

Justice-oriented, 'Thick' Approaches to Civics and Citizenship Education in Australia: Examples of Practice.

Keith Heggart and Rick Flowers

University of Technology Sydney

Abstract

There has been extensive research into formal approaches to civics and citizenship education which has identified different typologies (e.g justice-oriented and participatory) and underlying philosophies ('thick' vs 'thin'). However, research remains limited in regards to the pedagogical possibilities that enable such approaches. This chapter explores a range of different examples of justice-oriented and thick approaches to citizenship education. It begins by identifying both formal and informal examples from schooling before broadening the debate to discuss examples from civil society, such as refugee advocacy groups and cycling social movements. In doing so, this chapter explicates a typology that frames different forms of citizenship education from passive to active and participatory and then to justice-oriented.

Key words

Thick citizenship, justice-oriented citizenship, participatory citizenship, active citizenship, community cultural development, examples, grassroots, organising

Introduction

It is one thing to critique the state of citizenship education as being too constrained and narrowly focused only on information-giving and raising awareness, but is another to then argue that there should be bolder approaches to citizenship education which not only raise awareness but also foster active citizenship. An important and necessary starting point in detailing these bolder approaches is to focus on defining and theorising about their main features. In this chapter we examine approaches to citizenship education which foster active citizenship by drawing on existing literature to theorise two key concepts. The first concept is the

notion of 'thick' citizenship, and we begin by illustrating what constitutes a 'thick' approach by describing various examples from the formal education sector. The second concept is 'justice-oriented' and in the second half of the chapter we describe various examples from informal education projects to illustrate our angle on what constitutes 'justice-oriented' citizenship education. To make clear what thick and justice-oriented approaches look like in practice, we illustrate our analysis with examples drawn from the context in which we work; namely, Australia.

Thick and justice-oriented approaches to citizenship education have had to be resourceful and resilient in the face of politically conservative forces that have enjoyed an ascendancy in Australia for over 20 years. This conservatism is exemplified in criticism of the Australian Civics and Citizenship Curriculum by the then federal Education Minister, Christopher Pyne, as being biased and leftist (Crowe 2014). The conservative policy environment is illustrated further by recent legislative proposals to make Australian government funding for community organisations and charities conditional on them agreeing not to make critical comment on major policies of the government of the day. Peak bodies have labelled such legislation as seeking to gag NGO's in their political advocacy (Wade 2007; Hassan 2018). Despite recent, overly narrow policy agendas (see the chapter by Dadvand (2018) in this collection for a more detailed analysis), there is, nonetheless, good reason to remain optimistic about efforts to build and sustain radical approaches to citizenship education. When appraising these efforts - and as we seek to do in this chapter - attention should, however, be paid not only to official and institutionalised curriculum spaces, but also to informal and grassroots spaces.

'Thick' and 'thin' approaches to citizenship education

There is extensive scholarship about the prevailing models of minimalist or thin citizenship education that are dominant in most schools and educational systems in Australia (Cogan & Morris 2001; Kennedy 2007; Macintryre & Simpson 2009; Peterson & Tudball 2017). Typically, commentaries and critiques of these minimalist

or thin approaches to citizenship education seek to advocate for a wider, more expansive approach. In this section we examine and theorise 'thick' approaches to citizenship education and describe the ways in which these provide a valuable conceptual base for citizenship education in Australia.

The term 'thick' itself has a lengthy etymology in relation to notions of citizenship and citizenship education (Isin, Engin & Turner 2002) and has been used by a number of scholars - including Terence McLaughlin (1992), Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne (2004), and David Zyngier (2011a) - to describe citizenship education that emphasises student-led, activist and participatory approaches. One of the key differences between thick and thin (or maximal and minimal) approaches to citizenship and citizenship education is the level of civic involvement - which could be advocacy, activism or/and voluntary community service - expected and required of individuals within society. McLaughlin describes the difference in this way:

On minimal views, there is a degree of suspicion of widespread involvement, and the citizen is seen primarily as a private individual with the task of voting wisely for representatives. In contrast, maximal views favour a more fully participatory approach to democracy (2007, p. 237).

This more fully participatory approach is based on the assumption that a strong democracy relies on a robust public sphere and civil society, which in turn rely on the experiential, (nodding to John Dewey), conscientized (nodding to Paulo Freire) and emancipatory (nodding to Frankfurt School Critical Theory) knowledge of grassroots citizens. Thin approaches to citizenship, by contrast, emphasise didactic and teacher-led approaches underpinned by an assumption that strong democracy relies on citizens having instrumental knowledge about how political structures work. The tension between both thick and thin approaches to civics and citizenship education has informed much of the development of civics and citizenship education materials.

