



Framing the Moral Dimensions of the Australian Curriculum: A Role for Ordinary Virtues?

Andrew Peterson & Lucas Walsh

This is an unpublished conference paper for the 7th Annual Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues conference at Oriel College, Oxford University, Thursday 3th – Saturday 5th January 2019.

These papers are works in progress and should not be cited without author's prior permission.

Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues

University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT United Kingdom

T: +44 (0) 121 414 3602 F: +44 (0) 121 414 4875

E: jubileecentre@contacts.bham.ac.uk W: www.jubileecentre.ac.uk



Framing the Moral Dimensions of the Australian Curriculum: A Role for Ordinary Virtues?

Andrew Peterson - Jubilee Centre for Character & Virtues, University of Birmingham, UK

Lucas Walsh - Monash University, Australia

a.peterson@bham.ac.uk / lucas.walsh@monash.edu

Introduction

Our aim in this paper is to explore the moral dimension within the Australian Curriculum. Although we focus on analysing the content of the Australian Curriculum, we connect this analysis to the work of Australian schools, and particularly schools within the public (state) sector. While our analysis is likely to hold relevance to schools within the Independent and Catholic sectors, our focus on the public school system is deliberate. We concentrate particularly on public schools as they operate within a system founded on the principles of being ‘compulsory, free and secular’ and as such are not shaped directly by religious denominations. We start by examining the place of morality within the current Australian Curriculum. We suggest that while morality finds expression within the Australian Curriculum, the extent to which this translates into effective and meaningful practice in state schools remains unclear given a notable paucity of recent (last ten years) research in this area. We then, albeit somewhat briefly, consider two remaining tensions regarding values education in Australian state schools – namely, their politicisation and the continued tensions between the religious and the “secular” in Australian public schools. In the third section, we offer our main analysis and consider the extent to which a focus on “ordinary virtues” might offer a useful frame for understanding and approaching morality in Australian public schools. In doing so, we tie our analysis with our own, separate, empirical studies with young Australians as well as work on moral geographies to argue for the importance of the local in an educational context in which the global is often prioritised. In the conclusion, we identify some important tensions which remain in recognising the local on the lines we are arguing for here.

Moral dimensions in the Australian Curriculum: An unclear picture?

Current educational policy and curricular documents make clear reference to the need for Australian state schools to teach young Australians about morality. The Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians (2008: 10) sets out that students should be taught to understand the spiritual and moral dimensions of life, enabling them ‘to act with moral and ethical integrity’. Certain core elements of the within the Federal Australian Curriculum also have a clear moral and ethical intent, and it is notable that these elements were strengthened in response to Federal government commissioned national review of the Australian Curriculum in 2014 (Australian Government, 2014). Within its findings and recommendations, the review contended that the Australian Curriculum was

failing 'to adequately reflect the Melbourne Declaration's belief that a well-rounded, balanced education should deal with the moral, spiritual and aesthetic education of students', and, on that basis, that there was a pressing need to place 'more emphasis on morals, values and spirituality'.

The current Australian Curriculum includes *Ethical Understanding* as one of seven General Capabilities which sit across the curriculum. The curriculum states that through *Ethical Understanding* (2018a):

students develop ethical understanding as they identify and investigate the nature of ethical concepts, values and character traits, and understand how reasoning can assist ethical judgement. Ethical understanding involves students building a strong personal and socially oriented ethical outlook that helps them to manage context, conflict and uncertainty, and to develop an awareness of the influence that their values and behaviour have on others.

The inclusion of character traits in the overall aims of the General Capabilities is not insignificant, though it should be noted that the remainder of the curriculum for *Ethical Understanding* focuses predominantly on cognitive capacities rather than the affective and volitional aspects of morality which sit alongside the cognitive in character education. Here, and for example, the curriculum prioritises 'processes of inquiring into ethical issues include giving reasons, being consistent, finding meanings and causes, and providing proof and evidence'.

Another feature of the curriculum for *Ethical Understanding* which is relevant for our analysis in this paper is the extent to which it explicitly emphasises the global, while underplaying students' local engagements and connections. The curriculum (2018a) states that:

As cultural, social, environmental and technological changes transform the world, the demands placed on learners and education systems are changing. Technologies bring local and distant communities into classrooms, exposing students to knowledge and global concerns as never before. Complex issues require responses that take account of ethical considerations such as human rights and responsibilities, animal rights, environmental issues and global justice.

Areas related to morality can also be readily found within other areas of curriculum's content, most notably within the subject Civics and Citizenship and in the General Capability *Intercultural Understanding* (2018b). In the latter, the connections between the local and global are more clearly expressed. In this regard, the curriculum states that:

Intercultural understanding is an essential part of living with others in the diverse world of the twenty-first century. It assists young people to become responsible local and global citizens, equipped through their education for living and working together in an interconnected world. Intercultural understanding combines personal, interpersonal and social knowledge and skills. It involves students learning to value and view critically their own cultural perspectives and practices and those of others through their interactions with people, texts and contexts across the curriculum.

