important role in society, this model implicitly should
denote not only the status that one should acquire and possess, but also the ability to
uphold and use that responsibility in the best possible way for the common good.

It is amid all this urgency and complexity that debate within two main
philosophies, that is, the liberal and the communitarian philosophies, was focussing
on trying to define citizenship according to different ideologies, in the hope that
society moves on and changes into what is desirable rather than into what other
influencing forces mentioned above make of it. Oliver and Heater (1994) point out
that “from the Greeks to the eighteenth century particularly, there was a belief that a
citizen should undertake certain duties and responsibilities and be loyal to the state
rather than pursue his own selfish interests” (p. 114). The liberal view of citizenship,
Oliver and Heater (1994) argue “is so concerned about the rights of the individual that
it has little room for this kind of virtue” [although] “liberal qualities like tolerance and
respect for others and a desire to defend freedom and impartial justice can mark out
the good citizen in this tradition” (p. 114). Olssen et al (2004) confirm that “this
conception, which assumes that individuals are pre-social and that humans are
basically solitary, with needs and interests which are separate or opposed to others, is
the starting point of liberal theory and philosophy” (p. 100). Oliver and Heater (1994)
contend that

individuals are citizens when they practice civic virtue and good citizenship, enjoy but do not exploit their civil and political rights, contribute to and receive social and economic benefits, do not allow any sense of national identity to justify discrimination or stereotyping of others, experience senses of non-exclusive multiple citizenship, and by their example, teach citizenship to others (p. 8)
Olssen et al. (2004) affirm that “within liberal educational discourse, an individual’s ability to learn is seen as something determined by their inborn capacity, and their educational achievement is determined largely by individual effort, something for which they alone are responsible” (p. 101). And further down, the individual is seen as “a free, unified and autonomous being. Social positioning, is understood to be achieved quite independently of the influence of other people and structural barriers” (p. 101).

When one is faced with these two ideologies, one feels that there is very little way in which the dilemma that emerges from an analysis of the debate can be overcome. In this regard Heater (1999) asserts that, “by being a virtuous, community conscious participant in civic affairs (a republican requirement), a citizen benefits by enhancing his or her own individual development (a liberal objective). Citizenship does not involve an either/or choice” (p. 117).

Oliver and Heater (1994: 116-120) trace the ideology of Republican Civic Virtue (later communitarianism) to Aristotle, Machiavelli and Rousseau. For Aristotle, virtue (arete) meant excellence in a particular activity. His Greek view was that there are four virtues: temperance, justice, courage and wisdom. And furthermore, he says that the citizen must display different qualities depending on his role at any particular time. Aristotle firmly believed that human beings, by their very nature, are fitted to live in political communities. Machiavelli had a more cynical and pessimistic view of human nature, and argued that there was nothing in human nature
that would give a spontaneous urge to altruistic communal behaviour. Men had to be cajoled, bribed and bullied into being good citizens. Rousseau's understanding of human nature was much more complex. He argues that true morality can only be achieved by the performance of duties in a political community, an experience unknown in the state of nature. These three theories show that in three different stages in human history, the role of human beings in a community was seen from different perspectives, and one should point out that these issues still persist today. In devising a programme for citizenship education, one should definitely think about different interpretations of human nature that might still persist in cultures in different societies in the world.

Arthur (2001) states that “in the growing academic literature communitarianism is expressed in both radical and conservative forms which reflect the diverse understandings academics have of it. Nevertheless, the core understanding essentially holds that the community, rather than the individual or state, should be at the centre of our analysis and our value system” (p. 57). Communitarianism has been popularised in recent years, and has had a considerable impact on both the Democrats in the USA, and the New Labour Party in Britain, where it is often referred to in political rhetoric as ‘The Third Way’. Communitarians claim that persons are embedded in communities. They claim that the self is constituted to some extent through a community that provides shared values, interests or practices. A person’s individual values are formed in the social context of these communities and often pursued through communal attachments (Kymlicka 1993). Almost all communitarians, according to Mulhall and Swift (1996), are united around
a conception of human beings as “integrially related to the communities of culture and language that they create, maintain and sustain” (p. 162). Bell (1993: 93ff) agrees that deeply felt attachments to a number of communities help constitute a person’s identity, and these communities define a sense of who we are and provide a largely background way of our being in the world of thinking, acting and deciding. To reject these features of our identity would lead to a potential identity crisis or a form of disorientation. And further down, Bell (1993: 97) affirms that no individual can find an identity apart from others. Some attachments are so fundamental to our identity that we cannot set them aside, without harmful costs to ourselves and the community. It is interesting to note how this fits in with recent ideas from psychology about social constructivism and how individuals construct their own identity in the context of the community where they live.

Communitarian theorists thought that they held a monopoly on civic virtue. This led Stephen Macedo to promote his theory of liberal virtue. In his *Liberal Virtues* (1990), Macedo points out that “tolerance and respect for the rights of others, self-control, reflectiveness, self-criticism, moderation, and a reasonable degree of engagement in the activities of citizenship” (p. 2) are necessary for freedom. Oliver and Heater (1994) argue that “the freedom which to the liberal is the highest good is not licence: its enjoyment requires that the free individual respects institutional procedures and the reciprocal freedoms of others” (p. 120).

Good citizens, therefore, are those who take a sufficient interest in public affairs so that they can understand the decisions made, and then demand that those in public office give reasons for their action by way of public justification. Oliver and
Heater (1994) contend that “the liberal citizen combines responsibility with autonomy [and] is expected to be able to have the freedom to choose; not to be forced to be free” (p. 122). Further down, Oliver and Heater point out that the ideal liberal good citizen has five broad characteristics: (a) the individual’s self-knowledge, i.e. their ability to shape their own lives by using the reasoning faculty of self-criticism; (b) moderation; (c) tolerance and impartiality; (d) empathy and (e) liberal virtue is realistic and not prescriptive.

Oliver and Heater (1994) record criticisms by communitarians aimed at the liberal tradition and vice versa. Communitarians argue that:

*liberalism is an abstract, universal theory which is bound to be weak in fostering a commitment to the citizen’s particular community and its traditions. [...] For liberal citizens are guided by the subjective desire to protect their individual rights, not by the commitment to an objective public moral code. [...] Liberalism, communitarians further complain, is too apolitical. It tolerates the wish of too many to be ‘private citizens’; the duty to behave as a good citizen is thus pushed to one small corner of the individual’s conscience. [Liberals have] a ‘free rider’ mentality – of taking from society and giving nothing in return [...] which is the very antithesis of civic virtue and destructive of that communal harmony which is a prerequisite for its cultivation (p. 128).*

The general, and possibly even vague nature of liberalism can cause particular problems when it is applied to the field of education. Thus Amy Gutmann (1987: 55-6) notes that education seems to present special difficulties for liberal theorists. Because liberals in theory are neutral concerning a wide range of ways of life, the issue of ‘which type of education’ they opt for seems to necessitate or exert pressure in favour of accepting a notion of education being a matter of private preference.
On the other hand, liberals have been equally critical of the communitarian stance. According to Oliver and Heater (1994: 129) liberals criticise the communitarian stance by referring to historical arguments and arguments of principle. The civic republican ideal of virtue that was suitable for the Greeks and Rousseau’s imagination are not appropriate for modern nation-states. Modern societies are multicultural, and not compact for constant direct political participation. If the concept of republican virtue is applied it is seen as too intrusive in private life. As a synthesis Oliver and Heater (1994) proposed a definition which to their mind was acceptable to both theories, “a good citizen is one who enjoys freedom and is vigilant to defend it against the abuse of power; and participates as effectively as possible in public affairs, especially in the local community” (p. 130). It is with this statement in mind that this study will seek to analyse the effectiveness and/or shortcomings of the students’ understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ at the Junior College, Malta.

Tony Blair (1998) the leader of the political party, New Labour, in the UK, defines the Third Way as an ideology that

```
draws vitality from uniting two great streams of left-of-centre thought – democratic socialism and liberalism – whose divorce this century did so much to weaken progressive politics across the West. Liberals asserted the primacy of individual liberty in the market economy; social democrats promoted social justice with the state as its main agent. There is no necessary conflict between the two (p. 1).
```

Giddens (1998) in his book *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy* argues, that the government aimed “to transcend both old-style social democracy and neo-liberalism [...] The Third way new Labour had emerged from the necessity to
react with pragmatism to a world which has changed fundamentally over the past two or three decades” (p. 26). Giddens refers to changes such as, those of globalisation, a new individualism, the apparent collapse of the traditional left and right framework of modern politics, the problem of political agency or the future of democracy, and ecological problems. These changes left Social Democrats with a number of political dilemmas to cope with, such as the welfare state. In Malta, over the last decades, the Malta Labour Party has been undergoing a number of reforms in order to solve “a number of political dilemmas” similarly evident in Malta.

On similar lines, Anthony Giddens (2000a) sees the ‘third way’ as “concerned with restructuring social democratic doctrines to respond to the twin revolutions of globalisation and the knowledge economy” (p. 163). Previously, Giddens (1998: 64-8) had argued that an effective market economy requires a level of social cohesion that can only be sustained by a flourishing civil society. This involves a new relationship between the individual and the community founded upon two precepts: a) no rights without responsibilities, and b) no authority without democracy.

Notwithstanding these changes, critics like Callinicos (2001) (in Olsson et al. (2004)) sees the ‘third way’ “as an amorphous amalgam of irreconcilable values, based upon an attempt to steer a middle way between a free market and a traditional welfare state” (p. 201). Olssen et al (2004) affirm that the ‘third way’ “is not a coherent alternative to neo-liberalism” [...] the ‘third way’ discourse remains paramount, and replaces traditional leftist concerns” and that “critics see this system as likely to take government policy backwards to a pre-comprehensive era, allowing
for new tiers of selective schooling to emerge, reintroducing and further intensifying existing social class divisions” (p. 201). And Wain (2004) affirms that

_notwithstanding the boldness with which it [Britain under the government of the Third Way social democracy] projects a new modernizing vision and its discourse on empowerment, self-dependence, responsibility, and choice, [it] appears defensive and protective of the nation, the community, the economy, individuals at risk, national identity and social cohesion, and its solutions formal and institutional (pp. 219-20)._ 

In the 2002 Labour Party Conference in Bournemouth, Tony Blair stated (quoted in Wintour, 2002: 13) the introduction of a new concept, of the ‘enabling state’ seen as the vehicle by which devolution and diversity are managed according to ‘third way’ policy initiatives in education and health policies. In education it has involved the expansion and development of specialist schools as part of the ‘post-comprehensive era’. Specialist schools are encouraged to enter into public-private partnerships (PPP) or private finance initiatives (PFI) to start operating autonomously. This system emphasises localism, as against centralisation. Giddens (2002) (in Walker 2002: 13) who is in favour of localism defines localism as the ‘freedom to do things differently’. It is more flexible. While centralisation excludes people from democratic processes, localism is seen as more ‘innovative’ and fosters ‘participation’ and ‘democratic citizenship’. Localism is claimed to promote participation, more effective self-government, self-realization and self-development. This may also be seen to be applicable to the Maltese situation over the last two decades following the introduction of local council elections. Ironically, the turnout for these elections has always been at a lower percentage when compared to the national elections.

However, the Third Way is not without its critics. Gewirtz (2002a, 2002b) is critical of elements in the ‘third way’ because she claims that implicit within the ‘third
way' there are two notions of educational success. On the one hand one finds the neo-liberal policies that continue to promote commitments to marketisation, privatisation and competition. On the other hand New Labour has introduced a variety of ‘humanistic’, more social democratic type, policies that mark a “significant departure from the reforms of the Conservatives” (Gewirtz 2002a: 37). And further down: “Whilst, from a social justice perspective, the humanistic strands are clearly to be welcomed [...] the intensification of the managerial business-friendly element is in danger of undermining the possibility of the more humanistic strands being realised” (ibid. p. 39).

Notwithstanding this criticism Olssen et al. (2004) acknowledge that the attempt of “the ‘third way’ to marry social democracy and neo-liberalism suggests a more positive message in that it speaks to a more active state than was entailed under traditional laissez-faire models” (p. 215). It is with this aim in mind that this study moves on to critically evaluate the Crick Report (1998) as a product of the Third Way, to weigh the criticism levelled at it in these last years and then move on to evaluate theories of citizenship that were debated towards the end of the last century, but which seem to be moving towards the definitions of democratic citizenship in the first decade of the 21st century.

### 2.5 The Crick Report: Criticism and Beyond

This study has already referred to the Crick Report (1998) and to some of the criticism levelled at this report emanating from different academic circles. However, one may take the issue somewhat further. One feels that most of the criticism was
appropriate and fruitful because some issues were amended before they were put into practice. Yet, at the same time, one also feels that if one were only to consider the criticism one would commit an injustice to all the work of the Advisory Group headed by Professor Bernard Crick. McLaughlin (2000) acknowledges that “its recommendations have had a significant impact on the national policy for citizenship education which has emerged, [and more often than not, it has received a] favourable reception” (p. 542). One would not be wrong also to affirm that the Crick Report has had a significant impact not only in the UK but also all over the world, where citizenship has become a central theme of discussion. The Report has been referred to, studied, accepted or criticised by most academics and education policy makers all over the world, since it stimulated a lot of debate, and was one of the main sources that stimulated the concept of citizenship to be placed at the forefront of all discussion in Europe, if not in the world. The Crick Report contained a bold statement stating that the central aim of citizenship education is to effect:

no less than a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally: for people to think of themselves as active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in public life and with the critical capacities to weigh evidence before speaking and acting; to build on and to extend radically to young people the best in existing traditions of community involvement and public service, and to make them individually confident in finding new forms of involvement and action among themselves (pp. 7-8).

In the first years of the 21st century, in the UK one notes considerable activity going on around what is termed as ‘civil renewal’ led by the Home Office. This was started by the Home Secretary David Blunkett, who published two influential pamphlets (Blunkett, 2003a and b) on civil renewal that are evidence of the way forward taken by the British government inspired by and to strengthen the aims of the Crick Report. Kerr (2004) affirms that:
Civil renewal is promoted as happening anywhere, from the most deprived communities to the most affluent. It takes place when people become actively engaged in the well-being of their communities and are able to define the problems they face and tackle them together with help from the government and public bodies. Civil renewal is defined as comprising three essential ingredients: active citizenship [...] strengthened communities [...] and partnership in meeting public needs (p. 4)

The Crick Report makes a case in favour of active adult citizenship, and Crick (1999) himself points out that “the case for active adult citizenship should not be overstated. It cannot be made universal by persuasion, nor compulsory by law” (p. 338). Active adult citizenship has to be something accepted by those who are going to perform as democratic citizens, otherwise it all goes against the democratic spirit itself for which it is being proposed. At the same time Crick (1999) in his ‘Presuppositions of Citizenship Education’ states that

where a state does not have a tradition of active citizenship deep in its culture or cannot create in its educational system a proclivity to active citizenship, that state is running great risks. [...] The extreme risk is, of course, lack of support in times of war or in times of economic crisis, but the more obvious risk is lawlessness within society; perhaps not general but at least the risk that sections of young people may feel alienated, disaffected, driven to or open to strong degrees of anti-social behaviour (p. 338).

In the same paper Crick (1999) defines democratic values that are deeply ingrained in the Report (1998). These values give a clear insight into the aims and objectives of the said report. Crick defines ‘freedom’, ‘toleration’, ‘fairness’, ‘respect for truth’ and ‘respect for reasoning’. While defining ‘freedom’, Crick argues that it is different from liberty, “freedom is a status linked to the potential for activity, whereas liberty is simply being left alone” [...] “being free actually to choose between alternatives” [...] “freedom is to be encouraged, and tested by whoever it is exercised; but it will be limited by other values. So if freedom is a component of political literacy, it carries an image of use about it” (pp. 343-4). It emphasises the
responsibility of individual citizens, as stated earlier, to fulfil their role as active
democratic citizens.

‘Toleration’, Crick (1999) defines as “the degree to which we accept things
that we disapprove” (p. 344). Toleration is an important concept to be defined here
because one has to keep in mind the type of society we are referring to, societies that
are multicultural, and becoming even more so. “Toleration is a two-dimensional
concept: both disapproval but also restraint, forbearance and hopefully respect are
signalled – hopefully mutual respect” (p. 344). Crick (1999) continues that two
inferences emanate from this discussion of the concept: that someone who is
politically literate will hold views of their own, but be tolerant of the views of others;
and the importance of empathy as part of the knowledge that a politically literate
person should possess. What Waghid (2004) calls “compassionate citizenship”, after
Nussbaum (2001: 426), involves cultivating in learners the ability to imagine the
experiences of others and to participate in their sufferings – to extend their empathy to
more people and types of people” (p. 6).

Although Waghid (2004) is writing with South African society in mind, the
main emphasis is on multicultural citizenship. In fact, Waghid states that
“compassionate education should also be a multicultural education […] which
acquaints learners with a rudimentary understanding of the histories and cultures of
many different people, that is, major religious and cultural groups, as well as ethnic,
racial and social majorities and sexual minorities” (p. 6). Bhikhu Parekh (1997) in his
‘A Commitment to Cultural Pluralism’ states that a multicultural society has four
basic features:
First, contemporary multiculturality is both wider and deeper. It is deeper because cultural diversity now covers a much larger area of human existence than before, and deeper because it is grounded in profound differences about conceptions of the good life. [...] Secondly, contemporary multiculturality is more defiant. [...] Thanks to the spread of liberal and democratic ideas [minority communities] today demand equal status, rights, power and opportunity to participate in and shape the collective life of the wider society. Thirdly, contemporary multiculturality occurs in the context of increasing economic and cultural globalisation. Finally, contemporary multiculturality occurs against the background of nearly three centuries of the culturally homogenising nation state (pp. 1-2).

McLaughlin (2001) suggests that we should not stress the fragmentation that may appear to be an essential part of a diverse society:

[...] although we tend to think of ‘diversity’ and ‘pluralism’ as being concerned with difference and disagreement, it is important to note that both notions presuppose and require common values. Without significant values, ideals and procedures which are ‘common’ a diverse pluralist society would not only disintegrate but would also lack, among other things, reason, respect for persons and tolerance which are essential not only to liberal democracy but to the notions of ‘diversity’ and ‘pluralism’ themselves (p. 6.)

When Crick (1999) defines ‘fairness’ he states that “it would be that we should accept an outcome as fair if we can imagine that we are party, along with all others likely to be affected, in a state of equality (or equality of influence) to establishing rules to settle disputes without prior knowledge of outcomes” (p. 346). In this way citizens would accept making decisions without knowing if the outcome will benefit them or not.

When Crick (ibid) defines ‘respect for truth’ and ‘respect for reasoning’ the emphasis is on political literacy, and the importance to promote political literacy as a necessary component of democratic citizenship. Crick (1999) argues that “in a parliamentary democracy, the practice of politics and citizenship education do not always see eye to eye. [...] A politically literate person will ask awkward questions
early. Political literacy must involve knowing that truths have to be faced, however embarrassing or difficult. [...] Individuals can only grow and societies improve amid the tension between knowing what the facts are and wishing to change them” (p. 347). And further down, in defining 'respect for reasoning' Crick (1999) stresses that “to be politically literate means a willingness to give reasons (however ill-informed or simple) why one holds a view and to give justifications for one’s actions, and to demand them of others” (p. 348).

Criticism in the past five years, especially from the political Right in the UK, has pointed out issues that need to be addressed. Tooley (2000) argues that the Crick notion of citizenship and citizenship education is politically biased. Instead, he believes that citizenship education can best be taught, if at all, outside school and in an ad hoc way. Further, Tooley (2000) claims that some of the proposals made by the Crick Report (1998) may be better satisfied outside schooling, especially through community involvement. Kymlicka (1999) sees the virtues required by citizens in a liberal democratic society as additional to those general and economic virtues, which are necessary to any political order. Kymlicka (2002: 293) argues that there must be a sufficient number of citizens who possess the virtues of responsible citizenship to a sufficient degree, particularly those virtues associated with people’s commitment to public participation, respectful dialogue, or critical attention to government, the need for people to participate in public deliberation (Enslin (2001) about deliberative democracy). And furthermore, this study claims that this criticism is being addressed in the UK by the policy of ‘civil renewal’ agenda mentioned above. Other sources, though supportive of the introduction of citizenship education, claim that there is an
 illicit bias in relation to particular substantive matters such as race (Osler (2000a and b)) and gender (Arnot et al. (2000)). As the Crick Report (1998) states:

_A main aim for the whole community should be to find or restore a sense of common citizenship, including a national identity that is secure enough to find a place for the plurality of nations, cultures, ethnic identities and religions long found in the United Kingdom. Citizenship education creates common ground between different ethnic and religious identities (p.17)_

Olssen (2004) refers to _The Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain_ known as the Parekh Report set up by the Runnymede Trust in 1998 as an independent think-tank, and published in 2000, to address the problems of consensus and integration, and diversity and cultural differences manifest in the Crick Report (1998). The main aim was for the Commission to analyse the current state of multi-ethnic Britain and propose ways of countering disadvantage and racial discrimination in order to make Britain a more vibrant multi-ethnic society. Olssen (2004: 4) claims that the Parekh Report represents an important and necessary counterweight to the Crick Report because it questions the concept of ‘Britishness’, as a form of consensus that did not encapsulate, or assist ethnic relations. It advocates the use of ‘British’ in a more multi-ethnic way.

Olssen (2004) lists six principles that are stated in the Parekh Report (2000a) namely:

First [...] that all people have equal worth irrespective of their colour, gender, ethnicity, religion, age or sexual orientation, and all should have equal claims to the opportunities they need to realise their development and contribute to the collective well-being.

The second principle located citizens as both individuals, as well as members of local and regional communities.

The Third principle directly affirms the principle of difference [...] when equality ignores relevant differences and insists on uniformity of treatment, it leads to injustice and inequality [...] just as diversity is important, so, a fourth principle asserts, every society needs to be cohesive and must find ways of
nurturing diversity while fostering a common sense of belonging and a shared identity among its constituent members.

The fifth principle [...] every society needs a broadly shared body of values, including human rights, ethical norms which respect human dignity, the equal worth of all, equal opportunity for self development, and equal life chances [...] the final principle concerns racism [...] racism is a subtle and complex phenomenon [...] it can have no place in a decent society (Preface).


it recognises differences within unity, and seeks to advocate a model of citizenship on this basis. Having said that, it is not incompatible with the Crick Report, and by taking the two reports together a richer text on citizenship education is produced. Along with Parekh Report rich insights into diversity and difference, and into the structural basis of inequality, its focussed discussion and recommendations on the criminal justice system (including the police), it is possible to add the Crick Report’s pedagogical and educational designs for teaching civic participation, social and moral responsibility, and political literacy, represented now as a system of norms constituting democratic culture, and based on deliberation, participation, and understanding the procedural basis of a democratic culture (p. 6).

However, when one evaluates the Crick Report (1998) and the Parekh Report (2000a) one finds that they both emphasise equal dignity of all citizens, and equalisation of rights and entitlements, equality of inclusion, an equalisation of the right to participation, and a principle of equal citizenship which is universally accepted, and also that everyone should be recognised for his or her unique identity (Olssen (2004: 9)).

Other sources of criticism of the Crick Report (1998) identify difficulties that have the potential to undermine the development of effective citizenship education in the school curriculum. One may refer to some of these difficulties (after Kerr (2004)): to gain agreement on the conception or definition of citizenship (McLaughlin (2000)); bridge the gap between policy intentions and actual practice; agree on the
curriculum location for citizenship (Frazer (2000)); achieve teacher ownership of the aims and teaching and learning approaches associated with citizenship education (McLaughlin (2000)); give teachers sufficient training and confidence to teach citizenship education through active approaches; gain agreement on how citizenship education should be assessed, reported and inspected; help schools successfully to address the community involvement strand of citizenship education, in partnership with representatives from local communities (Potter (2000); Alexander (2000)). McLaughlin (2000) further criticizes the statutory Order issued in 2000, since some of the recommendations in the Order go beyond the recommendations of the Crick Report. This study contends that while accepting the line of criticism as put forward by McLaughlin (2000), the fact that two years after the publication of the Report, in the Order (Crick (2000b)) certain recommendations were changed, shows a development and a serious commitment from the authorities to actively consider any criticisms, and tried to implement changes before and in preparation for August 2002, when citizenship became a statutory subject in the National Curriculum in the UK.

As part of this discussion, Davies et al. (2003) argue that there are four problems or challenges that are linked to the problems mentioned above:

First, we need to consider who is perceived as the key recipient of citizenship education. We have moved, generally, from elitist to activist conceptions of citizenship. [...] Secondly, the form of citizenship that is provided tends to vary along what can be described as a conceptual/geographical interface. Teachers are not merely altering their geographical focus if they decide to concentrate on European instead of national or global citizenship. [...] Thirdly, [...] Indeed the Crick Report that presaged the National Curriculum in England had very ambitious aims. [...] Finally, we need to consider the relationship between the rise of citizenship education and the perception of a crisis in contemporary society. [...] Currently there do not really seem to be many crisis cards to play and as such it may not easily be imagined what will sustain citizenship education in the long run (pp. 48-9).
The foregoing has been a critical analysis of the reactions and criticisms emanating after the publication of the Crick Report (1998) and the subsequent proposals and changes made in more recent years. To further strengthen the theoretical background of this study, one may go on to analyse some of the most common theories of citizenship.

2.6 Contemporary Theories of Citizenship

Following the process of defining and analysing the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ and the different interpretations according to different schools of thought and academic circles, this study will seek to present a brief outline of some of the most important theories of citizenship proposed by different theorists and education policy makers. The theories are influenced by different political ideologies, and different schools of thought. The analysis is an important exercise to ground the empirical research that will follow in subsequent chapters onto a sound theoretical foundation.

However, before debating the four different theories of citizenship and citizenship education, it is important to restate that there are different conceptions of the concept mentioned above. These all depart from the conception of the compulsory entitlement for citizenship education as reflected in the three interrelated and mutually dependent elements described in the Crick Report (1998: section 2.11) i.e.

- Social and moral responsibility
- Community involvement, and
- 'political literacy' i.e. the acquisition of political knowledge and the skill to become active and make oneself effective in public life through knowledge, skills and values.

In fact, T. McLaughlin (2000) conceptualised a different conception of citizenship and citizenship education in terms of 'minimal' and 'maximal' interpretations of the notions located on a continuum. It is very difficult to 'mould' students into active democratic citizens of one type. McLaughlin argues that it makes more sense to think of citizenship as a continuum and that citizens find themselves in different places on the continuum according to the way they perform in life. According to McLaughlin (2000) citizens find themselves at one point between the two extreme poles of 'minimal' and 'maximal' depending on how one fares according to the following criteria: "the identity that citizenship is seen as conferring upon the individual, the virtues of the citizen that are seen as required, the extent of political involvement on the part of the individual that he/she is thought to follow, and the social prerequisites which are seen as necessary for effective citizenship" (p. 550).

On the 'minimal' side of the continuum, a citizen would be conscious of one's rights and obligations, and one's status in the political community but one is active only when participating in local, national or European elections for the election of representatives. Active citizens who are more on the 'maximal' end of the continuum are actively involved in shaping the way the community functions with a spirit of public responsibility. Voluntary and community activity is important but it is not enough; citizens also need 'political' understanding and action. In other words,
students who aim to become active citizens should be willing, able and equipped with the deliberative, communicative and thinking skills to know what “matters students are invited to address” (Crick Report 1998: section 10) and to understand that “controversial issues should not be avoided but should be tackled systematically by students” (Crick Report 1998: 5). Although one might think that the ‘maximal’ end of the continuum is an ideal, one must keep this end as an end towards which one should aspire.

The following theories all try to promote rights and duties of the individual towards the society where one lives in a democratic context. At the same time, the emphasis of each of the theories is through different means, although they all try to direct society to the same end. The first theory proposes a type of citizenship that promotes ‘national identity’, and tries to find a way of safeguarding the traditional identity of the society in question, and at the same time tries to find different ways of integrating the diverse cultures that are found in nearly every society in the world. Although this theory is the oldest type and has existed for hundreds of years, it has seen some changes. The main criticism of this theory is that in modern liberal democratic multicultural societies, to propose a national identity with the old conceptual foundation means to impose the dominant culture of the majority on that of the minorities. This, as has been pointed out above, goes against the spirit of democracy itself.

The second theory emphasises the role of an individual in a community of shared fate. This theory is relatively new, and proposes that given the multicultural characteristics of most rights, but in modern societies, it would be better to promote
unity in diversity, where different cultures are granted a status and a level of participation in the running of the said society. Here different cultures share equal rights, (not that the first theory is against rights, as will be shown below), promote freedom and tolerance to the extent that the issue of majority, and minority rights is decreased to an extent that it would not be one of the main stumbling blocks for the modern democratic performance of society.

The third theory proposes a type of intercultural citizenship. The term follows from intercultural education that emerges from the term multicultural education. These are umbrella terms, and at times their numerous definitions overlap. The definitions and terms used by scholars depend on the perspectives and prejudices that they bring to their analysis of certain aspects of education and social diversity. In general, intercultural or multicultural education refers to (a) educational measures, which aim at improving the education of immigrant children and other minority groups, or problem groups, or to schools with a socially and culturally diverse intake; or (b) educational measures, which aim at the adoption of a structure and content of education in a multicultural society. In this context, the intercultural processes in education are relevant for the whole society.

The fourth theory proposes a type of citizenship for the 21st century, where every citizen should possess a role with a global outlook, apart from the local and the national responsibilities of every citizen. The main reasons for this proposal are: that whether we like it or not, citizens of the new century are influenced by the global market economy (e.g. the prices of oil, and the changing role of multinationals);
global terrorism (e.g. 9/11); and global conflicts (e.g. the Iraq conflict and the involvement of international forces).

Whatever the choice of these theories that is made by education policy makers, this study (through the above discussion) emphasises the importance of keeping in mind the culture where the selected theory is going to be implemented, depending mainly on the historical events that led that country in question into nationhood. Furthermore, this study proposes that when one is planning education policy with regard to citizenship one should always analyse the past, but then one has also to look at the future, not only at the present. An education policy maker should look for a tentative end, and not a specific end, with an open mind, and the possibility and readiness to change during and after implementation.

2.6.1 Citizenship and National Identity

One of the functions of democracy is to build a national identity and at the same time give citizens the rights and freedom to adapt to change if the need arises. Most democracies in the world help to create and preserve an identity, and citizens in these countries are used to having this identity. In fact this question of identity was a topical issue in 2003, when Malta was voting in a referendum to join the EU, because euro-sceptics argued that by joining a union of different nations one tends to forfeit one’s identity. At the same time, it is difficult to imagine how a society can maintain the same identity due to all the movements of citizens, globalisation, and the way the world is evolving.
Heater (1999) affirms that this movement in favour of nationality and identity goes back two hundred years, when “citizenship was an assertion of freedom from arbitrary power, and usually intimately bound up with patriotism” (p. 95). Heater further states that, “modern citizenship became a coherent package containing rights, duties and a sense of tradition, community and identity” (p. 99). Heater argues that the “emphasis on identity is felt if a country is culturally homogeneous” (p. 103).

White (1996) while making a case in favour of ‘National sentiment in general’, affirms that “[l]ove of one’s nation does not necessarily bring with it a belief in the superiority of one’s nation over other nations. The latter should be condemned on the principle of universal equality of respect” [...] “[b]ut national feeling could be encouraged as one value among many without according it any privileged place” (p. 328). White (1996: 329) goes into detail to explain what makes a nation or what binds a nation together. White mentions, among other elements, a common language, and ethnic origin, political independence and shared beliefs of its members. This could cause problems especially in certain cultures where husbands either do not let their wives vote, or tell them how to vote. White also quotes Miller (1988) who argues that

a belief that each belongs together with the rest; that this association is neither transitory nor merely instrumental but stems from a long history of living together which (it is hoped and expected) will continue into the future; that the community is marked off from other communities by its members’ distinctive characteristics; and that each member recognises a loyalty to the community, expressed in a willingness to sacrifice personal gain to advance its interests. We should add as a final element, that the nation should enjoy some degree of political autonomy (p. 648).

White (1996) argues that “nationality has become, for many of us, closely connected with a sense of our own identity” (p. 330). Individuals are not atomic
entities, continues White (1996: 330-331) but social creatures, shaped by agents of
socialisation like the family, school, local communities, the wider national community
and other influences, and if belonging to a nation is not essential to personal well-
being, it can certainly contribute to that end. Together with our work, values, and
personal interests, we need a national identity to make sense of who we are.

David Miller (1989) (in White 1996) argues that “there is a good reason why
socialists should re-evaluate their traditional attitudes towards the nation. Socialists
favour a redistribution of resources and other benefits from the more to the less
affluent. [...] However, in a liberal democracy, some way has to be found to motivate
a sufficient number of citizens to favour redistribution, especially where it is against
their financial interest to do this”. On this point, White (1996) further stresses that

> the liberal democratic state needs widespread feelings of fraternity to animate it. But
> these can be fostered by building up attachments to the democratic polity itself, for
> instance by citizenship education in schools: the more aware people become of the
> importance of democratic life and government for their own lives and for the lives of
> fellow-citizens, the more committed to their own particular democracy they will become (p. 331).

White (1996) points out that in Denmark and in Malta there are moves to
make Danish and Maltese cultures respectively “more salient in school curricula.
National sentiment is encouraged in these cases not only for civic reasons but also,
and more centrally, to prevent the further erosion of a threatened culture” (p. 333).
Parekh (1994) (in White 1996: 342) in his provocative critique of liberal as well as
conservative defence of national sentiment argues that a weak point in both theories is
their antipathy to outsiders. He argues, indeed, that national identity can be thickened
and enriched by incorporating some elements of immigrant culture. This study tends
to agree with this issue because at present (2005) due to the influx of refugees and
illegal immigrants from North and Central Africa coming to Malta, while on their way to other European countries, Canada or the US, there is a great sense of antipathy among the Maltese population, against these ‘Others’. One of the reasons given for these feelings is the threat to the Maltese culture, as if there is no continuous threat from the international media. The government and other NGOs are trying to introduce activities of African and other cultures, in line with what Parekh stated (apart from increasing tolerance for these ‘Others’). One of the aims of this activity is to increase sentiments that the Maltese culture can be enriched if they incorporate elements of immigrant cultures.

White (1996) comments on how the NCC (1990) document *Education for Citizenship* does not mention national sentiment or national identity. And further on, White (1996) contends that “part of their (schools) role is to help pupils discover who they are, and they risk leaving them unnecessarily confused if they do not equip them to understand their national identity” (p. 339).

Linda Colley (1992) writes that the French and Germans have a greater confidence than the British do about their national identity. How can we (the British) go about “consolidating a deeper sense of citizenship on the home front?” (p. 375). Nick Tate (*TES* 1996) constructed and reiterated a discourse which envisages the school curriculum as a means of fostering a common culture, creating a more cohesive society and maintaining, transmitting and if necessary rebuilding a sense of community and an insistence that pupils should develop a clear sense of national identity. And after the 7th July London bombings, Tate (*TES* September, 30, 2005: 22) points out that “over the years we allowed ourselves to forget that a political
community needs a common sense of belonging and a shared collective identity, not just a token allegiance. We are now paying the price [...] We need to [...] develop a sense of identity with a wider political community at both national and local level” (p. 22).

It came as no surprise that the New Labour government in the UK pledged to “strengthen education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools” (DfEE 1997, p. 35). Similarly, in Malta in the Maltese National Minimum Curriculum document *Creating the Future Together* (pp. 48-50) one finds a section about ‘The Development of Citizens and a Democratic Environment’. Edwards (2001) argues that “debates about national identity and citizenship in the school curriculum emanate from wider anxieties about the future of the nation-states during a period of unprecedented political, economic and social transition” (p. 112). It is not surprising then that in the final report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship and Education for Democracy referred to earlier in the chapter, it was concluded that:

*a main aim for the whole community should be to find or restore a sense of common citizenship, including a national identity that is secure enough to find a place for the plurality of nations, cultures, ethnic identities and religions long found in the United Kingdom. Citizenship education creates common ground between different ethnic and religious identities* (1998, p. 17).


*recent exhortations and endeavours to utilise the school curriculum explicitly for the inculcation of national identity are based on two questionable assumptions. The first is that it is possible for citizens of the United Kingdom, coming as they do from diverse cultures and nations, to align themselves to a common national identity and the second is that it is desirable for them to do so* (p. 118).
And Toynbee (2000) in Edwards (2001) observes that “it is odd how many tin­
eared politicians keep banging the drum of Britishness, utterly oblivious to how
hollow it rings” (p. 118). And Edwards (2001) (further down) goes on to argue that

*it is not surprising that the governments of nation-states are keen to promote essentialist notions of culture, nation and identity. But little will be gained by foisting upon future citizens a homogenised, politically manipulated national identity based on a selective mythologised version of the past. To do so is an affront to their personal autonomy and an infringement of the basic principles of democratic living. Rather, education should help young people acquire the necessary understandings, skills, dispositions and values to construct for themselves identities that will enable them to live their lives meaningfully, purposefully and co-operatively amidst the change and uncertainty they will increasingly encounter (p. 119).*

On the same lines Melissa Williams (2003: 208) questions to what extent liberal democracy accommodates particular identities, and to what extent must they focus, instead, on inculcating a shared identity of democratic citizenship. Williams
casts doubts on the implicit premise that meaningful citizenship and stable constitutional order must be grounded in a shared identity among citizens. Williams challenges the idea that we should understand citizenship in terms of allegiance to certain moral commitments, and the function of democratic education as the inculcation of these commitments.

One understands the commitments of theorists and education policy makers who are in favour of the theory of citizenship for national identity, because it refers to values such as loyalty. At the same time, societies in the world are becoming so multicultural that one cannot think only about one identity. Furthermore, the existence of different identities does not mean there will not be any loyalty. Carens (2000) affirms that “to belong to a political community is to feel that one belongs, to be connected to it through one’s sense of emotional attachments, identification and
loyalty" (p. 116). One should understand what one’s responsibilities are and work to fulfil these responsibilities. And Williams (2003) argues “there must be some substance (such as culture and values) that binds them together in order that individuals should have a reason to identify with this political community rather than the other communities in the world” (p. 210). Furthermore, media and information technology have reduced the globe to one whole, and created, Heater (1999) argues, “a feeling of universal identity and the acceptance of universal morality” (p. 137). Citizens in a country feel cosmopolitan, since they travel the globe and they feel at home in a number of countries. Then there are global issues, such as man’s impact on the environment, that have created a new sense of what Heater (1999) calls “ecological interdependence” [and] “humankind’s stewardship of the planet” (p. 137).