In Australia, across the political spectrum, a succession of state and federal government education agencies have placed priority on teaching about the processes and mechanisms of government and have been criticised for this exclusionary and narrow approach (O'Louhglin 1997; Heggart, Arvanitakis & Matthews 2018).

Discovering Democracy, a citizenship education syllabus that was developed in the 1990s and ran until the mid 2000s, was one such example. While *Discovering Democracy* originally sought to embrace a more activist notion of citizenship education, it was ultimately too content-heavy, and was often delivered in a way that was teacher-centred and didactic (Heggart, Arvanitakis & Matthews 2018). The more recent *Australian Civics and Citizenship Curriculum* made some improvements, especially in the way that citizenship was defined for young people, but it is still limited and does not sufficiently recognise the diversity of citizenship and citizens within Australia and nor does it foreground the ways young people might be active within their communities. Instead, like other curricula before it, it perpetrates the notion of young people as 'citizens-in-waiting' (Arvanitakis & Marren 2009; Heggart, Arvanitakis & Matthews 2018).

In seeking alternative examples to thin approaches, we recommend looking beyond government developed and mandated approaches to citizenship education to local school, community and civil society initiated approaches. In these contexts, it is possible to find citizenship education examples that are more activist in focus, more local in context, and more student-centred in practice. We have chosen to characterise these models in two ways – *bottom-up approaches*, which are led by students and are often focused on a single issue that usually develops organically from a specific context - and *established curriculum frameworks* that are often deployed in schools, usually with local applications but draw on a pre-determined network of resources and structures.

Thick and formal approaches to citizenship education: Pop-up and student-led examples

If one's benchmark for a healthy democracy is framed through the lens of old social movements – where social action campaigns are run by organisations with a head office - then one would look for capacity to sustain advocacy over a long period of time. Through such a lens transitory and, especially, one-off, actions would be regarded less positively. Framed through the lens of new social movements - where campaigns are run through decentralised networks – locally initiated actions, even when one-off, are regarded as potentially powerful (Offe 1985). Indeed, like pop-up restaurants and stores, there are citizenship education initiatives that are one-off or transitory. A central argument of this chapter is to view citizenship education through a new social movements lens. Here, therefore, we critically discuss some examples of citizenship education that are not only student-led but have popped up organically around specific issues.

A key contention within existing literature is that young Australians relate to, and participate in, pop-up approaches which serve to challenge the traditional notion that young people are apathetic or ignorant (or both) about politics and civil society. Anita Harris, Johanna Wyn and Salem Younes (2010) corroborate this. Their empirical research suggests that young people are often neither apathetic or activists, but are largely disaffected from a political system that they feel is not responsive to their needs. Phillipa Colin and Lucas Walsh put a finer point on new ways in which Australian young people are expressing their interest in politics:

Young people are often more interested in direct, everyday, individualised and networked forms of participation. Their everyday participatory practices (such as boycotts and sharing political content via social media), interest-based activities (such as contributing to youth mental health service design or starting their own online petition or campaign), and creative and media practices (joining a flashmob, producing a mash-up or a Tumblr account) are often framed as “taking action” on issues they care about. Surveys or electoral rolls rarely pick up these forms of participation. But what they tell us is that taking part in elections is only one form of participation young people value (2016, p. 1).

One such example of a direct, networked and individualised response to an issue is the *Asylum Seeker Resource Centre (ASRC)*. We use the term 'individualised' here to describe examples that are developed by individuals or small groups of people but more often than not are undertaken in a collective and participatory manner. This project began in 2001 when Kon Karapanagiotidis, a teacher moved by the plight of homeless asylum seekers in Melbourne, decided to start a resource centre with his students at a technical and further education college. The ASRC began as a student project. 17 years later it boasts that it is

supported by a network of more than 1,000 volunteers and 100 staff in assisting around 4,600 people seeking asylum each year... [As an] independent, community-led organisation the ASRC is in a unique position to advocate for the human rights of people seeking asylum, exempt from the pressures of government or the private sector. For this reason, the ASRC has been able to take a leading position in the opposition of Australia's asylum seeker policy, while offering alternatives to issues faced by people seeking asylum and refugees (ASRC, 2018).

This approach exemplifies the organic or non-institutionalized nature of many social justice movements and activist citizenship education approaches (Gosden 2006).

While it began as a local collective, the ASRC now has a national – even international – reach, and continues to work to both support asylum seekers and educate Australians about these matters. This increased profile has inspired other, more localised activism – for example, the students at Bethlehem College in Sydney who protested the Federal Government's asylum seeker policies with a silent sit-in (McNeilage 2014).