We return to consider the relationship between the global and the local in a later section.

As it is currently expressed, the curriculum says very little about the precise traits, capacities and dispositions which are required beyond either (i) cognitive capacities or (ii) generalised, ambiguous and

non-moral “values” such as respect and empathy or (iii) simply knowing about other cultures, values etc. It is only within the Civics and Citizenship curriculum (2018c) – a relatively new subject within the wider Humanities and Social Sciences Learning Area and compulsory only in years 7 and 8 – that students are expected to learn ‘How values, including freedom, respect, inclusion, civility, responsibility, compassion, equality and a ‘fair go’, can promote cohesion within Australian society’.

In addition, while generalised forms of teaching and learning are mentioned (such as collaboration and teamwork), the pedagogical approaches suitable for bringing about *Ethical Understanding* and *Intercultural Understanding* are left to schools and teachers. At this point it should also be noted that while these various policy and curricular provisions offer some tentative optimism regarding the importance and place of morality within the Australian Curriculum, it is important to note that they actually tell us very little about the *actual* teaching of morality in schools given that, as Reid, Gill and Sears (2010: 5) assert ‘no matter how tightly the state seeks to prescribe educational practice to conform with the educational settlement, there is always ‘wriggle room’ for educators... That is, there is never a one-to-one correspondence between the state’s agenda and its realisation in the classroom’. In addition, delineating the actual place and nature of morality in Australian State schools is made harder by the paucity of recent empirical research on this area. Indeed, at the time we write this paper, very little empirical research has, at least recently, examined the moral dimension Australian schools (though it is perhaps worth stating here that this fact stands in stark contrast with the recent growth in empirical research in Australian schools on wellbeing, positive psychology and social and emotional aspects of learning).

The last major research project conducted to examine the teaching of moral dimensions in Australian schools – the federal-funded Australian Values in Education Program – produced its final report in 2010. The large-scale project highlighted the central importance of a shared vocabulary to values education. In line with other research literature, the study suggested that cultivating reflexivity on and about Australian values requires the development of a common language from which meaningful conversations can follow (Lovat, et al. 2011; Mergler and Spooner-Lane, 2012).

Two pressing tensions

The approach taken to the moral within the current Australian Curriculum comes within a particular context. Above, we noted that an official review of the first Australian Curriculum undertaken in 2014 criticised its lack of focus on morality, ethics and spirituality. However, we should also be mindful of tensions about the *strengthening* of the moral in Australian state schools. Here, two particular, related tensions stand out.

The first is the politicisation of values education in the Australian context. The most recent attempt to promote values education in Australia prior to the introduction of the Australian Curriculum has been viewed roundly as an exercise in a conservative and exclusive sense of Australian values. Introduced in 2005 by the John Howard federal government, the *Values for Australian Schooling* project was premised on challenging state-led curricula which had become ‘too politically correct and values-neutral’ (Crabb and Guerrera 2004). As others have argued, this formed part of a wider culture wars discourse on the part of Howard’s government that standards of education were in crisis (Reid and Gill 2010; Smyth 2016).

A *Values for Australian Schooling* poster containing nine values was produced, with federal funding for schools 'made conditional on the implementation of a number of federal initiatives, including the requirement that all schools must hang the values poster in the school foyer' (Reid and Gill 2010: 7). The values themselves were prefaced with the statements that 'these shared values ... are part of Australia's common way of life, which includes equality, freedom and the rule of law' and that 'they reflect our commitment to a multicultural and environmentally sustainable society where all are entitled to justice'. The nine values contained in the poster were: 'care and compassion', 'doing your best', 'fair go', 'freedom', 'honesty and trustworthiness', 'integrity', 'respect', 'responsibility' and 'understanding, tolerance and inclusion' (DEST 2005: 4). Opposing what he saw as a "moral neutrality" among teachers, then Minister for Education, Brendan Nelson (2006) argued that "values-free" education produced "values-free" adults implying that teachers were in the thrall of relativism (Walsh and Leach 2007).

The National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools (DEST 2005) included a poster featuring the values and an iconic image of Simpson and his donkey from the 1915 Gallipoli campaign, which was distributed to schools. Exemplifying the "ANZAC legend", the poster was deliberately imbued with ethno-nationalist imagery. As Clark (2006: 108) suggests, inherent in the campaign was a "troubling paradox": the coupling of shared values and national learning standards "implicitly capitalises on perceived divisions in Australian society (us/them, Australian/ unAustralian...)". The way it was delivered was also problematic.

According to Reid and Gill (2010: 7) the values education program represented a 'form of coercive federalism'. New funding conditions required the poster to be displayed in schools. In June 2004, a AUD\$31 billion package was announced tying government education funding to the "national values" framework with the requirement that all funded schools must have a flagpole to fly the Australian flag and display the values framework in a prominent place in the school, as a condition of funding".