One must emphasise here the importance of citizenship education as a means of promoting unity and cohesion in diversity. Macedo (1995) argues that “liberal citizens do not come into existence naturally” (p. 226). It is important to emphasise the importance and need, as was pointed out above, of having a mass of critical citizens with appropriate moral commitments and affective attachments. This cannot be left to chance. Macedo (1995), Callan (1997) and Feinberg (1998) argue that a just regime must not merely adapt itself to its citizens, but must consciously mould citizens who share a sufficiently cohesive political identity. ‘To mould’, for some, might be questionable ethically. Others might ask if this is one of the aims and roles of education. Stephen Macedo (2003) refers to this point again and explains the real meaning. This study on the same lines affirms that ‘mould’ should be taken in a positive connotation, presenting curricula compiled democratically, and away from any form of indoctrination. Macedo (1995) points out that
The civic health of liberal democracies depends not simply on a clear division of spheres but on a deeper convergence of public and private values: a convergence of individual conscience and the public good powerful enough to ensure the political supremacy of public values and institutions against competing imperatives (p. 33).

We seek to prepare students to think critically about the policies and programs that are debated in our politics. Legitimacy is not enhanced when citizens blindly obey the law or other authorities, or uncritically accept the status quo" (p. 331) [...] otherwise we create "subjects not citizens" (p. 350) (Macedo (2003).

Macedo (1995) further points out, that "a liberal polity must not rest on diversity, but on shared political commitments weighty enough to override competing values" (p. 146). Culture shapes ideas and values, or these might themselves arise from a particular culture. It might also be both ways. Although one acknowledges diversity, one should also look for common ideas and values arising from different cultures that unify society. The notion of living in a democracy itself could be one of the unifying ideas.

Those in favour of citizenship as identity, Williams (2003) states, "might argue that the price is worth paying if inculcating citizen identity yields the promised fruits: a loyal citizenry, ready to make a sacrifice for fellow citizens, and stable democracy" (p. 223). Having said that Williams (2003) argues that "globalisation pulls apart those spheres of human activity whose boundaries have coincided with the boundaries of the nation state. The increasing dynamism of population flows mean that boundaries of political and cultural identity are no longer exclusive and singular" (p. 223). It is with all this debate in mind that this study moves on to analyse the second theory of citizenship, namely that of citizenship as shared fate, which is a recent (the past decade, compared to the national identity theory) theory and one
which for many might make sense given the present circumstances of multiculturalism in the world.

2.6.2 Citizenship as shared fate

One can rightly suggest from the previous analysis that the theory of citizenship as shared fate emerged as a reaction to the theory of citizenship that promotes a national identity. Williams (2003) proposes that because we see "a model of citizenship as shared identity, we should move toward an idea of citizenship as shared fate. [This community] of shared fate can yield a pragmatic conception of citizenship that is freed from the pernicious tendencies that are inherent to notions of citizenship as identity" (p. 209). Modern multicultural societies are made up of people coming from different cultures, who cultivate most of their culture as part of their identity. At the same time, they also forfeit some of that identity, especially when it comes to values that belong to the dominant culture where they are residing and one value system. Or else they adopt separate public and private value systems. Contemporary democratic theory begins from the supposition that meaningful democratic citizenship requires citizens that share a subjective sense of membership in a single political community (Kymlicka & Norman 1995: 301). Indeed with reference to Malta, although it was previously pointed out that Maltese society tends to be rather conservative which may be the result of its history and the fact that it is still a young democracy, society is undoubtedly becoming more multicultural, due to various factors including, legal or illegal immigration. This no doubt has implications on society and its character.
Williams (2003: 229-30) moves on to propose a citizenship of shared fate, because we find ourselves in webs of relationship with other human beings that profoundly shape our lives. There are so many ways, especially through the media, where we are continuously influenced by different norms and values. One acknowledges the fact that this is an automatic process that cannot be halted. It would be detrimental to try to ignore any changes that occur around us and seek to remain loyal to an identity that definitely includes negative elements and which at the same time could be improved in the process of continuous change, whether on an individual or national level. An example from the Maltese context might be that of people working in the tourism industry (Abela 1991: 137-142) who come in contact with people coming from different cultures and who are undoubtedly influenced through observing and interacting with other ways of life, norms and values.

One may also argue that in the concept of promoting a national identity there is nothing that actually leads to a shared cultural identity or heritage and which in reality links human beings in bonds of interdependence and mutual accountability. This is especially the case when referring to the younger generations. It appears that since the younger generations have been born in societies that are relatively prosperous, they cannot understand what the same societies went through to safeguard the rights and prosperity that they possess today. This in itself might be the cause of increased feeling of racism and intolerance by the Maltese society, not only by the younger generation, when they come into contact with illegal immigrants or refugees who come to Malta while on their way to some other country in Europe or North America.
At the same time, one may argue that for a country like Malta, with a history of colonialism and different dominations, when other societies are moving away from the idea of developing a national identity, it is still very early and more challenging and topical (Independence 1964, British forces left the Island in 1979) to develop such a sentiment of strong national identity and real responsibilities of citizens in society. However, when observing the way that Maltese society is rapidly evolving, it appears that we are becoming ‘increasingly European’ (Malta became a full member of the EU in May 2004). Indeed, although one should attempt to safeguard a national identity, which is always automatically changing, one should not put aside the fact that it might be more beneficial to develop as a community of shared fate, after analysing the implications of such a stand. Williams (2003) lists a number of advantages for this new type of citizenship, namely:

it does not presuppose that any particular community is the privileged or exclusive site of citizenship (p. 232).

Although the idea of citizenship of shared fate implicitly affirms a specific set of citizen virtues, it does not require that we inquire into the content of an individual’s identity or the commitment of her conscience to know whether or not she is capable of good citizenship [...] Citizens should see themselves as participants in a project of cooperation that includes others who are different and distant from them (p. 233).

The idea of citizenship as shared fate does not presuppose that all individuals’ and groups’ understandings of their place in a community of shared fate need to be the same as those of all other. [...] Individuals identify with the community in some way, it does not require that they identify in the same way (p. 233).

These considerations of the various advantages, as they have rightfully been called, are appropriate since there is no one relatively prosperous country in Europe or in the world, that is not experiencing an influx of legal (from other developed or European member states) or illegal immigrants (from the Third World Countries),
who seek to be integrated and become part of that same society. Most political leaders consider this movement as a financial problem. However they are urged to consider this also as a far more serious challenge, that of integration, than that of continuous change in society. In fact, *The Times* (of Malta) on Monday, February 21, 2005, confirmed that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was in Malta promoting migrants’ integration. Apart from that, as Williams (2003) suggests “to act as part of a community of shared fate the individual must see herself as situated within, and to a certain extent bound by, networks of relationship with others” (p. 232). And further down, “participating in self-rule requires a capacity for shared deliberation with others, which includes a capacity for reason giving and judgement, [...] skills of critical reason [...] citizenship as shared fate would encourage us to focus on citizens’ performance in public deliberation rather than the content of their religious or other moral beliefs” (p. 234).

All individuals should rightfully learn about their civil and political rights, and that these rights are the product of struggles, ideas, experiments and more struggles (Walzer (1995: 181-9)). They should learn about the structure and process of the institutions of government, about the mechanics of political participation in the form of voting, lobbying, peaceful demonstration, petitions, and grassroots organising. Heater (1999) traces these struggles from antiquity to modern times, with emphasis on the American and French Declarations in the eighteenth-century and the twentieth-century, and the UN International Bill of Rights. Heater further emphasises that “a citizen, however, owes duties as well as enjoying rights; and we must ‘think globally’” (p. 138).
Children should particularly be encouraged to develop a sense of political agency, to understand themselves as contributing to an ongoing story of democratic self-rule with other people of other cultural and religious background, who form part of the society they live in and that they are able to work on projects of cooperation aimed at prompting shared ends. Williams (2003) lists a number of virtues that a citizen must learn, i.e.

*to see oneself as connected in a network of mutual interdependence and mutual impact with other human beings. [...] to take responsibility for the legitimacy of the relationships and for securing the institutional and social conditions in which they can meet [...] a capacity to see oneself as situated within several networks of human interdependence, and to be able to make judgements and choices among them as to when to invest one's energies of citizen participation in one network, and when to shift to a different network (p. 235).*

Here one could mention the role of individual or group community work or projects that give students the feeling of working on one's own, and with others, and for oneself and for others. In this way, one would be integrating the individual with the communitarian feeling, with a feeling of sharing and giving rather than only receiving.

Williams (2003) concludes that it is important "to highlight the connections between local diversity and shared national institutions of self-rule, and self-protection, though not to the exclusion of local, regional, global and trans-national institutions. [...] Ideally children will emerge from this process with common knowledge and realised capacities that will enable them to act together as citizens" (p. 241).
At the same time Williams (2003) points out that other theorists of democratic education in multicultural societies (Feinberg (1995), Tamir (1995) Macedo (1995)), have offered complementary and persuasive accounts of communal education, civic education and private or separate education, and common or public education, but also points out that “a conception of citizenship as shared fate offers something distinctive to our understanding of the project of democratic education in multicultural societies” (p. 237). In line with this position, Williams (2003: 238-9) suggests a focus on local diversity, teaching children to connect their experiences with the idea of how their diverse communities came to have shape, and how children learn what it is to engage in a project of cooperation aimed at promoting shared ends.

2.6.3 Education for intercultural citizenship

Another theory of citizenship is that which emphasises intercultural citizenship. The concept of intercultural and multicultural education for citizenship needs clarification since both concepts are often presented as equivalent and sometimes as aspects of each other. As Mehedi (1999) points out, while referring to Coomans & Batelaan (1993), “the semantic fields of these notions sometimes overlap according to the region of the world or political priorities. This explains why citizenship education is a priority for European countries while democracy education seems to be a priority for developing countries” (p. 2).

Kymlicka (2003) points out that “some authors draw a sharp distinction between ‘multiculturalism’ and ‘interculturalism’, others treat them as synonymous. In the Anglo-American literature, the former term is more common; in the Latin
American literature, the latter seems preferred” (p. 166). In fact, the Lima Declaration on 9th August 2002, states that

democracy and citizenship in Latin America is an aspiration of all; however, it is more a promise than a reality. [...] Our societies have continued excluding certain categories of persons and peoples; and continue being intolerant, unequal and authoritarian. [...] Our societies are fragmented and there are still suffering and domination and exclusion; for these reasons they are more inclined to injustice, confrontation, corruption and poverty (p. 1).

The Declaration by the European Ministers of Education on Intercultural education in the new European context (Council of Europe, Session 21: Athens Nov. 2003), proposes (4) a wish to “preserve the multicultural nature of European society and to avoid a situation in which globalisation exacerbates the processes of exclusion and marginalisation” (p. 1). And further down (5), after acknowledging the disturbing persistence of xenophobic and racist practices, violence and intolerance in European societies, the Declaration proposes (9) “the launch of the project ‘the new intercultural challenge to education: religious diversity and dialogue in Europe’, which will make a major contribution to the shared goals of mutual understanding, respect, and learning to live together” (p. 2). The Declaration requests (11) the Council of Europe,

as an organisation with a wealth of experience in the fields of managing diversity, intercultural education and quality education, to tailor its education programme and working methods in order to implement the following strategies:

re-launch conceptual research on intercultural education with a view to adapting terminology and clearly defining the content and context of intercultural education; [...] 

step up efforts in the area of content of learning methods and teaching aids, in order to provide the member states with examples of educational tools making it possible to take the intercultural dimension into account; [...]

encourage the member states to introduce the intercultural dimension in their education policies, in order to enable appropriate consideration of dialogue between cultures; [...] strengthen intercultural education and management of diversity within its programme of in-service training for education staff and encourage member states to contribute to that programme by organising seminars on topics directly linked to the aims of the present Declaration [...] (15) [...] make the necessary arrangements to take intercultural education into account as an important component of our education policies; this entails appropriate measures at the levels of curricula, school governance and teacher training (pp. 2-4).

Mehedi (1999) argues that the “definitions and terms used by scholars depend on the perspectives and prejudices which they bring to their analysis of certain aspects of education and social diversity (p. 2). In general, Mehedi (1999) continues multicultural/intercultural education refers to

(a) educational measures which aim at improving the education of immigrant children and other ‘minority groups.’ In this instance, the term intercultural/multicultural education is limited to ‘problem groups’ or to schools with a socially or culturally diverse intake. (b) educational measures which aim at the adoption of the structure and content of education in a ‘multicultural society’. In this context, the intercultural processes in education are relevant for the whole society (p. 2). Of the same opinion as the theory of citizenship as shared fate, Mehedi (1999) suggests that an initial approach for dialogue and understanding should favour “the community life of various groups and/or individuals. This presupposes that community life is possible only with an understanding of others, with an open-mindedness and an ability to put oneself in someone else’s place, irrespective of racial, linguistic or religious differences” (p. 2). While Mehedi (1999) refers to the traditional dialectic of minority rights/majority rights, he acknowledges that “a power
imbalance exists between minorities and majorities” (p. 3). There are two forms of intercultural education, “the soft form consists simply in promoting bilingual education of social groups in a position of inferiority, essentially refugees and immigrants. [...] The hard form consists in highlighting the cultural character and stressing the purposes of education, notably the creation and/or preservation of each individual’s identity and the establishment of a society in which diversity is regarded as an asset” (p. 4).

In line with the theory of citizenship as shared fate, where the community is of utmost importance, Kymlicka (2003) points out that ‘citizenship’ refers to “membership in a political community, and hence designates a relationship between the individual and the state. Any conception of citizenship, therefore, will inevitably make assumptions about both poles of this relationship, i.e. the individual and the state” (p. 147). In order to demonstrate the difference between the concepts ‘multicultural’ and ‘intercultural’, Kymlicka (2003) defines the former as referring to “what it means for the constitution, institutions and laws of the state,” and the latter “what sorts of knowledge, beliefs, virtues, habits and dispositions would an intercultural citizen possess” (p. 148). In this view, multiculturalism is referring to the state, and interculturalism is referring to the individual.

The characteristics of a multicultural state depend on the individual nations, and there are many definitions of a multicultural state. What all these definitions have in common is that they all reject the idea of a homogenous nation-state. Kymlicka (2003: 150) states that there is nothing ‘natural’ about the latter kind of nation states, and adds that homogeneity had to be constructed through a range of ‘nation-building’
policies that encouraged and preferred national identity, while suppressing alternative identities. Kymlicka (2003) defines a multicultural state as

*the repudiation of the older idea that the state is a possession of a single national group. Instead, the state must be seen as belonging equally to all citizens. [...] as a consequence, a multicultural state repudiates those nation building policies that assimilate or exclude members of minority or non-dominant groups. [...] a multicultural state acknowledges the historic injustice that was done to minority/non-dominant groups by these older policies of assimilation and exclusion, and manifests a willingness to offer some sort of remedy or rectification for them (p. 150).*

When describing the ‘intercultural citizen’, Kymlicka (2003) states that the intercultural citizen ‘matches’ the model of multicultural state. “It is important that intercultural citizens are able and willing to create and sustain these new forms of a multicultural state” (p. 153), and support the three principles outlined above. In order to be able to accept the three principles one needs a type of intercultural education that promotes intercultural “skills and knowledge”, and also “exhibits a range of more positive personal attitudes towards diversity” (Kymlicka 2003: 157). One of the main reasons for the need of an intercultural citizenship is globalisation. In this sense, one can state that it is unlikely that any group is self-sufficient, let alone any citizen. One acknowledges the influences of transnational economic and political structures, and international forces as well as events relating to the economy, environment and security. For these reasons Kymlicka (2003) points out that “inter-ethnic mixing [...] is intrinsically valuable. It enriches our lives to be able to have positive interactions with the members of other cultures; it expands our horizons, provides new perspectives, and teaches us to reflect more critically on our own inherited traditions” (p. 158). Intercultural education for citizenship emphasises the inculcation of all these points, through specific curricula and provisions that have been pointed out above.
Feinberg (1998) defines multicultural education as a “recognition by school of cultural differences and membership and addresses the children not just as citizens of one nation but in terms of their identity as members of different cultures” (p. 7). And Tamir (1995) points out that “it is especially important that all children learn to respect others who have different life styles, values and traditions and learn to view them – qua members of the political system as equals” (pp. 165-6).

The theory of intercultural citizenship is not without problems for its fulfilment. It is important that organisations like the Council of Europe draw up declarations to promote theories of citizenship that promote values of liberty and equality in a democracy. But, as Kymlicka (2003) affirms, there are tensions in putting this theory into practice. The first problem that Kymlicka lists is which type of interculturalism should a curriculum teach, that is local or cosmopolitan. Some argue that the local type of interculturalism should be taught. Others think that a more cosmopolitan type should be taught. Kymlicka (2003) states that “the goal of building and sustaining a multicultural state requires citizens to privilege local interculturalism over global interculturalism” [...] “we need to show how local interculturalism plays an important role in sustaining the just institutions of a multicultural state, and hence is something we have a duty to attempt, even if we do not find it personally enriching” (p. 161).

Apart from this problem of openness to other peoples, Kymlicka (2003: 161) argues that there are some groups that reject the idea that intercultural exchange leads to personal growth and enrichment. This creates a degree of isolation. This is created
when parents think that they should send their children to private schools that do not promote diversity, or they may opt to teach their children at home. The situation might occur as described by Macedo (1995, 2003), and known as the Mozert incident, where parents insist on their right, even if they do not have the knowledge and expertise, to decide for their children. Although living in a democracy, parents have the right to take decisions regarding the choice of school their children should attend. These same parents should also be made aware of the educational and social implications of their decision, and the future repercussions that their children will have to face (e.g. isolation as against inclusion and less opportunities) if they intend to live in the same society.

The last problem identified by Kymlicka (2003) that might hinder the success of education for intercultural citizenship is “tokenism”. This refers to what kind of knowledge one should be seeking about other peoples and cultures, rather than referring to those things that are known by all the people of the world that identify certain cultures. One should try to get an “understanding [of] the depths of a culture’s beliefs, hopes, loyalties, fears and identities” (p. 163), as was pointed out above in the Lima Declaration. On the other hand one should not devise a type of utopian education that is unattainable because it is too demanding. “What matters”, Kymlicka (2003) asserts, “is that we recognise that we have different deeply-held beliefs, and we agree that the state does not belong to any one religious group” (p. 164). One should not aim for full mutual understanding. One should understand that in a “multicultural state, there are institutions that operate to reduce the need for such mutual understanding” (p. 165). Indeed, one should rather acknowledge the “(partial) opaqueness of cultural differences, and hence the necessity for groups to speak for
and govern themselves, and the necessity of finding ways of co-existing that can be accepted by all” (p. 165).

It is not the aim of this study to solve these tensions, but it is important to note that there is a difference between theorising and actually putting theories into practice. When organisations like the Council of Europe urge member states to promote education for intercultural citizenship, there are innumerable challenges that have to be surmounted before theory is put into practice. One should also be ready to accept partial success when the odds are so great, and when there are so many different theories that have the well-being of every citizen in mind. Tamir (1995) points out that “promoting an illusion of harmony within diversity is as dangerous and oppressive as the old liberal illusion of neutrality. It is only when this illusion is rejected that we are able to consider various models of conflict resolution, appreciate the advantage of the liberal democratic model and fashion the educational tools necessary for its construction and endurance” (p. 165).

2.6.4 Global citizenship and global education

The final part of this analysis refers to the clear acknowledgment of the fact that there is a growing consensus that people have to be prepared to live in an increasingly global world. Power seems to be concentrated in increasingly fewer hands and there is a sense of impotence among citizens of the world. The events of September 11, the subsequent military action in Afghanistan, recent developments in the Middle East and the Iraq Conflict, and health epidemics like SARS and AIDS, all
bring a sense of urgency into this debate. A number of political theorists argue that we need to re-think democracy in the context of our increasingly interdependent world. Theorists like Held (1995 and 1996) propose a model of 'cosmopolitan democracy', challenging the notion that the nation state is the most appropriate locus of democracy. Natural and fundamental questions are reawakened as a result of the above. Questions are asked regarding what the role of the citizen in this scenario is, and what the type of education that citizens should receive should be, in order to be conscious of what is happening in the world and to be prepared to tackle these problems in a mature way.

The proponents of the other three theories discussed in this chapter acknowledge the importance of giving citizens living in a democracy a global dimension to their thinking. Williams (2003) argues that "it is noteworthy that the current wave of interest in inculcating shared identity as a project of civic education should arrive just at the moment when the nation-state to which such identity would attach is itself on the wane" (pp. 224-5). And Kymlicka (2003), while proposing the importance of interculturalism, contends that "this sort of interculturalism is often said to be increasingly necessary due to the factors of globalisation. There is also a much higher level of interdependence today between members of different groups. No group is truly 'self-sufficient' any more" (p. 157). While discussing the effects of globalisation and the shifting boundaries of citizenship, Williams (2003) calls for a conception of citizenship that is adaptable to new circumstances without abandoning the legacy of the democratic tradition. Williams (2003) asks "How can we conceptualise a meaningful citizenship that is not so closely tied to the weakening
boundaries of territorially defined nation-states? I believe this to be one of the most important challenges for political theory in the coming years” (p. 227).


there is a global erosion of national state authority and a declining confidence in hierarchical institutions in general, but at the same time a rise of unconventional citizen interventions. The more educated and younger the population, the truer this is. The spaces in which people think and act in a morally responsible manner are becoming on the one hand, smaller and more intense in personal relationships. On the other hand, they are becoming global and thus difficult to manage. Young people are moved by that which national politics largely rules out; how can global environment destruction be resolved? How can one live and love with the threat of Aids? What does tolerance and social justice mean in the global age? These questions slip through the political agendas of nation states (p. 29).

As democratic laws and processes are extended across borders and the global level of citizenship becomes more significant, young people all over the world need to be educated for local, national, European, and global citizenship and to understand the difference between the rhetoric and reality of democracy and active citizenship.

Throughout the 1990s there was a debate as to whether globalisation was a meaningful concept, with some asserting that the world economy continues as it has done in the past, and that the world has not changed that much. The focus of the debate has now shifted, and the focus is now on the consequences of globalisation rather than whether or not it exists (Giddens (2000b)). For many people, the question
is not how to stop globalisation, but how to influence, if possible control it and shape it.

Different definitions of 'globalisation' outline its key features that show that globalisation is a set of processes (economic, political and cultural) rather than a singular condition. There is no agreement regarding its definition, conceptualisation, dynamics and consequences. The following two definitions provide a tentative introduction:

A social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding (Waters (1995) p. 2)

Globalisation is best understood as a multifaceted or differentiated social phenomena. Understanding its dynamics and consequences therefore demands some knowledge of the differentiated patterns of interconnectedness in each of these domains (Held et al. (2000) pp. 27-8).

Olssen et al. (2004) contend that globalisation is not a new phenomenon but it is becoming more complex and more pervasive with the advent of new technologies and the expansion of new markets. Olssen et al (2004) argue further that:

Contrary to what some would argue, nation states, in our view, are not disappearing. However, internally they are changing in their spheres of control, while externally they are radically unequal in the extent of their international influence. Global governance, we argue, is necessary for global survival, but such governance cannot be established and maintained without the support of strong nation-states. This has been clearly evidenced in the Iraq crisis of 2002-03, where the authority of the United Nations has been challenged both by Iraq, as an undemocratic ‘rogue state’ and also paradoxically, by the USA and Britain, ostensibly democratic states that have been unwilling to concede to the majority view of the United Nations Security Council (p. 1).
And further down Olssen et al (2004) affirm that

*a deep and robust democracy at the national level requires a strong civil society based on norms of trust and active responsible citizenship and that education is central to such a goal. Thus, the strong education state is necessary to sustain democracy at the national level so that strong democratic nation-states can buttress forms of international governance and ensure that globalization becomes a force for global sustainability and survival (pp. 1-2).*

It is on these lines that one should view the role of global education. Osler & Vincent (2002) stress that the aim of global education is “to build a global culture of peace through the promotion of values, attitudes and behaviour which enable the realisation of democracy, development and human rights” (p. 2). They further define global education as

*encompass[ing] the strategies, policies and plans that prepare young people and adults for living together in an interdependent world. It is based on the principles of co-operation, non-violence, respect for human rights and cultural diversity, democracy and tolerance. It is characterised by pedagogical approaches based on human rights and a concern for social justice which encourage critical thinking and responsible participation. Learners are encouraged to make links between, regional and world-wide issues to address inequality (p. 2)*

Demaine (2002) makes a condition for the success of global citizenship education and argues that it “appears workable as long as it recognises and acknowledges the limits of action of individual citizens confined as they are within the legal and political structures of the nation state and, in the case of member states such as the United Kingdom [and Malta], in the European Union” (p. 118). Giroux (1999: p. 102), as quoted in John Huckle (2001: 16), suggests “that globalisation produces a new generation of youth between the borders of a modernist world of certainty and order informed by the culture of the West and its technology of print and a postmodern world of hybridised identities, electronic technologies, local cultural practices, and pluralized public spaces”. Apart from this, one has to keep in mind
poorer countries and what modern technology, such as the global electronic citizenship, actually means. Citizens in poorer countries will find websites offering items they cannot afford. If they are able to read, they will come across ideas that they cannot react to (Demaine (2002: 127)). This would result in a serious shortcoming for global education since it would be a source of frustration, rather than a source of building a global culture of peace and the realisation of democracy. It might also become the driving force behind all the movements of illegal immigrants at the beginning of the 21st century, who are in search of a better life and better future.

Olssen et al (2004), in their more recent theory, emphasise the role of the state and education in relation to citizenship and democracy in a global order. It theorises a new conception of the political interpretation of citizenship moving beyond ‘third-way’ formulations currently practised in the UK based on the relationship between democracy and education. They advance the model of the education state, where “education can give stability to civil society by inculcating norms of trust and responsibility, and without such norms markets cannot prosper and democracy cannot survive” (p. 275).

Olssen et al (2004) also defend the argument for public schooling (in the light of new policies to privatise education in the UK and maybe to a certain extent or indirectly also in Malta) because they claim that “the benefits [of public schooling] are related to issues such as citizenship, tolerance, literacy and the democratic functioning of a community” (p. 240). They contend that “the education nation-state, with strong institutions of democratic citizenship, offers the positive way forward in a world that is increasingly threatened by global conflict, terror and catastrophe” (p.
And further on they also claim that "neo-liberalism delivered obvious policy disasters within nation-states, and bears the prospect of even greater catastrophes as it expands at the global level" (p. 245).

The main argument presented by Olssen et al (2004), presents a case for the construction of a non-bureaucratic welfare state that has radical democratisation as its main aim. Essential to the creation and maintenance of this form of participatory democracy is a strong democratic system of public education that has education for citizenship as its primary aim. Arguably, it is in this way that education can promote a more active role for citizenship. Like Williams (2003), but in different words Olssen et al (2004) propose the "idea of 'multiple overlapping' communities, in that individuals can identify with many different communities – ethnic, religious, political and social - at the same time" (p. 261). Then they move further by proposing "a 'community or communities', so there is a common good for humanity expressing the core of these values and species necessities" (p. 261).

Olssen et al (2004) define democracy as a comprehensive discourse including (1) safety and security, (2) freedom and autonomy, (3) inclusion, (4) fairness and justice, (5) equality of resources and capabilities. "Democracy has to be seen as more than merely participating in society [...] If there is no commitment to substantive principles, democracy may be reduced to mere rule of the majority [...] and ignore its moral significance" (p. 268). All these conditions create the need for a deliberative democracy, as suggested in previous parts of this section, and an educated citizenry.
Although Malta has nearly always assumed a European character, it has cultural characteristics moulded by centuries of colonialism. This experience is likely to have nurtured, in the majority of the Maltese citizens an attitude of subservience, where most of the decisions were left to be taken at the higher echelons of local government, or even from abroad (depending on different colonisers), without any inclination towards the right of participation by citizens in decision-making. Although Malta achieved Independence in 1964 and became a Republic in 1974, it was only in 1979 that the British forces officially left Malta. Therefore, there are still generations of Maltese citizens who find it difficult to define democracy and citizenship in a way that makes them conscious of the right and role of full participation in a representative democracy. Furthermore, it is felt that many Maltese still need to understand that their participation is important throughout any particular government’s term of office and not only in the electoral process every five years, in elections for local councils and those for MEPs, as in 2004, given the substantial turnout for every example mentioned. However, the readiness of the Maltese population to participate should be ongoing and should be encouraged on the national and global levels as well as the more local one.

Maltese citizens should be ready to participate actively when there are issues that affect them at local level. A case in point was the decision of the Maltese government to turn two unused quarries situated near two World Heritage sites (Hagar Qim and Mnajdra) into temporary landfills. The local councils of neighbouring villages staged a strong opposition, commissioning studies and environmental impact assessments. But this should have been a national issue, and all the Maltese should
have participated not only NGOs like Nature Trust and Heritage Malta. Fortunately, in this instance common sense prevailed and the project was shelved.

Osler & Vincent (2002: 20-23) point out that for some years now, one response to the forces of globalisation has been for governments to place greater emphasis on the need for education systems to respond to the need for international competitiveness, rather than to emphasise the need for greater international understanding. However, if citizens are to shape the processes of globalisation and participate in democratic processes at local, national and regional levels, schools will need to prepare learners for global as well as national citizenship. This implies an education rooted in democratic practice, where learners will take on different careers and roles in the future. They will recognise that their own worldview and many of their values are not universally shared; will understand the complexities of differences and similarities; and will develop the political skills to become effective participants in decision-making who are able to resolve conflicts peacefully.

Osler & Vincent (2002: 23-4) ask important questions that should be seen as the foundations of a global education curriculum, such as: what are the challenges that face the global community? What is the background of these issues and problems? What values are important, i.e. what sort of a world order do we want to move towards? The major challenge here would be how to address these questions when taking into consideration the diversity of societies. This implies that we acquire skills of intercultural communication, and intercultural evaluation (Hall (2000) and Parekh (2000b)). Citizenship education is an important vehicle through which global education can be mainstreamed in the curriculum. Osler & Vincent (2002) argue that
“if global citizenship is to be mainstreamed, we need to ensure that its aims and objectives permeate the whole of the school curriculum, both the taught curriculum and the informal curriculum. Global education is unlikely to be successful if it is restricted to lessons entitled Citizenship” (p. 114). Students are not equipped to explore the political dimensions of the issues that concern them. For this reason, Osier and Vincent (2002) contend that

*developing the skills of political literacy is an essential aspect of global education. We have argued that education for a sustainable future requires an understanding not only of environmental, social and economic aspects of sustainability but also of political aspects. Political literacy requires knowledge and understanding of how political systems work, as well as skills to participate and effect change: for example, skills of language, advocacy and mobilisation. In our increasingly interdependent world it is vital that cosmopolitan citizens are equipped to tackle challenges at all levels, including the global (pp. 32-3).*

Although Osler & Vincent (2002) stress that local citizenship, national citizenship, regional citizenship (such as European citizenship) and global citizenship are not necessarily in tension, the “greatest challenge that cosmopolitan citizens face is being able to make connections, to critique and to evaluate within contexts of cultural diversity” (p. 124). In this context, one has to understand ‘political literacy’ not only as “understanding rights, democratic processes and institutions. It also implies the skills to operate in intercultural contexts, and this, inevitably, requires a confidence in one’s own culture and worldview” (p. 125).

Global education in the process of creating global citizens makes citizens more conscious of the differences, and similarities, that are found in society. It equips citizens with the knowledge, skills, understanding and attitudes to live in a diverse
community. At the same time, citizens are prepared to understand what takes place in local, national and global events (political, environmental and others) and debate the repercussions of such events. Then citizens should be able to prepare themselves for the effects of these repercussions, in order to control the effects of globalisation in the modern world.

2.7 Reflections and conclusions

This chapter has documented and critically analysed the more recent events and changes in the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’, at an international level, whilst keeping in mind the context of the Maltese Education System. The publication of the Crick Report (1998) in the UK, coincided with the publication of the Maltese National Minimum Curriculum (1999) document. It included, if not the same, similar aims, objectives and proposals.

One important reflection is that while documenting and critically evaluating the literature published to date, the researcher noted the extent to which changes in the UK influenced and reflected the development of systems of education in the Western World as well as in the Commonwealth countries. This can be easily detected by the number of cross-references by international theorists that refer to the Education System in the UK. Malta is no exception. It was a British colony for 179 years, is a Commonwealth member, has participated in the Council of Europe for a long time, and is now an EU member state.
In a world influenced by globalisation, the Maltese System of Education is also influenced by the economic, political, and cultural influences, even though Malta is an independent nation like other European states. At times one feels that in this global scenario, countries feel compelled to join other blocks (EU) and a European Monetary Union (the euro) not out of their own free will, but because one cannot afford to be left out and marginalized.

These influences create conflicts and dilemmas. Therefore, while on the level of political rhetoric, systems of education propose the enhancing of a national identity, in reality, international research shows that because of the intercultural characteristics of modern societies, it would be more appropriate to promote citizenship as a community of shared fate, intercultural citizenship, or an individual identity within the concept of global citizenship. While countries call themselves democratic, intentionally or unintentionally, they might not promote the important role of participation in democracy. It is true that democracy promotes human rights, especially tolerance, freedom, equality and compassion, amongst others, but at the same time citizens should be taught the knowledge, skills, attitudes and understanding to truly live as democratic citizens. If democracy is not made available to all, then one would be correct to say that there is a difference between political rhetoric and reality.

This chapter also provided a conceptual and theoretical framework, referring to particular issues such as the readiness of citizens to become active citizens living in a democracy. The literature review also sought to focus the research in a global perspective, where one understands that the effectiveness or shortcomings in Malta of
the understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship' are not a unique phenomenon, though they are influenced by the local economic, political and cultural strands. The conceptual and theoretical framework will be further referred to in Chapter 5 Analysis, Synthesis and Discussion to identify the challenges and recommendations for the conclusions of the study.
3.0 Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Aims and Objectives of the Research

The research proposes to study the extent to which students at the Junior College of Malta are prepared to participate fully as democratic citizens. The study aims at exploring what understanding the students have of their own identity as democratic citizens, and their role as active citizens in society. Most of these students, particularly those represented in this study, born after March 1979, when the last British forces left the Maltese Islands. This historical fact seems to have reduced rather than raised the pride and patriotism that every citizen may be expected to feel for one’s own country, especially now that Malta is a full member of the European Union after May 2004.

The issue mentioned above, and the fact that now Maltese citizens still have to get accustomed to the idea of being European citizens with all that it entails, makes one feel the need to explore whether the Maltese students at the Junior College are equipped with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and understanding that help them in this new role as European democratic citizens.

For a long time, education has been considered as the best means to prepare students for life on the local, national and global level. Giddens (1998) sees education as “a continuing part of life” (p. 128). And Wain (2004) refers to the Lifelong Education Movement, and critiques the concept of ‘the Learning Society’ and ‘the Learning Democracy’. Therefore, this research aims, first of all to support the
development of a consciousness about the change in values and culture that has already started to take place in the mentality of young Maltese students. Furthermore, the research aims to identify ways and means that might help youngsters through the above-mentioned change.

One of the ways that this can be achieved is through the teaching of Systems of Knowledge. This is a compulsory subject for all post-secondary students in Malta, who intend to continue with tertiary education. This study focuses on the part of the syllabus dealing with the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship'. Outlined in a number of presentations during a Council of Europe seminar entitled *Citizenship: an educational challenge*, held in Malta between 14 – 18 March 2005, was the fact that citizenship in Malta is taught across the curriculum. However, as yet the researcher does not feel that there is a national strategy that adequately addresses this issue. It seems that although some teachers and heads of schools, are doing their best and are guided by the Education Officer in Malta for Democracy and Values, local initiatives in this area are rather piecemeal, independent and exploratory. This continues to emphasise the importance of the role of Systems of Knowledge as a subject at post-secondary level, which partly tries to drive home the knowledge, skills, understanding and attitudes that students need to live as democratic citizens in the 21st century. The conclusions and recommendations of this research will be passed on to the Syllabus Panel for Systems of Knowledge which has for a long time been trying to revise the 1997 syllabus to update it in keeping with contemporary developments, and to improve its effectiveness for the main stakeholders, lecturers and students alike.
With all this in mind, and following the outcome of the study, the researcher proposes to forward the conclusions and recommendations to the authorities, including the Minister of Education, and the representative of the Opposition responsible for Education, and to the Education Division, to serve as feedback and evaluation for any necessary further changes that might result from the study, being conducive about the Maltese National Minimum Curriculum.

As stated earlier, the hypothesis of this study proposes to explore whether students are able to transform content (about the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship') discussed and acquired during lectures into knowledge. This study aims to explore if students possess the skills that help them make this leap. This in itself raises certain concerns because students might be studying only for examination purposes and do not fully absorb that what they learn today is to go beyond the immediate importance of theory but towards further pragmatic considerations which can also make a real difference to people's lives and society in general.

In the U.K. citizenship education became a statutory subject in September 2002. One of the reasons for this was the preoccupation felt by politicians and educators alike about the laissez-faire attitude of young people with regard to politics in general, and their vision of themselves as democratic citizens. Bernard Crick (2000a) refers to

*how voting turnout among the young is only one measure of this. To my mind, even more significant, is the low level of participation of young people in voluntary bodies. Yes, splendid examples to the contrary can be found, and they are heartening reminders of what is possible. But in number they disappoint grievously. Change will not come of itself (p. 78).*
In Malta, although a high turnout is noted in general elections, one can still argue that when it comes to everyday life situations, young Maltese citizens react in much the same way as other young people in the U. K. or even in Europe. They tend to focus more on themselves, rather than the well-being of Maltese society as a whole. Giddens (1998) contends, “civic decline is real and visible in many sectors of contemporary societies, not just an invention of conservative politicians. It is seen in the weakening sense of solidarity in some local communities and urban neighbourhoods, high levels of crime, and the break-up of marriages and families” (p. 78). In fact, one might argue, that there is a strong preoccupation about the erosion of values in the Maltese society. This preoccupation does not only emerge from the Church (Roman Catholic Church) in Malta but also from the political class and the government. The concern over the erosion of values is similar to that being experienced in other EU societies, including the UK. This erosion of values is seen to create a sense of insecurity and lack of discipline. It may also lead to an erroneous and dangerous definition of liberty i.e. where one thinks that one can do what one likes.