Here we also want to draw attention to the epistemological politics of these two examples. Although quite different, both ASRC and the work of students at Bethlehem College are arguably examples of thick citizenship education in that they are projects that were activist in orientation, and were developed and led by students and participants. Furthermore, rather than seeking to develop government-mandated curriculum knowledge, they instead begin from the concerns and

understandings of the young people in question. The knowledge that is privileged is that of the young people themselves. In the second half of this chapter, we go onto explain how this is a central feature of justice-oriented approaches to citizenship education.

Another example of a thick approach to citizenship education is the *Aussie Democracy* project, which began just before the Australian federal election in 2010. It took place as part of a Civics class in a Victorian school and made heavy use of social media as a means to build engagement amongst students and involve them in the real-world election as active participants rather than disinterested bystanders. This project was the idea of Mike Stuchbery, a teacher who was conscious that despite the looming 2010 federal election, students were, for the most part, apathetic about the election and the issues related to parliament and government. Instead of teaching them in a standard way (a minimalist approach) by using textbooks and the *Discovering Democracy* syllabus and resources, Stuchbery attempted to teach the students about Federal Parliament by actually involving them in the election campaign – as political commentators, reporters and journalists. He describes the change that this caused in the classroom:

As I move around the room, showing them the Twitter account I've set up for them, the blog and a few other gadgets I've picked up, they get it. They sit down in groups, working on questions that they want to direct at politicians. They're good questions too. There are ones on trade alliances, school funding and the pressures of public scrutiny. Truth be told, I'm kind of gobsmacked. One kid asks me whether he and his mate can call a TV station, that they reckon they might be able to get Julia or Tony if someone reported on what we're doing. I nod, smile, and send them off to write a script for the phone call they'll make. There's electricity in the air. It doesn't feel like school. It feels like something else. The kids are alert, focused, loving what they're doing (Stuchbery, 2010).

By making the lessons about citizenship education much 'thicker' (i.e. more student-led and activist), Stuchbery tapped into the interests of young people. This presents an example of David Gauntlett's techno-optimistic perspective that Web 2.0 platforms can strengthen democracy because they offer new opportunities for

participatory action and learning (2015). *Aussie Democracy* served as a powerful example of thicker and justice-focused citizenship education as it taught young people that it is essential for members of a democracy to challenge their leaders, to ask difficult questions and to demand transparency. These are the kinds of attitudes that are often overlooked in thinner, more minimalist approaches to citizenship education, but they were firmly foregrounded in *Aussie Democracy*.

Thick and formal approaches to citizenship education: Examples that established a place in school curricula

While thin approaches to citizenship education continue to be dominant, there are, nonetheless, examples of innovative and thick citizenship education initiatives that have gained places in school syllabi. The first example we present is from the *Australian Youth Climate Coalition* (AYCC) which draws together a range of youth climate action groups, and seeks to place young people in positions of leadership in the climate change debate. It does this by campaigning, educating and agitating for changes to governmental policy. They see the education of young people, by young people, as central.

We are ambitious and innovative, and we're not afraid to make mistakes and learn from them. By giving young people the opportunity to be courageous, we give them the space to learn (AYCC, 2018).

The AYCC have developed 'peer-to-peer education, empowerment and training programs for high school students' (Patridge, 2018, p. 8).

The second example is *RUMAD?* (Are You Making A Difference?) developed by David Zyngier. This program is 'values-focused, student-led and at its core starts from student-identified values and visions' (2007, p. 54). Unlike thin citizenship education programs which focus only on the learning of political knowledge, *RUMAD?* actively seeks to engage and support young people to build and enact their knowledge in the community through action research projects. It seeks to break

down the walls that exist between schools and communities, and instead, through school and community participation, equip young people with self-esteem, confidence and skills to solve real world problems (Zyngier 2011b, p. 140).

One example of a project using the *RUMAD?* framework is Jessie's Creek. At a small primary school in Victoria, students worked with a selection of government and non-government agencies to clean up the local creek. They conducted a biodiversity study of the local area, during which they had to engage with the public, undertake problem-solving activities and work collaboratively to achieve desired outcomes. Zyngier (2007) writes:

From the outset they have been at the centre of the campaign to save Jessie's Creek, mustering community support by producing brochures, conducting surveys and sending letters to government bodies linked with management of the creek (p. 53).

Another example of an established curriculum framework being applied in a local context is the *Global Connects* program. This program, developed by Lynette Schultz et al (2009), arose out of a recognition of the impact that globalization is having on young people. While it might be true that young people are having difficulty processing the rapidly changing nature of the world and their place in it due to the influence of globalization (Schultz et al, 2009), it is also true that many young people want to contribute to their society and solve problems of injustice and inequality, but they are hesitant to do so because they feel they lack the ability to do so (Eckersely, Cahill, Wierenga & Wyn 2007).