Giddens (1998) argues that “the appeal of democracy [...] comes] from the deeper forces that are reshaping the global society, including the demand for individual autonomy and the emergence of a more reflexive citizenry.” At the same time one has to be very careful not to produce intelligent, informed sceptics that might undermine rather than promote the well-being of society. Furthermore, according to Giddens, democratisation is outflanking democracy, and the imbalance must be addressed” (p. 71). Referring to the Maltese education system, the researcher is of the opinion that this is still inclined to emphasise content and the teaching of books rather
than skills, as well as placing greater emphasis on examinations with all the stress that this entails. Maltese citizens, who are also global citizens, may therefore grow to lack the necessary skills that make them more aware and understand that democracy is a system that needs to be nurtured. Democracy may indeed be sacrificed as the process of democratisation infiltrates Maltese society if this same society is not aware of these developments. And on the same line of argument, White (2003) in ‘Liberalism and Communitarianism’ affirms, “autonomy depends on the existence of options. Education cannot supply these, but it can make students aware of them. Its job is partly to open up horizons on different conceptions of how one should live – ways of life, forms of relationship, vocational and nonvocational activities” (p. 97). This study seeks to evaluate whether the Maltese system of education is fulfilling this important role in the life of the young generations.

With all these reflections in the background, and as a result of this study, the researcher seeks to further understand and to answer the following key research questions and therefore, also to contribute to the ongoing debate and developments particularly locally, regarding:

1. What understanding do the students at the Junior College have of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’? This includes the understanding of the above-mentioned concepts that they may already possess through their socialisation process, that is the influences of the family and the media and from their cross-curricular primary and secondary school lessons on the one hand, and the content they are taught as part of the Systems of Knowledge syllabus on the other. The student
intake at the Junior College is from all over. They come from state, Church (Roman Catholic), and private secondary schools.

2. Do the students have an idea of what it means to be a citizen of Malta and a European citizen? (Malta has been a full member of the EU since May 2004). The study will explore the way students look at their role as Maltese citizens, with an emphasis on what they have to offer to society rather than what they can get out of society. Maltese society is a ‘welfare state’ or a ‘welfare society’ and young people grow up in a society that takes care of its citizens from the cradle to the grave. Maybe their laissez-faire attitude is the demonstration of an ‘enlightened self-interest’ attitude that might be the direct outcome of the fact that they are living in a welfare state, or welfare society. With regard to the idea of European citizenship, one tends to affirm that it might still be premature to draw hard and fast conclusions, given the fact that EU membership was so politicised in Malta. This is in contrast with most of the other nine new member states. Much energy and resources were spent on polarising the nation rather than informing citizens of their new roles and responsibilities.

3. What is the students’ understanding of the rights and duties of citizens in a democracy? It might be the case that students (maybe like adults) emphasise more the importance of their rights rather than their duties, to further confirm what has been argued in question 2 above.
4. Do students possess an understanding of the major values promoted by democracy, such as equality, liberty (types of freedom), participation, tolerance, loyalty and patriotism? Here one might look at different types of equality, that between sexes, and that between people coming from different cultures, given that most societies in the world are becoming more multicultural. Alongside this, one should refer to the level of tolerance students demonstrate when interacting with students who are not Maltese or European. One might also think about the different freedoms on the Maltese level and the European level and therefore, the problems of loyalty, to which level, and if this affects the students' notion of patriotism. Last, but not least, one has to explore the need for every citizen to feel responsible and active, and to participate on the local, national, European and even global level, to safeguard and nurture democracy. Here one should keep in mind the discussion in Chapter 2 about the individual and common good.

5. Is education a good medium for preparing the young citizens, or are there other more appropriate media? As has been emphasised above, education is a major formative medium. But one should not put aside the importance of other agents of socialisation such as the family, and the influences of the media, given that we are living in an age of information technology. What concerns the researcher is the question regarding whether students acquire or not the skills they need to deal with the revolution of information technology, to be able to learn on their own, and to learn what should be learned.
6. If it is found through the research, that Systems of Knowledge is not sufficiently effective in reaching its aims and objectives, what should be changed? If there is a need for change, should change emphasise content or the acquisition of skills and understanding? If Systems of Knowledge is not sufficiently effective, then one might propose a change with more emphasis on updated content that satisfies the present day needs, and more time for the acquisition of skills and the preparation for participation for active citizenship.

After expanding the research aims and objectives and the clarification of the research questions, this study will move to the next important part of this chapter, that focuses on the description of the research design in order to explain the choice of this design and why is it appropriate for its particular purpose.

3.2 Research Design

As has been stated above, the study is an investigation set within the distinct context of the Junior College at a very specific point in time, i.e. the past years (2002-2005) in which the 1997 syllabus for Systems of Knowledge is being undertaken. This study will investigate the effectiveness and shortcomings of the students’ understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ at a Junior College. Therefore, this study should not be taken a priori, as a generic analysis of the effectiveness and shortcomings of the Systems of Knowledge syllabus, referring to
the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ in all post-secondary schools in Malta. This is categorically stated because it would be incorrect to extrapolate the findings of this study to other schools without taking due consideration of the different circumstances and environment of those schools.

At the same time, the researcher does not exclude the possibility that this research might lead to findings that can be used on a national level, especially for further research, not only about the subject itself, but perhaps also on the role of the concept of citizenship in general. Sikes (2004) points out that

research comes into the lives of people who are the focus in various ways, taking up their time, involving them in activities they wouldn’t otherwise have been involved in, providing researchers with privileged knowledge about them – and therefore, potentially, power over them. If the research is simply to confirm a personal theory, satisfy a curiosity or help the researcher get a qualification and there are no benefits for anyone else, then maybe it is unethical to proceed (p. 25).

It is for the sake of correctness, and for a more holistic approach that this study aims to analyse the relevance and appropriateness of both positivist and interpretative paradigms to perform the research. By holistic approach, the researcher means, quoting Gray (2004), that

a single case is examined, and at a holistic level, for example, an entire programme, not individual elements within it. A single case study should be chosen when it can play a significant role in testing a hypothesis or theory. [...] There may be other times when a single case study is merely the precursor to further studies and may perhaps be a pilot for a later multiple study (p. 132).

At this point in time, one might refer to further studies and one might recommend similar research, undertaking the same research design and methodology with students who would have then learned about the concepts of ‘democracy’ and
‘citizenship’ but, as part of the new syllabus for Systems of Knowledge, if and when it is implemented. Freebody (2003) points out that “educational researchers need to re-render those processes that have shaped them as cultural members, as people: the spoken and written texts that have helped give form to their own consciousness, that have structured, interrupted and re-structured their own thoughts, disciplined their own feelings and enlivened their own commitments, such that these processes themselves can become the object of their analyses” (p. 217-8).

Morrison (2002) quotes Bassey (1999) where the latter defines ‘paradigm’ as

*a network of coherent ideas about the nature of the world and the function of researchers which, adhered to by a group of researchers, conditions the patterns of their thinking and underpins their research actions* (p. 42), in Morrison (2002: 12).

Sikes (2004) following Guba (1990: 17) and Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 19) defines ‘paradigm’ as “a basic belief that guides action” (p. 19). It is through this “network of coherent ideas about the nature of the world” and through this “basic belief” that the researcher will undertake this study. Furthermore, it investigates the possibility of undertaking both positivist and interpretivist paradigms in triangulation to enable a better understanding of the whole issue being researched. Although Morrison (2002) contends that combining approaches in triangulation creates an opportunity for a “rich diversity of perspectives” (p. 21), one has to be conscious of potential dangers before embarking on such a study. Morrison (2002) lists some notes of caution, such as:

(a) “that there might be a tendency for tutors of research methods courses to encourage their students to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of qualitative and quantitative ‘methods’ as if in isolation from the epistemological roots in which they are located”;
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(b) "there may still be a tendency to confuse methods and methodology, a confusion that may be magnified when mixing-and-matching methods in a non-reflective 'cook book' style";

(c) "not all researchers exhibit strong epistemological 'leanings' towards any one philosophical tradition"; and finally,

(d) "the tendency of some researchers to engage in rationalisations about their epistemological positions 'after the event' (pp. 21-2).

Similarly, Sikes (2004) stresses that "if people do mix-and-match and employ triangulation by using more than one procedure (Cohen et al., 2000)," then Sikes believes that "it is important for all researchers to spend some time thinking about how they are paradigmatically and philosophically positioned – and the fundamental assumptions they hold – might influence their research related thinking and practice" (p. 19).

The positivist paradigm is also known as the scientific research paradigm and is usually concerned with objectivity, prediction, replicability and discovery of generalisations (Ernest 1994). Morrison (2002) points out that, amongst other things, a strength of "positivist approaches to educational research is its adherence to the scientific method. [...] People are the objects of educational research, notwithstanding their uniqueness as one from another [...] scientific knowledge is obtained through the collection of verified 'facts' [...] based upon empirically established regularities. [...] Positivists [...]quoting Bryman (1988: 15)] 'purge' themselves of values which may impair their objectivity and undermine the validity of the research" (p. 15).
On the other hand, the interpretative research paradigm is referred to as the naturalistic, constructivist approach concerned with human understanding of events within a given context. Morrison (2002) points out that "recognising the inter-subjectivity of educational research may be viewed as 'obviously' the most appropriate way of conducting research on/with or for human beings [...] For interpretavists, reality is not 'out there' as an amalgam of external phenomena waiting to be uncovered as 'facts', but a construct in which people understand reality in different ways" (p. 18). The positivist paradigm is concerned with the discovery of general laws whereas the interpretative paradigm is more interested in discussing the uniqueness of a given situation. Gray (2004) affirms that "while the natural sciences are looking for consistencies in the data in order to deduce 'laws' (nomothetic), the social sciences often deal with the actions of the individual (ideographic)" (p. 20).

A major area of concern for the researcher was the appropriate research design for the study. The second area of concern was the actual content, structure and sequence of the questions to be asked during the interviews. A research design is, according to Macmillan and Schumacher (1997), "the plan and structure of the investigation used to obtain evidence to answer research questions" (p. 33). And Yin (1994) defines research design as the "logic that links the data to be collected (and the conclusions to be drawn) to the initial questions of a study" (p. 18).

Qualitative research is distinguished by its unique scope and focus. It provides a wealth of information about a relatively small sample, in this case eight interviews, which provide a more intimate picture of the individual and issue being
studied. Opie (2004) stresses that it is qualitative research, which “gives any research its richness and values” (p. 111). Patton (1992) affirms, “the qualitative approach provides a more holistic picture of the phenomena being studied” (pp. 187-8). In this qualitative study, that is the semi-structured interviews, the researcher sought to explore the understanding of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ of eight lecturers and their perception of the students’ understanding of the concepts mentioned above. At the same time the researcher aimed at exploring “the meaning of that experience for them [the lecturers]” as Merriam (1998) puts it, “which is one of the prime advantages of the qualitative research” (p. 5-6).

In drafting the questions for the semi-structured interviews, the researcher’s first task was to come up with a clear identification of the categories of data to be studied. These, as already stated above, were based on an earlier study conducted by the researcher. This consisting of a content analysis of twenty examination scripts by Junior College students carried out in October 2003. In this earlier study through content analysis the researcher was able to identify categories such as ‘defining democracy’, ‘democracy in practice’, ‘equality in participation’, ‘majority and minority rule’, ‘freedom of expression’, ‘criticism of democracy’, ‘women in politics’ and ‘democracy and pluralism’ amongst others. These categories were later used in the qualitative research to draft the questions for the semi-structured interviews.

Wragg (2002) points out that “a semi-structured interview schedule tends to be the one most favoured by educational researchers as it allows respondents to express themselves at length, but offers enough shape to prevent aimless rambling” (p. 149). Gray (2004) adds on, “the semi-structured interview allows for probing of views and
opinions where it is desirable for respondents to expand on their answers. This is vital when a phenomenological approach is being taken where the objective is to explore subjective meanings that respondents ascribe to concepts or events. Such probing may also allow for the diversion of the interview into new pathways which, while not originally considered as part of the interview, help towards meeting the research objectives” (p. 217).

This was supported by the theoretical framework reflected in the debate regarding democracy and citizenship, presented earlier in Chapter 2. This provided a sound background to the interview questions and data analysis. Both Yin (1994: 28) and Merriam (1998: 45) argue that every study has either an explicit or an implicit theoretical framework that guides the design of the study. By stating the study’s propositions, the researcher makes the focus explicit and identifies what Miles and Huberman (1994) call the researcher’s “conceptual framework” (p. 16). The conceptual framework for this study was developed from the exploration of the ongoing debate of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ in education. The main emphasis is on the developments during the last decade on the different ways of defining democracy, and the changing role of citizenship education as the main proponent and at the same time, the main safeguard of democracy in society.

The final component of the research design was the piloting of the interview schedule with one respondent. The researcher was also guided by the comments from the research methodology tutor at the School of Education University of Leicester. This exercise resulted in the researcher changing the wording of some questions to further subscribe to the guidelines mentioned above. The researcher also used the
critical friend approach where one respondent was given the schedule and was asked to comment about the questions. One example of the piloting process and the eventual change is in the following question, which was changed from: "what do you think is the Maltese society's understanding of racism (including the Junior College students)?" to 'How does the Maltese society respond to racism?'

The students are the focus of this educational research, notwithstanding their individual uniqueness. Educational phenomena that are of direct relevance to the study will be observed through experience that the researcher has acquired while lecturing at the Junior College. Positivists may predict, and this research in fact proposes to predict from the positivist point of view that given similar circumstances and significant associations between variables, the same situation exists in the other schools in Malta, with regard to the teaching of the concept of democracy and citizenship, and the lack of involvement that the students may currently feel in their democratic community.

Key features in the interpretative research that will be referred to in this research are the immersion of the researcher in the subject, especially during lectures and contact hours, where students come to the researcher’s office and discuss issues relating to the two concepts in question. The researcher, (as argued by Mayall (2000)) should feel that he or she is working ‘with’ and ‘for’ rather than ‘on’ the students. The interpretative paradigm does not emphasise one theory or tie the researcher to any modification, according to the research findings. The researcher also uses words rather than numbers. In this study the content analysis of the mock examination papers is carried out in order to further understand the extent to which students
consider themselves to be part of the democratic community, and to elicit categories that will be used to compile the questionnaire and the semi-structured interview schedule.

Clearly, therefore, the phenomenological stance taken from the onset will have a strong influence in the overall design of the study. Opting for one paradigm would result in a limited view of the situation. It is true that (as some researchers argue) the study would in this case be more ‘objective’, but it would remove the “sensations, reflections or intuitions” from the formula (Easterby-Smith et al. 2002, p. 28). Alternatively, using only the positivist paradigm would allow for a wider sample to be studied. One would then be in a position to generate greater quantities of data and perhaps making it easier to generalise the results. However, in this case, the study would lose out on the depth of understanding “the real meaning of the situation” (ibid. p. 39). Sikes (2004) contends that

if people do mix and match and employ triangulation by using more than one procedure (Cohen et al. 2000), I believe that they are paradigmatically and philosophically positioned and for them to be aware of how their positioning – and the fundamental assumptions they hold – might influence their research related thinking and practice. This is about being a reflexive and reflective and, therefore, a rigorous researcher who is able to present their findings and interpretations in the confidence that they have thought about, acknowledged and been honest and explicit about their stance and the influence it has had upon their work [...since] assumptions about ontology, epistemology and the nature of human relations are intimately bound up with assumptions that impact upon educational researchers’ decisions about methodology and procedures (p. 19).

For the content analysis, the researcher selected twenty scripts, from one hundred and twenty students taught by the researcher and other members of the academic staff prior to the mock examination. These twenty came from three
different classes who studied the content of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’. In order to be as objective as possible, twenty scripts were to be chosen out of 120 students who answered question A2 (Ref. Appendix 2 p. 249) about democracy. From each class scripts were divided into male and female students, and the researcher chose the first four males and three females from one class, three males and four females from the second class, and three males and three females from the third and last class.

For the questionnaire, undertaken in Spring 2004, based on the findings of the first part of the research, described above the researcher then proposed to choose randomly, five hundred respondents to whom to administer a questionnaire out of a student population of about one thousand two hundred. Following this the researcher proposed to triangulate the research by interviewing all eight lecturers lecturing in Systems of Knowledge, through a semi-structured interview after making available the research findings to them to further strengthen the reliability, and validity of the research findings. Which process would then lead to recommendations and conclusions? This is an example of what Denzin (1984) refers to as “methodological triangulation” where one approach to research is followed by another in order to increase the validity, reliability and confidence in the interpretation. Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) argue that there is no reason why data collected by one method should not be supplemented by data obtained by another means.
3.3 Validity and ethical issues

This study emphasises the importance attributed to the difference between the definition of a concept, and the understanding of the same concept, in this case by students at post-secondary level, who are mainly 16 to 18 years old, and given the size of Malta, representing the different areas of the island. The education background of the students is basically the same because although the students would have attended government, Church or private schools, all schools in Malta have to follow the same National Minimum Curriculum (1999) set by the Education Division. While all government schools would use the same means (i.e. books and most of the resources that are provided free for government school students throughout the primary and most of the secondary level), Church and private schools might opt for different means and approach or method of using those means, but at the end they are all obliged to guide their students towards the same end.

Furthermore, the study emphasises the relevance and appropriateness of both positivist and interpretative approaches. An important consideration is the aim of placing this research in an ethical framework. It is very important that when people are observed, asked for opinions or are involved as respondents in a questionnaire, or as interviewees, they should be informed beforehand about this and they should also be convinced that their rights are respected. All respondents should participate out of their own free will, as should be the case in any democracy, what is known as informed consent.

First and foremost, one must consider the means and ends of the research. The respondents should be randomly chosen, and informed. In this study this is an even
more serious issue (not only for ethical reasons only) given the fact that the researcher lectures at the same college, and with the same students and lecturers who are taking part as respondents and interviewees respectively in the research. They should be always seen as participating in a "moral sphere", where according to Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) "judgments are held about what is right and wrong, good or bad, appropriate and inappropriate, justifiable and non-justifiable" (p. 44).

Bush (2002) points out that "although research methods should be determined largely by the aims and context of the research, they should also have regard to quality criteria. [...] This notion of scrutiny is important: can the researcher defend and explain decisions about methodology to peers, professionals and examiners? [...] Validity, reliability and triangulation are all important and complex terms whose meaning and salience varies according to the stance of the researcher" (p. 59).

Scaife (2004) argues that "reliability is an important consideration, in that it may be useful as an indicator of 'goodness' or quality in the research" (p. 65). Bush (2002) contends, "despite this claim, there is a wide support for the view that reliability relates to the probability that repeating a research procedure or method would produce identical or similar results" (p. 60).

Validity, according to Bush (2002) "is used to judge whether the research accurately describes the phenomenon which it is intended to describe. The research design, the methodology and the conclusions of the research all need to have regard to the validity of the process" (p. 65). Following this one has to define triangulation. Bush (2002) points out that "triangulation means comparing many sources of
evidence in order to determine the accuracy of information or phenomena. It is essentially a means of cross-checking data to establish its validity [...] using several methods to explore the same issue (methodological triangulation) and asking the same questions of many different participants (respondent triangulation)” (p. 68). Although as was pointed out previously, there are many different opinions about the way one should define reliability and validity, and also with which research paradigm they should be used, Easterby-Smith et al. (1994: 90) apply both reliability and validity to both research traditions.

Bush (2002) concludes his chapter ‘Authenticity – reliability, validity and triangulation’ by affirming, “authenticity may be an elusive target but it is an important objective for educational management researchers. While there is no perfect truth, a focus on reliability, validity and triangulation should contribute to an acceptable level of authenticity sufficient to satisfy both researcher and reader that the study is meaningful and worthwhile” (p 71).

Of same importance are ethical issues that a researcher has to keep in mind while implementing the research. Busher (2002) concisely defines the underlying principles in educational research “as a commitment to honesty (Sammons, 1989) and an avoidance of plagiarism (Berger and Patcher, 1988). Pring (2000: 143) identifies them as respect for the dignity and privacy of those people who are the subjects of research; and the pursuit of truth” (p. 73).

This study starts, as was pointed out previously, with the content analysis of twenty scripts of the mock examination in Systems of Knowledge at the Junior
College. Robson (1994) points out the value of using interviews and observations for triangulation in a study primarily based on content analysis of documents that:

*the documents have been written for some purpose other than for the research [mock examination in Systems of Knowledge], and it is difficult or impossible to allow for the biases or distortions that this introduces [...There is a] need for triangulation with other accounts [and] data sources to address this problem (p. 243)*.

With respect to the quantitative research, the support of colleagues was needed to undertake the questionnaires in the shortest time possible, and in so doing, the latter were participating in the research. The same colleagues were formally asked to participate in the interviews afterwards. They were asked questions about the data analysed and which they had helped to collect. In so doing, the data was not analysed only by the researcher but also the opinions of other colleagues were also sought in order to validate and continue to strengthen the reliability of the research.

Busher (2002) points out that “in the end researchers have to take decisions about how to carry out research that makes the process as ethical as possible within the frameworks of the project, including budgets of time and finance which they have available to them” (p. 86). With regard to the qualitative research, the evidence or data collected comes from identifiable respondents. Therefore, if the study were to be published, one has to be careful not to give any identification that could connect the data to the respondent. With respect to content analysis, no names were mentioned, and where possible and for the further sake of objectivity, students were chosen from classes that were not taught by the researcher himself, although at the time of the analysis they were being taught another module by the researcher. For clarity, it is
stated that Module One is taught in the first year, and the mock examination is taken at the end of the second year.

With regard to the quantitative research, it is assumed that issues of ethics, do not feature much in this method. Yet, precisely because readers give more external validity upon quantitative research, and they might lack statistical analysis skills, then the researcher may need to be more careful and ethically conscious about quantitative research. Jowell (1982) argues that “ethical codes are frequently written by professionals for professionals. To overstate only slightly, they advocate caution not so much to promote the public, more because overstepping the norms would queer the pitch for the other professionals” (p. 168). For this purpose students were asked in class whether they objected to participating in this research before they were involved in any way in the research. Those who opted not to participate had their choice respected and other students were included in the sample. If, when presented by the questionnaire in the lecture room, any students felt that they would not like to participate, for complete anonymity, they were asked to leave the questionnaire blank.

The third study, i.e. the semi-structured interviews, was administered because as Merriam (1998: 199-201) argues, the reliability and validity of the results of any research study are contingent upon the way data is collected, analysed, interpreted and presented. The choice of a semi-structured interview that is focussed on the particular theme was made firstly, because questions were formed and based on categories gathered in the previous study that was carried out with students. Secondly, as Bell (1987) advises, “if you are a first time interviewer, you may find it easier to use a structured format” (p. 93). And further, Bell (1987) contends, “the advantage of a
focussed interview is that a framework is established beforehand and so analysis is greatly simplified. This is important for any research, but particularly so for limited time studies" (p. 94) as is the case of this study.

Apart from all this, the researcher met the Principal of the college and gave details of the research, and requested approval for the research to be undertaken. In so doing, the researcher asked for official consent to carry out the research at the College and also accepted the responsibility that the data collected would not be used in an unethical manner. It was also agreed that whatever results from the research will be treated with the utmost confidentiality.

3.4 Methodology

This part of the study aims first to describe the methods of investigation used in the research. It also seeks to justify these methods of investigation by referring to the strengths and limitations of each method through the research literature. The second objective of this section is to show the results obtained through each method in terms of data. Finally, the researcher will explain how the data will be analysed in Chapter 5.

This study, as already presented, comprises three stages of research carried out over two years, between 2003 and 2005. While in continuous contact with the research methods tutors at the School of Education, University of Leicester, the researcher selected three methods of investigation to undertake the proposed research. The researcher decided to choose content analysis, a qualitative method for the first
part. Then for the second part a quantitative method i.e. a questionnaire, was selected as the most appropriate tool and the last method selected is a qualitative method, i.e. semi-structured interviews with colleagues/lecturers of Systems of Knowledge who work at the same college. This choice of a ‘mix and match’ approach was made in line with (as discussed above) recent trends in educational research methods, to enhance the validity, reliability and generalizability by the method of triangulation. The sections that follow will describe in detail the methodology used for this study and will also seek to justify this choice of research methods.

3.4.1 The Methods of Investigation: description, strengths and limitations

The primary method of investigation undertaken is content analysis. The first aim of this investigation is to conduct a pilot study to investigate, before actually coming up with a hypothesis whether what the researcher had been observing and also discussing with colleagues, about the effectiveness and shortcomings of the 1997 syllabus for Systems of Knowledge is likely to be true or false. In other words, the researcher sought to investigate whether there is sufficient evidence that shows the need for further study of students’ understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’.

According to McNeill (1985) “a pilot study should give a feel for what is being studied; or as evidence in itself, as the topic for research” (p. 112). Through content analysis the material is considered systematically. The method supports the analysis of the contents of scripts or other non-statistical material in such a way that it is possible to make statistical comparisons between them later on after undertaking
the quantitative research. It was with this aim in mind that the researcher chose content analysis as a research method. In fact, Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) point out that “content analysis is a technique that enables researchers to study human behaviour in an indirect way” (p. 469). Wilkinson (2000) adds further by saying that content analysis is a useful tool that “involves the examination or analysis of the contents of a communication [...] to explore the writer’s own ideas, beliefs and attitudes relating to the subject matter” (p. 53).

Before undertaking this study the researcher also fully explored the purpose of this research. Brendan Duffy (1993) in Bell (1993) proposes the following questions as guidelines:

*what exactly do you need to find out? Why are you consulting documents? Are you likely to find the information you need from [...] students’ assignments [or scripts]?* (p. 73).

The researcher sought to answer these questions that were intended as guidelines for the actual study undertaken. With respect to the aim and scope, this study tries to explore what the researcher and colleagues had been feeling for a number of years through observation of different groups of students when answering questions in assignments, tests, mock examinations, and seminars about ‘democracy’. With respect to the consultation of documents, this study focussed on the analysis of examination scripts. After students’ experience in primary and secondary school, following lessons in Civic Education and Personal and Social Development, (where the curriculum makes reference to the concepts under study) and a further two years following Systems of Knowledge, where a small part of the first module is about the concept of ‘democracy’, one may be justified in expecting that students would have formulated some understanding of these concepts. It was also believed that under
examination conditions, students would actually be less hindered to write about these concepts, than they might be in an interview. It is felt that the use of scripts provided further anonymity and therefore, objectivity from the students’ side.

Burgess (1991) argues that a researcher should raise questions about “authenticity, distortion and deception, availability and sampling and also presentation” (p. 137). By choosing actual examination scripts the researcher aimed at fulfilling most of these conditions, especially as the students were supervised by the academic staff or by competent staff vetted by the University of Malta. Regarding the information that one hopes would be gained, one can argue that examination scripts are first hand information of what the students have learned. It is therefore possible for the researcher to use the information acquired and to compare and contrast it with information acquired through further research, always keeping in mind that there are limitations and there might also be disadvantages.

Cortazzi (2002) points out that these approaches (i.e. analysing narratives and documents) “complement other approaches and can readily be used alongside them. At the same time, insights from these approaches can extend and challenge some aspects of research that might otherwise be overlooked” (p. 196). Further down, Cortazzi (2002) argues that “documentary analysis can focus on the analysis and classification of themes, keywords and meanings. Generally this is done through selecting particular units of analysis, such as mention of important themes, and counting frequencies or occurrences of categories [...] this essentially means seeing the document as a text in its social context” (p. 202-3).
Although Duffy (1993) states some critics of content analysis argue that the method is "merely the application of common sense", he further quotes Barzan and Graff (1977: 130) as saying that "as you study the sources, you will gradually gain insight and detailed knowledge which will give you a 'higher common sense' which will in turn permit a fuller appreciation of the worth of the evidence" (p. 74). Marwick (1970) further argues that content analysis will allow the researcher to "squeeze the last drop" (p. 138) of information from each script. Content analysis allows the researcher to immerse him/her self experientially in the holistic nature of the phenomenon, an immersion in text. It is through deep personal reading and thinking about textual data that a researcher can develop authentic and well-polished conceptualisations and understanding. According to Cortazzi (2002)

*in education, as elsewhere, text is evidence in a way in which speech is not. Text is held to be evidence of past and current realities or future plans, for example in written examinations and assignments, in the documentation made available for school inspections and other quality assurance procedures, or in mission statements and policy and strategy documents [...] where what matters is how meanings are generated through a certain textual form, with particular textual functions, in certain contexts and with particular effects [...] documents do not simply reflect reality, they also construct it and contribute to subsequent views of it (p. 196-7).*

Referring to Mayring (1983) and Flick (1998), Gray (2004) distinguishes three steps in the analysis process:

*Summarizing content analysis, where the material is paraphrased with similar paraphrases bundled together and less relevant passages eliminated.*

*Explicating content analysis, which clarifies ambiguous or contradictory passages by introducing context material in the analysis. [...]*

*Structuring content analysis seeks to identify types of formal structures in the materials. Hence, the analysis might extricate key features in the material and describe them in more detail (p. 328-9).*

In this case, whilst reading the scripts, the researcher selected all phrases that included the word democracy, or which referred to the democratic process, or to
living in a democracy. During this exercise, a number of phrases were compiled, and after rereading these phrases, some were transferred from one group to another, and others were omitted completely. At the end, categories were formed including phrases referring to the same category.

Other strengths of content analysis are its use in hypothesis testing, as is the case with this research. It is highly cost-effective since there may be no need for large-scale research instruments to acquire information, but at the same time this might be seen as a limitation since the approach has to rely on 'old' data rather than gathering fresh information. Flick (1998) (in Gray (2004)) “also points out the very conceptual structures that content analysis imposes on the data may obscure some of the interpretations that may have emerged inductively from within it” (p. 329).

The themes that emerge from a rigorous exercise in content analysis could then be used as the basis of another research instrument. In fact, the next stage of this study is a quantitative research, mainly the administration of a questionnaire to five hundred college students, following the categories that emerged from the content analysis. These categories were then used in the compilation of the second research instrument.

Aliaga and Gunderson (2002) (in Muijs (2004)) define quantitative research as follows:

*Quantitative research is ‘Explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analysed using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics)’* (p. 1).
In quantitative research, researchers design research instruments aimed to convert phenomena that do not naturally exist in quantitative form into quantitative data. Although such researchers emphasise the importance of statistics, one should emphasise the importance also of the research design, the formulation of the research instrument and the data collection stage. Furthermore, although many researchers feel that by using quantitative research methods their findings and conclusions are going to be objective, Muijs (2004) points out that “this view, that there is a true reality out there that we can measure completely objectively, is problematic. We are all part of the world we are observing, and cannot completely detach ourselves from what we are researching” (p. 4). It is true that quantitative research methods are best suited to study hypotheses but one has to be careful that the researcher minimizes bias as much as possible.

In this case, the researcher, from the outset sought to decide whether the study would be merely describing a situation, in which case the instrument would give descriptive data, or if the researcher was in fact seeking to explain something, that is inferential data. Then the following task focuses on asking whether the researcher has the aim of keeping that data to him/her self or whether the researcher would like to generalise the findings to a wider population.

Muijs (2004: 9) points out that quantitative research methods have limitations when a researcher wants to explore a problem in depth; when researchers want to develop hypotheses and theories; if issues to be studied are particularly complex, since in a quantitative research there are a number of limited variables to be studied while in qualitative research unexpected variables may emerge. Also quantitative
methods are better suited when looking at the cause and effect of a problem while qualitative methods look at the meaning of particular events or circumstances.

It is for these reasons, among others, that researchers may therefore opt to choose the mixed methods, since according to Muijs (2004) “mixed method research is a flexible approach where the research design is determined by what we want to find out rather than by any predetermined epistemological position” (p. 9). Other strengths of the quantitative methods are that the researcher is able to gather large amounts of data, at reasonably low cost and effort compared to other methods. At the same time one could easily guarantee respondents’ anonymity, especially with pencil-and-paper methods. The use of standardised questions allows for easy comparability between respondents and groups of respondents.

One limitation, according to Bell (1999), which is perhaps the most important limitation, is that quantitative methods “can provide answers to the questions What? Where? When? and How? but it is not easy to find out Why? Causal relationships can rarely, if ever, be proved by a questionnaire. The main emphasis is on fact-finding” (p. 14). Questionnaires are research instruments through which people are asked to respond to the same set of questions in a predetermined order. Like any other method, questionnaires should be used when they fit the objectives of the research. In the case of this particular research, the researcher uses the questionnaire to confirm whether there is a recurrent pattern in the students’ perception of the concept of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ at the Junior College, when answering questions set around the categories that emerged from the first research, i.e. content analysis of the students’ examination scripts.
The problem with questionnaires, however, is that they seem like a very easy way to get hold of data. Researchers make a mistake if they think that anyone can come up with a set of questions and administer the questionnaire. In fact, one of the most difficult tasks is that of compiling a set of questions, or else to produce a research instrument that is a ‘good’ questionnaire. Bell (2002) points out that “before any method of data collecting can be considered, decisions have to be made about precisely what it is you need to find out” (p. 159). Out of a list of priorities that Bell (2002: 160) provides for, the researcher of this study sought to study “relevance of the college course to the work […] balance of theory and practice and the effectiveness” or shortcomings of the students’ understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ at the Junior College. Further down Bell (2002) argues that “decisions have to be made about what is essential, what is merely desirable and what can be done in the available time” (p. 161).

Therefore, designing a questionnaire is a key part of survey research. One has to pay attention to the precise wording of the questions. Bell (2002: 162) refers to the need to be absolutely sure that questions or wording of questions is not ambiguous, imprecise, and that the researcher should not assume that all the respondents will understand certain words in the same manner. Furthermore, the questions should not lead the respondents to give a desired answer. One should also not presume that respondents know every word that is presented in the questionnaire. Therefore, one must be careful to ask about those things that the respondents will have no problem to answer and to give the respondents a choice without leading them to particular answers. The researcher should also avoid double or even triple questions, because
this might confuse the respondents. One has to remember that the respondents are likely only to have a short time to answer the questionnaire therefore, one should not ask questions that rely on memory, or that might be based on the knowledge of the respondents of methods or procedures that might not in reality be a first hand knowledge to the respondents.

As stated earlier, in this study, the researcher was guided by the categories that emerged from the content analysis exercise. So, in a way, the researcher had already piloted the knowledge base of the students. At the same time the questions asked were based on the content that each and every student received during lectures. Furthermore, attention was given to the wording of the questions, so that there would not be any ambiguity, nor imprecision. Questions (Appendix 4 p. 251) were kept as short as possible. In the case of Q14 it was divided in two 14a and 14b. The respondents had to tick one response. The responses were kept as short as possible and most of the time were the whole phrase chosen from the examination scripts. Only terms that one could presume students know their meaning were included in the questionnaire. Muijs (2004) argues that “it is best to err on the side of caution here, and to remember that what may be clear to you as a researcher may not be clear to respondents” (p. 50).

The researcher also kept in mind the importance of question order and appearance (Bell (2002: 166). The questionnaire consisted of seventeen questions, laid out on four pages, with the title and clear instructions at the beginning, followed with a request for limited personal data on Sex and Age, and a note at the end thanking the respondents for completing the questionnaire, and assuring the respondents of the
protection of their anonymity in the analysis of the research. Muijs (2004) points out that the questionnaire should be kept brief not to annoy respondents and “four sides of A4 is a good rule of thumb for maximum questionnaire length” (p. 50).

The questions were closed questions. Gray (2004) defines a closed question as “one to which the respondent is offered a set of pre-designed replies” (p. 195). Furthermore, while the questions were based on the categories emerging from the content analysis, the choice of replies, (mainly five out of a longer list) were taken from sample phrases selected from the same content analysis. Opie (2004) points out that closed questions are “easy to answer and the answers easy to quantify. In this sense they follow a positivistic approach” (p. 106). Fifteen questions of the seventeen were a “list type” whilst two questions (no. 10 and 11) were “ranking questions” (Gray (2004: 196-7)). Gray (2004) argues that “while the list, clearly, influences the direction of people’s responses, this does not make the approach invalid. If the questionnaire is concerned with issues that require recall of information, the list might act as a useful memory-jogger” (p.196). In the questionnaire there were no open-ended questions. Opie (2004) points out that “open-ended questions can be set to try and achieve such exploration [asking why?] but often fail to do so. This is done primarily because many respondents are either not keen or do not feel confident in expressing their views, thoughts or feelings on paper, particularly if they are being required to write in what is not their first language” (p. 111). About ranking questions Gray (2004) points out that “it is important to make the instructions for completing the question clear and explicit. Be aware that more than seven or eight items in the list may make it too complex for many respondents to complete” (p. 196).
study, the instructions for the ranking questions were written before each question, and the researcher only included five items in the response list to each question.

As pointed out above, at the end of the questionnaire the researcher assured respondents of their anonymity in the analysis. Sapsford and Abbot (1996) write that “confidentiality is a promise that you will not be identified or presented in identifiable form, while anonymity is a promise that even the researcher will not be able to tell which responses came from which respondent” (p. 319). In the study this issue was even more important to emphasise since the researcher is also a lecturer at the same college. The researcher sought to put the students’ mind at rest, that although the researcher was also a lecturer and although additionally many of the respondents may have been the researcher’s students at one time or another, they were not going to be identified in the analysis.