The *Global Connects* program, developed by *PLAN International*, is an example of active citizenship-centred, youth-led, global learning. One example involved middle school children in Melbourne who engaged in conversations over the course of six months with youth groups in Indonesia (Schultz et al 2009). The two groups exchanged communication pieces about issues that they felt were of significance to their lives. These texts included letters and posters, as well as short films. Crucially, the global elements of technology made this project more feasible than would have

been previously possible, and much more relevant and engaging to the young people involved.

Having begun communicating with each other, the next step of the *Global Connects* program was for the two groups to identify common issues, and then establish action plans to address these issues in their local communities. The project was intended to develop active citizenship skills: 'As a result, *PLAN* expects that children will undergo more of a personal transformative experience than they would if they were passive recipients of information' (Schultz et al. 2009, p. 1025). This appears to have occurred:

[Students] demonstrated a number of skills and personal changes that have allowed them to engage as active citizens, within their own communities and in wider national and global communities, now and in the future (p. 1027).

While the *Global Connects* program had a global focus, other examples of established curriculum frameworks are available which demonstrate a greater focus on the local. One example of such a local approach is *Justice Citizens* (Heggart 2015a, 2015b). Based at a school in Australia, this program was established by the authors, and worked within the local community in which the school was based, and sought to empower students to identify and then challenge sources of injustice in this community through collaborative film-making. In the next section, we focus on the structure of *Justice Citizens* project and argue that it constitutes an example of what thick citizenship education in a formal setting might look like.

Justice Citizens was a project designed by the authors to explore the concepts behind justice-oriented citizenship (as defined by Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne, 2004) as well as to examine how such notions correlated with young people's own understandings and practices of active citizenship, both in person and online. We have, since then, developed the notion of justice-oriented citizenship further (as is discussed in the second half of the chapter). *Justice Citizens* was implemented at a Western Sydney Catholic high school in 2012. The aim of the course was for students

to develop the skills, values and attitudes required of active citizens. In particular, it sought to develop critical thinking, digital literacy, research skills and collaborative learning practices.

The course was broken into three main sections. In the first section, students were challenged to consider their own agency. This was done by presenting students with a range of situations in the form of true/false statements (for example: 'Young people are capable of organizing nationwide protests'). Students were then presented with real-world examples where young people had done organized nationwide protests. This led to discussion about why young people were capable of doing such things, and whether the participants in *Justice Citizens* could conceive of themselves undertaking similar actions. In addition, students identified the kinds of skills and knowledges that were required in order to take this form of action, as well as whether they possessed these.

In the second part of the course, students worked with journalists from local newspapers to develop an understanding of research and interview techniques. Students also had the opportunity to speak to a range of community members about different topics that the community member felt was important. During this phase in the intervention and study, a number of issues constantly recurred: these included racism, the treatment of asylum seekers, the dangers of drug and alcohol abuse and bullying and harassment.

The final part of the course involved students researching, planning, shooting and editing their films. Students worked in small groups (chosen by themselves), and the groups ranged from pairs to one group of seven. Students were responsible for 'pitching' an idea for their film to their teacher, then researching it. They then had to devise a script collaboratively, as well as a storyboard, before shooting their film. For many students, this was undertaken during school time (either during the lessons themselves or during other free time) but some groups used their own personal time

to meet up with participants or people they wanted to film. More than 30 films were produced.

These films were then shown to the whole cohort, who voted on which ones they thought were the best; these films were placed on the school's YouTube channel and also presented at a local Film Festival. The online space and the actual physical film festival were important for different reasons. The physical festival allowed students to invite prominent members of the community to see their films, and also engage in discussion about the topics, while the online space provided a chance for students to share their films with a much broader audience.

A threefold typology of informal citizenship education with adults: Examples from Australian refugee advocacy groups

In this section we illustrate further the features of 'thick' citizenship education, through focusing on justice-oriented approaches to citizenship education drawn mostly from informal 'educational' initiatives with adults. Following Griff Foley's (1999) and Tony Jeffs' and Mark Smith's (1999) typologies we define informal education to refer to education which is neither credentialed (formal) or classroom-based (non-formal). Informal education is also to be distinguished from incidental learning because informal education is planned with clear intent to facilitate learning. Unlike schooling, the informal education space is not regulated, and this means that there is little consistency of terminology used to describe it.

In order to draw out the distinction between active and justice-oriented learning, we describe and discuss a threefold typology drawing on Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) concepts of passive, active and justice-oriented learning. Three refugee advocacy organisations that each work in distinct ways, are used to illustrate the typology (see table 1). The context is a long and rich history of campaigns led by a myriad of local, national and international NGO's seeking to mobilise public support to bring about change to Australian government policies in relation to refugees who

arrive by boat. One example is 'A Fair Go for Families: campaign for family reunion' led by the *Refugee Council for Australia*. In order to support the campaign, people are asked to inform themselves about refugees and relevant laws, sign a petition, donate money and host a picnic as an awareness-raising activity. This can be seen as enabling informal citizenship education where members of the community learn about political context and structures. The 'learning' takes place not with the guidance of a 'teacher' or 'facilitator' but through study of web- and print-based information prepared by 'experts' and provided by the *Refugee Council for Australia*. Drawing on Westheimer and Kahne (2004)'s typology, we would describe this type of education as serving to promote the personally responsible citizen, given that it involves mainly didactic 'instruction' and passive learning and thus corresponds to the first tier of the typology below.

Table 1: Threefold typology of citizenship education for and with refugees

	<i>Passive learning</i>	<i>Active and participatory learning</i>	<i>Justice-oriented learning and grassroots knowledge</i>
<i>Refugee Council for Australia</i>	Citizens (who are not refugees) studying web- and print-based material given to them to inform solidarity-actions		
<i>Chillout</i>		Citizens (who are not refugees) locating materials for themselves; devising and writing own materials to inform participatory activism	
<i>RISE</i>			Refugee-citizens research, plan and lead actions for themselves

We would argue that an example of active learning is provided by *Chillout*, an NGO that campaigns to promote the rights of children seeking asylum. In addition to

petitions and publication of research reports, *Chillout* has instigated a number of actions which require supporters to not only read, donate and sign; but also to undertake their own research to inform their own initiatives. These include writing letters to asylum seeker children in detention centres and supporting refugees to present in school classrooms. Again drawing on Westheimer and Kahne (2004)'s typology, we would describe this type of informal education as serving to promote the participatory citizen. This is the second tier of our typology. Here, citizens do not only learn information in a passive manner (because it is made available to them in the form of *Chillout* research reports that is why the column in Table 1 connects to more than one category) they also learn in an active manner because they are supported to undertake research for themselves when preparing letters and presentations. The key 'curriculum' feature, however, that we want to draw attention to is not just how participatory the learning is, but to what extent the advocacy and social action builds on the grassroots knowledge of the frontline citizen-activists.

We now want to present the third type that does not exclude the first two approaches, but extends them; namely justice-oriented citizenship education. *RISE*, is, in its own words, the 'first refugee and asylum seeker organisation in Australia to be run and governed by refugees, asylum seekers and ex-detainees' (*RISE*, n.d.). *RISE* undertakes petitions, research and presentations, much like the *Refugee Council of Australia* and *Chillout*, mentioned above. The important difference is that *RISE* campaigns are underpinned by the grassroots knowledge of refugees themselves.

This difference is important because it points to epistemological distinctions. Westheimer and Kahne call for an approach that places emphasis on learners' challenging inequalities to promote the justice-oriented citizen. Here they draw attention not only to acts of advocacy but also to a structuralist analysis which seeks to identify root causes and address them. But the argument we are developing is that it also matters who gets to undertake the analysis, informal education and social action. It is one thing when a justice-oriented, structuralist analysis is researched and

presented by 'experts;' and another when it is undertaken by frontline citizen-activists themselves.

This is why we focus not only on Westheimer and Kahne's justice-oriented process of structurally analysing and challenging inequalities but also on the epistemological politics of John Dewey (1938), Paulo Freire (1970) as well as Lew Zipin and Alan Reid (2008). Dewey saw democracy and justice being enacted through curriculum that walked the talk; in other words built on the experiential and subjective knowledge of learners. Freire, likewise, has been influential in his case for championing a notion of justice where curriculum is developed from the perspective of those who are most poor, least powerful and are oppressed in both material and epistemological terms. Zipin and Reid argue that approaches to citizenship education focusing on personally responsible and participatory citizenship are inherently individualistic and instrumentalist because they do not challenge dominant classed, racialised and gendered epistemological views of political structures. They see justice being enacted through educators privileging what they call the lifeworld knowledge of less powerful socio-cultural groups.

When considering frontline citizens and their grassroots knowledge, there is a difference to be drawn between citizens who are not refugees acting in solidarity for and with refugees; and refugees advocating for themselves. The informal education that both types of citizen undertake is important but there are specificities. At the risk of over-simplifying, we tentatively offer another binary opposition to thin and thick approaches. We suggest there are 'soft' and 'hard' approaches to citizenship education. It is soft and easy to rely on experts devising and delivering citizenship education. It is hard and challenging to support frontline activists or ordinary citizens to undertake their own research and plan their own learning. It is even harder when those citizens are in precarious circumstances; for example, have restricted work and study rights.