Opie (2004) in his ‘Research procedures’ points out that the “sample size should always be quoted in any research, [...] and in addition to sample size there is also the issue of the representativeness of the sample” (p. 101). In this study, the researcher opted for five hundred respondents out of a college population of nearly three thousand students, including both first and second year students. The respondents were chosen from amongst second year students (around one thousand three hundred) most of whom then had sat for their mock examination, therefore they would have prepared and studied for the examination, and would have had the time hopefully, to understand core concepts well and had time to form their perceptions of the same concepts. Furthermore, regarding the issue of representativeness and/or generalisability, one has to remember that in Malta, considering all the post-secondary
students who sat for the MATSEC (Matriculation and Secondary Education Certificate) examination in Systems of Knowledge in April 2004, the total number of students was two thousand two hundred and thirty six (2236) students (IM Examiners' Report May 2004).

Initially the researcher had proposed to administer the questionnaire to ten groups of fifty students, from ten different classes. Although research methods literature proposes different ways of random sampling, e.g. by referring to class lists, and choosing the tenth student on the list, for this research, because of the fact that the researcher had encountered some problems in obtaining permission to administer the questionnaire, and because of the fact that the researcher lectures at the same college, the researcher thought it more appropriate for the sake of anonymity and to reduce bias, to leave it in the hands of colleagues who were helping out in the distribution and collection of questionnaires, to select to whom they would give the questionnaire. In fact, Opie (2004) points out that “if you have good relationships with other colleagues teaching the groups you might select a group from each lecturer – but be sure to ensure anonymity for both the students and the lecturer” (p. 104).

The researcher administered the questionnaire in March 2004, during lectures, with the support of colleagues. The research instrument had in fact been compiled as part of a research methods assignment. Tutors at the School of Education, University of Leicester, had assessed it a few days before. March is also the period when the second year students sit for their mock examination. Unfortunately, after the mock examination the level of absenteeism of second year students increases drastically because they start concentrating on their studies for their MATSEC examinations.
The researcher and the other lecturers therefore, had to opt for small groups of twenty-five students from twenty different classes. At one point, student numbers had dwindled so much that attendance was around 25 or less out of 50 or more. In actual fact lecturers had no choice but to include the students present who agreed to participate in the questionnaire. The total College population in March 2004 was two thousand nine hundred and fifty four students, one thousand three hundred seventy of whom were second year students. Therefore a total of 36.5% of second year students were surveyed and a 100% response was recorded. For this exercise the researcher found the full support of all lecturers of Systems of Knowledge lecturing second year students at the College. Furthermore, Muijs (2004) affirms that

> the single most effective strategy to minimise problems is to make sure you pilot your instruments. Test them first by having colleagues read them. Test them with a small number of people from the population you want to sample. Ask them to provide feedback on the instrument and test the instrument statistically to see if there are any unusual response patterns that could indicate that certain items have not been properly understood (p. 51).

Bell (2002) argues that “all data-collecting instruments have to be piloted. [...] it’s only when a group similar to your main population completes your questionnaire and provides feedback that you know for sure that all is well. [...] Even if yours is to be a straightforward descriptive study which only requires frequencies (the number of items in each category) and frequency distribution (how often each item occurs), trial analyses need to be made and methods of presentation considered” (p. 167-8). In fact this questionnaire was given to one of the researcher’s colleagues for comments. It was piloted with some twenty students during contact hours when students come to the researcher’s office by appointment. There are four (one hour) contact hours set as part of the timetable every week at the college where the research was administered. Apart from the above, a draft questionnaire accompanied the Research Methods
assignment focussing on the content analysis for feedback before actually administering the questionnaire to the five hundred students at the college.

Oppenheim (1992) stresses that

questionnaires do not emerge fully-fledged; they have to be created or adapted, fashioned and developed to maturity – it has to be piloted. Piloting can help not only with the wording of questions but also with procedural matters such as the design of the letter of introduction, the ordering of question sequence and the reduction of non-response rates (p. 47).

Opie (2004) provides a number of questions that a pilot study can answer. These include: “how long did it take to answer the questionnaire? Were the instructions clear? Were any of the questions unclear and ambiguous? If so, which and why? Did you object to answering any of these questions? Anything major omitted? Was the layout clear and attractive? Any other comments?” (p. 104-5). With respect to the piloting with colleagues, the process went very well and there were some minor changes of the wording of some questions, following the exercise but when it came to the students, they felt they could answer the questions with ease and in the majority of cases it took only a few minutes to answer.

The choice of the actual student respondents was made from different classes, some whom the researcher had taught the previous year, others from other classes taught by colleagues. This procedure adopted sought to ensure that the pilot would be representative of the main sample or population to be studied. Sapsford and Jupp (1996) argue that

for it to work effectively the pilot sample must be representative of the variety of individuals which the main study is intended to cover. Pilot investigations do not need to represent, in the statistical sense, the correct proportions of different types of individuals in the population because the purpose is not to estimate the true proportions of such types but to cover the entire range of replies which might be given to any of the possible questions in the first draft of the questionnaire (p. 103).
One important point that a researcher should remember concerning pilot studies is that, according to Opie (2004) "it is not wise to include the students used for it in the main research. Those undertaking the pilot will have been sensitised to the questions so that any answers they give in the main study will be influenced in a different way from those who have not" (p. 105). In fact, in this study, the researcher advised the students who took part in the pilot study that they should not answer the questionnaire when it is administered in their class, because they had participated already in the research.

When one considers the advantages and disadvantages of the questionnaire discussed above it is evident that the method is not all that flexible. But, at the same time, as pointed out, open-ended questions are not feasible, when the intention is to obtain close-ended answers. As a result of the pilot study, the researcher confirmed that the respondents opted to choose one of the available answers as had emerged from the content analysis, rather than give other answers. Furthermore, drawing on comments written by the researcher, after the pilot study, one may be inclined to think that this happened because the respondents might have thought that they had no time to think, or that they were not trained to think and give alternative answers (which is one of the questions being studied in this study). For this reason it was decided to leave the questionnaire as distributed in the pilot study in the original form.

Furthermore, the researcher chose a questionnaire rather than an interview for this survey since the researcher lectures at the same College, and the researcher and most of the respondents might have felt that they are being assessed about the subject,
and the respondents generally want to “look good” in the eyes of the lecturer/interviewer/s. They might have felt that they should not say anything that might embarrass them in front of the lecturer, especially if group interviews, were to have been the method chosen because of the number of respondents. If one asks people for information that might put them in this kind of position, they may not tell the truth, or they may “spin” the response so that it makes them look better. This may be more of a problem in an interview situation where they are face-to-face with their interviewer, individually (in personal interviews) or with class mates (in group interviews).

Furthermore, in a group, people tend to work as a group, listening to each other’s comments and answering the questions. Someone takes notes for the entire group – people do not complete an interview individually. The researcher felt that for this research this might not be appropriate because the intention was to get individual responses even though the data analysis and findings are to be presented as a group. Apart from this with respondents of this age group, and who are not prepared for this research method (interviewing), it would have proved too challenging task that may have deterred respondents from the actual task at hand.

In the same lecturer/interviewer/student/respondent situation (with other lecturers helping out in the interviews), interviewers may themselves also distort an interview. They might avoid questions that make respondents uncomfortable. The interviewers may not listen carefully to the respondents, on topics regarding which, they have strong opinions. They may make the judgment that they already know what the respondent would answer to a question based on their prior responses, even
though they might not be true. Another reason might be that not all lecturers are 
competent at interviewing, and one cannot expect them to devote so much time to 
help the researcher out. On the other hand, it would have been impossible for the 
researcher to meet all five hundred respondents during the limited hours on the 
timetable. With respect to administrative issues, the cost to administer the 
questionnaire was not too high, but with regard to the time factor, if the researcher 
had opted for an interview, given the time available for lectures and students on the 
time-table, the College administration would most probably not have granted 
permission. Furthermore, it would have proved to be an almost impossible task if all 
the interviews were recorded, and then transcribed.

Clearly, there are various issues to consider when one selects the type of 
survey for a study. There are no clear and easy ways to make this decision. There is 
judgment involved and there might not be one approach that is clearly the best in all 
situations. It was for this reason that during the preparation for different research 
methods assignments the researcher, with the help of the research methods tutors, 
devised a strategy using first a qualitative method (content analysis), followed by a 
quantitative method (questionnaire). And for further validity and reliability, a further 
qualitative method (a semi-structured interview) with lecturers for Systems of 
Knowledge featured after the research findings. Undoubtedly, the emerging data 
from the questionnaire could be analysed in further depth and different variables 
could be further correlated and analysed for relevant results. The researcher restricted 
analysis to the main objectives of the research hypothesis described earlier on. Given 
this debate about the difficulties encountered in choosing the right research methods, 
the researcher felt it was more appropriate to corroborate the above observations
resulting from the research methods literature in the discussion of the methodology, undertaken for the third and final part of the research, that is, the interviews of eight members of the academic staff who teach Systems of Knowledge, to avoid any repetition.

One of the reasons for the decision of the researcher to triangulate this study through a number of interviews with lecturers in the field was, as Wragg (2002) points out

> research interviews, although apparently a perfectly natural means of communication and enquiry, are in practice riddled with numerous pitfalls for the unwary. For example, the questions asked may turn out to be loaded ones, if the interviewer merely seeks to confirm a prejudice. Respondents may not tell the truth, particularly if they believe their answers may show them in a bad light or reach the ears of their superiors. Consider the following hazards, describing but six out of countless opportunities for inaccuracy or distortion, which could render interviewing worthless if it were undertaken without forethought (p. 143).

Despite the potential hazards, Wragg (2002) argues, “interviews are still a fruitful source of information when handled skilfully, either as the sole means of enquiry, or in conjunction with observations, diary analysis, or questionnaires” (p. 144) as is the case with this study. Gray (2004) points out a number of unavoidable and hidden factors that might make the interview successful such as the type of verbal responses and the body language of the interviewee. “However,” Gray (2004) continues, “despite the challenges involved, the well-conducted interview is a powerful tool for eliciting rich data on people’s views, attitudes and the meanings that underpin their lives and behaviours” (p. 213). Arksey and Knight (1999) comment that “interviewing is a powerful way of helping people to make explicit things that have hitherto been implicit – to articulate their tacit perceptions, feelings and understandings” (p. 32). In fact, in the last question, some interviewees declared that
the interview had made them think about different issues such as the syllabus, the
subject and their method of teaching. And Oppenheim (1992) says “interviews
should encourage respondents to develop their own ideas, feelings, insights,
expectations or attitudes and in so doing allowing the respondents to say what they
think and to do so with greater richness and spontaneity” (p. 81).

On the other hand, Freebody (2004) refers to the “deceptive complexity of
interviews” (p. 132). Freebody (2004) while referring to a research conducted by
Gilbert and Mulkay (1984) elicits the following negative observations:

there is an underlying interest in the perceptions of participants, but an overlaid
assumption that it is what these perceptions have in common, rather than their
distinctiveness, that constitutes the notable ‘findings’. Further, what is taken to
be ‘in common’ is to a large extent determined by the researcher’s theoretical
premises, set up in advance, and by the ways which these direct the contents of
interview questions. Thus participants’ specific statements in interviews are
subsumed under more general concepts and reshaped into idealized accounting
procedures. The analyst identifies those segments of participants’ talk that are
to be taken by the reader, presumably because they are regarded so by the
analyst, as representative of generalized processes – ‘idealized’ sayings – at
work ‘out there’ (p. 135).

While keeping all these positive and negative points in mind, when actually
administering the interviews, the researcher kept to the interview schedule as much as
possible, and even when the respondent was answering a question that was listed later
in the schedule the question was asked just the same later on because at times the
respondents gave more information. While compiling the questions, great care was
given to the fact that the questions would be worded in such a way so that the
respondents would be asked one thing at a time. While compiling the questions, the
researcher was careful to avoid leading questions (that unwittingly prompt a certain
response from participants) (Seidman (1998: 69-70)). While there are no set
guidelines for the sequencing of questions (Patton (1990: 294)), the researcher thought it best to begin with an uncontentious question, which asks for basic descriptive information and which enables the respondent to talk at some length (Merriam (1998: 82)). Drever (1995: 21-25) advises moving from more general to more specific questions using prompts (for more detail) and probes (for more clarification) for more information. General questions enable the researcher to discover the respondent’s overall understanding of an experience and a general frame of reference, as well as helping to determine the significance the respondent places on a particular event. More focused questions allow the researcher to seek out detail, explore complex meanings, and to break a response down into various parts (Keats (1988: 43). The interview schedule was concluded with what Denver (1995) calls “a sweeper question, which invites the respondents to share any additional pertinent information not already covered in the interview” (p. 27).

Once the interview schedule was compiled, the researcher passed the schedule to some of the colleagues for comments. “What is straightforward to you” Wragg (2002) contends, “may be baffling to another person. Sometimes you are too close to your research and others can be more objective” (p. 153). Following this, the interview schedule was piloted with one of the researcher’s colleagues, and as a result of which, some of the questions were modified. The researcher also passed on the interview schedule to the research methods tutor at the School of Education University of Leicester for comments. Again, other questions were modified following comments and suggestions made.
The first question asked was "how do you define democracy?" The interview was administered to lecturers who teach the subject to all first year students or are involved in the correction of examination scripts at the College. They all found it interesting to participate and respond to the interview questions. Some of the lecturers even went as far as to add their personal comments, apart from the content that they usually teach to their students. The "sweeper question" at the end (Is there anything you would like to add that has not been addressed by any of my questions or your responses?) often elicited responses that the researcher had not anticipated. Two respondents stated that they had nothing to add and that they had said everything they had to say in the interview, or that it was a very interesting experience for them that made them think about the content and the pedagogical side of the topic. Another respondent affirmed that she would ask some of the questions put forward in the interview to the students to see their reaction because she had never considered the issue from that angle, and she felt she should involve the students more in her lectures.

The actual focus of the questions arose directly from the research questions that were in turn based on the conceptual framework that the researcher articulated in the research design. The substance of those questions arose from the literature on the continuing debate about the definition of 'democracy' and 'citizenship' explored in Chapter 2 of this study. In developing questions, and then when actually conducting the interviews, there were certain ethical considerations that had to be considered. Firstly, the researcher asked for the consent of the lecturers and informed them that the information was going to be used in this study. For this reason, the respondents were given the opportunity to ask any questions they may have had prior to the
interview and even during the interview. However there were no questions asked, and none of the respondents found any problem in answering the questions. Another ethical consideration related to the researcher’s personal attitude toward information that was being shared, the researcher was always conscious of bias and to attain an attitude of neutrality sought hard during each interview. For this reason, it was made clear prior to the start of the interview that the respondents had to consider the interviewer as a researcher and not as their colleague.

Hinds (2000) also suggests that “you should record accurately what was said and not what you think should be said” (p. 49). For this reason, the researcher asked consent of the respondents to tape-record the interviews. In that way, apart from recording all that was said during the interview, the researcher had more time to observe body language and reactions, and show attention to what was being said during the actual interview. This encouraged the respondents to continue with their replies to each question. The recordings of the interviews were later transcribed. Qualitative research, Bell (1987) contends

*is a highly subjective technique and therefore there is always the danger of bias” (p. 91) [...] “if you hold strong views about some aspect of the topic you need to be particularly careful about the way questions are put” (p. 95) [...] “honesty about the purpose of the exercise, integrity in the conduct and in the reporting of the interview and a promise to allow interviewees to see the transcript and/or draft of the report will all help, though cost and time may make it difficult to circulate drafts (p. 98).*

The researcher conducted eight interviews during October 2004. The respondents were contacted at work and arrangements were made to meet them individually in a convenient location relatively free from distractions. Wragg (2002) argues that “The timing of interviews may not seem important, yet it can be quite a critical issue, particularly if the interview is part of a battery of data-gathering
devices" (p. 147). And further down: “Interviewing in a school or college requires the same sort of careful advance planning. Find out when teachers are free if they are to be interviewed” (p. 154). Bell (1987) affirms that “people who agree to be interviewed deserve some consideration and so you will need to fit in with their plans, however inconvenient it may be for you” (pp. 96-7).

In most cases the interview was administered in the interviewer’s or interviewee’s office, and although most of the interviews were free from distractions there were one or two occasions when students needed to see the particular lecturer for some urgent matter. The researcher discovered that some of the questions were more thought provoking for respondents than others. “Besides the verbal aspects of the interaction,” argues Hinds (2000) “non-verbal communication also affects the encounter both in obvious and more subtle ways. Both body language or eye contact are important and you may wish to record and note an interviewee’s body language or eye contact when you cover a particular important question or theme” (p. 48).

The interviewer observed that there were a number of issues relating to validity. Whilst the researcher remained as neutral as possible during each interview, it was evident that each respondent brought his or her own background to the responses given. In fact, one may claim that each participant brought a unique personality and perspective onto the interview. One can mention the following characteristics that made every interview unique: nationality, the academic background and field of specialisation, gender differences, the lecturer’s outlook to the concepts, their work experience, and their present life situation. One particular challenge arose when one interviewee kept talking for a longer time. This
respondent's answers were not always focused on the question. In this case, the researcher did not interrupt, but when the interviewee had finished the researcher tried to redirect the conversation to the question and used prompts or probes to get a more relevant answer. The researcher undertook considerable effort to minimize such effects and took account of these instances in drawing conclusions from the data collected during these semi-structured interviews.

3.4.2 Data collection through each method and explanation of the process of data analysis

As has been stated above, the data was collected initially through content analysis for the qualitative research, as the first part of the study. Then guided by the categories that emerged from this first part of the research, the researcher moved on to compile a questionnaire. The questions were based on the categories emanating from the first part, and this second part is recognised as the quantitative research. The third part of the study is the administration of eight semi-structured interviews, again based on the categories compiled through the first part of the study. The transcripts of the interviews are used for triangulation in a qualitative method. The collected data will be presented in Chapter 4, and analysed in Chapter 5.

Analysis under the interpretative paradigm is often conducted using the inductive procedure. Cohen and Manion (1985) describe the inductive method as one which may eventually provide a generalisation, but the initial stages include observation of a number of individual cases which leads to a hypothesis and then perhaps eventually to a generalisation.
While data from observation and discussion during lectures and during meetings with students during contact hours was collected at intervals over a period of time, the analysis of the examination scripts was performed as a one time event, as explained above. This analysis identifies certain common characteristics or categories, which in turn will be used to formulate the questionnaire for the quantitative research sample.

Analysis involves the process of breaking data down into smaller units to reveal their characteristic elements and structure. This exercise will be undertaken in Chapter 4, but Gray (2004) further affirms that additionally "we want to interpret, to understand and to explain" (p. 327). This features in Chapter 5. More specifically, content analysis involves the making of inferences about data (usually text, and in this case examination scripts) by systematically and objectively identifying special characteristics (classes or categories) within them. Gray (2004) argues that "the attempt to achieve a measure of objectivity in this process is addressed by the creation of specific rules called criteria of selection which has to be established before the data can be analysed.

In content analysis there are three procedures for identifying classes and categories (Gray 2004: 328): (a) common classes, comprising categories in everyday thinking such as age, and gender; (b) special classes, including labels particular groups or communities use to distinguish among things; and (c) theoretical classes, or those that arise in the process of analysing the data, providing the key linkages and patterns. The next stage would be that of reducing the volume of textual material. The process again is in three stages, (Gray 2004: 329) i.e. (a) summarizing content
analysis, or paraphrasing, choosing the relevant and putting them in a list, and eliminating the irrelevant material; (b) explicating content analysis, where the researcher clarifies ambiguous and contradictory passages, and (c) structuring content analysis, where the researcher seeks to identify types of formal structures.

Data analysis under the positivist paradigm is conducted according to a predetermined set of criteria and hypotheses. This is often referred to as the deductive procedure. In this case, this procedure aims to answer a particular question and arrive at a generalisable truth. The researcher proposed to administer a questionnaire to five hundred respondents, (as stated in detail above), and the hypothesis tested by means of the questionnaire which was structured in a way to ensure that the number of questions would not exceed twenty, (in fact there are only seventeen), and would include responses in the form of multiple choice. These represented answers taken from the categories identified in the content analysis, whilst allowing for a range of responses. The data was collected with the least interruption as possible to lectures and inconvenience to other colleagues. The researcher sought to analyse the data manually first, compiled into broad sheets, and raw scores calculated to form a set of descriptive data, in order to get a feel of the whole exercise. This is what Pell and Fogelman (2002) call “the descriptive and exploratory stage of the analysis [...] checking for possible errors in the data or your sample and that your instruments have worked as you would have hoped [...] to get to know and understand your data, to appreciate both its potential and its limitations [...] and preferably of some of this analysis being done by hand and calculator” (p 235). Then the same data was inputted into a computer using Excel spreadsheet software. Later for inferential data SPSS software was used.
In the first stage the researcher aimed clearly to elicit descriptive data such as the frequencies and percentages. Then the research delved further into inferential data analysis including Chi-Square analysis in order to get more in-depth experience of the findings and significance of data, and arrive at some generalisable comments and conclusions. These comments and conclusions are presented in Chapter 6.

The third stage of the research featured data collection through another qualitative instrument, namely the administration of eight semi-structured interviews, data transcription, data analysis and the eliciting of conclusions from this data. In addition to the interview transcripts compiled from tape recordings of the interviews, the researcher added notes taken during or after the interviews or the discussions that followed in the following weeks, if the need arose, and especially in recording emotions and other reactions expressed by the interviewees during the interview elicited from the tape recording.

The transcripts were examined using the 'constant comparison method' to explore responses about the key themes which frame the research as well as to look for emerging new themes. The examination of the responses aimed at bringing out the commonalities and the divergences in the lecturers' understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship' and their perception of the students' understanding of the same concepts.

The last part of the study identified the criteria for the interpretation of the results of the study. Due to the fact that in qualitative research, there are no statistical
tests that can be done, there is no precise way to set the criteria. The researcher decided on two criteria for this study. Areas of convergence and commonality among participants were taken to indicate a significant finding, whereby, areas of great divergence suggested that a broader theoretical framework might need to be developed. While performing this analysis, the researcher took special care to study the responses of the interviewees when answering the main hypothesis of the research, i.e. if the students are able to change the content they receive about the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship' into knowledge. While analysing transcripts, the researcher sought to draw inferences, and by undertaking in-depth content analysis, and through the selection of illustrative quotations for the actual report, these were double-checked. Wragg (2002) suggests a two or three stage operation for analysing interviews;

*usually the investigator knows why certain questions are asked, but when all interviews have been completed other matters of importance often emerge. A first rapid reading of all transcripts by two independent readers can be used to decide how the main analysis should be conducted, or a 'sandwich' model may be employed, whereby this analysis is followed by a final rapid re-read to see if anything has been missed or become distorted (p. 155).*

In addition, as described earlier, the researcher employed the principle of triangulation in Chapter 5, by comparing transcript evidence with written documentation of the previous research, the content analysis of scripts, administered in October 2003, and the quantitative data from the questionnaire administered in March 2004. All this analysis was carried out keeping in mind the conceptual and theoretical background acquired through the literature review in Chapter 2.
4.0 Findings

4.1 An Introduction to data

As stated earlier in the Methodology, this study consists of three stages carried out over two years, between 2003 and 2005. Following discussions with the research methods tutors, at the School of Education, University of Leicester, the researcher chose three methods of investigation to undertake and triangulate the research. The researcher decided to select content analysis of twenty mock examination scripts for Systems of Knowledge, a qualitative method for the first part of the research. This study was administered in March 2003. The aim of this investigation was to carry out a pilot study to test, before actually coming up with a hypothesis, if issues which the researcher had been observing and also discussing with colleagues, about the effectiveness and shortcomings of the 1997 syllabus for Systems of Knowledge were true or false. In this way the researcher wanted to investigate whether there was enough evidence that shows the need for further study of students’ understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’.

This was followed by a second stage a quantitative method i.e. a questionnaire, which was chosen and administered with five hundred college students. The research instrument was compiled from the findings and categories drawn up as a result of the content analysis of the examination scripts undertaken in the first stage. This second part of the study is aimed at investigating the hypothesis and to check if what was observed and studied in the twenty scripts is confirmed or refuted. This part of the research was administered in March 2004.
The third part of the research, i.e. undertaking of eight semi-structured interviews, a qualitative method, with colleagues/lecturers of Systems of Knowledge who work at the same college, was administered in October 2004. This choice of this 'mix and match' approach was undertaken with the aim of triangulating the research. The interview questions were again based on the categories which emerged as a result of the first part of the study, i.e. content analysis, and it aimed at confirming or refuting the hypothesis set at the beginning of this study, as well as to analyse the lecturers' understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship' and at the same time analyse the lecturers' perception of the students' understanding of the same concepts mentioned above.

4.2 Description of data

This chapter aims to describe as clearly as possible the data generated through the three research methods. It describes the eleven categories that emerged from the content analysis. The study then moves on to present the findings of the seventeen questions used in the questionnaire and again based on the categories of the content analysis. Finally, the researcher will present the findings generated through the eight semi-structured interviews, through the eighteen questions based on the categories of the content analysis.
4.2.1 Findings: Content Analysis

The first part of the research analysed the twenty examination scripts for Systems of Knowledge particularly the question about the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’. The question analysed (Appendix 2 p. 249) is the following:

Some say that politics is about who decides. It could be through winning the consensus of the people or else by having a system in which rulers decide for the ruled. Reflecting on these two systems discuss the main differences between ancient Athenian democracy and modern representative democracy.

The process of analysing the scripts was a long and rigorous one. It focussed on reading and rereading and choosing mostly phrases with recurring words. The next step was to start grouping the phrases or sentences together and coding them to categorise particular groups. There was no set limit for the number of phrases in each group, since the researcher let the scripts manage the research rather than the other way round so that there would be the least influence of bias. The researcher analysed the twenty scripts manually because in that way one could get a feel of the data. When this process was concluded then the researcher started to re-examine the categories and phrases and to eliminate phrases that might not be appropriate for that category. At times if this exercise resulted in more than one phrase matching another, another category was formed and given a separate title. For an extract of the different categories emerging as a result of this first study, one can refer to Appendix 3 (p. 250). This section refers only to the main categories and the most significant phrases for each category. The study thus tries to be as objective as possible while acknowledging that such procedures are bound to be partially subjective. Furthermore, this chapter is mainly a presentation of findings. The analysis and synthesis will be presented in Chapter 5. For the purpose of this presentation of
findings, the italicised words or phrases are examples taken from the examination papers.

The first category that emerged through the exercise of content analysis is **Defining Democracy**. Most of the responses refer to the *rule of the people*, taken from the ancient Greek definition of democracy *demos kratei*, with an emphasised reference to the political aspect, in the sense of parliament, laws and representatives rather than democracy as a way of life. Some referred to *equality*, as an important element of democracy but at the same time did not refer to equality in everyday life, but only when it comes to elections.

The second category is **The Power of the People**. In this category the researcher found references to *participation*, but again this referred to *general elections*. A respondent referred to the fact that there are those who argue that *citizens are free only on election day* and others who (as indicated by the respondent in the script) argue otherwise. Given this response, the respondent did not stipulate what kind of others, or what kind of freedom. The second type of response refers to the responsibility of each citizen to guarantee the life and smooth running of a democracy and not the other way round i.e. that democracy is there for the citizen, and not the citizen for democracy. But again, respondents failed to indicate how. One explanation would be that the students know the different elements of a democracy, but do not know how to convey those ideas in writing, or that they are not aware of them.
The third category refers to the difference between Direct and Representative Democracy. Again, here, the responses show that the students do not have a proper grasp of the definition of direct democracy. They argue that it is very similar to the one we have today. When a respondent refers to participation of the citizens, the same respondent does not expand on the value of participation and the concept of active citizenship. This particular respondent gives the impression that the reference is to participation in elections and not the running of the daily affairs in a democracy, where citizens are called to decide certain important issues and ensure that the governments are held accountable about issues that will affect the same citizens on the local, national, European and international level.

In the next category the researcher sought to categorise phrases and sentences that refer to Democracy in Practice. The findings in this category show that the students were influenced by their immediate experience of the referendum where the Maltese electorate had to decide whether or not to join the EU in 2004. The referendum was probably still fresh in the students’ minds. From the responses one might deduce that when citizens participate in a democracy, they can only ‘participate’ in issues that are presented to them by their representatives, and do not refer to the fact that citizens can come up with their own issues that affect them and that the politicians might be doing their utmost not to involve citizens in the decision process. It might also suggest that they do not feel empowered or their perceptions are influenced by recent events.

The fifth category, which according to the findings shows that it received the highest number of references is Equality in Participation. The respondents in this
category refer to equality which every individual enjoys regarding who is eligible to become a representative of the people. The emphasis in the findings is about the appropriate people, those who are qualified to have the responsibility to lead the rest. Most of the responses show that the respondents are willing and ready to give up their responsibility, their rights and duties to ‘govern’, and to hold the representatives accountable, because these representatives are the only citizens who possess some special ability to govern. However, it seems through the findings that the students do not think about the fact that a good doctor might not make a good Minister of Health, or that a lawyer might not make a good Minister of Justice. Sovereignty, for the respondents, does not feature in the life of a democracy. Their emphasis is on merit and not luck. The respondents should know most representatives in parliament have not attended any course or preparation in politics, and even more unfortunately, have no preparation in political virtues, (here Machiavelli’s The Prince comes to mind). The other issue then is, that not all the electorate is qualified to vote responsibly. According to Miller (2000) it is not enough that one is merely a civic and political activist. Citizens must “act responsibly...[must] not merely...get involved in public decision-making, but...promote the common good” (p. 85).

The sixth category refers to Majority and Minority Rule. Within this category, the researcher found that the respondents do know the difference between majority and minority rule, and that all the citizens, whether they are a majority or a minority have rights, and that everyone in a democracy should be respected even when citizens have different opinions. In fact, one of the respondents wrote that the majority still has to safeguard the rights of the minority. Here, no reference was made to citizenship as status, and to the fact that in Malta there are citizens and
residents (refugees and illegal immigrants). No reference was made either to hundreds of refugees who reside in Malta with minimum or no rights, awaiting visas to move on to other countries, nor to nearly two thousand illegal immigrants that are kept in special quarters, whose fate is still very undecided, but who (racism apart) are likely to be eventually integrated into the Maltese society.

The seventh category refers to *Freedom of Expression* in a democracy. The emphasis in the findings is about *the right to agree and/or to criticize negatively government activities or projects*. Another positive response is that which refers to the people who are able to become informed about what lies ahead and decide which system is better suited in the circumstances. Another respondent pointed out that *it is our duty to be interested in such matters and cast our vote as this affects us directly and the rest of the country*. The findings again lack discussion regarding the way forward from these positive comments, in other words, how one could express oneself in favour or against an issue.

The next category is that referring to ancient Greece, namely *Plato's criticism of Democracy*. The findings in this category refer to the defects of democracy as a system. This response may be attributed to the fact that part of the Systems of Knowledge syllabus is the study of Plato's *Apology*. Here, the death of Socrates is shown to be the outcome of a jury's incompetence and the prejudices of the masses. The reference to *demagogues* and the *dictatorship of the ignorant masses* might be a direct reference to the abovementioned work. A respondent is optimistic to the extent that it is stated Plato (an aristocrat, oligarch and a proponent of a utopia in his *Republic*) would agree with the system of modern representative democracy.
The ninth category refers to *Women in Politics*. The findings refer to the role of women in society and politics since women have acquired equal rights as men, giving the impression that there are no gender issues existing in Maltese culture. Another response refers to *equality and dignity of all persons regardless of their position, class or sex*. This is positive, but no reference is made to statistics that show that in most democracies, even at the political level alone, the number of women politicians, is still in a minority. This goes to show that the acquisition of rights is not enough in a democracy but those rights have to be supported, to be put in practice. The last response in this category shows lack of knowledge about Athenian democracy, where women were not allowed to participate in politics, and lacked rights. Presumably respondents had been taught this as a matter of historical fact and had no time to think about the implications behind this fact.

The tenth category refers to the importance of *Numbers in a Democracy*. The findings show that the respondents had grasped the issue that in a democracy most decisions are taken by votes and numbers. The respondents can be seen to be against the system of drawing *by lot*, and that *this system left a lot of space for corruption*. At the same time these findings show that the secret ballot system is indirectly one where politicians are drawn or elected by lot. There is the same level of chance and luck, and the decision does not depend on the ability of the electorate or of the potential representative.

The last category resulting from the content analysis refers to *Democracy and Pluralism*. The findings show that a number of respondents had grasped the different
types of pluralism in a democracy like beliefs, the press, and opinions. Another respondent refers to accepting diversity within the laws and pluralism in all aspects of our lives. This response might be taken to mean a reference to multiculturalism, and the theories of multicultural citizenship.

After describing the data found in the first study, that of content analysis, this study moves on to describe the findings emerging from the second study, that of the questionnaire (involving five hundred students at the Junior College). The description of data starts with descriptive data and will move on to inferential data.

4.2.2 Findings: Questionnaire

This section explores the students’ understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ at the Junior College. Indirectly, the study tries to explore the effectiveness and shortcomings of the 1997 syllabus for Systems of Knowledge, as pointed out in Chapter 3. Two questions feature through which the students are asked to rank five options that provide a medium for freedom of expression for citizens living in a democracy. In a way, through these questions, the researcher aimed at exploring what ranks as the most important medium for the students and also, what is likely to influence them most as young adults in forming their understanding of the concepts being studied.

The results are straightforward in terms of the questionnaire, and they reveal a clear picture of the students’ understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’. Stated very briefly, the data collected strongly supports the belief that
democracy refers mostly to the electoral process, and the rights that a citizen obtains while living in a democracy are there to fulfil this process. The questionnaire findings show that when the students discuss the issues of minorities, gender equality and pluralism in broadcasting, they show a certain amount of scepticism about whether in reality democracy truly provides such opportunities, even though they know that these issues are experienced in a legal framework. Finally, Question 17 categorically reveals the students' understanding of their role as active democratic citizens when asked if they would participate to voice their opinion against a government policy.

This section is divided into two parts: (a) a very brief recapitulation of methodological considerations, and (b) an account of questionnaire findings about the students' understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship'. It becomes of paramount importance to determine whether the present provisions for citizenship in the Primary and Secondary level as part of the Maltese National Minimum Curriculum, and the part in Module 1 in Systems of Knowledge at Post-Secondary level, are truly geared towards the development of democratic citizenship.

4.2.2.1 Some Brief Methodological Comments

The questionnaire was administered to five hundred second year students at the Junior College of the University of Malta. The aim was to create a sample, as described above in Chapter 3, which reflected the following criteria by including:

1. Students from different geographical areas of Malta; students attending the College hail from all over the Island
2. Students who come from different home backgrounds in terms of social class
• Students who possess different abilities and aptitudes (if one had to refer to their Matric/Sec qualifications, and their choice of subjects – every student at the College has an individual time table)

• Students who followed the Primary and Secondary courses in Government, Church (Roman Catholic) and Private schools as outlined by the Maltese National Minimum Curriculum (although, as pointed out previously, they might have used different means)

• Students whose age varies mainly from 16 to 18, where the majority are 17 year olds and only a few are 16 and 18+.

It is important to note that:

• All students at the Junior College follow the same Syllabus for Systems of Knowledge

• All students at the Junior College follow the same Syllabus for Systems of Knowledge as other students in Post-Secondary level at the Government Higher Secondary Schools, at the Church Sixth Forms, at Private Sixth Forms, and at some Government MCAST institutes.

4.2.2.2 Questionnaire Findings

The respondents were asked to tick one answer out of five in most questions. For Question 5 and 14 they had to choose between two responses, and for Questions 10 and 11 the respondents had to rank five responses from 1 to 5, 1 being the most important and 5 the least. However, for these two questions, the researcher inverted the ranking for weighting whilst carrying out the analysis and 1 was given 5 points while 5 was given 1 point. For Question 17 the students had four responses to choose
from. While analysing the data (Tables 3-6 pp. 260-265) the researcher compiled the following:

- Table 1 with the frequency and percentages of each response (all questions except questions 10 and 11 p. 152).
- Table 2 with results of CHI-SQUARED analysis of correlation between responses and Gender (for all questions except 10 and 11) p. 153.
- Two tables (Table 3 and 4 p. 260) with the frequencies of the ordered responses for questions 10 and 11
- Table 5 (p. 261) with percentage frequencies of the responses where gender was shown to have a significant effect on response all questions, i.e. significance value for CHI-SQUARE test <0.05
- Table 6 (p. 264) with percentage frequencies of the responses by Gender (all questions except 10 and 11)

To curtail length, the researcher will comment mainly on Table 1 p. 152 where one finds the Percentage Response Analysed by Gender Selected Questions With CHI-SQUARE <0.05, and Table 2 p. 153. The researcher will then refer to the other tables (Table 3 to 6) in Chapter 5 in the Analysis of Findings. It is also important to state at this point, that the student responses are their stated views, and not necessarily a record of what they actually believe.

The Chi-Square method is utilised to show if the results of the findings are statistically significant. It might only be significant for the group of five hundred respondents who participated in the questionnaire administered at the College in
March 2004. Clive Opie (2004: 137) in his ‘Presenting data’ states that this is the case if we do not know the social background of the students, details of the College they are in, how old they are and how they are presently taught. But in this study, we know to a certain extent what might be their social background since they are all Maltese, and they come from the same cultural background. We have details of the College they are in, how old they are and the Syllabus they are currently taught in Systems of Knowledge, with particular reference to the section in Module One about the concept of ‘democracy’. In this case according to Opie (ibid) we might extrapolate to other students at the same level in other post-secondary schools in Malta. For the Chi-Square test administered with the frequencies and percentages found in the questionnaire, the null hypothesis is ‘does gender have an effect on the responses to the questions?’
Table 1: Percentage Response – Analyzed By Gender
Selected Questions - with Chi Square < 0.05
Results reaching the 5% level are highlighted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q02</strong> How much power do people have in a democracy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 People are allowed to vote in elections</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 People can decide certain issues</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 People compete for power in a democracy</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 People have all the power</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 People in a democracy have no power</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q05</strong> Is Malta a Direct or Representative Democracy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Direct</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Representative</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q07</strong> Does every citizen living in a democracy have equal rights of participation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 All citizens participate in the government of a country</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Only the representatives have the right to decide</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Some citizens have full rights of participation</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 All citizens participate in decisions of the local council</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Only qualified people have the right to decide</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q14</strong> Do you think that in reality democracy really reduces gender discrimination?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1 Yes</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2 No</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q14(b)</strong> Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.1 Males still dominate the world</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.2 There is a need for cultural change</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.3 It is not enough to issue laws</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.4 Because of cultural restrictions</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.5 Biological differences</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q15</strong> Why are numbers (18+, the jury system etc.) important in a democracy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 18+ is a sign of maturity</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2 It is a form of control</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3 It is easy to decide a majority through numbers</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4 Numbers help to declare decisions as final</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5 It is a form of discipline</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q17</strong> If there is an issue you feel strongly against which the government plans to implement, how prepared are you to take an active role in voicing your opinion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1 Criticise</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2 Sit and watch</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.3 Active campaign</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.4 None</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Q2 *How much power do people have in a democracy?* In 2.1 204 respondents (41 per cent) chose response 2.1 *people are allowed to vote in elections,* and 204 (41 per cent) chose response 2.2 *people can decide certain issues.* In 2.2 when analysed by Gender (Table 2 Q2 Chi 10.9, df 4 p: 0.028) there is a 10.3 per cent difference in choice between male and female respondents, and this is a significant difference.