Drawing on practices of community cultural development for justice-oriented citizenship education

To pursue this type of 'hard' epistemological politics to do advocacy and informal education for refugees requires more than an organisation like *RISE* simply having refugees and asylum seekers as members. It involves deploying strategies that require sophisticated skill-sets to enable grassroots members to undertake their own research that will inform ideas and initiatives for informal citizenship education. Enabling grassroots people, especially those with histories of exclusion, to research, plan and implement informal education is easier said than done. For anyone, but more so for people who are not used to having their voice and knowledge regarded as important, to research and present educational 'stories' is a process that requires not just highly developed technical skills but also an epistemological disposition. Paulo Freire (1974) described this as a process of moving learners through stages from magic, then naïve to critical consciousness.

It is no coincidence that a good deal of justice-oriented campaigns and citizenship education initiatives rely on the involvement of arts workers. This is because they have expertise in researching, producing/making and presenting 'stories' in ways that are creative. This is a field of practice known as community cultural development (Adams and Goldbard 2005). An illustrative example is an Aboriginal reconciliation campaign known as *The Torch*. *The Torch* was a partnership between the *Brotherhood of St Laurence* and a Melbourne-based theatre company and a justice-oriented and informal education program that sought to facilitate learning with grassroots 'citizens' in rural towns about the history of local interactions between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal residents. This was done through a story-making process. Writers and actors with the theatre company prepared a skeleton script. The plot involved the local country town preparing for a visit by the Queen and torch bearers shortly before the 1956 Olympics that were staged in Melbourne. A major part of the preparations included moving Aboriginal people living in shanty make-shift accommodation away from the main streets. They were regarded as an eyesore.

The theatre workers would spend several weeks in the respective town prodding and provoking both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people to undertake research to flesh out the skeleton script. Local stories were unearthed. There were, as Zipin refers to them, accounts of 'dark' knowledge dimensions (2009). For example, a farmer undertook research about his grandparent's accounts of Aboriginal people being shot by police; and an Aboriginal woman investigated the circumstances surrounding the taking of children by welfare authorities. But there were also accounts of 'lighter' knowledge dimensions; for example, a local football club welcoming Aboriginal players, and a local pub hosting Aboriginal musicians for more than thirty years. Such local stories were woven into the script. But the justice-orientation of this approach to citizenship education for reconciliation went beyond local people including their research in the script/curriculum. It also included local people being recruited and supported to assist with stage and costume design, and perform on stage, whether it be singing, acting or dancing. This process of collaborative storymaking enacts what can be called a justice-oriented approach to citizenship education. *The Torch*, of course, is not an isolated example of this type of practice. Indeed the field of community cultural development or applied community arts includes various Australian arts organisations; for example, *Chorus of Women*, *BigHart*, *Urban Theatre Projects*, *Somebody Daughter's Theatre Company*, and the *Artful Dodger's Studio*.

Citizenship education for and with cyclists

We now turn our attention to efforts to promote more bicycle friendly cities. This is an arena for informal citizenship education which relies heavily on the campaigning efforts of grassroots cyclists' groups. In order to illustrate a justice-oriented approach, we will compare three different epistemological perspectives. The first is an instrumentalist perspective which prioritises informing current and potential cyclists about the political structures which make decisions about and fund bicycle infrastructure. While we acknowledge that in this perspective citizens are learning passively, this type of informal education practice is, nonetheless, important and

foundational. A second epistemological perspective is interpretive and prioritises supporting bicyclists to enact active citizenship. There is, of course, a continuum from passive to active, then to justice-oriented citizenship. But the act of cycling itself can be seen as a participatory action and these groups not only encourage more people to cycle, but also to write petitions and post stories on social media. Through such advocacy these citizen-cyclists are educating themselves and others about creating cities that are less dependent on motorised transport and more reliant on human-powered vehicle movement.

To continue moving along the continuum, *Critical Mass* and *CycleHack* present examples of even more participatory and justice-oriented citizenship. *Critical Mass* began in 1992 in San Francisco and is now active in hundreds of cities across the world, including Australia. There is no formal organisation, no office holders; just monthly political-protest rides. Typically cyclists ride en-masse through major road intersections. There are variations. Some groups obey the road rules but make a point of taking up all road space. Other groups make a point of clogging up intersections for a short period of time and handing out pamphlets and chanting slogans to car drivers. And some do actions such as die-ins where cyclists lie on the road with their bicycles to draw attention to bicyclists being killed by cars, or lifting bikes above their heads as a celebratory gesture.