**Table 2: Chi Squared Results – Responses By Gender**

Does Gender have an effect on the responses to the questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>CHI-SQ</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>p &gt; 0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q01 How do you define democracy?</td>
<td>5.347</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q02 How much power do people have in a democracy?</td>
<td>10.900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03 What do we mean by 'Direct' democracy?</td>
<td>5.962</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q04 What do we mean by 'Representative' democracy?</td>
<td>6.298</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q05 Is Malta a Direct or Representative Democracy?</td>
<td>8.659</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q06 How can we identify democracy in practice?</td>
<td>5.038</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q07 Does every citizen living in a democracy have equal rights of participation?</td>
<td>11.054</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q08 Why do we say that in a democracy the majority is always right?</td>
<td>6.599</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q09 Does the minority in a democracy posses any role and rights?</td>
<td>6.828</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 If democracy is one of the best political systems in the world, why do philosophers like Plato, and modern citizens criticise democracy?</td>
<td>3.722</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Why can we say that democracy reduces gender discrimination?</td>
<td>4.021</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 Do you think that in reality democracy really reduces gender discrimination?</td>
<td>3.411</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14(b) Why?</td>
<td>11.333</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Why are numbers (18+, the jury system etc.) important in a democracy?</td>
<td>17.678</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Why can we say that pluralism in a democracy is a symbol of liberty?</td>
<td>4.568</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 If there is an issue you feel strongly against which the government plans to implement, how prepared are you to take an active role in voicing your opinion?</td>
<td>14.028</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Q5 *Is Malta a Direct or a Representative democracy?* We have 54 respondents (11 per cent) choosing Direct. Although this is not a high percentage it is still significant when one thinks that all students followed the same course and discussed the issue. In actual fact Malta is a Representative democracy. It is even more significant (Table 2 Q5 Chi 8.659, df 1, p:0.003) when considering that the respondents had been led to Q5 by Q3 and Q4, which focussed on the meaning of Direct and Representative democracy.

Respondents answering Q7 *Does every citizen living in a democracy have equal rights of participation?* 191 respondents (38 per cent) chose 7.1 *all citizens participate in the government of a country* and 174 (35 per cent) chose 7.2 *only the representatives have the right to decide*. Analysed by Gender (Table 2 Q7 Chi 11.054, df 4, p: 0.026) there are 6.8 per cent more female respondents who chose 7.1 and 11.4 per cent more male respondents who chose 7.2.

There were 255 (51 per cent) respondents who answered yes and 245 (49 per cent) who answered no to Q14 *Do you think that in reality democracy really reduces gender discrimination?* When one refers to Table 1 p.147 it is interesting to note that the difference by Gender for 14.1 and 14.2 is 8.5 per cent more male respondents, which could be described as reasonable in a patriarchal society like Malta. It is even more interesting to note that there are 43.8 per cent male respondents who think that it does not reduce gender discrimination.

Following the above, those who answered no (245 respondents) were then asked Q14b *Why?* 70 respondents (29 per cent) chose 14b.1 *males still dominate the
world. Referring to Table 5 (p. 261) 28.2 per cent male respondents and 28.8 per cent female respondents chose this response. It is also significant (Table 2 Q14b Chi 11.333, df 5, p: 0.045) to note that in 14b.2 there is a need for cultural change 31.9 per cent female respondents as against 20 per cent male respondents chose this response. However then ironically, in 14b.4 because of cultural restrictions 24.7 per cent male respondents chose this response as against 12.5 per cent female respondents. Although 14b.2 and 14b.4 are very similar responses with respect to meaning, males were more attracted to respond to by cultural restrictions rather than by cultural change.

The findings for Q15 in Table 5 (p. 263) for the question why are numbers (18+, the jury system etc.) important in a democracy? 231 respondents (46 per cent) chose 15.1 18+ is a sign of maturity, out of these 57.2 per cent were male respondents and 39.2 per cent were female respondents. It might be the case that male respondents emphasise more the importance of maturity through age, while with respect to 15.2 it is a form of control, 27.5 per cent female respondents chose this response. Further more, 18.6 per cent male respondents chose the latter. For female respondents, age seems to be a form of control, a more negative point rather than a positive point. One can also detect a significant difference (Table 2 Q15 Chi 17.678, df 4, p: 0.001) in 15.4 numbers help to declare decisions as final where 6.2 per cent male respondents chose this response compared to 12.7 per cent female respondents who selected this response. Therefore, it might be the case that female respondents look at age as a form of security, especially when deciding gender issues. It is true to note that if one refers to Table 5 (p. 262) Q13 why can we say that democracy reduces gender discrimination? 316 respondents or 63 per cent chose 13.1 women
have equal rights, and this percentage can be further analysed by gender as 61.9 per cent male respondents and 64.1 per cent female respondents, but this only refers to reducing gender discrimination with respect to the law, and Q14b has shown this rather clearly.

A significant difference (Table 2 Q17 Chi 14.028, df 3, p: 0.003) can be observed through the findings presented in Table 1 Q17 where respondents were asked if there is an issue you feel strongly against which the government plans to implement, how prepared are you to take an active role in voicing your opinion? 265 respondents (53 per cent) are prepared to criticise and only 79 or 16 per cent are prepared to take part in an active campaign. Out of these respondents it is significant to observe that in 17.1 45.9 per cent are male whilst 57.5 per cent are female respondents. It seems that for many reasons, female respondents are more prepared to criticise. While 23.2 per cent male and 11.1 per cent female respondents are ready to participate in active campaigns. Here male respondents are more ready to participate actively even though the percentage of respondents who are willing to participate is low.

When respondents were asked in Q10 (Table 3 p. 260) to rank the importance of certain institutions in a democracy that provide for freedom of expression, 262 respondents ranked the media as the most important element in society followed by trade unions and courts of justice. When the respondents were asked in Q11 (Table 4 p. 260) for their opinion regarding which medium would the citizen chose to express his/her opinion again 242 respondents ranked the media as the most important medium to express opinions in a democracy, followed by trade unions as in Q10.
Here one has to refer to the interview findings about pluralism in broadcasting in the Maltese situation to get a real feeling of the difference between what the respondents think about media as expressed in the questionnaire and what is available in reality as expressed by interviewees in section 4.2.3 B3 (p. 172).

As a concluding remark, and following the presentation of findings of the questionnaire the observation by Ian Davies et al (1999) comes to mind when they quote Oliver and Heater (1994) who affirm that “education is clearly one way in which the foundations for citizenship may be laid and laid better” (p. 7). However then they argue that “it is becoming increasingly evident that the meaning of ‘education’ in this context is broad; that education for citizenship commences long before a child formally enters the classroom” (p.72). This section of Chapter 4 clearly shows that even though respondents followed the same Maltese National Minimum Curriculum in the Primary and the Secondary stage of their education and whilst they also followed the same syllabus for Systems of Knowledge, their understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ as identified through the responses, is substantially moulded by influences coming from other factors other than their educational experience. The researcher will refer to this issue further on in Chapter 5 in the Analysis, Synthesis and Discussion and again in Chapter 6 with recommendations aimed at improving the present situation. These recommendations are supported by the theories discussed in Chapter 2, the Literature Review.
4.2.3 Findings: Semi-Structured Interviews

As pointed out in previous sections, the third part of the study consisted of data collection through the recording of eight semi-structured interviews carried out with colleagues during October 2004. All eight interviews were transcribed. This also gave the opportunity to the researcher to get a hands-on approach to this process. It can in fact be stated that through the semi-structured interview method the researcher acquired a substantial amount of information, not only as a result of implementing the research instrument but also through other observations of the human experience, such as non-verbal communication, that emerged whilst conducting interviews. The researcher made short notes after the interview referring to, for example, the emotional reactions when the interviewees referred to certain issues that they felt strongly about. Non-verbal communication was observed in nearly all interviews, whether the interviewees were male or female.

The diversity of perspective and experience is what makes qualitative research challenging, yet rewarding. While the researcher gained many insights about the way lecturers define the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’, other related perceptions about citizenship, and also their perception of the students’ understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’, the researcher was able to gain an insight and explore the richness and complexity of how people think, react and respond to the world around them. Although the researcher interviewed only eight lecturers, the researcher handled 47 A4 pages of transcripts i.e. approximately 26,500 words apart from the notes, which provided a wealth of data that was not only stimulating and enriching but also a great eye-opener on some issues that made the difference between reading theory and actually exploring theory in practice.
The transcripts were examined using the ‘constant comparison method’ aimed at exploring responses focussing on the key themes which frame the research as well as looking for emerging themes. The examination of responses included a comparison aimed at actually bringing out the similarities and divergences.

The interview schedule (Appendix 5 p. 250) included eighteen questions; the first question was deliberately general, open question asking the interviewees ‘how do you define democracy?’ and the last question was a general question asking the interviewees ‘is there anything you wish to add that has not been addressed by any of my questions or your responses?’ in order to give the opportunity of another open ended type of question. Nearly all the respondents answered each of the seventeen questions, (declining to answer only when they felt they had already provided a response to the particular question elsewhere during the interview) and only two decided not to add anything to the eighteenth question. It may be argued that there seems to be an imbalance in the presentation of findings for the questionnaire and those of the semi-structured interviews. The Tables presented earlier in this chapter present more concise and inferential data that resulted from the questionnaire. As for the semi-structured interviews, the researcher felt it necessary to present findings to give a complete picture of the responses, and at the same time, present the information as was emphasised in Chapter 3.

Furthermore, the researcher also felt that it might not be appropriate to try to select only the more significant responses of the different interviewees while presenting the data or findings for the semi-structured interviews as part of this
chapter. Initially the researcher actually selected this method. The outcome of this approach resembled, what in research methodology circles is frequently known as ‘the shopping list’ presentation. For this reason, and guided by the thesis supervisor, the researcher then decided that it would be more appropriate to include analysis, together with a presentation and description of data. The semi-structured interviews produced considerable information, which, although slightly conditioned to an extent by the same research instrument presented to all interviewees, was by and large, in fact an open-ended outcome. The researcher also felt that by adding partial analysis of the interviews in this section, the differences as well as the similarities that such a qualitative approach produced would be further elicited.

To the question (A1) ‘how do you define democracy?’ the respondents had different answers. As pointed out in Chapter 3, this was a simple initial question that was intended to break the ice and encourage the interviewees to feel at ease, and open up during the exercise. It was also intended to prepare the interviewees for the second question, which is more central to this study. Crick (1999) stated that “definitions do not settle arguments and important concepts cannot be defined too precisely. […] But theories are built on concepts. Concepts are our primary perceptions of a field of cognate problems” (p. 341).

Most answers given for question A1 noted that democracy is a positive system, for example: I1 ‘democracy is the decision of the many and not of the few’, and I5 ‘a way of life more than a political system’. (Note that I1 refers to interviewee 1 and so on). A few referred to the question of majority and minority rule. One respondent emphasised the importance attributed to the majority and minority rights
as follows: I3 'a system where everyone has rights and all should be heard [...] even those who are in a minority'. In the Maltese context, this 'minority' refers mostly to the minority in elections, and not really to minorities living in a multicultural society, nor to the rights of inclusion in that society. Others emphasised the role of the people in decision making such as I4 'to give part of the decision making to the people [...] each citizen has a kind of say in the government [...] a lot of freedom in society because of human rights'. However, this interviewee, like most of the others, seemed unaware of the responsibilities, and the importance of preparedness that goes hand in hand with the right to participate in decision-making. Some respondents also considered the positive and negative activities that unfold in a democracy. I7 stated 'democracy is a process that lives [...] democracy is what people really want to make out of it themselves [...] something internal that is shown externally in the way we live and participate in society and the community'. Another I8 pointed out that 'it refers to what it means to live in a democracy, i.e. one has rights, duties and responsibilities [...] pluralism, many voices and many views'. Indeed, the breadth of responses subscribe to what was pointed out by Crick (2002b) "if there is one true meaning then it is, as Plato might have said, stored up in heaven; but unhappily has not yet been communicated to us" (p. 1).

The above responses are in line with the definitions presented by the researcher in Chapter 2, the literature review where the researcher describes how different definitions of the same concept of 'democracy' emerged through time. Of particular concern is the fact that responses rarely referred to the negative aspects of a democracy, or of participating in society as a democratic citizen. Neither did the respondents refer to the roles of citizenship education (through various approaches),
to fulfil the purpose (as discussed in Chapter 2) of 'normal' citizens evolving to democratic citizens, ready and able to live so, in all the spheres of life, possessing knowledge, skills, understanding and attitudes to fulfil that role.

When the interviewees were asked to give their perception of (A2) 'the students' understanding of democracy at the Junior College', the answers referred to voting, elections, and a party system. Some examples are: 11 'mostly the rule of the country, electing a government and a majority in parliament', 12 'the ability to vote and choose a political party [...] might refer to a free press [...] do not appreciate the idea of the general rule of the law', and 13 'a party system', 'they do not have a clear idea, they do not keep up with the news'. One of the respondents argued that students think that democracy is always positive, while in fact another 18 argued that it is [...] a strict partisan approach to democracy which is painted very much in terms of the two main political parties and to a lesser extent by the third party'. Another believed that students are passive to the extent that 15 argued that 'they are not really interested to express their ideas about democracy'. Another interviewee felt that those students who participate in extracurricular activities are more prepared to participate in a democracy, 16 stated 'those who participate in extra-curricular activities seem to have a grasp of what democracy is because they practise democracy. They would know the idea of citizenship and its relationship to democracy [...] does not necessarily mean that they see democracy as a process'. It is unfortunate that not all students feel the urge to participate in extracurricular activities, yet it must be noted that these activities might not have the aim of evolving students into democratic citizens. This is of particular concern in the context of what has been argued in Chapter 2 about the danger of having inactive citizens, especially youngsters, who are ready to forfeit their
rights and duties of participating in a democracy to their representatives. One of the respondents 17 pointed out that ‘their idea is simplistic, it revolves around the idea of elections.

When the interviewees were asked (A3) ‘how accurate and complete do you feel is that understanding?’ most of the responses indicated that they felt, it is inaccurate. One respondent 12 said that ‘It is not accurate’, and another 15, ‘most students think that democracy has to do with elections, with parliament, ministers’. Another 16 went as far to say that ‘it is totally incomplete and totally inaccurate [...] they are told by politicians that democracy is about elections’. One respondent 17 felt that ‘at the academic level (university) they seem to know, especially after attending the course’. However, one may argue that few young Maltese actually get to university. Furthermore, it does not necessarily follow that by following a course at university level one will acquire an understanding of the concept of ‘democracy’ and even more how it works in practice. What is worrying is the response 18 that says ‘I think that initially students’ understanding is more or less a reflection of the wider society. I do not feel that the Maltese are immature politically considering that we take interest in politics but very often [...] it goes as far as how it affects you personally and what you are going to get out of it’. This statement brings out the importance of implementing changes in the curriculum that prepares students for democratic citizenship, if anything to overcome the emphasis on liberal individualism, or enlightened self-interest, and to introduce a community feeling. This is in line with what the Education for Citizenship in Scotland paper proposes, i.e. “citizenship is about making informed choices and decisions, and about taking action, individually and as part of collective processes” (p. 4).
In question A4 the researcher asked the interviewees 'where do you think they got their understanding?' Their responses have to be analysed keeping in mind the responses given to Q10 and Q11 in the questionnaire (presented above). In the questionnaire, the respondents opted mostly for the media. In the semi-structured interviews, the respondents argued that the main influencing agents are the family, media and the Church. Here this refers to the Maltese Roman Catholic Church, internationally it would refer to Religion. This concurs with what Davies et al (1999) point out in their research, reflecting the significance of these influencing agents. One of the respondents 12 argued that 'it is obviously from the family background, the media and the school. Society in general, the feelers of a majority that imposes in a normal way the messages in a direct and secondary manner'. What is worrying in the response of 12 is the emphasis on the imposition of the understanding of the majority on the minority. Another 16 stated that 'the mass media will highlight anything [of political parties] that politicians on both sides want to highlight [...] the family is the first learning context [...] what parents say will filter in your home background [...] the Church [...] religion was directly involved in politics in the sixties, the Church had a slight inclination to one particular political party'. And 18 'they are influenced by the affairs in Malta and the family attitudes and the media'. Two interviewees 15 referred to the fact that 'most students simply get an idea from lecturers [...] a great percentage of the students simply restate what they learn in class and they do not get a critical understanding of what democracy is', or 17, 'from the course content itself'. This will have a positive bearing with respect to the long awaited changes in the syllabus. Also one should strive to make the lecturers conscious of this situation and
their responsibility while working with students about the issues of democracy and citizenship.

For interview question A5, the interviewees were asked: 'to what extent do you think democratic principles are exercised on the local level (local councils, College, University); on the national level; and on the global/international level?' One respondent I1 argued that 'lack of participation on the local level [...] there should be more political parties so that democracy functions at its best [...] our democracy is different from other countries because they all vary from each other'. Crick (2002b) supports this claim when he acknowledges that 'the unchanged sacred word 'democracy' can cause troubles enough because it can mean all things to all men as it is translated into different cultures and its thread is spun for different purposes' (p. 7). Another interviewee I3 was very blunt in saying that 'local councils in the villages are at an initial stage because they have existed for the last ten years [...] here at College and at the University it is a joke. On the national level, formally we have a democracy but the government in power [...] is doing what it feels like even if we leave aside the rights of the minority and at times even the opinion of the majority and then people feel hurt [...] on the international level it is a great joke [...] the fact that today we have America that does whatever it wants and even surpassing the UN, the decisions taken there, we are living in difficult times'. A very relevant point for this study, put forward by one of the interviewees I4 is that 'I think that the possibility has increased [at the College] but I say that students are not that involved [...] it makes sense to have students participating in local governments or councils or ministries with some work-study or volunteer experience, a number of hours, in an area that they are interested in'.
However even here one has to be careful, since as Crick (2002b) pointed out "too much volunteering can simply be young people being told what to do by well-meaning older folk" (p. 115). Interestingly, Stephanie Psaila in her article in *The Times* (of Malta) on Friday, August 12, 2005, quotes Josephine Vassallo, Education Officer for Democracy and Values (Education Department, Malta) when referring to a pilot project called ‘Anzjani u Tfal Ghal Xulxin’ (Old people and Children for each other), experimented during a summer school (2005), she says “the idea was for children to enter a community service”. And further down, she states that this scheme is for students (aged ten to twelve years) who “would choose to spend some of their free time doing community work” (p. 18). This gives the impression of the project being a voluntary service. Yet one cannot truly state whether the students who took part did this out of their own free will, or else were made to participate as part of their summer school experience. What, however, raises concern, is the fact that “the outcome of the pilot project will take the project a step further and introduce it in schools through the “Adopt a Ward Project”, which is scheduled to commence in the next scholastic year” (p. 19). The rationale is presented further as “although we will propose the project during the scholastic year we do not plan to run it during school hours because the idea is for children to take up a community commitment in their free time” (p. 19). The title of this article ‘Learning citizenship values through education’ gives the impression that such a pilot project is an ideal means of creating active citizens in a community. As argued by Crick (2002b) and elsewhere (2004), this may be far from the more appropriate methods of evolving citizenship values in our younger generation especially if participants have no direct say in the organisation of the project. However, this particular project is definitely an important experiment,
which could support and highlight critical issues raised in this research. It also brings to the forefront the urgent need of further discussion and awareness regarding the issue, its importance and the understanding of Citizenship among local education authorities and academics who are responsible for developing local curricula.

Other respondents see the family and the Church as agents that restrict the workings of democracy. One, 15, points out that 'even in the Maltese family undemocratic ways prevail. Our religious system is definitely undemocratic [...] on the national level we are highly participative in the electoral process however we stop there [...] an undemocratic society where the political leaders are expected to provide all the answers, all the knowledge and solutions that we create'. Two respondents referred to the fact that Malta is now a full member of the EU, and that at the same time membership does not solve local problems. In fact one 17 argued that 'I would say that since we have joined the EU, the only way I could look at it is from a European perspective [...] we cannot look at ourselves just as an island [...] In Malta we are such a small country that everyone knows everyone. How democratic is that? How truly free are we to practice democracy with such a constraint, such a social constraint', and another, 18 'I think that we, the persons in the street are just faced with rubber stamps and the decisions are ultimately taken by the people who represent us because it would be difficult to have everybody's view taken into account [...] on the international level, if we take the debacle at the European parliament yesterday and democracy in practice it would seem that if you are an honest person like Rocco Buttiglione and cannot address certain ideas, then you cannot have those ideas [...] again how feeble or how strong is the UN with the things that happened in Iraq and the weakness of democracy in general'.
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In question A6, the interviewees were asked *to what extent do you think that the majority and minority rule contributes to cohesion in society?* The responses for this question are interesting because they show that there are different possible solutions and opinions about the challenge. One example is ‘to make it [democracy] function at its best you need to legislate [...] the chairperson should always be proposed by the minority. Therefore there should be laws to make the minority participate fully in the democratic process and the minority should be involved in the decision-making’. The term ‘minority’ for a number of interviewees refers only to the political minority in parliament. In fact one, I2, argued that ‘majority rule that respects the aspirations of the minority, otherwise it will not make sense, if it undermines the legitimate aspirations of the minority’, and another, I3, ‘the majority has the right to govern [...] but when the minority is 49% in the Maltese situation, [...] then what do you do? It brings separation and conflict’. What is significant to note is that two interviewees took the term ‘minority’ to refer to different types of minorities in society and the importance of inclusion and integrating the minorities in society. Respondent I6 argued that *the majority and minority principle has worked out but [...] this is not simply a question of political parties because minorities want their democratic status as well [...] but as far as minorities are concerned they just float about*. I7 states, ‘it is a fair rule, better than the opposite [...] minority rights are taken into consideration [...] one day it has to disappear [...] we need to accept that this idea of majority and minority rule is another false dichotomy, because here the real issue is that everybody is a citizen*.
Question B1 reads ‘Through what channels can a citizen in a Democracy express his/her opinion freely?’ One common answer to this question is to be found by referring to the means of the media (Q10 and Q11 in the questionnaire above), especially these past ten years where in Malta we have experienced pluralism in broadcasting, although two major radio and television stations are owned by the two major parties. One interviewee refers to the role of the media in the democratic process: 11 ‘I think today we have reached a situation where plurality in broadcasting is an important aspect in a democracy [...] I think the use of the media is becoming more important in the democratic process’. Others refer to the media as a tool or a medium to voice one’s opinion or a complaint: 13 ‘the broadcasting legislation guarantees your voice even if you are in opposition’, 14 ‘people write to complain and if they complain enough something is usually done’, 17 ‘if people want to express their disagreement they can write a letter to a newspaper, and there are groups that are anti-establishment’; 18 ‘by having recourse to the media. I do believe that people should not be victimised for showing their opinion’, that is by being transferred to another place of work, or are discriminated against in the workplace when it comes to getting a promotion. The last comment shows that in a democracy not everything is well. On the same line, another interviewee, 16, argued that ‘connections are very important in Malta. They are more important than merit [...] the driver of the minister is more powerful than the minister [...] the parties are ruled by a clique, a group who is more powerful than others and whatever they say counts’. What is worrying is the fact that one of the interviewees 15 attributed this state of affairs to the system of education and argued that ‘our socialisation process should teach us how to participate in a democracy [...] unfortunately our education system is meritocratic and this kills many democratic ideals [...] the system is based on non-participatory
values in which many citizens are afraid to participate [...] many citizens in the Maltese society cannot participate because of many reasons: disability, unemployment and illiteracy’. There was only one respondent, 12, who took the term ‘pluralism’ to refer to the multicultural aspect of the Maltese society. S/he pointed out that ‘pluralism is an essential aspect, in that people appreciate that there are different values from their own and should also be taken into consideration’. Reference to this situation goes on to emphasise how important it is to implement changes in the Maltese National Minimum Curriculum, particularly in the Systems of Knowledge syllabus, in an effort to support and safeguard democracy from moving away from its original aims, as outlined in the discussion presented in Chapter 2.

Although the last three questions were not directed at the students’ perception of the issue being researched, most of the responses focussed on the citizen as the centre of the response. This obviously includes also the role of the student as a young citizen or future adult citizen living in a democracy. Question B2 was directed towards the lecturers’ perception of the students’ preparation for their role as democratic citizens. The question reads as follows: ‘after their studies in the primary, secondary (PSHE/Social Studies) and the Junior College, do you think students will have been prepared to live as democratic citizens?’ The answers to this question show that there is a general consensus among the interviewees that students are not fully prepared to live as democratic citizens. One of the respondents 11 affirmed: ‘I think that students are becoming more aware of the situation [...] our students would have a simple idea of how democracy works. It is up to them [to see] how they are going to implement it in their life, if there is the fear of participating and involvement’. Another respondent, 12, pointed out that ‘prepared maybe to learn how
to be democratic citizens. Now they lack that and someone has to show them that way. They are ready for tolerance but they do not know how to tackle tolerance’. It is another thing when it comes to acquire the skills to become democratic citizens. I3 responded that, ‘at this level this course is very helpful in informing students about what it takes to be part of a democracy. At the same time they cannot participate because they do not know that part of being a citizen is that you have to be knowledgeable about how the government works, you cannot be part of a system without knowing what it entails, and Systems of Knowledge is a good preparation for that knowledge and information’. Another, I8, answered ‘let us say that they are given the tools to live as democratic citizens. If we equate giving the tools with preparation then they are prepared. I still wonder when it comes to participation, there is still a lot of apathy in the majority of the Maltese people; we complain but we are not keen on taking action personally. We expect other people to take action and do so for us, what we ought to do for ourselves [...] we need more pressure groups in Malta’. What is worrying is that students are not prepared for a critical and dynamic democratic system, I4 argues that ‘students are prepared to fit within society [...] within the traditional democratic system. However they cannot fit within a critical democratic system, which is a dynamic system [...] unfortunately even the University of Malta does not prepare critical citizens who can change democracy’. This is worrying since as Kymlicka (2001) pointed out

Children acquire these virtues and loyalties not just (or even primarily) in civics classes. Rather, they are inculcated in children throughout the educational system. The aim of educating citizens affects what subjects are taught, how they are taught, and in what sort of classrooms. In this sense, education for citizenship is not an isolated subset of the curriculum, but rather is one of ordering goals or principles which shapes the entire curriculum (p. 293).
With respect to question B3, although the issue of pluralism in broadcasting has already been referred to by the interviewees in question B1, the researcher felt the need to emphasise this as a separate question. It is important that as an interviewer, one should keep to the schedule as much as possible, as argued in Chapter 3. However, at times more interesting data might emerge and then the issue could be referred to in a separate question as is the case with this particular question. Question B3 reads as follows: ‘Democracy promotes pluralism in broadcasting; do you think in Malta in the last decade (after the legislation) this proved to be a positive means of expression for democracy?’ Some interviewees argued negatively. 11, (a male interviewee), argued: ‘No, I do not think so, radio and T.V. stations have degenerated into juke boxes playing music, and if anything it helped to go against the idea of pluralism for the mass of the people with a particular political belief and to only listen to that political belief and not to be exposed to different conflicting beliefs’. 12, stated, ‘No in fact most of the channels are trying to go for the middle of the road solution, in fact with the Public Broadcasting Services for discussions, even though it is a government station, there is a moderation of the situation. The others are watched by party supporters and the message is arriving in a way where it is not used as democratic education [...] when it is a political subject no but at least now we accept to sit near each other and discuss and to learn, before we used to fight in the seventies’. Others answered in a positive manner. 13 stated that ‘Yes I think they are helpful if there are more than one; people have a choice and will have the chance to think about all the sides of the issues and not just one [...] freedom of choice, there is more than one opinion and there is no dictatorship’. Another, 18, said that ‘From the gagging that there was in the seventies and eighties the changes were a positive step forward. But I sometimes feel that these systems are reinforcing polarisation as well.'
On the one hand we have a democratic system where everybody is going to find an arena, whichever station is ready to voice out opinion but you tend to participate on stations that reflect your political views’. One interviewee, 14, emphasised the idea of polarisation and control by saying that ‘It has definitely brought progress [...] However, the three major radio stations are owned by the Malta Labour Party, Nationalist Party and the Church [...] people are not free to express their pluralist ideas. It indoctrinates rather than educates and creates dependent and uncreative citizens who are not part of a real dynamic society. The political parties also use the stations to increase their control over the people, rather than to create creative thinking citizens, they use their programmes to create people who do not ask, who are ready to be filled with information and be passive thinkers’. Another one 17 referred to the content provided: ‘If you are going to answer the question keeping in mind the number of stations, yes, but you have to look at the content of those radio stations and you have to see what message they are sending [...] there are stations that are less cultural and others that are purely partisan [...] most Maltese are going to listen to their party radio or the mainstream pop music’.

Question C1 concerns a very topical and important issue, that of Gender Equality. The researcher asked the lecturers’ opinion about the fact that democracy provides legislation to create Gender Equality. Although the interviewees were males and females, the responses were mainly on the same line, that there is a difference between what exists in theory and what really exists in practice. It is true that in Malta there are the same laws about gender equality as there are in other countries in Europe and the USA. But, when one delves into everyday reality, there still appears to be a lot of discrimination. It argues, ‘we still need more participation
from women, in every aspect of life, not just at University level [...] participation in the local councils, statistics show that there is more involvement than last year. But we are still far away from reaching the point where participation is like other countries [...] comparing Malta with other countries where the patriarchal system is strong because of religion, politics and traditions; these three aspects are crucial and one thinks there is a lot to be done even in other countries.

Discrimination is found at all levels. It is found in the family. 12 argues that 'the family background, the traditionalist family background is still dominant. Although some people tend to be influenced by the situations and would adjust their views and in this case the majority would disagree that gender stands at fixed poles.

It is also found at school. Respondent 17 says 'As a law it is there, and if I am not mistaken there are more female students at University [...] but in the faculty of engineering the number is lopsided, we have to be clear when we refer to top managerial levels and we have only a few women politicians [...] unless this is instilled in children at school, there will be a lot of stereotyping'. There is discrimination at work. Respondent 15 argues, 'We have a lot to talk about improving the situation for women in society, however the practice is much different. The female labour force is much smaller than the male and the participation of women in paid jobs is smaller [...] women are channelled to part time jobs and housework and the males are getting the best jobs. At the workplace there is a huge discrimination when one considers the top jobs'.

Most responses refer to gender discrimination in society in general. Respondent 14 states: 'I know that there is legislation about gender issues [...] but
sexual harassment exists, and I do not think that a lot of men are aware especially the things they say are actually sexual harassment’. 18 says ‘Ideally yes […] I think that the framework is there, so the spirit is willing but in practice it is not always working out like that, […] in this country, on the whole, only a few women have broken through the glass ceiling, and when you do that you will be approaching forty […] in Malta we do not have enough nurseries so we do pay lip service to the fact that we do have a great contribution to give and nothing should stop them and keep them at home but then we do not have enough provision to make it easier for them’. This is worrying since as Enslin and White (2002) in their paper ‘Democratic citizenship’ point out

> [g]iven women’s initial exclusion from the franchise, from eligibility to stand for election to public office, to apply for work on equal terms with men, and in some countries restrictions on their freedom to be out unescorted in public, from one point of view it seems obvious that participatory citizenship is valuable both for its own sake and for the further gains that it promises for women as they share in decision-making (p. 119).

In question C1, the interviewees had already referred to the Maltese situation. The researcher asked further about gender equality, or lack of it in Malta, through question C2 where do you see Malta when compared to other countries? The respondents added some short comments about the issue of gender equality or lack of it. Some respondents argue that it is a question of tradition. 11 states ‘we can say that women have all rights. I think it is tradition, it is the old mentality […] on the other hand if you are going to change you are going to lose the other aspect […] if you want more participation […] you have to be careful not to lose the positive elements’. 15 argues ‘Malta is male dominated and families are male dominated […] I believe that Malta is well ahead of many other countries from Latin America, African or Asian’. 17 responds that ‘It depends which countries […] towards the north of Europe
there seems to be more gender awareness [...] but then people who live in technologically advanced countries like Japan, there are huge gender issues and inequality, much more than I would find in Malta. There is a history and a culture to take into consideration, and no amount of education can get rid of those'. Respondent 13 believes that 'The Scandinavian countries are more advanced but there are other countries where we are alike [...] in Italy women are renouncing their feminine role and the biological function of that role. But that is their choice and it might be their idea'.

Other respondents acknowledge that in Malta there are problems concerning gender equality that vary from lack of awareness, to not enough legal provisions. In fact, respondent 14 argues that 'I have lived in England and I have lived in the United States and I have not run into so many problems because there they are aware'. 16 further states 'the fact there are still lobby groups means that women still consider that there is something to be done', and 18 argues rather strongly that 'we do not have enough provision to make it easier for women. So yes there is legislation, it has created an awareness of gender issues but it has not solved any problem in any Western country'. Whilst the latter may not really be the case in all Western countries, as there is no doubt that legislation has supported the drive against gender discrimination, the reality is that there still remain much to be done in practice in this area.

C3 is directly addressed at the lecturers' perception about whether they think that Junior College students are well informed about legislation that reduces gender issues? The general impression is that students (males and females) are not
prepared, and informed, and that there is a lot to be done. This is of concern because this study was carried out in one of the largest post-secondary educational institutions in Malta. In fact it strengthens the argument that more emphasis on this field should be made through the curriculum and subjects like Systems of Knowledge. II responds, 'Not fully. I think there is a lot more to be done'. I4 argues that 'It should be part of the curriculum, to make them aware now before they go out in the workforce'. I5 confirms 'definitely not, from my experience in trade unions, they are not well informed [...] on the national level, even if we have a directorate for gender issues there is no strong campaign to educate about these issues [...] they remain at the legislative level and students do not make these gender issues part of their democratic living'. Some of the reasons for this state of affairs is proposed by Enslin and White (2002) where they argue that:

Regardless of the support that many theorists of citizenship, feminists and others, give to a vision of participatory citizenship, the reality of many women's lives restricts much of their activity to the private, where they carry a disproportionate responsibility for the care of children, the elderly, and the sick, and for domestic labour, thus reducing opportunities for public participation (p. 119).

Other interviewees refer to the same problems and in a negative fashion. I6 argues 'I do not think they know about their rights and responsibilities let alone gender issues in the wider world [...] they were never introduced to it [...] knowledge is power and if a person does not know about it, one cannot use it'. I8 categorically states 'Absolutely not. For a start I do not see that it enters the curriculum'. One respondent, I7, said: 'Personally I doubt it, but I might be pleasantly surprised if someone had to perform a survey'. Here the researcher would like to point out that the questionnaire featured three questions about this subject, focussing on gender equality or lack of it in a democracy i.e. Q13, Q14a and Q14b. Although the data will
be analysed in Chapter 5, it is already possible at this point for one to argue that most of the respondents are conscious that democracy should in reality (for one reason or other) reduce gender discrimination. In fact, through Q14a, 255 respondents (56.2% males and 47.7% female) said ‘yes’, while 245 respondents (43.8% males and 52.3% female) answered ‘no’. This, however, also shows that nearly half the respondents of this questionnaire are conscious of the fact, that, in reality, democracy does not reduce gender discrimination.

When the interviewees were asked (C4) about the issue of racism in a democracy, the comments were immediately levelled at the problem of illegal immigrants, coming from North Africa, and the financial repercussions of this issue on the nation, as well as the possible threats that these foreigners pose to the Maltese population. Most interviewees argue that the Maltese define racism mainly as anti-Arab sentiments, because the Maltese have always been in contact with North Africa. Respondent 13 argues ‘Here the students are more tolerant when compared with other people in other places [...] I do not have to underline that what is European is nice and what is not, particularly Arabic, is seen in a racist way’. 14 argues ‘I think there is racism especially with Arabs [...] the Maltese do not want to rent property to Arabs, they have a discrimination;’. 16 believes ‘We are worried a lot with what others may think of us: we are identified as Arabs. Our language gives that impression [...] fear is widespread. Arab names are splashed all over the press when any one of them is involved in a criminal act’. 18 says ‘ [...] I think that racism is equated in this country with people coming from North Africa, therefore black people’. With illegal immigrants, the concept of racism is even wider, and it includes people mainly from Africa. Some interviewees look at racism also with economic
implications. Respondent II argued that 'I think the problem is financial [...] I do not think it is a question of religion or criminality'. 12 says 'Obviously, the majority look at illegal immigrants as a threat to their jobs, to genetic impurity and to their standard of living [...] I presume that the students would reflect the traditional view from the family background [...] when we should see financial benefits. If you employ them and give them a decent wage and they pay taxes you would do away with black jobs. They would contribute to the economy and would not be like those Maltese who work without a permit'. The argument here shifts from what the others think about the Maltese to what the Maltese think about others. Some interviewees, such as 15, argue that 'definitely the Maltese are racist, perhaps because of the problems raised by insularity in the past solved only through emigration. The Maltese are racist and they look upon other cultures and skin colours to be threatening to their living space and their rights'. 17 argues that 'I want to start with my immediate contacts, my friends outside work, and I would say that they are pretty racist. Not just Maltese friends but even foreign friends. They believe that most of the wrong things in the country, economic and social are directly linked to the influx of illegal immigrants [...] I would say that racism is on the increase and with what has been going on not just in Malta. Racism is of particular concern in any society because as Benhabib (2002) points out “cultures are not homogeneous wholes; they are constituted through the narratives and symbolizations of their members, who articulate these in the course of partaking of complex social and significative practices” (p. 61).