Table 2: Threefold typology of citizenship education for and with cyclists: Instrumental, interpretive and critical epistemological perspectives

	<i>Passive learning and instrumental knowledge</i>	<i>Active, participatory learning and interpretive knowledge</i>	<i>Justice-oriented learning and grassroots, critical knowledge</i>
<i>Australian Cycle Alliance</i>	provide information via meetings, brochures, films and newsletters	but also encourage grassroots cyclists to write petitions and post stories on social media	
<i>Critical Mass</i>			

		Cyclists meet once a month and 'occupy' a major road intersection as a protest spectacle	Some are emboldened to research and plan further actions
<i>CycleHack</i>			Grassroots and expert cyclists connect to research for themselves ways to improve experiences and infrastructure

The reason we are focusing on epistemology is to draw attention to whose knowledge and what sort of knowledge is at play. In the *Critical Mass* actions it is the embodied knowledge of diverse grassroots cyclists, as opposed to the authoritative knowledge of 'senior' / expert organisational bike-citizens in information-based advocacy, which counts. This is participatory, verging on justice-oriented, citizenship. It is participatory because there is active involvement in collective decision-making and action. For some participants it may only be a spectacle where is neither passive or active learning. But for other participants it may spur or require them to research for themselves local issues facing bicycle advocates. And for some this may embolden them to deepen their learning and sustain their advocacy efforts. In this vein, *Critical Mass* can be seen as sitting on a continuum between participatory and justice-oriented citizenship as depicted in Table 2.

If one was to design a movement that was further along the continuum towards justice-oriented citizenship, one might develop something like *CycleHack*. *Cycle Hack* sits in column 4 of Table 2 indicating how its' approach is an example of justice-oriented citizenship. This movement started in 2014 in Glasgow as a one-off event to bring together cycle activists, developers, designers, planners and engineers to brainstorm the barriers that stifle more bike-riding and collaborate on new ideas. *CycleHack* has quickly grown into a movement and there are in 2018 collectives in over 40 cities across the world. We see this as an example of justice-oriented citizenship because it directly harnesses the knowledge of bicycle-citizens to develop substantial 'curriculum.'

As citizens, we are all experts in our own right. We all have countless hours of experience travelling through our local streets, interacting with other road users & using the products / services that surround us.... Our approach to solving the barriers to cycling connects citizens and allows them to be part of a positive change where they live.... We want to reduce the number of barriers that surround everything from; how you learn to ride a bike; where you lock your bike up; how you interact with others; to how cycling can fit into your daily routines (CycleHack 2018).

These bike-citizens see themselves addressing the injustice of apathy and hostility towards measures to make cities less reliant on motorised transport and to feature more human-powered vehicles. It is not just about their agency and subjectivity, it is that they have developed a structured process – some call human-centred design – where they drive the ‘curriculum.’

Conclusion

In this chapter we have defined and analysed justice-oriented and thick approaches to citizenship education. In doing so, we have sought to extend Westheimer and Kahne’s definitions of passive, participatory and justice-oriented citizenship on various levels. First we have highlighted differences and similarities between thick and justice-oriented approaches. Second, we have drawn attention to the centrality of epistemological politics. Third, we have highlighted the value of applying a broad lens to capturing the scope and multifaceted nature of radical approaches to citizenship education. Through this lens, one can see formal and informal education initiatives, pop-up and institutionalised curricula strategies. The main implication of our argument is that a justice-oriented approach to citizenship education requires more attention be paid to the question: Does it matter whose knowledge we harness? The challenge is not only to design and implement ‘curriculum’ – be that in formal or informal education contexts – that enables learners to pursue a structuralist analysis and action, but to do this with diverse groups of learners. It is important to support learners who are already confident of their capacity to be active and justice-oriented citizens, but also important to support those who are not.