On the same line an article in The Sunday Times (of Malta) entitled ‘Maltese intolerant towards foreigners’, based on the conclusions of an ‘Opinion Survey’ the findings show that “Palestinians and Arabs in general were unwelcome by 95.3% and
93.7% of the Maltese respectively, with Africans (90%) and Jews (89%) faring only slightly better” (p. 1). And further down, “according to 92% of the Maltese, illegal immigrants should be denied the right to work in Malta” (p. 1). Asked for his comments, Professor Vassallo said “This study reveals a somewhat sad side of Maltese national identity and cracks the traditional belief that Maltese are a highly hospitable people, a feature so often paraded as a selling point for the Maltese” (p. 1). Further down, and more in line with the findings of this study, Professor Vassallo concluded that

“although it is understandable that the recent illegal immigrant phenomenon and the recent spate of terrorist attacks could have fomented fears among the Maltese, the findings of this study clearly point to a set of social and moral problems that require urgent and focused attention from the educational, ecclesiastical and political authorities to re-educate the Maltese to some basic values. Foremost among these is that each person is born equal, has the same dignity irrespective of skin colour or creed, and is the bearer of the same set of fundamental human rights” (p. 1).

Question D1 focussed on whether equal rights of participation at all levels is promoted in a democracy. When the interviewees were asked for their opinion about this issue, some referred to participation in general. 11 argues that ‘participation is lacking in some sectors, in others it is working. The local council where I live, because of lack of participation by the majority, few are interested in decision-making. In sports or band clubs, participation is higher’. Others refer to participation of women. 13 states that ‘legislation is there but the mentality is different. You have resistance by men for the fact that if both partners work there is still the chance that the housework is performed by the women’. Others referred to student participation at the College. 18 argues ‘Again this is something written on paper but when it is translated into action how much does it really work? [...] so at the level of students at the Junior College, yes, not just voting but it affects students in
the micro and the macro sense. But then on the adult level [...] it is there, there are
opportunities, but I do not see many people are making use of this [...] we prefer to
rely on other people to do the job for us [...] at the school level, even the fact that
school children are not encouraged to participate verbally in class, is already stifling
any germ or seed which will lead to any expression of view and therefore any
participation later'. Again, the respondents referred to the difference between theory
and reality. One respondent 15 argued that 'as an educationalist I believe that such
values should be encouraged at school [...] outside school democratic values can be
taught either through methods which go against the grain and should use non-
traditional methods through democratic progressive methods and through other
systems like the adult education system in which one is not hindered with the normal
examination process'. Another respondent, 16, argued that it is not only a question of
how citizens treat each other but also how politicians treat citizens, 'if it is about how
one realises such high sounding values as equality in society then it is a bit more
complicated. We are equal but we should be treated equally'.

The interviewees were generally pessimistic when answering question D2 about whether they felt that Maltese society including the Junior College students
are prepared and ready to participate to show their disagreement against a policy
issued by the government. The responses mainly emphasise the laissez-faire attitude
of the students, depicting students as only interested with issues that affect them
directly. Respondent 12 argues 'only if it affects their pockets in the short term'; 16
states 'students are more interested in getting good grades than in becoming good
citizens [...] they are afraid to reflect in depth on an issue, they are afraid to ask, they
simply store what they learn and regurgitate it during the examination'. 18 argues, 'I
think that when the students are united against a policy is when the policy affects them directly. Otherwise they have very little appreciation of what is happening around us and would just let things roll over them as long as they have money in their pockets. Here one has to keep in mind that in the questionnaire findings for Q17 (Ref Table: 1 p. 152) respondents show that they are ready to criticise but only a small percentage are ready to take an active role and participate to show their disagreement with any government policy.

Other interviewees affirm that things might improve. Respondent 11 says ‘recently this aspect is improving, because if we take the student bodies at the College [...] there is more to be done’. Others argued that they need guidance. Respondent 14 argues ‘they could be aware that the policy is mistaken but the problem is to find a way, even formulate their thinking in a constructive manner and then to send the message. More than leadership they need guidance. The issue makes a difference [...] those things that do not concern them directly they do not care. The same can be said about international affairs, they have no idea what is happening’. 15 states ‘I think in my class I ask them to take an extra step that Systems is about critical and creative thinking so they have to come up with their own opinions and give examples to back their opinions [...] it takes them a while to come to a point where they can disagree because again society is so homogeneous, and they do not want to speak against the institutions and values in society because they are afraid that in some way they may be harassed’. One respondent referred to the eighties when students protested against the removal of their stipend, which obviously goes against their interest. In fact, respondent 17 states ‘Yes they are ready and we know that from past experiences. In the eighties, when democracy was at the very edge, they
demonstrated. Now the Maltese demonstrate against the development of a valley, 
they are environmentally conscious, more than they were in the past [...] they do this 
with something that affects them directly.

In question D3, the researcher aimed at going deeper into this issue of 
participation, and readiness to participate, by asking whether in terms of what has 
been said in D2, do you think that when one does not participate to boycott, one is 
forfeiting one’s right to uphold and nurture democracy, and at the same time would 
be giving a free hand to the majority in power? Here the responses were mixed, 
since some thought one should always participate, insisting that one can show 
disapproval by voting ‘no’. Respondent 12 argues ‘I think one should always 
participate and choose the least evil and not leave the decision in the hands of others. 
If you want, you can do that but it is better if you participate in a choice’. Respondent 
17 argues, ‘Definitely it is so stupid. If you want to show disagreement with something 
all you have to do is say ‘No’. When you do not vote, all you are doing is showing 
disapproval to democracy as a whole and not at the political parties in Malta. It is a 
statement of non-chalance, I do not care, laissez-faire. If you want to show 
disapproval you fight’. 18 argues ‘I do not think that you are strengthening 
democracy but you are giving up your right. And I do not know what point one is 
making, because instead of boycotting you vote ‘yes’ or ‘no’, you are exercising your 
democratic right. You are still protesting because you are still voting against an 
issue, but you are clear. By boycotting you are neither here nor there, and you are 
pleasing the party who called for the boycott’. Others thought that the fact that there 
is a lot of absenteeism would be a sign and a stronger message in itself. Respondent 
13 argues ‘Not necessarily. If everybody boycotts a referendum? Boycott is a
democratic way of showing your disagreement [...] If you use this method intelligently, not because the party tells you to do so'. Respondent 16 states 'boycott is a democratic right and I also believe that it has its importance as I believe as a researcher, in trade unions and strikes. Silence is often a huge voice'. Respondent 15 adds 'boycott is one of the many methods or techniques that we can use to show disagreement [...] boycott is one easy or practical way to protest. Obviously here it depends on motivation, [...] so boycott can be used for different purposes, one of them is to show reasoned protest when their expression is possible'. Another interviewee, 14, felt that whatever you do, it is always a choice: 'Well if you do not participate to make a change then they [the citizens] are still making a choice. Whether they are aware or not to do something, or not to do something, is still a choice, and that is their right not to participate in it, even if they want their [students'] stipends [...] but if they [the Maltese] did not want the EU they should have voted 'No' and by not voting they took away their own free will to determine what type of government they were going to have'. Crick (2002b) while referring to the 'role of the inhabitants' in a democracy, argues that “voluntary and individual participation is encouraged in modern democracies, but not compulsory. A person is free to act as a citizen or not, hence a discriminatory kind of loyalty” (p. 94). In other words, it is at the discretion of the citizens to choose to participate or not. This is of great concern if citizens are not informed or if they have no deliberative skills (Benhabib (2002)) to make such important decisions.

The penultimate question (which is an open-ended question) is again a general question about democracy. The interviewees were asked what they thought about the following issue; (E) if democracy is considered as the best political system, why is
there so much criticism against this system on the national and the global level?

Some interviewees refer to criticism as a right in a democracy; if there is no democracy you cannot criticise. Respondent 13 argues 'Democracy gives you the right to show your opinion. In Germany, in certain places you have representatives of the Extreme Right party because they won the elections. Democracy permits that even those who are against and work against democracy, have the right to participate'. Respondent 17 argues 'because democracy is the only system which entails the right to criticise, [...] it is its life force. This for two reasons: first because politicians are not perfect and secondly criticism generates more criticism'. Respondent 18 argues 'Some people who criticise democracy should have a spell of living in a non-democratic country and then they would appreciate what it really means. They can hop over to Cuba and see what is happening, [...] so one appreciates democracy by considering the alternative and the alternative is unthinkable'. On the other hand, others argue that democracy is criticised because of the way great powers in the Western World use democracy for their own interest. Respondent 12 argues 'If you refer to the Western principles, we often speak of an ideal state, something that is worth going for and that one should go to Iraq and export it (ideal state). But then there are different cultures that say that you cannot actually foster democracy and you cannot impose democracy on a country [...] students see it as positive because all parties pay lip service to it [...] still students are shocked in lectures when they see that democracy can be such a hot potato [...] the financial backing of a club or a group in America [...] in Italy where a person like Berlusconi came to power because of his T.V. stations and newspapers [about corruption and bureaucracy] they might hear their parents complain how they had to wait for a building permit [...] it is something frightening but a bit far away from
them'. 14 says 'If we look at what is going on today and those democratic countries who have the most power, they just do whatever they want [...] I do not think it is democracy, what is happening in the world today'. Two interviewees refer to economic parameters to answer the question about criticism levelled at democracy. 15 claims that 'Some define democracy as the best among evil, [...] if we are not critical thinkers within a political system we cannot improve our political system. Democracy has evolved and women have rights now but there is still a long way to go. And perhaps the beauty about democracy is the fact that it is not a complete system and it can change [...] however democracy cannot be measured in economic parameters. The Chinese Communist system is [as] successful as most democratic systems, so economically we cannot gauge democracy'; respondent 16 argues Democracy is one word but it hides many systems [...] democracy is not a mummified system [...] the situation in global terms as far as I think democratic politics are much more flexible to develop economic interests than in other particular societies, much more than if you have communism, [...] now with regards to the international scene of democracy I tie it with economics because I feel that economics give the push forward [...] with a bigger Europe [...] I doubt whether democracy will be better, because of greater numbers'. It appeared that as the respondents answered the questions put to them, they reflected on their own opinions and beliefs, opening possible avenues of discussion.

In fact, through the last open-ended question, the interviewees were asked if there is anything you wish to add that has not been addressed by any of my questions or your responses? Six out of eight interviewees did in fact add a comment, and five of them emphasised the need to change the method and the content
of teaching, of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’. This is in line with the whole rationale of this study where one acknowledges the importance of the concepts being studied. At the same time the researcher and the interviewees acknowledge the need to change content and emphasise rights and duties, and to reduce time allotted to delivering content to have more time to deliver skills, especially that of participation in a democracy as active democratic citizens.

One interviewee, 11, said that: ‘At our college we should review the methods how you tackle this subject [...] in our syllabus we need to involve more the students, not only in the individual seminars [...] we need to bring speakers, and not only politicians because democracy is not only politics [...] Democracy starts in the family [...] Democracy is lacking in our Church’. Another respondent, 15, said: ‘I believe that the major objective of education should be to create a just society, and a just society can only be created in relative terms by democracy. [...] this can be achieved not by preparing students for a job but by creating citizens who can change society and can participate actively. [...] Democracy should be beneficial to the whole education system at all levels in the lifelong span from childhood to adulthood’. And another one, 14, said: ‘[...] I think if we can move from giving information about democracy and we ask students to think about it, to discuss it and give examples, to think creatively about it and write essays, but there can be an extra slot, the actual participation. It is okay to talk about values in participating in active citizenship but it is another thing to be an active citizen and have that experience’. This is in line with previous studies referred to in Chapter 2, especially the Crick Report (1998), where an emphasis is directed towards political literacy, and furthermore, in Crick
(2000a: 59-74) where one of the papers refers mainly to the different knowledge, attitudes, values and skills needed for democratic citizenship.

A second point raised is the issue of rights, and the importance to balance these rights with duties. One respondent, 12, said: The only thing I want to add is that democracy does not only give you rights but it also gives you obligations, something our students should be taught [...] Political parties know that this is correct and they should emphasise this idea'. Another, 16, said: 'I think that unless people are ready to push forward not just the down to earth practical things like employment, prices [...] democracy should be widely discussed [...] this will mean more participation [...] first, one should get the message through better rights, [...] secondly make some kind of institutionalised structures for those rights to arrive even where decisions are made, [...] third, it is a matter of culture and [...] if people do not change, it is not going to work out but it will only be plans for an ideal future'. One interviewee, 17, felt that one should emphasise the different ways that different countries implement democracy as a system: 'It would be interesting to learn how people in different nations live democracy, maybe there are things that are different about it. There are so many different issues involved'. The interviewee might here have been referring to what he or she wishes, or what the students should be getting during lectures, i.e. a different experience from their own.

The interview ended with an expression of thanks to all the participants, for their free time, and for their professionalism. Through the constant comparison method, the researcher managed to elicit the most important responses from the considerable amount of material generated through the transcripts. The next section
(4.3) links the data with issues outlined in the research questions (4.4) links the overall aims with the findings.

4.3 Data linked with issues outlined in research questions

This study aims at exploring the students' understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship' at the Junior College of the University of Malta. One specific aim is that of exploring what the students' understanding of the concepts mentioned above should be in the 21st century in the light of the available theoretical and conceptual literature presented in Chapter 2, compared to the real understanding of the concepts possessed by the students, that emerged in Chapter 4 through the presentation of findings of the qualitative and quantitative research.

The hypothesis that emerged from the first qualitative research, namely, the content analysis of twenty examination scripts is 'to explore whether students are able to transform content (about the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship') discussed and acquired during lectures, into knowledge'. The data acquired through the quantitative research, specifically through the questionnaire used as the research instrument suggests a rather negative outcome to the hypothesis. When one refers to Q05 Is Malta a Direct or Representative democracy, of the questionnaire, there were 54 respondents or 11 per cent who actually replied that Malta is a Direct democracy. The majority showed that they knew that Malta is a Representative democracy, and in Q04 what do we mean by Representative democracy 343 or 69 per cent of the respondents replied (4.1) all the electorate participates in general elections. However, it is still worrying that 11 per cent of the respondents who follow the same
course as other students do not know the difference. Furthermore, one may refer to the qualitative research, namely the semi-structured interviews conducted with eight lecturers, and specifically to their responses for question A2. This shows that the students refer to democracy only with reference to elections of representatives, and the responses for A3 focus on the accuracy and completeness of the students' understanding of the concept of 'democracy'. Again, the interviewees replied that students' understanding is incomplete and inaccurate. These findings refer to students who can be considered as representative of this sample of the Maltese younger population (i.e. those who followed the education process described above) and not necessarily the rest of the population. This was pointed out in question B2 where respondent 14 argued that “students are prepared to fit within society [...] within the traditional democratic system”.

Apart from that, when the interviewees were asked whether they feel the students at the College possess the skills to help them show their disagreement with a policy issued by the government, the replies show that they believe that students will do so only if the issue affects their pockets, that they would not be able to formulate their thinking in a constructive manner, and that they are more interested in getting good grades than in becoming good citizens. The last comment shows that, when referring to the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’, most students consider themselves to be studying for examination purposes, and do not think about democracy as a system that goes beyond the immediate importance of theory or their immediate needs. There seems to be no reference to the role of democracy that should be seen as a system that makes a real difference to peoples’ lives and to society in general.
Another research question referred to the 'accepted' opinion among politicians and educators about the laissez-faire attitude of young people with regard to politics in general and their vision of themselves as democratic citizens. The data in Q12, response 12.1 shows that 378 respondents, or 76 per cent are conscious of corruption in the system. However, then when one refers to Q17, where the respondents were asked if they are ready to participate and take an active role in voicing their opinions, 265 or 53 per cent of the respondents chose the response criticise. Only 79 or 16 per cent were ready to participate in an active campaign. In the semi-structured interview, in question B2, where the interviewees were asked whether they think that the students are prepared to live as democratic citizens, the respondents generally argue that students are becoming more aware but they still have only a simple idea of how democracy works. Students might be ready for tolerance, especially with regard to racism, but they do not know how to tackle tolerance. Other respondents argue that they lack knowledge about how the government works, or that they cannot fit in a critical democratic system. The interviewees also argued that most students, even at University level, worry about grades and about their future job or career. Another interviewee argued that even if students are given the tools through Systems of Knowledge, there is still the question of actually participating and putting those tools to use in practice.

This last comment guides the researcher to the final question, namely that this study also tries to evaluate whether the Maltese system of education, (with particular reference to Systems of Knowledge and what the students learn about the concepts here being researched) is fulfilling this important role in the lives of the young
generations. Unfortunately, it seems that there is the need to evaluate the current education system if one is to address the situation whose picture has emerged from this study. There is a need to safeguard what is positive, and remove the more negative points, slowly but surely, since there is a difference between rhetoric and reality. The relevant discussion followed by recommendations will be presented in Chapter 5.

4.4 Overall aims linked with findings

As has been pointed out in the overall aims to this study, Malta is still a democracy in its infancy. Malta acquired independence in 1964, became a republic in 1974, and the last British soldiers left the Maltese Islands in 1979. Unfortunately, it seems that these events diminished rather than raised national pride and patriotism of the Maltese citizens. As may perhaps be detected in Maltese literature (Friggieri (1979) p. 295-310), the young generations in the sixties, (post-independence), and the seventies, (post-republic) felt that they were betrayed by these historical events, and the eighties are characterised by a retreat by poets of the time, and the immersion of novel writers into works portraying social crises. For the past twenty-five years drama in Maltese literature seems to have experienced a crisis. Maltese artists, most of whom studied abroad, have for the past years used techniques influenced by artistic movements from abroad, even if they use those techniques to portray Maltese scenes or emotions. Whether or not this reference to Maltese literature and art, may be taken as evidence of the influences that our young generations are receiving while studying aesthetic values, is unclear and more study is needed. What one can, however, deduce from the findings is that something has to be done to change the present attitudes of
the younger generations from one of passivity to one of activity. Young Maltese
generations should evolve feeling that they ‘own’ their country democratically, and
they have a share, together with their representatives, in the responsibility of
governing their country.

The findings show that students at the Junior College might be equipped with
the knowledge and also, to a certain, extent by the understanding that they have a role
to live as democratic citizens, and now as European democratic citizens. However,
they still seem to lack the skills (Q17, 7.1) and a positive attitude to become active
democratic citizens. As was pointed out above in question F, 14 “it is okay to talk
about values in participating in active citizenship but it is another thing to be an
active citizen and have that experience”. Although they are conscious that there
might be issues that affect them and that they as Maltese citizens, should share in the
decision making process, they prefer to criticize, rather than take an active part in a
campaign.

Students at the Junior College are also conscious of the fact that there are
changes in values and culture occurring that directly or indirectly will affect their way
of life and the vision that lies ahead for the Maltese nation. However, as one
interviewee (F, I6) put it, “unless people are ready to push forward not just the down
to earth practical things like employment, prices [...] if people do not change, it is not
going to work out but it will only be plans for an ideal future”.

After having presented all these findings, the study will now proceed to
Chapter 5, to analyse, synthesise and discuss these findings, contrasting them with the
theories discussed in the literature review in Chapter 2. Furthermore, in Chapter 6, the researcher will seek to identify how it may be possible to support young generations through the abovementioned required changes. This will then be presented in the conclusions and recommendations.
5.0 Analysis, Synthesis and Discussion

5.1 An Introduction

After presenting the findings of the empirical research in the previous chapter, this chapter aims first of all, to subject the findings to closer scrutiny in an effort to consider what they suggest. This process will be undertaken whilst keeping in mind the aims and objectives, the research hypothesis that emerged from the content analysis of twenty examination scripts, and the key research questions stated at the beginning of this study. Secondly, and in order to be as concise and coherent as possible, the researcher aims to compare and contrast the findings with the views and research presented in the literature review in Chapter 2. Furthermore, while performing this task, the researcher will discuss and analyse theories, ideas, issues and challenges that emerged in the literature review, at the same time as emphasising their relevance to this study. Thirdly, during the same analysis, synthesis and discussion, the researcher will seek to make sense of the findings and to understand the implications of the findings of this research. Understanding the implications of the findings will undoubtedly serve as preparation for the conclusions and recommendations that will follow in Chapter 6.

The study will first analyse, synthesise and discuss the findings, guided by the main themes that emerged from the first qualitative research, i.e. the content analysis of twenty examination scripts for Systems of Knowledge, as discussed in Chapter 3, while referring to the theoretical and conceptual framework that emerged in the discussion presented in Chapter 2, and not the other way round. The researcher also
aims to undertake the method of analysis, synthesis and discussion as suggested above, referring in sequence to the three research methods, i.e. the content analysis of twenty examination scripts in Systems of Knowledge, the questionnaire administered to five hundred College students, and the semi-structured interviews conducted with eight lecturers in Systems of Knowledge at the same College, which is the third instrument administered for triangulation purposes. The last two research instruments, the questions for the questionnaire and the semi-structured interview schedule were structured on the main themes that emerged from the content analysis.

5.2 Making sense of the findings, comparing and contrasting findings with the literature review and considering the implications

This part of the chapter will seek to give an answer to the research questions as set out in Chapter 3. It is appropriate at this stage to briefly restate the research questions. This study aims to answer the questions:

- What understanding do the students at the Junior College have of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’?
- Do the students have an idea of what it means to be a citizen of Malta and a European citizen?
- What is the students’ understanding of the rights and duties of citizens in a democracy?
- Do students possess an understanding of the major values promoted by democracy, such as equality, liberty (types of freedom), participation, tolerance, loyalty and patriotism?
• Is education a good medium for preparing the young citizens, or are there other appropriate media?

• If it is found through the research, that Systems of Knowledge is not sufficiently effective in reaching its aims and objectives, what should be changed?

While keeping these research questions in mind, it is also appropriate to point out that the main preoccupation of the researcher (as pointed out in the Chapter 1), is aptly and vividly depicted by Meira Levinson (1999):

...an apathetic, ill-educated, and non-participatory citizenry can allow shocking violations of democracy or infringements of liberal rights to take place, even if liberal democratic structures are formally in place. [...] if too many people take a passive or anti-democratic stance toward politics or even toward their fellow citizens, then the social order may quickly become illiberal and the political order become dominated by an unrepresentative, often fanatical few who compete to shape the state to their own, illiberal ends. In such a case, the stability and sustainability of the liberal state will be threatened (p. 102).

The critique and exploration of the students' understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship' in this study aim at identifying the present state of affairs at the College, and then to come up with recommendations that might help enhance the situation if the situation turns out to be similar to that stated above by Levinson.

The first category that emerged from the content analysis of twenty examination scripts in Systems of Knowledge is defining democracy. As stated in Chapter 4 most of the responses in the script refer to the rule of the people, with the participation in elections in mind. Others referred to equality and one said everyone is considered the same in front of the law. When these responses were reproduced and
were listed in the questionnaire, most respondents (47.8%) opted for equality in the eyes of the law. Interestingly, when it comes to gender discrimination through Q13 of the same questionnaire 63.2%, said that women have equal rights. Further probing on the response to Q13, brought a response to Q14 which shows that only 51% believe that democracy really reduces gender discrimination. Furthermore, 17.6% opted for a system where the people are allowed to vote in elections, 14% a system where the people rule and 10% the rule of the people (presumably in elections). In the semi-structured interviews, respondents similarly argued that the students' understanding of democracy at the Junior College (Q:A2) refers mostly to 11 the rule of the country; 12 the ability to vote and choose a political party and 17 their idea is simplistic, it revolves around the idea of elections.

This situation might be the result, as pointed out previously (2.6.1.), of long periods of colonialism, where the Maltese citizens are still 'happy' with their 'new' role of participating in elections, whilst at the same time, being unable to perceive a wider definition of democracy. Furthermore, it might be that participating in elections (local, national or European) might be part of our culture and in a way a means of nurturing national identity. Participation in the electoral process is what Patrick (2000) defined (previously in 2.3) as “minimal democracy” (p. 4). In such a case, as has been pointed out above (2.2), Crick (1999) argues that “where a state does not have a tradition of active citizenship deep in its culture or cannot create in its educational system a proclivity to active citizenship, that state is running great risks” (p. 338).
The implications of the findings in this first category are that after being taught content in the primary, and secondary school, in Social Studies and PSHE, and after attending lectures at the Junior College about the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’, the students have not yet grasped a wide definition of the concepts nor embraced the emerging values. If they have a definition of the concepts mentioned above, at times they seem to consider only issues that directly affect them, as if to check whether they can gain something out of them, otherwise, (as will be pointed out later) they would not participate. This might be the result of a liberal system of education, emphasising autonomy of the individual. It is only in the past decade that an emphasis has been made on a communitarian type of education, depicting the successful individual as one who should be fulfilling one’s duties in and towards a community.

While analysing different definitions of ‘democracy’, another category emerged emphasising one specific role of democracy. This second category that emerged from the content analysis is the power of the people. Again in this category, most students referred to the power of the people in general elections, while some referred to the responsibility of each citizen to guarantee the continuance and smooth running of democracy, and not the other way round. One respondent said that politics is about who decides and another today we take part in general elections, while another said that this is criticised by those who say that citizens are free only on election day. In the questionnaire, when the respondents were asked how much power do people have in a democracy, 41.2% chose people are allowed to vote in general elections while 40.8% chose people can decide certain issues, presumably by a vote, collectively and not individually. Deciding collectively has no negative
connotation, in line with the communitarian philosophy as presented in the literature review, but it would reflect negatively if even in a communitarian setting, everything has to be decided by taking a vote, and without referring to a sense of communitarian living that aims at reducing the number of conflicting issues.

Through the responses to some questions asked during the semi-structured interviews, it is possible for one to understand the state of affairs that has emerged as described above. Most of the interviewees argue that the students' understanding of the concept of democracy (A3) is 12, not accurate; 15, most of the students think that democracy has to do with elections; and another 18 said, it goes as far as how it affects you personally and what you get out of it. As has been pointed out in Chapter 4 (A4), the students developed their understanding through the influence of the family, the media and the school. In response to question A5, when asked to what extent the interviewee believed that democratic principles are exercised in Maltese society, one interviewee, I4, said that the possibility has increased [at the College] but I say that students are not that involved [...] it makes sense to have students participating in local governments or councils with some work-study or volunteer experience, a number of hours in an area that they are interested in.

Through these responses, one becomes more aware of the apathy that reigns amongst the students. Furthermore, that the students' idea of participating is motivated by an enlightened self-interest. With respect to the promotion of a proposal for volunteering, for College students, Crick (2004: 8) (in Linsley B. & Rayment E. (eds.)) refers to the latest craze promoted by schools and youth organisations, that all citizenship must include volunteering at some stage. Crick (2004) argues that
not all volunteering involves citizenship. [...] Volunteering becomes citizenship when the volunteers are well-briefed on the whole context, given responsibility about how to organise their actions, and debriefed afterwards [...] whether they think the task could have been done better, or was even worthwhile at all. [...] Volunteers are free citizens acting together, they should never be canon fodder, however worthy the organisation they work for, however time-tested – or ossified (p. 8).

On the same lines, Miller (2000: 69) (in 2.2 above) argued that it is a good thing to be active citizens but at the same time Miller emphasises the importance of being informed, critically responsible and reflective. Miller (2000: 28 in 2.4 above) sees citizens as consumers of public services who have consumers’ rights and who are actively involved in shaping the way their community functions.

This brings to the forefront an important current issue in Malta. The Minister of Education, Youth and Employment in Malta, published a document on the 28th June 2005, entitled For All Children to Succeed: A New Network Organisation for Quality Education in Malta. Through this document, the Minister in the ‘Acknowledgments’ thanks the Education Division and the Faculty of Education, University of Malta and the National College of School Leadership (www.ncsl.org.uk) “who have contributed in a valuable manner to this document, for their time, patience and commitment” (p. iii). And further down, the Permanent Secretary within the Ministry of Education, Youth and Employment (Malta) refers to the EXCEL Network National Conference held in Malta between the 17th and 18th May 2005, and states that the “EXCEL Network, launched in May 2003, is a forum which networks Maltese school leaders with their counterparts in the UK, in order to share ideas and good practice” (p. xv). The Director General within the Ministry of Education, Youth and Employment furthermore affirms that “local leaders in Education have never lived in isolated contentment but have systematically looked
beyond our shores to ensure that what was taking place in our schools was comparable with the latest happenings and trends internationally” (p. xvii). These acknowledgements confirm the affinity of the Maltese educational system and its developments.

Without going into detail about the reforms being proposed, in the above-mentioned document, or the undoubted goodwill and intentions of all those who contributed for this reform, the researcher questions how it is possible that in a democracy, such as that evident in Malta, the abovementioned document is first published, and then, it is discussed with the Malta Union of Teachers (August 2005), and later with teachers and lecturers (2-5 August 2005)? What about the opinions of parents? As pointed out above (2.2 above) by Parsons (1999) “parental choice is the force identified to produce ‘the schools of tomorrow’” (p.160). This reform might create what Olssen et al. (2004) (2.4 above) call “new tiers of selective schooling to emerge, reintroducing and further intensifying existing social class divisions” (p. 201). It might also encourage the already existing removal of pupils by their parents from government schools in Malta to receive their schooling at Church schools (that ask for a nominal donation by parents) or at private schools (that charge hefty fees and therefore creating a form of elitism which goes against the value of equality in a democracy). Or is the Maltese educational system going for what Gewirtz (2002a) (2.4 above) calls “the intensification of the managerial business-friendly element [which might be] in danger of undermining the possibility of the more humanistic strands being realised” (p. 39). Whichever the case, and certainly it is beyond the scope of this research to explore this further, there still remains the fact that there is
lack of involvement and participation by critical stakeholders in these and other important issues.

In fact, for the second category, there are other implications. While on the one side, the students feel that power lies in the electoral system, it has been pointed out that in a democracy there are many issues that call for the participation of active citizens. It is true that politicians are there to govern, as representatives, in the name of the rest of the citizens. But, even in a democracy, if the citizens show lack of interest, and adopt a passive attitude, then their representatives would not think twice (intentionally or unintentionally) to rule without asking for the citizens’ consent. The above example may indeed be a case in point.

A category that emerged from the content analysis that is related to the power of the people, is numbers in a democracy. The findings show that the respondents grasped the issue that in a democracy most decisions are taken by votes and numbers. The respondents were seen to be against the system of drawing by lot, and that this system left a lot of space for corruption. Another respondent pointed out that this system where accountability and transparency were not simply catchwords but real values put into practice. But one respondent rightly argued that a juryman might not be capable to take decisions. What is of concern is the fact that one respondent refers to the electorate who vote for their favourite leader. But one has to understand what ‘favourite’ may mean: possibly a ‘good’ leader who is honest and upright and has the common good at heart, or a charismatic leader, who has charm, and convinces easily.
In order to go deeper into this category, one can refer to the questionnaire findings for Q15 where the respondents were asked why numbers are important in a democracy. 46.2% of the respondents opted for *18+ is a sign of maturity*, presumably referring to adulthood and that an adult is capable of taking good decisions, in the majority of cases. 24% thought numbers are *a form of control*. Society needs systems to control itself, and to accept that choice is final, and that the majority are in favour of that choice. In fact 13.2% said that numbers in a democracy *is easy to decide a majority through numbers* and 10.2% argued that *numbers help to declare decisions as final*. So numbers in a democracy refer to a system where society finds a means of decreasing disagreement, i.e. a system of convenience. But one should also think about the ability of the electorate to make the right choice, in the interest of the common good. If one refers to Table 1 Percentage Response – Analysed By Gender in p. 147, one notes that for Q15 57.2% of the respondents who opted for (15.1) numbers as a sign of maturity were males, while there were more female respondents who chose (15.2: 27.5%) numbers as a form of control and (15.4: 12.7%) numbers help to declare decisions as final. This might be interpreted that in a paternalistic society such as that found in Malta, males emphasise maturity when it comes to numbers, while female respondents see numbers as a form of control, and that decisions are final.

In the semi-structured interviews the researcher asked the interviewees D3 the question where a citizen opts to abstain from participating. Some respondents look at the issue of boycotting an election as their right to do so, and that at times abstaining still has to do with numbers and delivers a message in itself. Others see boycott as something stupid, and that, if anything, one should participate and vote ‘no’. But here
one calls to mind Crick's (2002b) observation (quoted above 4.2.3) that “voluntary and individual participation is encouraged in modern democracies, but not compulsory” (p. 94).

The implications that emerge from the findings of this category refer to the importance attributed to elections and numbers in deciding certain issues. But then one may ask, how many times are the citizens called to decide an issue using this system of numbers, in a democracy? It is only in general elections, and local council elections, that citizens have the right to vote. In exceptional circumstances they might vote in a referendum. The system is also used in board meetings and club meetings amongst others. In all situations, it is important that those casting their vote possess the right deliberative skills to make the right decision.

At this stage the researcher also explored the difference between Direct and Representative Democracy, focusing and analysing whether the students have a grasp of the definition of different systems of democracy. The former emerged in Ancient Greece and the latter system is still with us today. The researcher did not ask specific questions about this subject in the semi-structured interview, since the interviewees were lecturers of Systems of Knowledge, and would have known the content. However, one respondent, in content analysis, said that democracy changed a lot, another said that today we build and mould our democracy on that of Athens. What strikes the researcher as significant is that one respondent said that the Greek way of democracy is very similar to the one we have today. In the questionnaire, the respondents were given three questions about the issue of defining democracy. In the response to Q3, when asked the meaning of Direct democracy, 42.8% answered that
all the citizens are involved in politics, while 28.2% said that all the citizens vote for each policy. For Q4, 68.6% of the respondents opted for all the electorate participates in general elections. This, in a way, might clarify what the students understand by the definition of Representative democracy. What is of concern is the fact that in response to Q5, when the students were asked what type of democracy is practiced in Malta, 10.8% of the respondents said that Malta is a Direct democracy.

This percentage raises concern because these were respondents who had explored this topic during lectures. One wonders what other young Maltese students who did not receive the same lecture content actually think of these issues, or whether, they think at all about them. This situation also has negative repercussions on the electoral process itself. Patrick (2000: 7) (in 2.2. above) argues that the electorate votes for a constitution that limits and at the same time empowers the government. It provides for periodic elections of representatives by all the adult population. The challenge arises when one considers whether the adult population is prepared to take this responsibility, if the electorate possesses the knowledge, skills of deliberation, attitudes and understanding to make the right choice.

In the next category to be analysed, the researcher refers to phrases and sentences about democracy in practice. Some respondents simply opted for their understanding of why democracy initially started in Athens, i.e. because it ‘orders’ society. One respondent stated they hated chaos and confusion and they came up with the idea of democracy. This might be true, and democracy as a system, even today, gives a sense of organisation. However, at times, it also creates bureaucracy and may lead to corruptive practices. Other respondents referred to the referendum, called by
the Maltese government, about Malta’s membership in the EU. One respondent said *when the issue is very important, people might be asked to vote in a referendum*. This respondent gives the impression that for people to participate, the issues have to be political, and that these same issues are presented to them by their representatives.

In the analysis of the questionnaire findings about democracy in practice, it emerged that 39.4% of the respondents opted for democracy as the provider of *liberty and human rights*. Another 30% said that *the citizens participate directly or indirectly in decisions*. However, it is important to note this is what they think and not necessarily what they might do when faced with an issue where there is a need for active citizenship. In fact, in response to Q17, when the students were asked if they would take an active role against the government that intends to implement a policy that they disagree with, 53% of the respondents said they are ready to criticise, 19.4% said they would sit and watch, 11.8% had no choice in mind, and only 15.8% were prepared to participate in an active campaign. The implications of this state of affairs, are very worrying. It confirms what Miller (2000: 26) points out (2.2 above) that citizenship is not something that people learn spontaneously. The researcher agrees with Kerr (2003) (in 2.2 above) that “the worrying signs of alienation and cynicism among young people about public life and participation [leads] to their possible disconnection and disengagement with it” (p. 3). Oliver and Heater (1994) affirm: “a good citizen is one who enjoys freedom and is vigilant to defend it against the abuse of power, and participates as effectively as possible in public affairs, especially in the local community” (p. 130).
With reference to the outcome of the semi-structured interviews on the same issues, as has been analysed above (4.2.3), most of the interviewees (B2) argue that students are not fully prepared to participate in a democracy because they lack the necessary knowledge and skills. Others argued that students start to become aware after the experience came as a result of following the subject in Systems of Knowledge. One respondent, I3, said that *at this level, this course is very helpful in informing students about what it takes to be part of a democracy.* Another respondent, I8, argued *I still wonder when it comes to participation there is still a lot of apathy in the majority of the Maltese people.* As a result of the semi-structured interviews, the researcher felt that an important part of democracy in practice is the value of tolerance. This factor emerged from the opinions of the interviewees. An example of this is described below.

With the problem of illegal immigrants reaching alarming levels in Malta in 2004, and now, even more, in 2005, the researcher felt that one should include a question (C4) about the lecturers' perception of the students' understanding of racism. While one could say that most of the interviewees argued that the Maltese are racist, the problem is actually not one that has emerged recently. There is no doubt that the Maltese have racist sentiments against Arabs from North Africa. This has intensified with the problem of illegal immigrants, as the racist feelings of the Maltese seem to have extended to other African nationalities, as well as immigrants from the Far East. One respondent, I3, stated *here the students are more tolerant when compared with other people in other places [...] I do not have to underline that what is European is nice and what is not, particularly Arabic, is seen in a racist way.* The value of tolerance has already been discussed above in section 2.5 where Crick (1999: 344)
contends that tolerance denotes mutual respect. Waghid (2004: 6) refers to compassionate citizenship. And Olssen et al (2004: Preface) in the same section above were quoted as saying that all people have equal worth, irrespective of their colour, gender, ethnicity, religion, age or sexual orientation. It appears, through an ‘opinion survey’ in *The Times* (of Malta) August 14, 2005, quoted above in Chapter 4, that society in Malta generally still needs to develop these sentiments.

The implications that emerged from the above discussion are that the students who participated in this study have different problems with their understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’. The problem does not lie only in the general definition of the concepts, but also in the way the concepts influence their lives, and our lives generally, as we live as part of a community. This is also said in light of the fact that it is no longer possible as members of the EU, to repatriate illegal immigrants. It seems more probable that the Maltese government will have to come up with some sort of a scheme to integrate these people within Maltese society, even if this means granting them refugee status until they decide about future possibilities or they acquire a visa to move on to other countries in the West. At least such a decision will mean that they will not be kept in detention centres and they could start working and earn money that they need for themselves and (in some instances) for their families.

It is with this aim in mind, and coupled with the fact that Maltese society, whether one admits it or not, is becoming even more multicultural, that this study discussed in section 2.6, different theories of citizenship, such as citizenship as shared fate, multicultural or intercultural citizenship and global citizenship. As a result of
these intercultural characteristics of modern societies, it would seem appropriate to start considering the introduction of a theory of citizenship that caters for these changes within society while keeping in mind the positive elements of having a national identity.

At this stage, it appears appropriate for the analysis and synthesis of the findings of the category majority and minority rule to be discussed before equality in participation since minorities have always experienced different types of inequalities in society. In Chapter 4, the researcher found that the respondents did know the difference between majority and minority rule, and believe that all citizens in a democratic society possess rights. In fact, one of the respondents wrote that the majority still has to safeguard the rights of the minority. Another respondent wrote that the minority voters still have a say in the country. However, here no reference was made to citizenship as a status, or to the problems faced by refugees and illegal immigrants, as pointed out above, and neither to other inequalities experienced by other minorities in Maltese society. This implies that students are unable to use their knowledge about the political meaning of democracy and move on to the social meaning of majority and minority rule in a democracy with the political referring to the electoral, the social referring to democracy as a way of life. This has serious implications, since it appears that students have a narrow perspective. In this way, students would be missing out on what really matters in everyday life of citizens, and what really promotes inclusion and coherence in society.

With reference to the question in the questionnaire (Q8) about why do we say that in a democracy the majority is always right, 42.4% of the respondents chose the
majority represents most of the ideas of the citizens, and 36% chose the majority represents most of the citizens. This might be true, but at this point one has to emphasise the importance of the preparation of that majority, so that it really represents the majority of citizens and that they are not merely concerned with electing representatives to parliament for their personal aims and ambitions. On the same line, in Q9, the respondents were asked whether the minority in a democracy possesses any role and rights. Most respondents (54.6%) chose the minority has an important role and right to be heard. A further 23% opted for the response that the minority has the role and the right to balance arguments. This implies that 78% of the respondents think that the minority (even in parliament) has no real power, if its role is to be heard and balance arguments. Only 20% of the total respondents chose the role of the minority to pressure the majority and act as a 'watchdog'. It should come as no surprise then that in Q17 only 15.8% of the respondents were ready to take up an active campaign. The respondents showed by their choice that they do not realise that the minority, in and outside parliament, has the power to protest, organise demonstrations and petitions, and that, more often than not, minorities have changed the course of government policies in democracies.

In the semi-structured interviews, the researcher posed question A6 to the interviewees themselves as opposed to the question being directed at their perception of the students’ understanding of the issue. From the responses, it was intended to analyse whether the ideas of students about the role of the minority in a democracy were acquired through lectures or whether the students come to college equipped with these ideas. One of the interviewees replied that I1 the chairperson should always be proposed by the minority. Another one, I3, stressed the power of the minority (even
in parliament) by saying the majority has the right to govern [...] but when the minority is 49% in the Maltese situation. One interviewee, 16, showed the difference between minorities in parliament and outside, but at the same time lacked optimism about the fact that they may obtain any power or respect by saying this is not simply a question of political parties because minorities want their democratic status as well [...] but as far as minorities are concerned they just float about. Another respondent, 18, said one has to draw a very fine line between running the majority's decisions down the minority's throat and on the other hand you cannot have a government by consensus.

From the replies above, one may conclude that the students come to College with preconceived ideas, which at times hinder the learning process. In fact, there are differences between the lecturers’ responses and those of the students, even though the same lecturers had taught the students. Their preconceived ideas are likely to be included in their answers in examination scripts, or maybe, to a certain extent, in discussions during seminars. One might then think about how far should students take on the ideas put forward in lectures, in a rather passive way. The implications here might be a bit worrying, because lecturers always assess the ability of the students to assimilate what is taught during lectures. This can be remedied by implementing the appropriate reforms in the syllabus and in the curriculum itself.

Furthermore, Osler (2000b) argues: “far from diversity being disintegrative or a fault to be overcome, the experience of the different is primary, and a rich resource. What matters is how the diversity is articulated with other factors such as the distribution of status, resources and power, and how it is perceived and evaluated” (p. 54). This is endorsed by Kymlicka (2001) when pointing out that “no one can hope to succeed in
political life if they make no effort to listen to or accommodate the needs and views of others. However in many cases, a winning coalition can be built while ignoring the claims of marginalized groups" (p. 301).

Another category that emerged from content analysis of the examination scripts is equality in participation. This category received the highest number of references from the respondents in the content analysis. The main emphasis is on the issue of equality that every individual is entitled to with respect to who is eligible to become a representative of the people. One respondent said that a representative should have the ability to make decisions of such magnitude because mistakes can make or break a country. Another said that not everyone had the skill to be part of politics and that is not right to get people drawn by lot to take administrative positions. One respondent was concerned that decisions are left in the hands of the masses who may turn out to be ignorant and so take unethical decisions. Yet another stated that citizens vote for persons whom they trust and think are right for the job. All these responses show a certain concern about the ability of the representatives. Yet another respondent, who probably did not know that his comment contained Machiavellian traits, argued that nowadays the leader chosen has to consider the citizens’ choices, opinions and what they really want in order to satisfy them and be successful. This is another cause for concern, because most of the time students seem to look at their representatives when referring to participation and not at the role they should take themselves as active citizens. Furthermore, it seems that some might use the word ‘ethical’ while others do not know what it means. The last response quoted above highlights that for that particular respondent it does not seem to matter what the representative’s beliefs really are, but what is important is the way s/he reacts to
accommodate the wishes of the electorate, in order to be successful; i.e. he has to show that s/he is honest and upright even if in actual fact s/he is not.

In the questionnaire referring to the same question Q7 about the equal rights of participation, 38.2% of the respondents chose the response that *all citizens participate in the government of a country*. For them, sovereignty does not appear to feature in the life of a democracy. 34.6% chose the response that *only the representatives have the right to decide*. This implies that these two groups are contradictory to each other in emphasis. It is also important to note that from what has been discussed in the content analysis findings, and the importance attributed to the competence of the representatives to occupy that post, in the questionnaire, only 3.6% opted for the response that refers to *qualified people have the right to decide*. If one refers to Table 1 in Chapter 4, one observes for Q7 that there are more female respondents who chose *all citizens participate*, while there are more males who opted for *only representatives have the right to decide*. This might be the case, intentionally or unintentionally, linked to the fact that in the West comparatively only a few women manage to enter politics (excluding Scandinavian countries), while most representatives are males. Here one should also keep in mind the discussion and reference to the implications raised in Q17 as discussed above in this section, i.e. the fact that only 15.8% of the respondents were ready to participate in an active campaign against some policy they disagree with and which is going to be introduced by the government.

When the interviewees were asked about equal rights of participation in a democracy (D1), some referred to participation in general. One respondent, 11, said *participation is lacking in some sectors, in others it is working*. Others referred to
participation of women. One respondent, 13, said *legislation is there but the mentality is different. You have resistance by men for the fact that if both partners work there is still the chance that housework is performed by women.* Others referred to participation by students at the College. Respondent 18 affirmed: *at the level of students at the Junior College, yes, not just voting but it affects students in the micro and the macro level.* For question D2, which refers to students taking part in an active campaign against a policy issued by the government, the interviewees were very pessimistic and pointed out that the students would participate if the issue affects them directly. Respondent 12 said *only if it affects their pockets in the short term.* 16 said *students are more interested in getting good grades than in becoming good citizens.*

As has been emphasised in the findings presented above, one might get the impression that one can solve the challenges raised by giving more opportunities of participation to citizens in any country (e.g. Iraq). However, Kymlicka and Norman (1994) argue, “emphasising participation does not yet ensure that citizens participate responsibly – that is in a public-spirited, rather than self-interested or prejudiced way” (p.361). This argument continues to emphasise the importance of the teaching of citizenship education at school. Enslin and White (2002) endorse this view when they argue that

*As an institution the school, like any other institution in the society, will be expected and run on democratic lines. In this sense the ethos in all schools, however old or young their students, will be democratic and the arrangements, characteristic ways of doing things, and the attitudes of staff and students will, thus indirectly, mutually encourage in the members of the school the qualities required for living in a democratic community (p. 124).*
Another category that emerged from the content analysis and that is closely linked to equality in participation is women in politics, and the gender issues that exist in society. The findings refer to the role of women in society and in politics following the acquisition of equal rights for men and women. In fact, most of the respondents give the impression that women have the same rights as men, and that in reality, there are no gender issues in the Maltese society. One of the respondents points out that nowadays women have the right to vote and also have exactly the same rights men have.

However, when in the questionnaire respondents were asked in Q13 to say why democracy reduces gender discrimination, 63.2% chose women have equal rights. But then, the same respondents, when asked if in reality democracy reduces gender discrimination, 51% said ‘yes’ and 49% said ‘no’. Those who replied ‘no’ were further asked why they think so. 28.6% replied that males still dominate the world, and 27.7% replied that there is a need for cultural change and 16.7% because of cultural restrictions. For a further analysis by gender one can refer to section 4.2.2.2. But it is appropriate here to point out that if one adds the last two percentages, one finds 44.4% of the respondents think that gender discrimination is further promoted by culture. Enslin & White (2002) argue that “women’s socialization into the idea that it is natural for them to assume domestic responsibilities, and an accompanying assumption that the public realm and politics is more suited to men, makes participatory involvement an intimidating prospect” (p. 120). Further down, Enslin & White (2002) call for a change in culture when they say, “citizenship requires that inegalitarian families be changed so that they may become places in which future citizens learn to treat one another as equals” (p. 120).
Camilleri Cassar (2005: 286) writes that her study seems to suggest that the distribution of paid and unpaid work in Maltese families is often influenced by the husband’s decision in his position of authority, that may not always be to women’s advantage. Indeed, the voices of the women in the study reflect male authority and women’s subordinate role in Malta’s gender regime.

In the semi-structured interviews, the researcher asked three questions about gender discrimination. The first question was addressed to the interviewees to find out what their perception about legislation to provide gender equality in a democracy is. The respondents, males and females, stressed that there is a difference between what exists in theory and the actual situation in practice. In Maltese society, the laws are there, but one respondent, II, said *we still need more participation from women*. Some argued that discrimination is found everywhere, in the family, at school, at work (4.2.3). When the interviewees were asked (C2) where in their opinion does Malta stand when compared to other countries, some respondents argued that while in Malta all the relevant laws exist, it is the family that keeps women from participating more fully in society. In this respect Malta, as a developing country, lies between the Scandinavian countries where women have equal rights, and the other extreme found in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Another respondent went as far to say that one should not go to extremes by saying that *in Italy women are renouncing their feminine role and the biological function of that role*, implying that this should not be emulated. For the third question, C3, the interviewees were asked about their perception as to whether the students at the Junior College are informed about legislation that reduces gender discrimination. The general impression is that they are not prepared, they are not informed and that there is still a lot to be done. It is
unfortunate that gender issues are not included in the Systems of Knowledge syllabus. Respondent 15 argues that even if we have a directorate for gender issues there is no strong campaign to educate about these issues.

The implications of the analysis for this category are a source of concern since equality in general, and more so, gender equality, is very crucial in the democratic set up. The respondents of the content analysis of the examination scripts, under examination conditions, did not even think about the issues of gender discrimination. In the questionnaire, when asked if democracy really reduces gender discrimination, the responses were nearly balanced in two. However, then, more important information emerged from Q14b where the respondents were asked why they think that democracy does not in reality reduce gender discrimination. The reasons given are male domination and cultural restrictions. This may be further corroborated by Camilleri Cassar’s research (2005). On the other hand, the lecturers/interviewees argued that although the students might have an idea about the existence of laws that promote gender equality, they are not prepared to tackle this social problem. Furthermore, gender equality or gender discrimination are not included as subjects in the Systems of Knowledge syllabus. It is at the discretion of the lecturer to include this important topic or not.

The next category is freedom of expression in a democracy. This is a fundamental right in a democracy, where the constitution and the government itself create and/or support provisions and institutions, such as the office of the Ombudsman, Trade Unions and the Media, which help the citizens express themselves freely, even if against the very same government that instituted the
provisions. The emphasis in the findings for the content analysis, refer to the right to agree and/or to criticise negatively government activities or projects. Here, one can also refer to the questionnaire findings for Q17, which show that the students know what their rights are, but again, this does not necessarily mean that they will involve themselves actively. A positive response is that which refers to the people who are able to become informed about what lies ahead and decide which system is better suited in the circumstances but at the same time there seems to be a lack of any discussion regarding the way forward i.e. how one could express oneself in favour or against an issue. Another respondent argued that it is our duty to take interest in such matters and cast our vote as this affects us directly and the rest of the country. This response refers to the individual per se, and at the same time the individual living in a community. It is the duty of every citizen to be informed and become active, even if, as has been pointed out above (2.3) there are instances where democracy itself works against the citizens, such as the case of the Iraq War, where those who are in power repeatedly try to give the impression that they are acting in the interest of the people, and decide on issues that might actually have a majority of citizens against it. This situation is ironic when one refers to Blunkett's (2003a and b) quote above (2.4) where, while defining “civil renewal”, states: “it takes place when people become actively engaged in the well-being of their communities and are able to define the problems they face and tackle them together with help from the government and public bodies” (p. 4). Further down Crick (1999) defines ‘freedom’ as “actually to choose between alternatives” (p. 343).

The questionnaire findings (Q10 and Q11 above) both refer to the media and trade unions as the two most powerful means of expressing oneself in a democracy.
The former refers to opportunities of expressing oneself both individually and collectively, while the latter refers to expressing oneself solely collectively. As for the question 'how does democracy provide for freedom of expression?' 26.8% of the respondents rated the media as the most important means of expression, and 22.6% opted for the trade unions, whilst 20.7% chose the courts of justice. When considering the question, 'how can a citizen in a democracy express his/her opinions freely', the media recorded 25.9% and trade unions 20.7% and pressure groups 19.3%. As a response to this question, the members of parliament were the least rated, 15.6%. However, in actual fact, because of Malta’s small size, and because the people have been brought up in a culture of nepotism, where when one needs something one can approach someone in authority, many Maltese citizens still refer their needs to the members of parliament.

When responding to a similar question (B1) about freedom of expression in a democracy during the semi-structured interviews, most respondents also refer to the media, and the importance of the media this past decade. In Malta we have only recently experienced pluralism in broadcasting, although, the two major radio and television stations are owned by the two main political parties in Malta. One respondent, I1, refers to plurality in broadcasting [as] an important aspect in a democracy. And another, I2, refers to pluralism as an essential aspect, in that people appreciate that there are different values from their own and [that these] should also be taken into consideration. Some respondents also aired their negative opinion about freedom of expression in Malta by stating that our education system is based on non-participation. I5 argues that citizens are afraid to participate, while another respondent, I6, pointed out that connections are very important in Malta. And yet
another one, 18, argues *I do believe that people should not be victimised for showing their opinion*. The last comment raises a serious concern since it refers to lack of freedom of expression in a democracy, where the legal set up exists but in actual fact there is a difference between political rhetoric and reality.

Although the issue of pluralism and broadcasting emerged as a response to the category focussing on freedom of expression, the researcher still felt that it is appropriate to include a category on *democracy and pluralism in broadcasting*. This was felt to be important, firstly, because the researcher was unsure of the possible outcome of the findings of the research, and secondly, because at times respondents go deeper into their responses if they are given space a few minutes later. In fact, in this case, in the content analysis, respondents referred to *beliefs, the press* and *opinions*. Another referred to *accepting diversity within the laws and pluralism in all aspects of our lives*. This response might be taken to refer to multiculturalism, or theories of intercultural citizenship (2.6.3 above). One respondent argued that democracy respects *human rights and the environment, and it controls individuals not to harm others or the environment they live in*. This is an important point because in this case, this respondent is widening the meaning of the concept of citizenship to include the environment as well.

In response to questionnaire Q16, 35.6% of the respondents chose *people have different opinions*, while 33.6% *people can choose ways and means to express themselves*. But only 8.4% opted for *people can make informed decisions* when asked about (Q16) *why can we say that pluralism in a democracy is a symbol of liberty?* This brings to mind what Crick (1999) argued above (2.5) "individuals can only grow
and societies improve amid the tension between knowing what the facts are and wishing to change them” (p.348). Other respondents (14.4%) opted for pluralism enhances liberty. However, if citizens are not prepared to take decisions, a democracy will experience more incidents such as the Mozert incident (2.6.3) where according to Macedo (1995, 2003) parents practise their right even if they do not have the knowledge and expertise, to decide for their children.

During the semi-structured interviews, question B3 focused on whether pluralism in broadcasting has proved to be a positive means of expression in a democracy. This proved very fruitful (as can be seen in 4.2.3 above). Some respondents (I1 and I2) said that they believe that pluralism in broadcasting did not improve the situation, that is, to educate citizens to appreciate different opinions before deciding. Others (I3 and I8) argued that it was an improvement and a positive step forward during the past twenty years. Another (I4) said that it definitely brought progress [however] it indoctrinates rather than educates and creates dependent and uncreative citizens who are not part of a real dynamic society.

The two categories discussed above call for further discussion of the political, social and, most of all, educational implications, that emerge from the analysis and synthesis above. The findings, when analysed, imply that providing for legal framework to guarantee rights, such as that of freedom of expression, is not enough. There is a difference between what one can read on paper (political rhetoric) and what really exists in practice (reality). This emerged clearly from the research findings,
justifying the strength of empirical research, and at the same time of the ‘mix and match’ method.

With reference to the social implications, much has already been said about the definitions of concepts that vary in different cultures (2.2), and what Benhabib (2002) refers to as “social constructivism as a comprehensive explanation of cultural differences” (p. 5). Still the researcher feels that it is important to note that when a society conditioned by a culture introduces the same provisions found internationally, one has to prepare that same society for reforms. In order for a society to benefit from positive provisions in a democracy it has first to be prepared and not the other way round. It is very unfortunate that at times politicians seem to think that they are coming up with a statute for a local club, when they are representing a nation and not simply a group of members. Citizens are born in society, whether they like it or not, and they are bound by the regulations of that society. On the other hand, prospective club members choose to belong or otherwise. It is their choice.

The political and the social implications of the findings for the categories mentioned above lead to important and critical educational implications. It is true that there are many influencing agents (as has emerged from this study) that have an effect on people from the cradle to the grave, but education is regarded as the most important because more often than not, it is the agent of socialisation that carries the responsibility to promote change and improve society. It is for this reason that the Crick Report (1998) (2.5 above) contained a bold statement stating that the central aim of citizenship education is to effect “no less than a change in the political culture
of this country both nationally and locally” (p. 7). This view is endorsed in the Foreword by the Maltese Minister of Education, Youth and Employment, in the document published in June 2005, For All Children to Succeed, where the minister affirms that:

Over the past fifty years we have been delivering education for all: Malta's strong educational roots now seek a new space, freedom, and the tools to ensure quality education for all in the coming years. Only a quality leap forward guarantees to present and future generations a full and equitable participation in a healthy democracy and an economy replete of challenges and opportunities (p. xi).

The Ministry of Education (in Malta) has “embarked on a comprehensive process of educational review” (p. xii), the researcher hopes that this will include sound provisions for citizenship education, with an emphasis on political literacy, if the changes are to succeed in guaranteeing for “present and future generations a full and equitable participation in a healthy democracy” as pointed out above. As has been already argued, this study believes that the provisions for citizenship education should have been introduced before the implementation of these reforms, rather than concurrently, or, worse still, after implementation.

The last category that emerged from the content analysis refers to Plato’s criticism of democracy. The responses first referred to the early definitions of democracy in Ancient Greece, whilst this category refers to the ‘defects’ of democracy as a system. The responses to this category refer once again to the ability and competence of the electorate. One respondent argued that this system was wrong because important issues should not be decided by people who have little or no
knowledge of the subject. Another respondent said that you cannot be ignorant and become a minister.

In the questionnaire the researcher referred to Plato's criticism but also included criticism by modern citizens. In the students' response to the questionnaire, most of the respondents (75.6%) attribute criticism against democracy mainly because of corruption. Most of them feel that corruption is the most important element that is instigating criticism against democracy, more than inadequacy of the welfare state (5.2%). This might be due to the fact that the students are still at an age when they are benefiting from the Maltese welfare state (which is somewhat abused) as they are not only granted a stipend to study at college and university, but they do so free of charge.

During the semi-structured interviews, the interviewees were asked why they believe there is so much criticism of democracy at the national as well, as at the global level. The interviewees replied they believe this is the case mainly because democracy gives one the freedom to criticise. Some referred to international events that identify politicians using democracy for their own interest. Others referred to the market economy, and the situation of nations experiencing poverty as an effect of globalisation.

The implications presented show that the respondents appear to have a good idea regarding why there is so much criticism of democracy. This attitude would be
of concern if the respondents do not value the positive elements of democracy, mainly rights, and if they did not see a way forward or the possibility of changing the situation from the current state. If the latter is the case, it is no wonder that youngsters are ready to adopt a laissez-faire attitude and forgo participation in political decisions. This study proposes that citizenship education should be seen as a medium, a tool that will support the required turn to this state of affairs. However, it is important that citizens should be primarily encouraged to renounce their defeatist attitude and seek to generate new ideas and recommendations. This study will propose conclusions and recommendations in Chapter 6.
6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Original Research Objectives and Questions Answered

The research studied the extent to which students at the Junior College of Malta are prepared to participate fully in Malta, as democratic citizens. For this reason, the study explored what understanding the students have of the meaning and responsibilities associated with citizenship. This is particularly interesting, as at the time of the study involving Junior College students, one finds these students are still struggling to define a Maltese National Identity. This coincides with having to get accustomed to the idea of being European citizens. This situation gives rise to the need to explore whether the Maltese students at the Junior College are equipped with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and understanding that help them in this new role as European democratic citizens as well as participating more fully as active citizens in their own communities.

The research also aims to support the need for the development of a consciousness about the ongoing changes in the traditional Maltese values and culture through influencing agents (such as the media and perhaps studying abroad) that have started to take place in the mentality of young Maltese students. With this aim in mind, the research aimed to identify ways and means that might better support and equip youngsters to meet the change they will undoubtedly face whilst also raising consciousness about the need for them to contribute and participate as active citizens with the aim of creating an enhanced democratic society.
Social constructivism argues that reality is constructed by people living in society. As a consequence, the researcher was faced by ontological questions, referring to what we believe exists or is the case, and epistemological questions, referring to what proof will we accept about what constitutes reliable and valid knowledge. There is a difference in maintaining that a situation exists, to actually studying that situation scientifically. In order to answer the ontological and epistemological questions the researcher came up with a research design aimed at producing reliable and valid data to verify whether what the researcher and colleagues at the Junior College believed exists, truly exists. Furthermore, the researcher guided by the supervisor, and the research methods tutors, decided to select methods (mix and match as explained in section 3.0) that were appropriate to support the actual physical collection of the data to test the researcher’s beliefs about reality.

Guided by this rationale, the researcher primarily undertook a qualitative method through the content analysis of examination scripts to study in depth and obtain a thorough understanding of the students’ understanding and perceptions, and as a result to design the hypothesis, namely: whether students are able to transform content (about the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’) discussed and acquired during lectures into knowledge. Following this the researcher administered a quantitative study, involving a questionnaire, aimed at giving a broader view of the situation. Finally, the researcher triangulated both qualitative and quantitative methods through a semi-structured interview administered to all Systems of Knowledge lecturers (eight in October 2004) to confirm and re-confirm previous findings. Scaife (2004) argues that “the word ‘triangulation’ is a helpful metaphor
here, derived from the practice of surveying; a better map of the landscape can be obtained if one uses more than one line of sight” (p. 72).

With regard to the research questions (as stated in Section 3.0), the findings show that students understood the definition of ‘democracy’ as passed on through the content as a result of their schooling experience, including their studies as part of Systems of Knowledge at the College. Students knew the historical evolution of the concept from Ancient Greek Direct democracy to modern day Representative democracy. However unfortunately, students did not seem to ‘possess’ that understanding, i.e. as their understanding seemed to be limited to a role of onlookers to a process, rather than being part of the system.

As a consequence when the researcher analysed whether the students have an idea of what it means to be a Maltese and a European citizen, the findings show that within the definition of the concept of ‘citizenship’, the students are interested in what they can get out of society and not what they have to offer to society. Findings show that students would participate more actively in society only if the issue affects them directly, in the short term, and are not interested about the long-term effects. This stance emerged strongly at the local and national level, and one can only extrapolate what the students’ stance on the European and on the international level could be. Reasons that one might attribute to this state of affairs are complex. There are two possible reasons. First, the insular mentality of the majority of the Maltese population (although this is changing, as was pointed out above). A second reason that emerged out of the research findings is the polarised political mentality of the Maltese society as seen through the eyes of the students who participated in the research, i.e. that
democracy is closely associated with the electoral process and that everything has to be decided upon by ‘good’ representatives in parliament, in this way decreasing their (the students’ own) responsibility and their role as active citizens.

A direct consequence that has emerged from the findings is that students seem to know exactly what their rights are, but seem to be less inclined to remember their duties. As long as certain issues in the Maltese society do not have an immediate effect on their lives, they do not feel duty bound to participate even if this is simply limited to showing their disagreement (Questionnaire Q17, Findings: 17.4). They are ready to criticise or stand and watch, while others, maybe the parliamentary representatives, try to come up with a solution to a pressing issue.

Since students have such a narrow definition of democracy, the findings indicate that students do not have an understanding of the concept of democracy as a way of life. They do not make a distinction between democracy as a political system and living in a democracy. It is not difficult to understand from the findings that students know what the different types of freedom available in a democracy are, because these freedoms are their right. The indicators that the researcher initially obtained during lectures are that most students define liberty as ‘one is free to do what one wants’ rather than ‘to be able, rationally to give up some freedoms to live freely in a community’. Therefore, it came as no surprise to find that students were divided on the issues of gender equality (findings analysed by gender), that they do not feel they should participate in public issues, and they also lack a sound idea of tolerance, especially with the increasing problem of the influx of refugees and illegal immigrants.
into Malta. From the research findings one can also deduce the students' stance when it comes to loyalty and patriotism to their country.

After the research findings and ensuing discussion, the researcher will now move on to the next section to consider some general conclusions as well as focussing on the last two research questions as stated in section 3.0. These relate to a discussion on the issues of whether education is an appropriate medium for preparing young citizens as well as the issue of whether Systems of Knowledge is sufficiently effective in reality in its aims and objectives. Apart from that the researcher will comment on the original findings that emerged from the same research.

6.2 General Conclusions and Original Findings

Research is like a journey to an unknown destination, guided by aims and objectives, where the researcher is many times controlled by the research and not the other way round. Apart from this, research is continuous and not finite, and the more one researches, the more one understands that there are so many influencing factors that need to be researched. It is with this broad conclusion and lesson in mind that the researcher will venture to come up with general conclusions, and later in this same chapter, with recommendations. This study should not be seen as an end in itself, but as a means to an end, i.e. part of continuous research in the field of democracy and citizenship and of education as a whole.

The last two research questions of this study, in fact referred to education. In the literature review it was argued that education, and directly in the context of this
study, citizenship education, in fact is a good medium for preparing young citizens to become democratic citizens. However, after analysing and discussing the research findings in this study, and within the Maltese social and educational framework, one tends to reconsider whether that statement is totally correct. This is not only the researcher’s conclusion or sentiment, since in international media, educators attribute failures or negative events taking place in society to failure of the educational system. In fact Sean Lang in his article ‘This global conflict is teaching us home truths’ in TES August 5, 2005 p. 15, while referring to the July 7th London bombings, argues that:

What we did not know on the morning of July 7 was how closely involved the British education system was with those terrible events. The attackers were British and had been through British schools; one of the bombers’ photos shown on the news was clearly a school portrait and one bomber was a respected primary school mentor. [And further down:]

[...] they were products of an education system that has agonised for years about how to promote racial harmony and to instil mutual respect between different traditions and cultures (p. 15).

The conclusion that emerges from the analysis is that it is incorrect and an over-simplification for politicians and educators to assume that education or citizenship education are the best and only media that ‘socialise’ citizens in a society. As has been discussed in the literature review, there are many other media that influence a citizen’s socialisation process, and at the same time there are also so many different issues in society that influence that same process.

Without giving the impression that the researcher is satisfied with the present state of affairs and additionally without giving the further impression that one should give up in view of the challenges that are undoubtedly encountered in life, one may be likely to conclude that both the respondents in the study, and the terrorists referred to
by Sean Lang, grew up in a system that has been there for three decades, and if anything one can consider the unfortunate attacks as a sign of how effective it was for the British government (and in other countries in the world in the last decade) to make citizenship a statutory subject in August 2002. To state whether citizenship education in the UK has been successful or not, is premature and open to further research. What one can state is that through research, and with the goodwill to change where and when the need arises, one can continue to enhance the education system. Societies are changing so fast that education policies should always be in a state of readiness and flux, since they are addressed to societies and people that are continuously changing. Sears (2004) argues, "citizenship in a modern pluralist society is complex and shifting and that educating for citizenship will require much more nuanced and sophisticated approaches than have dominated in the past" (p. 367).

6.2.1 An enhanced Systems of Knowledge syllabus

What the researcher concluded from the findings of this research and in response to the sixth research question, is that the Systems of Knowledge syllabus in Malta is not sufficiently effective in reaching its aims and objectives. It has been used nearly for a decade and the time has come for change. The Systems of Knowledge Board together with the MATSEC Board have been working on and intend to implement a new syllabus for Systems of Knowledge. This study can support and be used as a catalyst for this change. This study, based on the research findings, further concludes and suggests that in the new syllabus there should be more emphasis on updated content that will satisfy present day needs, and demand more time that can be devoted to the acquisition of skills and participation for active citizenship.
6.2.2 A national strategy for Citizenship Education

The proceedings of the Council of Europe seminar entitled *Citizenship: an educational challenge* referred to in section 3.1 depicted a situation that showed that there is a lack of a national strategy for the teaching of Citizenship in Malta. Local initiatives are rather piecemeal and independent with some exploratory instances being found in the Maltese Education System. Apart from that, the emphasis that emerged on the importance of the role of school councils and student participation in school councils which while giving an experience of democracy at work in the Maltese setting, unfortunately it continues to promote the limited understanding of the students that democracy has to do only with elections, and representatives (in this case student representatives). This understanding needs to be balanced with the promotion of skills to uphold rights and duties and to participate as active citizens in a community. The Crick Report (1998) suggests political literacy as “one of the fundamental skills to help students learn about and how to make themselves effective in public life through knowledge, skills and values” (p. 41). Additionally, Osler (2000) argues that students require “an appropriate pedagogy based on active participation and active learning” (p. 13).

As a result of this journey, an original experience as well as original knowledge has emerged which have resulted in changing the researcher’s outlook to the understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’, and on a wider scale towards the field of education in general. Research humbles the researcher, it makes the researcher feel somewhat small sailing through an ocean of knowledge, and
the more one moves forward, the more one feels the urge to continue to struggle to understand. This journey is not always characterised by plain sailing. It is difficult and rigorous whilst it has moments of great satisfaction and ‘discovery’, it also has its limitations.

6.3 Evaluation and Critical Reflection on Limitations

The researcher chose the research topic due to the personal intrigue regarding the concept of democracy and its theoretical application that has been going on for years. As has been stated earlier, democracy cannot exist in a vacuum. It is a system practised, as elsewhere, in society through the performance of democratic citizenship. So, one primary reason was, a personal need felt by the researcher to delve deeper into the concepts to verify whether what is discussed theoretically, can really exist in practice.

The purpose of the research has been to critique, investigate and explore what has been argued through observation for years, (i.e. the effectiveness or shortcomings of the students’ understanding of the concept of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’) and then to serve as a source for more research and discussion. This research should not be seen as an end, but as a means, or a contribution to an ongoing debate about two very important concepts that influence not only the field of education, but society as a whole.

One of the main limitations of this research is the lack of literature about the concepts of democracy and citizenship in education that exists in the Maltese field of
education. Furthermore it appears that it is only recently that the need was felt to start a debate about citizenship education in the Maltese context. At times, one also feels that the emphasis is more on civic education and personal and social development rather than on citizenship. Faced with this lack of literature, the researcher decided to acquire a conceptual and theoretical framework by reading about the two concepts through the extensive literature found worldwide. The researcher then chose to focus on a particular theoretical background. As has been explained earlier, since Malta was a British colony, and since our system of education has been influenced (and still is to a certain extent) by the British system mainly in the 20th century, the researcher felt that it would be beneficial to base this research in conceptual and theoretical framework that evolved in the UK and in the West.

The vastness of the literature in the field of citizenship education in the West might prove to be a limitation in itself, because the researcher felt it was very challenging to master all the different issues, being a foreigner, and additionally someone who had not participated in the debates about citizenship that took place, especially in the UK at least, over the last two decades.

While framing the research questions, the researcher felt that the main challenge was that they were based on impressions, and experience as yet and they then had to be answered scientifically. Since the researcher teaches at the same College where the research was undertaken, the researcher was always careful not to take a biased approach. However, as has been pointed out in the research design, one cannot be sure that one is totally objective. What one can seek to do is to reduce bias to the minimum. For this reason, the researcher with the support of the research
methods tutors, opted for a research design and a methodological framework that fitted the research. Again, the area of research methods could be a source of limitation to this study. First of all, although the researcher had studied research methodology at masters' level, that dissertation was purely theoretical research, in the field of philosophy of education. The researcher felt that the Study Schools in research methods were an asset to the research in that they showed that after ten years (from the submission of the masters' dissertation) there were so many further methods developed that one could administer in research, yet at the same time one felt that one was starting afresh.

Secondly, another positive aspect of the Study Schools is that while learning about the research methods, students have to try out these methods especially when writing papers. This proved to be of great help to the researcher because it provided a purpose to read research methods literature, especially the most recent literature, and then to test those methods in an educational environment chosen by the researcher.

The researcher feels that the use of content analysis to come up with a hypothesis and the use of the categories as guidelines for the questionnaire schedule and the semi-structured interview schedule might be seen by some researchers as a limitation. However, the researcher also used the same categories as guidelines in the analysis of findings. This procedure was extremely helpful because the collection, presentation, analysis and discussion of findings could be made in a logical manner. Every research instrument undertaken produced so much data that one needed to be logical to obtain a coherent vision of the findings, in order to interpret the findings and come up with implications, conclusions and recommendations.
One could also argue that the questionnaire as a research instrument does not explore the problem in sufficient depth. However, at the same time, the questionnaire studies a large and broad spectrum of respondents. What might be taken as a limitation is the fact that the questionnaire was administered in March, a time when second year students sit for their mock examinations, as it is then normal practice for most students to stay at home to study for the MATSEC exams. This would have created a problem of sampling if the administration of the questionnaire was postponed to later in the academic year.

One might argue that the respondents to the questionnaire were those who did not want to miss the last lectures because they are the ideal or best students, but on the other hand they might be the more apprehensive or carefree students because they did not stay at home to study for their examinations. It was partly as a result of these considerations that the researcher also undertook to administer the semi-structured interviews with the lecturers in the same College to obtain their impression about the students' understanding of the concepts of democracy and citizenship and in so doing to triangulate, confirm and reconfirm the findings.

With more than twenty-four thousand five hundred words transcribed from the interviews, it was very difficult to choose those quotes that were really essential for the research. This difficulty arose because the researcher was always aware of the problem of bias, and there might have been some instances of bias on the researcher's part in interpretation. Again the researcher tried to be as objective as possible, and the findings included quotes that at times are in favour and at times against the argument
in question. It might be the case that some respondents said what they felt they ought to say.

Notwithstanding all these limitations, one can argue that the importance of this research is to serve as a means, a source that instigates more debate about such an important subject and hopefully contributes to the decisions that need to be made regarding the future of Systems of Knowledge syllabus and citizenship. Debate and research in education is essential and necessary, as it is in every field of research. It is necessary that research is continuous and administered not only by academics, but also by teachers themselves who are active in the field.

6.4 **New Directions for Further Research**

As was stated above, research is essential in any field, but in the field of education, it is even more necessary since here we are dealing with human beings (not a product) whose education process is an influence on these lines and those of others. They are the future citizens. This research is not about one method relating to one subject or a trend in the choice of a subject. When researching the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’, one is researching the present and the future of a nation. The way of life of all the citizens in that nation is influenced by the citizenship education they have received or even the lack of it.

There are several options for further research. As was stated above there is a need for further research in the field of citizenship education, wherever it is part of the curriculum, but more so in Malta where this field of research is in its infancy. One
idea for further research which comes to mind is that should the syllabus for Systems of Knowledge remain unchanged, it would be interesting to administer a longitudinal study, with the same research instruments in a few years time to study whether there was a change in the students' understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship', supported by the fact that lecturers will be made aware of the present situation and challenges when this research is published and/or discussed by the researcher during staff meetings.

Another direction for further research might be that of using the same research design and methodology with a group of students at the Junior College if and when the new syllabus for Systems of Knowledge is introduced and implemented, especially if it includes a whole module about democratic citizenship. It would be interesting to note whether the new content taught at post-secondary level, and also if the method used, would manage to influence the students to the extent that they change their understanding about the concepts notwithstanding the influences of the family, the media, the political parties and other agents of socialisation as pointed out above in section 5.0.