References

- Adams, D., & Goldbard, A. (2005). *Creative community: The art of cultural development*. Lulu. com.
- Arvanitakis, J., & Marren, S. (2009). *Putting the politics back into Politics: Young people and democracy in Australia: Discussion paper*.
- Asylum Seeker Resource Centre (n.d). *About Us*. Retrieved June 8, 2018, from <https://www.asrc.org.au/about-us/>
- Australian Youth Climate Coalition (2018). *About*. Retrieved June 7, 2018, from <http://www.aycc.org.au/about>
- Collins, P. and Walsh, L. (2016) Many young people aren't enrolled to vote, but are we asking the wrong questions? *The Conversation*, May 16th
- Cogan, J. J., & Morris, P. (2001). The development of civics values: an overview. *International Journal of Education Research*, 35, 1-9.
- Crowe, D. (2014) Christopher Pyne tacks leftist 'bias' in classrooms, *The Australian*, January 14
- CycleHack (2018). *Our Story*. Retrieved June 8, 2018 from <https://www.cyclehack.com/our-story/>
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experiential education*. New York: Collier.
- Eckersley, R., Cahill, H., Wierenga, A. and Wyn, J. (2007). *Generations in Dialogue about the Future: The hopes and fears of young Australians*. Melbourne: Australia 21 Ltd & the Youth Research Centre.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1974). *Education for Critical Consciousness*. London: Continuum Books.
- Foley, G. (1999). *Learning in social action: A contribution to understanding informal learning*. London: Zed.
- Gosden, D. (2006). 'What if no one had spoken out against this policy?' The rise of asylum seeker and refugee advocacy in Australia. *Portal: Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*, 3(1), 1.
- Gauntlett, D. (2015). The internet is ancient, small steps are important, and four other theses about making things in a digital world. In *Creativity in the Digital Age* (pp. 17-33). Springer, London.
- Hassan, T. (2018, February 4). Coalition efforts to restrict influence of charities go too far, *Sydney Morning Herald*.
- Heggart, K. (2015a). Social capital and civics and citizenship: Developing a framework for activist education. *Issues in Educational Research*, 25(3), 276-290.
- Heggart, K. (2015b). Justice citizens: Contesting young people's participation and citizenship at the start of the 21st century. *A critical youth studies for the 21st Century*.

Heggart, K., Arvanitakis, J., & Matthews, I. (2018). Civics and citizenship education: What have we learned and what does it mean for the future of Australian democracy?. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*,

Isin, Engin F. & Turner, Bryan S. (2002). Citizenship studies: An introduction. In: Isin, Engin F. and Turner, Bryan S. (eds). *Handbook of citizenship studies*. London, UK: Sage, pp. 1-10.

Jeffs, T. & Smith, M. (1999). *Informal education: Conversation, democracy and learning*. Ticknall: Education Now.

Kennedy, K. J. (2007). Student Constructions of 'Active Citizenship': What Does Participation Mean To Students? *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(3), 304-324. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8527.2007.00381.x>

Macintyre, S., & Simpson, N. (2009). Consensus and division in Australian citizenship education. *Citizenship Studies*, 13(2), 121-134.

McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, Diversity and Education: A Philosophical Perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), 235-246.

McNeilage, A. (2014, August 15). Catholic school kids protest against asylum seeker policies, *Sydney Morning Herald*, <https://www.smh.com.au/education/catholic-school-kids-protest-against-asylum-seeker-policies-20140815-104iq1.html>

Offe, C. (1985). New social movements: challenging the boundaries of institutional politics. *Social research*, 817-868.

O'Loughlin, M. (1997). Education for Citizenship: Integrating Knowledge, Imagination and Democratic Dispositions. *Time*, 52(2), 24-33.

Partridge, E. (2008). From ambivalence to activism: young people's environmental views and actions. *Youth Studies Australia*, 27(2), 18.

Peterson, Andrew & Tudball, L. (Eds.) (2017). *Civics and Citizenship Education in Australia: Challenges, Practices and International Perspectives*. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

RISE (n.d). *Refugee Survivors and Ex-Detainees*. Retrieved June 8, 2018, from <http://riserefugee.org>

Schultz, L., Guevara, J. R., Ratnam, S., Wyn, J., & Sowerby, C. (2009). Global Connections: A Tool for Active Citizenship. *Development in Practice*, 19(8), 1023-1034.

Stuchbery, M. (2010, September 28). *Learning to teach social media*. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2010-08-03/35652>.

Wade, M. (2007) Canberra is gaggin us, says charities. *Sydney Morning Herald*, May 30th

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269. <http://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002237>

Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010). Improving student engagement: Ten proposals for action. *Active learning in higher education*, 11(3), 167-177.

Zipin, L. (2009). Dark funds of knowledge, deep funds of pedagogy: Exploring boundaries between lifeworlds and schools. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30(3), 317-331.

Zipin, L., & Reid, A. (2008). A justice-oriented citizenship education: Making community curricular, in Arthur, J., Davies, I., & Hahn, C. (Eds.). *Sage handbook of education for citizenship and democracy*. Los Angeles: Sage. (pp. 533-544).

Zyngier, D. (2007). Education through Elegant Subversion. *Professional Voice*, 6(3), 51-56.

Zyngier, D. (2011a). The Australian Experience of Doing Thick Democracy in the Classroom. In *Critical Service Learning as a Revolutionary Pedagogy: A Project of Student Agency in Action* (pp. 133-152).

Zyngier, D. (2011b). Raising Engagement and Enhancing Learning: School Community Partnerships That Work for Students at Promise. *Creative Education*, 2(4), 375-380.