It would also be interesting to conduct a similar study in other government and private post-secondary schools in Malta to obtain a wider spectrum of the students' understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship'. The population in these post-secondary schools, where Systems of Knowledge is taught, is smaller than the population of the Junior College.
Another direction for further research is to study the students' understanding of the two concepts mentioned above in post-secondary schools, or institutes where Systems of Knowledge is not part of the curriculum, and then one could compare and contrast the findings and come up with inferential data of one margin of the Maltese population, and from that research one can deduce where the Maltese society is heading as a democratic country.

Ideally, research should also be administered in the primary and secondary sectors of education in Malta, with the aim of introducing a sound strategy for citizenship education that benefits all students whether they continue in post-secondary education or not. This issue will be dealt with in the next section, where the researcher undertakes to list a number of recommendations aimed at enhancing the situation.

6.5 Recommendations for Enhancing the Situation

This section presents two main sets of recommendations: first, those that are strictly related to the research i.e. short term recommendations aimed at improving the students' understanding of the concepts of 'democracy' and 'citizenship' at the Junior College of the University of Malta. Secondly, long-term recommendations with a broader vision, referring to the Maltese System of Education, where the researcher suggests a number of recommendations that aim to contribute to the debate, enhance the local situation and potentially serve as guidelines on a national level.
Through the research findings, it has been shown that there are major shortcomings relating to the 1997 syllabus for Systems of Knowledge. With all the good intentions of giving an idea to the students of the different values as one is socialised within a culture, as well as raising the idea of interdisciplinarity where students are encouraged to consider the subject as a whole and not in separate modules, the current syllabus undoubtedly emphasises more content rather than actual skills to support students in actually practicing that content in life.

6.5.1. Implementing a new Systems of Knowledge syllabus

The first recommendation is to implement a new syllabus for Systems of Knowledge where the emphasis would be at least in part, to support students become more democratic citizens. The emphasis should also be on the skill to deliberate about issues, and to show students the importance of participating in discussions and providing the time to do so. This should be aimed at making students feel that they are part of a community and that they are encouraged to adopt an active stance. Furthermore, students should become aware that their observations are valid and accepted, and that it is every student who counts, and not only their representatives.

It is also recommended that during lectures about democracy and citizenship students should be taught to trust representatives at College and in Parliament whom they have elected and to understand that most of them are working in the interest of the common good. Yet it is also critical that at the same time students should also be taught not to forfeit their responsibility towards their representatives, and that citizens should be vigilant of any policy or decision taken by their representatives.
Another recommendation is to reduce lecturing time in Systems of Knowledge and instead students could have talks by guests, not necessarily politicians, who talk to them about different issues in society such as racism, the problem of illegal immigration and gender equality and discrimination. It seems that in Maltese society when one refers to inclusion, the emphasis is mainly attributed to persons with special needs. When people discuss gender equality and discrimination, they are labelled as feminist and radical, as if to put people off the debate. For this reason, lecturers in Systems of Knowledge and teachers in general should be trained and encouraged to stimulate discussion about important issues and turn them into an educational experience. Crick (in Linsley & Rayment (eds.) 2004) affirms that

It is this minimalist approach to citizenship that made me, thirty years ago, voice scepticism about an old tradition of Citizenship Education as Civics which stressed the primacy of the rule of law, without encouraging discussion of whether some laws are unjust, work badly and if so how to change them (p. 6). [And further down] [...] schools re-emphasis on the knowledge-based part of the curriculum, a retreat into something like old Civics, a nervousness about holding discussions on real issues (p. 116).

6.5.2 A broad vision and strategy for citizenship education in Malta

With respect to long-term recommendations, and always in the context of the findings of this study, the researcher feels that in Malta there is the need for a broad vision supported by a strategy for democratic citizenship for our future generations. Ideally future Systems of Knowledge syllabi should be one part of this overall strategy. The researcher recommends the setting up of a National Citizenship Education Council (NCEC) by the Education Division (Malta) consisting of
academics in the field of citizenship education, the Director for EDC/HRE, the EO for
Democracy and Values as well as practitioners, teachers from the field.

The first responsibility of the Council should be that of planning and
investigating research to serve as a foundation for the proposals mentioned hereunder
and to disseminate information needed to prepare the ground for change. Following
this the Council should devise a draft national strategy for Citizenship Education, and
propose changes to the Maltese National Minimum Curriculum. While doing this, the
Council should prepare resources, guidance support and encouragement to the
teachers who will be the implementers of the new provision. The draft should also be
open to comments and reactions from all interested stakeholders and publicised
widely. Following sufficient debate, a national strategy can then be formalised.

6.5.2.1. Citizenship Education and teacher training

From the pedagogical point of view, changes in teacher training should be
implemented in the B.Ed course and the PGCE at the University of Malta. The
necessary changes in modules taught at the academic level should be made after
considering the four theories discussed in Chapter 2, the literature review, in order to
devise a model that is appropriate for this modern age, and at the same time a model
that works within the Maltese culture and that would therefore have a greater chance
of success.

At the same time it is recommended that there should be Inset courses for
teachers who will be implementing changes and who teach citizenship education in
class. Davies et al (1999) point out that “teachers are not familiar with the key
aspects of citizenship education as characterized by theorists. This in itself may not matter if there was also a lack of confusion, wide knowledge (even if of a particular type) and skilled teaching” (p. 115). A further development should be the appointment of a teacher coordinator for Citizenship in each school, who would have regular meetings with the EO for Democracy and Values. However, there might be a drawback in appointing a representative, or coordinator, because other teachers may feel that they do not have to be involved, as it is the representative’s job. This point has to be clarified from the beginning, with the staff. Otherwise, this move would be counterproductive, and it would create passive teachers. This would go against one of the main aims of democracy and citizenship, that is, to encourage participation on all levels, including the teachers who are the driving force in the whole set up.

These recommendations are broad and the researcher is conscious that there is primarily a need for a change in the mentality (Enslin & White 2002 p. 124-5) and culture, which emanates from key people who are responsible to effect the necessary changes which obviously is not easy. This must be accompanied by a readiness, a willingness to undertake change rather than be satisfied with the status quo. There is also a need of considerable goodwill from all those involved, especially politicians and policy makers. Davies et al (1999) are critical of the fact that “successive governments have discouraged any serious debate about education, its aims and purposes. They have exhibited a dispiriting certainty that they know what is best and how it is schools can be improved” (p. 131). Reforms have to be made after involving all the stakeholders in such a reform. And most of all, it is important to understand that there should be continuous discussion about what kind of knowledge, understanding, skills and attitudes should be promoted in citizenship education.
According to Davies et al. (1999) “unless teachers and pupils are given, compatible with the nature of democratic politics, the freedom to pursue issues wherever they may go, citizenship education will be undermined from the very start” (p. 131).

It is with all these recommendations in mind that reforms in citizenship education should be made, reforms that would promote a democratic citizenry, ready, willing and able to take responsibility and participate on the local, national, European and global level, in order to nurture and safeguard democracy, in a sustainable way for current and importantly, for future generations. It is a responsibility that current stakeholders bear.
7.0 Appendices
1 Aims

Systems of Knowledge is an integral part of the Matriculation Certificate programme of studies. It is an interdisciplinary course aiming to:

- promote an awareness of values
- afford opportunities of going beyond the traditional limits of particular disciplines and gaining insight into different systems of knowledge
- develop the candidates' ability to view ideas, skills and situations from a wider standpoint than that of a single discipline
- foster a greater flexibility in adapting to changing patterns of work and life in a post-industrial age.

1.1 Objectives

The course focuses on:

(a) a number of values: life, community feeling, knowledge, religion, work and play, aesthetic experience, democracy, science and technology. These values are reflected throughout Mediterranean civilization. Particular values seem to be predominant in specific periods;

(b) the political, socio-economic, ethical and cultural environment in which these values developed, in different periods of Mediterranean history;
the products of man throughout history, whether literary, aesthetic or technological;

(d) the development of critical and creative thinking across the Systems of Knowledge curriculum;

(e) the development of communicative skills in both Maltese and English.

The Systems of Knowledge course is divided into three modules, each focusing on a particular period in history:

- Antiquity and Early Middle Ages
- Middle Ages and Renaissance
- Modern and Contemporary World

2 Scheme of Assessment

The distribution of the marks shall be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>% of Global Mark</th>
<th>Examining Authority</th>
<th>Mode of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antiquity and Early Middle Ages</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>School based</td>
<td>Literary Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Ages and Renaissance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>School based</td>
<td>Aesthetic Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern and Contemporary World</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>School based</td>
<td>Technological Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synoptic Examination</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>MATSEC</td>
<td>Written paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderators’ Assessment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>MATSEC</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 General Guidelines

Candidates are expected to express themselves clearly and competently, showing a mastery of the content and the ability to think critically about it. Creativity in project work is encouraged. The qualities of good writing may be briefly stated as Clarity, Conciseness and Euphony.

The competence referred to in this Module will not insist on profuseness if it is so bad that it is the candidate means; so once again it is penalized.

Students must obtain 50% of the total assessment before being allowed to take the examination.

4 Programme Outline

4.1 Module ‘Antiquity and Early Middle Ages’

- Focus on the values of Life, Religion, and Man’s relation to this period in history, as well as ethical and technological values.

- Focus on man’s relation:
  (a) values of Life
  (b) values of Religion

- Focus on the political, social and religious environment throughout the period of the Middle Ages.

- Reflection on the literary products of this period.

Recommended Reading:


Plato - The Apology

4.2 Module ‘Middle Ages and Renaissance’

- Focus on aesthetic values and social and political environment prevalent in the Medieval and Renaissance periods.

- Focus on aesthetic values and social and political environment prevalent in the Medieval and Renaissance periods.
• Focus on the self-perception of man and on social relations throughout this period.

• Focus on political, socio-economic, ethical and cultural environment.

• Reflections on the artistic productions of the time, in the form of art and literature.

Recommended Reading:


4.3 Module ‘Modern and Contemporary World’

• Focus on scientific and technological values, and work and play, as well as on ethical, religious and aesthetic values.

• Focus on the relations of humanity with itself and with the environment.

• Focus on the political, socio-economic, ethical and cultural environment throughout the Modern and Contemporary periods.

• Reflection on the technological/scientific products of the periods.

Recommended Reading:


Sciascia Leonardo (1993) Council of Egypt. Harvil. (Students and teachers may adopt the original Italian version or a Maltese translation.)

5 School-based Assessment

The Projects

Approval of Proposed Projects

Candidates should submit a short description of their proposed project to their school at least five weeks prior to the end of the Module. The projects should be handed in by the end of the Module, except for the Technology Project which should be handed in as directed by the school.

Candidates will be informed whether their Project has been approved or otherwise by the school.

Project themes may not be changed without prior approval of the school.

Procedure of Assessment

For candidates presented by Schools, supervision and assessment of the projects must be carried out by a teacher from the candidate’s own school. The school’s assessment mark for each project should be made available to the MATSEC Board by the end of April of the second year of the course.

All the projects of candidates attending a school may be carried out at the school or at home but they must be made available at the school for the purpose of moderation by the MATSEC moderators. In awarding marks, the teacher should take account of the phenomena of normal distribution and average deviation.

Private Candidates

The projects presented by private candidates will be assessed directly by the Markers’ Panel. Such projects should be readily portable and made available at the University of Malta for assessment. The Literary Project and the Aesthetic Project are to be submitted to the MATSEC Board by
the end of April 1996. The Technology Project must be submitted to MATSEC Board by the end of March 1997.

5.1 Literary Project

Candidates following the Systems of Knowledge course must complete a Literary Project. The project may be carried out by individuals or groups of not more than five candidates, provided that the personal contribution of each member can be identified.

The aim of the Literary Project is to encourage students to have a go at producing a literary work themselves. This project must take the form of an autobiography or a journal.

The autobiography should help students reflect on their past, using the contents of the module to reinterpret their 'history'.

The journal should include a diary of the student's thoughts on the contents of the lessons in the module. It should demonstrate reflective thinking on the part of the student.

Assessment

The Project, which should not be more than 1500 words, is to be assessed on its clarity, originality and reflective expression.

In assessing this project, account should be taken of a candidate's ability to:

(1) understand and convey information;
(2) understand, order, and present facts, ideas, and opinions;
(3) evaluate information in reading and other media, selecting what is relevant to specific purposes;
(4) articulate experience and express one's feelings and imagination;
(5) recognize implicit meaning and attitudes; and
(6) communicate effectively in either

5.2 Aesthetic Project

Candidates following the Systems of Knowledge course must complete an Aesthetic Project. The project must be carried out by individuals or groups of not more than five candidates, provided that the personal contribution of each member can be identified.

The aim of the Aesthetic Project is to encourage students to have a go at producing an aesthetic work themselves. This work might be a play, a performance, a piece of music, etc.

The project should reflect the student's thought and/or artistic sensibility on the contents of the lessons in the module.

Assessment

In assessing the aesthetic project, account should be taken of a candidate's ability to:

(1) give evidence of a personal response to a theme, or subject;
(2) record from direct observation and experience of sensitivity to the medium through exercise of the imagination tempered by appropriate skills and knowledge;
(3) use and compose visual and concrete elements, e.g. colour, texturing, form, proportion, etc. Assessing the musical elements for consideration of skills and performance styles; identification of individual contributions, familiarity with approximate; rhythm and pitch; s
(4) carry out a chosen study from conception to realisation.

5.3 **Technological Project**

Candidates following the Systems of Knowledge course must complete a Technological Project. The project may be carried out by individuals or groups of not more than five candidates, provided that the personal contribution of each member can be identified.

The aim of the Technological Project is to achieve an understanding of what technology is ("the application of knowledge for making and doing purposeful things" - UNESCO) and its requirement of other knowledge besides scientific (e.g. skills in design, evaluation of solutions, etc.)

The project is intended to provide candidates with an opportunity of exercising the required skills in a relaxed environment and is therefore more likely to lead to the production of interdisciplinary material characterised by some degree of integration.

**Assessment**

Assessment will be based on:

1. the production of an object or programme
2. an account of its making, i.e.
   (a) Problems to be solved, relevance, and constraints
   (b) Ideas (thought of, discussed, researched) for solution
   (c) Design (rough sketch, drawing, description, of first prototype) of solution
   (d) Construction
   (e) Testing
   (f) Evaluation
   (g) Display/Modification.

**Abilities**

In assessing the project, account will be taken of the candidates' ability to:

(a) describe and apply facts, principles and concepts related to the production of the object or programme
(b) give evidence of graphical and other communication skills necessary for describing the object or programme
(c) identify problems which lend themselves to solutions through practical technological activity
(d) identify the resources required for solving practical technological problems
(e) produce and interpret data by means of diagrams, charts, graphs, experimental results,
(f) think up and record ideas being likely solutions to problems
(g) describe the interaction between technology and the needs of society
(h) record the production of the object or the development of the programme.

6 **MATSEC Assessment**

**Synoptic Examination**

There will be one 3 hour paper carrying 50% of the marks. At least one of the questions must be answered in a different language from the others (i.e in English or Maltese).
7 **Moderation**

The term 'moderation' covers the following two distinct operations:

1. Moderation of the marks awarded for the three school-based projects, which may be carried out through visits to the schools or through correlation between marks for different components of the course, ensuring that a sufficient level has been reached in the three projects.

2. Moderators' award of up to 10 marks for the degree of interdisciplinarity evidenced by the candidate's performance across the different components of the course.

8 **Resits**

The marks obtained in the three projects may be carried forward to the following May session only.

9 **Note to Teachers**

**Specific Knowledge and Broad Frames of Reference**

The drafters of this syllabus are deeply aware of the requirements of the Post-Secondary National Minimum Curriculum, one of the main aims of which is very aptly expressed in the following excerpt from the Norwegian Ministry of Education's *Core Curriculum for Primary, Secondary and Adult Education*:

"Specific Knowledge and Broad Frames of Reference

In education, knowledge must always constitute a careful selection, presented in a progression to provide overview and create coherence.

Concrete knowledge is needed for learning, and the course of study must identify what the learners should be familiar with, in what order and at which level.

Experience and research show that the less previous knowledge one has to link new information to, the slower and less successful is learning. Of particular importance are the constitutive frames of reference in different subjects. These are indispensible for interpreting new information, as well as for directing the search for new facts. If the fundamental frames of reference which can give meaning to the flood of impressions and fragments of information are lacking, the overall picture is easily lost in momentary flickerings. Knowledge that orders information is needed to learn to learn, and for using what one knows to grasp what one does not know. It is the general pattern which provides the code and key when new pieces are added to a mosaic.

To provide context, coherence and perspective, it is important to design and coordinate teaching across subjects and fields, so that their relevance to each other is disclosed and a more integrated understanding can emerge."

Moreover, the prime aim of this course is to prompt students to develop a system of values within such broad frames of reference.
Subject: Systems of Knowledge  
Date: 12 March 2003  
Time: 14.00-17.00

Answer 4 questions, one question from each section.  
You may answer in either English or Maltese.

Section A

A 1). Our values are found in our personal choices and decisions, our comments and  
judgements, in our aesthetic, political, and religious views. How do we deal with  
them? What can we learn about how we deal with our values from the speeches by  
Socrates in defence of his life?

Il-valuri tagħna jinstabu fl-ġ tadlieti u d-decizzjonijiet personali tagħna, fil-kummenti u  
fil-ġudiżji tagħna, u f'dak li nażbu dwar l-estetika, il-politika, u r-religjon. Ahna kif  
nitrattawhom? X'għallimma dwar kif għandna nitrattaw il-valuri tagħna kliem  
Sokrate meta kien qed jiddefendi l-ħajtu fil-qorti?

OR

A 2). Some say that politics is about who decides. It could be through winning the  
consensus of the people or else by having a system in which rulers decide for the  
rulled. Reflecting on these two systems, discuss the main differences between ancient  
Athenian democracy and modern representative democracy.

Hemm min jaffseb li l-politika hi dwar min jiexu d-decizzjonijiet. Dan jista' isir jew  
billi jiġib il-kunsens tal-poplu jew inkella billi jkollok sistema fejn min imexxi  
jiddèċiedi għal min jittmexx. Afsel dwar dawn izżewġ sistemi u ddiskuti d-differenzi  
l-kbar bejn id-demokrazija f'Ateni antika u d-demokrazija rapprezentattiva moderna.

OR

A 3). ‘We make a great mistake when we suppose that morality depends on religion.  
Belief in God never was a motive for moral conduct. It isn’t moral to be ‘good’ in the  
hope of heaven or in fear of hell; truly moral behaviour is freely chosen, and other-  
centred’ (Colin Swatridge, General Studies).

These thoughts were expressed by a young student. Do you agree with them?  
Dawn huma l-šebbijiet ta' student żgħugh? X'taħseb inti?

Section B

B 1) ‘Renaissance is a word which is very generally understood, but which few  
people would care to define very closely’ (Peter and Linda Murray, The Art of the  
Renaissance).
Appendix 3 Extract from Categories – Content Analysis

Defining Democracy

The rule of the people: direct /representative
Demos kratei the rule of the people.
Ruled by the people for the people.
Everyone in the polis had a say.
Equality for each and every member of society.
There is equality in every which way.
Everyone may be elected and therefore there might be lack of interest on the part of
the person being elected.
A group of people chosen by the people to lead the country.
Everyone is considered the same in front of the law.
Democracy is the frame of every modern country in the world.
The people used to decide a vote...consensus.
The people elect representatives ...to take the best decisions for the country and its
citizens.
You have a combination of consensus of the people and a system where rules decide
for the ruled.
Refers to those decisions that a party or individual takes and these affect all the
country.
Today’s democracy concerns more winning the consensus of the people.
Abraham Lincoln “the rule of the people, by the people for the people.”
A system where the people rule.

The Power of the People

Politics is about who decides...it also means power.
The best political system in the world but it is us who must make sure that democracy
is used in the right manner.
There were various ways in which people could participate...today we take part in the
general elections.
This is criticized by those who say that citizens are free only on election day.

Direct and Representative Democracy

The Greek way of democracy is very similar to the one we have today.
Modern democracy is ‘built up’ over the democracy of ancient Greece, but with slight
changes so that everything would be fair and more professional.
Changed a lot...a few rules changed...all the people...today representatives decide.
Today, we build and mould our democracy on that of Athens.
Democracy is most fair because citizens participate directly.
Modern democracy relies on winning the consensus of the people through a general
election and those who are elected cater for the rest of the population.
Appendix 4 Questionnaire Schedule

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
EdD

An exploration of the students' understanding of the concepts 'democracy' and 'citizenship'

Please tick ✓ one response to each question

Personal Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions

1. How do you define 'democracy'?

- The role of the people
- Everyone is considered the same in front of the law
- A system where people are allowed to vote in elections
- A system that creates a number of freedoms
- A system where the people rule

2. How much power do people have in a democracy?

- People have all the power
- People are allowed to vote in elections
- People can decide certain issues
- People in a democracy have no power
- People compete for power in a democracy

3. What do we mean by 'Direct' Democracy?

- All the population is involved in politics
- All the citizens are involved in politics
- All the landowners are involved in politics
- All the citizens vote for each policy
4. What do we mean by ‘Representative’ Democracy?

- All the male citizens vote for each policy □
- All the population of a country is involved in politics □
- All the citizens are involved in politics □
- All the electorate participates in general elections □
- It is a system providing the best values for life □
- It is a perfect system of government □

5. Is Malta a Direct or Representative Democracy?

- Direct □
- Representative □

6. How can we identify democracy in practice?

- The representatives decide for the electorate □
- The electorate participate in general elections □
- The citizen experiences liberty and human rights □
- The citizen participates directly or indirectly in decisions □
- The citizens have total freedom, and do what they like □

7. Does every citizen living in a democracy have equal rights of participation?

- All citizens participate in decisions of the local council □
- All citizens participate in the government of a country □
- Some citizens have full right of participation □
- Only the representatives have the right to decide □
- Only qualified people have the right to decide □

8. Why do we say that in a democracy the majority is always right?

- The majority should decide what is the best for the country □
- The majority represents most of the citizens □
- The majority represents most of the ideas of the citizens □
- The majority is responsible for the government □
- The majority has the right to rule □

9. Does the minority in a democracy possess any role and rights?

- The minority has the role of ‘watchdog’ □
- The minority has an important role and a right to be heard □
- The minority has the role to pressure the majority □
- The minority represents those who agree with its beliefs □
The minority has the role and the right to balance arguments □

10. How does democracy provide for freedom of expression?

(Please rate on a scale of increasing importance from 1 to 5, where 1 is very important and 5 is least important)

The media □
Pressure groups □
Trade unions □
Religious groups □
Courts of Justice □

11. How can a citizen in a democracy express his/her opinions freely?

(Please rate on a scale of increasing importance from 1 to 5, where 1 is very important and 5 is the least important)

Local councils □
Members of parliament □
Media □
Trade unions □
Pressure groups □

12. If democracy is one of the best political systems in the world, why do philosophers like Plato, and modern citizens criticise democracy?

Because of corruption □
Too many rights □
Less emphasis on duty □
Abdication of the citizens’ responsibility □
Inadequacy of the welfare state □

13. Why can we say the democracy reduces gender discrimination?

Women have equal rights □
More women are involved in politics □
More women are involved in all aspects of life □
Women can become prime minister □
Women have the right to vote □
14. Do you think that in reality democracy really reduces gender discrimination?

Yes □
No □

Why?

Because of cultural restrictions □
There is a need for culture change □
Biological differences □
Males still dominate the world □
It is not enough to issue laws □

15. Why are numbers (18+, the jury system etc.) important in a democracy?

It is easy to decide a majority through numbers □
It is a form of control □
18+ is a sign of maturity □
It is a form of discipline □
Numbers help to declare decisions as final □

16. Why can we say that pluralism in a democracy is a symbol of liberty?

People can choose ways and means to express themselves □
People can make informed decisions □
People have different opinions □
People choose different beliefs □
Pluralism enhances liberty □

17. If there is an issue you feel strongly against which the government plans to implement, how prepared are you to take an active role in voicing your opinion?

None □
Sit and watch □
Criticise □
Active campaign □
Appendix 5  Semi-Structured Interview Schedule

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

First of all I would like to thank you for accepting to participate in this interview as part of my research. As I have already pointed out before, I would like to emphasize the anonymity and confidentiality of all the responses that will be recorded during this interview.

Focus of Discussion and Research

The purpose of this study is primarily to explore the students' understanding of the concepts of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’. The research evolves mainly around the concept of ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’ and their influence, if any, on the development of students as democratic citizens. The focus of discussion and the research will be the administration of seven (8) interviews with lecturers of Systems of Knowledge to understand what is the lecturers' own understanding and their perceptions of what their students understand by ‘democracy’ and ‘citizenship’.

A1 How do you define Democracy?

A2 From your experience during lectures, discussions with students and comments from other members of staff, what is the students' understanding of Democracy at the Junior College?

A3 How accurate and complete do you feel is that understanding?

A4 Where do you think they got their understanding?

(What is the students’ knowledge about the Maltese political system?)

A5 To what extent do you think democratic principles are exercised on the local level (local councils, college, University of Malta); on the national level; and on the global/international level?

A6 To what extent do you think that the majority and minority rule contributes to cohesion in society?
B1 Through what channels can a citizen in a Democracy express his/her opinion freely?

(Maybe through the media, pressure groups, trade unions religious groups, courts of justice, local councils, members of parliament)

B2 After their studies in the primary, secondary (PSHE/Social Studies) and the Junior College, do you think students have been prepared to live as democratic citizens? (participation)

B3 Democracy promotes pluralism in broadcasting; do you think in Malta in the last decade (after the legislation) this proved to be a positive means of expression for democracy?

(Was there a visible improvement in the way people think (including the Junior College students) about the media as a medium of expression?)

C1 Democracy provides legislation to reduce Gender Equality. What is your opinion about this statement?

C2 Where do you see Malta, on gender equality, when compared to other countries?

C3 Do you think students at the Junior College are well informed about the legislation that reduces Gender Issues?
(Do you think they are in favour or against these reforms? Are most students ready to change in favour of more gender equality?)

Now with regards to another related issue of the major value of equality and the important role played by Human Rights.

C4 How does the Maltese society responds to racism (including Junior College Students)?

(Are they racist against one race and not another? What about the problem of illegal immigrants? Do the Maltese including the Junior College students know about legal immigrants?)

(There is antagonism against immigrants, especially illegal immigrants, is it because of: lack of funds as a nation; they are seen as competitors for work; different religions; more criminality, problem with mixed marriages or different reasons? If you had to put these examples in a hierarchy of importance which one would come first and which one the last?)

D1 Equal Rights of Participation at all levels is promoted in a Democracy: what is your opinion about the existence of this right in general and with respect to Malta?

D2 Do you think that different groups in the Maltese society (political, age, educational level and status), and including the Junior College students (to a more or lesser extent) are prepared and ready to participate to show their disagreement against a policy issued by the government?
(Are people ready to participate without any political bias, to protest directly (protest march) or indirectly (passive resistance or boycott)?

D3 In terms of what has been said in D2 do you think that when one does not participate to boycott, one is forfeiting one’s right to uphold and nurture democracy, and at the same time would be giving a free hand to the majority in power?

E If Democracy is considered as the best political system, why is there so much criticism against this system on the national and the global level? (Bureaucracy and corruption, the decision about the building to replace the ruins of opera house, the Iraq war)

F Is there anything you wish to add that has not been addressed by any of my questions or your responses?

Message of thanks

I would like to thank you for your cooperation and help during this interview, which will definitely prove fruitful for my research.

Philip Caruana
Appendix 6  Extract from Transcript I8

INTERVIEW 8 TRANSCRIPT

How do you define democracy?

I think I find it easier to define what it means to live in a democracy rather than to define democracy itself, and I would consider that living in a democracy means that one has basic rights duties and responsibilities and there is a form of government in which I contribute to because I participate in elections. I believe that democracy does not start and end with elections, lots of people think that that is the be all and end all that is the end of their democratic responsibilities. I believe that it involves participation of the citizen at the level that a citizen can participate, and it entails the idea of pluralism and therefore there is the idea of many voices and many views. I suppose that one has to talk about the obvious the head of state the elected parliament and the separation of powers.

From your experience during lectures what is the students’ understanding of democracy at the Junior College?

When one starts lectures their idea is really simplistic, it revolves round the idea of elections. And I find that in Malta they have a strict partisan approach to the idea of democracy which is painted very much in terms of the main two political parties and to a lesser extent by the third party. As one explores the issues they realise that there is a much broader meaning of democracy particularly their understanding of the laws of a country and the guarantors of our freedom that they are restricting our freedom. That idea comes across pretty clearly by the end of it. I am not particularly interested in politics they say. After a few sessions they realise that politics is really about themselves and not really about other people outside themselves.

How accurate and complete do you feel is this understanding?

I think that the students’ understanding initially is more or less a reflection of greater society, I do not feel that we as Maltese are immature politically considering that we take interest in politics but very often and I do not want to generalise it goes as far as how it affects you personally and what you are going to get out of it. What is good about it now in the last few years is that people do not stick close to their political party. I think that it is inaccurate and it is incomplete and I think that it is a good thing that they have lectures at Junior College that try to expand and round up the subject.

Where do you think they got their understanding from?

We are talking about students who are sixteen, when they start the subject and I think that they have been influenced by the affairs in Malta and the family attitudes. This year because we had two very important decisions to take I think I haven’t started doing the subject yet but I think that there is a bit more awareness of what it all
entails. So about where they got their understanding I say from their family and the media.
Appendix 7 Extra Tables

QUESTIONS REQUIRING ORDERED RESPONSES – 1 TO 5

Table 3:
Q10 how does democracy provide for freedom of expression?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The media</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>4.016</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure groups</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.672</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.394</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts of justice</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.098</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:
Q11 How can a citizen in a democracy express his/her opinions freely?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local councils</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of parliament</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.344</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>3.884</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.104</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure groups</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.898</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: The students were instructed prior to the administration of the questionnaire that they should rank the options from 1 to 5, 1 being the highest and 5 the lowest.

Note 2: When analysing Q10 and Q11 the researcher inverted the scores given by the respondents to be able to carry out the analysis, that is score 1 changed to 5 and 5 was changed to 1.
Table 5: PERCENTAGE RESPONSE – ANALYSED BY GENDER ALL QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q01</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>TOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How do you define democracy?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Everyone is considered the same in front of the law</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 A system where people are allowed to vote in elections</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 A system where people rule</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 A system that creates a number of freedoms</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 The rule of the people</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How much power do people have in a democracy?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 People are allowed to vote in elections</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 People can decide certain issues</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 People compete for power in a democracy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 People have all the power</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 People in a democracy have no power</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q02</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>TOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do we mean by 'Direct' democracy?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 All the citizens are involved in politics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 All the citizens vote for each policy</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 All the male citizens vote for each policy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 All the population is involved in politics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 All the landowners are involved in politics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q03</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do we mean by 'Representative' democracy?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 All the electorate participates in general elections</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 It is a system providing the best values for life</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 All the citizens are involved in politics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 It is a perfect system of government</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 All the population of a country is involved in politics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q05</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is Malta a Direct or Representative Democracy?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Direct</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Representative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q06</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How can we identify democracy in practice?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 The citizen experiences liberty and human rights</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 The citizen participates directly or indirectly in decisions</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 The representatives decide for the electorate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 The electorate participate in general elections</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 The citizens have total freedom, and do what they like</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q07</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does every citizen living in a democracy have equal rights of participation?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 All citizens participate in the government of a country</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Only the representatives have the right to</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q08</td>
<td>Why do we say that in a democracy the majority is always right?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>The majority represents most of the ideas of the citizens</td>
<td>77  135  212  39.7%  44.1% -4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>The majority represents most of the citizens</td>
<td>66  114  180  34.0%  37.3% -3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>The majority should decide what is the best for the country</td>
<td>17  27   44   8.8%  8.8% -0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>The majority has the right to rule</td>
<td>21  20   41   10.8%  6.5%  4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>The majority is responsible for the government</td>
<td>13  10   23   6.7%  3.3%  3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q09</th>
<th>Does the minority in a democracy possess any role and rights?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>The minority has an important role and a right to be heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>The minority has the role and the right to balance arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>The minority has the role to pressurre the majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>The minority has the role of &quot;watchdog&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>The minority represents those who agree with its beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>If democracy is one of the best political systems in the world, why do philosophers like Plato, and modern citizens criticise democracy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Because of corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>Abdication of the citizens' responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Less emphasis on duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Inadequacy of the welfare state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Too many rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Why can we say that democracy reduces gender discrimination?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Women have equal rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>More women are involved in all aspects of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Women have the right to vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>More women are involved in politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Women can become prime minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Do you think that in reality democracy really reduces gender discrimination?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14(b)</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14b.1</td>
<td>Males still dominate the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.2</td>
<td>There is a need for cultural change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.3</td>
<td>It is not enough to issue laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.4</td>
<td>Because of cultural restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.5</td>
<td>Biological differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Why are numbers (18+, the jury system etc.) important in a democracy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | 18+ is a sign of maturity                                             | 111 120 231 57.2% 39.2% 18.0%  
|     | It is a form of control                                              | 36 84 120 18.6% 27.5% -8.9%  
|     | It is easy to decide a majority through numbers                      | 24 42 66 12.4% 13.7% -1.4%  
|     | Numbers help to declare decisions as final                          | 12 39 51 6.2% 12.7% -6.6%  
|     | It is a form of discipline                                           | 11 21 32 5.7% 6.9% -1.2%  
| Q16 | Why can we say that pluralism in a democracy is a symbol of liberty? | 0.0%  
|     | People have different opinions                                       | 67 112 179 34.5% 36.6% -2.1%  
|     | People can choose ways and means to express themselves               | 71 98 169 36.6% 32.0% 4.6%  
|     | Pluralism enhances liberty                                           | 21 51 72 10.8% 16.7% -5.8%  
|     | People can make informed decisions                                   | 18 22 40 9.3% 7.2% 2.1%  
|     | People choose different beliefs                                      | 17 23 40 8.8% 7.5% 1.2%  
| Q17 | If there is an issue you feel strongly against which the government plans to implement, how prepared are you to take an active role in voicing your opinion? |  
|     | Criticise                                                            | 89 176 265 45.9% 57.5% -11.6%  
|     | Sit and watch                                                        | 37 60 97 19.1% 19.6% -0.5%  
|     | Active campaign                                                      | 45 34 79 23.2% 11.1% 12.1%  
|     | None                                                                 | 23 36 59 11.9% 11.8% 0.1%  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q01</strong></th>
<th><strong>How do you define democracy?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Freq</strong></th>
<th><strong>Perc</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Everyone is considered the same in front of the law</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>A system where people are allowed to vote in elections</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>A system where people rule</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>A system that creates a number of freedoms</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>The rule of the people</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q02</strong></th>
<th><strong>How much power do people have in a democracy?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Freq</strong></th>
<th><strong>Perc</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>People are allowed to vote in elections</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>People can decide certain issues</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>People compete for power in a democracy</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>People have all the power</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>People in a democracy have no power</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q03</strong></th>
<th><strong>What do we mean by 'Direct' democracy?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Freq</strong></th>
<th><strong>Perc</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>All the citizens are involved in politics</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>All the citizens vote for each policy</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>All the male citizens vote for each policy</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>All the population is involved in politics</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>All the landowners are involved in politics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q04</strong></th>
<th><strong>What do we mean by 'Representative' democracy?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Freq</strong></th>
<th><strong>Perc</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>All the electorate participates in general elections</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>It is a system providing the best values for life</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>All the citizens are involved in politics</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>It is a perfect system of government</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>All the population of a country is involved in politics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q05</strong></th>
<th><strong>Is Malta a Direct or Representative Democracy?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Freq</strong></th>
<th><strong>Perc</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q06</strong></th>
<th><strong>How can we identify democracy in practice?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Freq</strong></th>
<th><strong>Perc</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The citizen experiences liberty and human rights</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>The citizen participates directly or indirectly in decisions</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>The representatives decide for the electorate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>The electorate participate in general elections</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>The citizens have total freedom, and do what they like</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q07</strong></th>
<th><strong>Does every citizen living in a democracy have equal rights of participation?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Freq</strong></th>
<th><strong>Perc</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>All citizens participate in the government of a country</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Only the representatives have the right to decide</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Some citizens have full rights of participation</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>All citizens participate in decisions of the local council</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Only qualified people have the right to decide</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q08</strong></th>
<th><strong>Why do we say that in a democracy the majority is always right?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Freq</strong></th>
<th><strong>Perc</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>The majority represents most of the ideas of the citizens</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>The majority represents most of the citizens</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>The majority should decide what is the best for the country</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>The majority has the right to rule</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>The majority is responsible for the government</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q09</td>
<td>Does the minority in a democracy possess any role and rights?</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Perc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>The minority has an important role and a right to be heard</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>The minority has the role and the right to balance arguments</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>The minority has the role to presssure the majority</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>The minority has the role of &quot;watchdog&quot;</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>The minority represents those who agree with its beliefs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>If democracy is one of the best political systems in the world, why do philosophers like Plato, and modern citizens criticise democracy?</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Perc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Because of corruption</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>Abdication of the citizens' responsibility</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Less emphasis on duty</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Inadequacy of the welfare state</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Too many rights</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Why can we say that democracy reduces gender discrimination?</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Perc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Women have equal rights</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>More women are involved in all aspects of life</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Women have the right to vote</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>More women are involved in politics</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Women can become prime minister</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Do you think that in reality democracy really reduces gender discrimination?</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Perc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14(b)</th>
<th>Why?</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14b.1</td>
<td>Males still dominate the world</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.2</td>
<td>There is a need for cultural change</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.3</td>
<td>It is not enough to issue laws</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.4</td>
<td>Because of cultural restrictions</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.5</td>
<td>Biological differences</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Why are numbers (18+, the jury system etc.) important in a democracy?</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Perc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18+ is a sign of maturity</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>It is a form of control</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>It is easy to decide a majority through numbers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Numbers help to declare decisions as final</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>It is a form of discipline</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Why can we say that pluralism in a democracy is a symbol of liberty?</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Perc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>People have different opinions</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>People can choose ways and means to express themselves</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>Pluralism enhances liberty</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>People can make informed decisions</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>People choose different beliefs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>If there is an issue you feel strongly against which the government plans to implement, how prepared are you to take an active role in voicing your opinion?</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Perc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Criticise</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>Sit and watch</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>Active campaign</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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