The second tension regarding values in Australian education and schooling concerns religion, and this tension has played out in two connected ways. First, questions and contestation remain about the place of religious and faith commitments within a state schooling system founded on the principles of being compulsory, free and *secular*, particularly when the allocation of federal funds to religious schools, the continued federal funding of school pastors, and the teaching of special religious instruction in some state schools remain (see, for example, Maddox 2014; Byrne 2014; Peterson, 2016).

We should also be mindful that religious and faith commitments still play a part in the lives – including the moral lives – of many young Australians. Here Bouma's clarification in his contextual analysis of Australian society and culture is insightful:

it is essential to correct a misapprehension that dominated the late twentieth-century discussion of religion and secularity: secular societies are not irreligious, antireligious or lacking in spirituality ... Rather, in secular societies religion and spirituality have seeped out of the monopolistic control of formal organisations like churches. This has resulted in increased diversity of both organised religion and private spiritualities. (2006: 5)

The tensions between a "secular" state and religious values have been further raised by the increased inclusion of religious vocabulary within the Australian Curriculum. Launching the review of the Australian Curriculum in 2014, the Federal Education Minister at the time, Christopher Pyne, suggested

that the curriculum needed to do more to recognise the significance of Judeo-Christian values to Australia's way of life. Citing a number of submissions to the review which considered there to be a lack of recognition of Judeo-Christian values the review itself recommended that the Australian Curriculum be revised to better recognise Australia's 'Judeo-Christian heritage' (Australian Government 2014: 246). As a result, the Civics and Citizenship education curriculum now requires students to learn that Australia is a 'secular democratic nation with a dynamic, multicultural, multi-faith society and a Christian heritage'.

Not unrelated to the focus on Christian heritage within the curriculum has been an increasing discourse – mainly stemming from the immigration and border security policy actors – about securitisation and radicalisation. In such discourses, which are also played out in the mainstream Australian media, the need to educate for Australian values are positioned against a need to counter radical violent extremism (for a more extended discussion, see Peterson and Bentley, 2016).

Ordinary virtues for everyday life

What possible ways are there for developing a more cohesive approach to teaching the moral in Australian schools that can develop a shared and inclusive moral vocabulary and which, at the same time, avoid the tensions set out in the previous section? In this final section, we wish to explore one possible response – a focus on ordinary virtues – and to do so by focusing on a tension identified in the first section of this paper; namely, the connections between the local and the global.

In taking this focus we need, focus, we need first to recognise two crucial features of young Australian's lives. The first is that young Australian's are often viewed and positioned (whether explicitly or implicitly) by policies and policy actors through a number of altogether unhelpful prisms. Such prisms typically represent young people negatively, and serve to obfuscate the nuances and complexities of everyday experiences. So, for example, young Australian's (either collectively or particular groups of) have been systematically portrayed as being apathetic, risky, violent, vulnerable.

The second is that while these various prisms present static conceptions of young Australians, a large body of empirical studies testify to the *fluidity* of young people's engagements within their communities. Crucially, here the relationship between the local and the global is illustrative. As we suggested in the first section, while the current Australian Curriculum presents the local and global as (i) important arenas for the moral and (and indeed for citizenship) and (ii) interconnected. However, the curriculum focuses on the global only in terms of diverse cultures and global issues, including nothing about global or universal values. To press this point, the curriculum, for example, cites issues such as global warming and human rights but does not connect these with any precise values – or indeed virtues. In addition, the curriculum does not provide any framework or substantive depth for precisely how the connections between the local and the global as they are experienced by young Australians might be understood.

In our previous, separate, work we have both explored – theoretically and empirically – how young people encounter and understand the local and the global. A theme common to all of this work, is to

seek to understand how a globally oriented form of citizenship is shaped by and plays out within local contexts. As Walsh and Black (2018: 108) argue:

the ubiquity of the discourse of global mobility, whether in education and youth policy and in popular culture, belies the continued importance of the local for many young people. While globalization and its attendant flows of capital, culture, ideas and affiliations may have transnationalized many aspects of young people's identity, the evidence is that locality, geography and place remain important elements of their lives.

In addition, and while not wishing to dismiss cosmopolitanism *per se*, we have raised questions about the way in which its appropriation by educationalists has served to obscure the importance of both locality and virtues. Our concern, therefore, has been to suggest that educating students for dynamic global communities will need to build upon the sorts of knowledge, skills and dispositions central to participatory and dialogical engagement at a local level. Crucial as well to understanding the local in young Australian's lives are the roles that families, peers and community-associations (religious or otherwise) play in mediating young people's engagements at the local level.

In his recent book, Michael Ignatieff (2017) offers an account of ordinary virtues as a basis for moral order in a divided world. Exploring the moral lives of ordinary peoples across eight countries, Ignatieff suggests that rather than a focus on the language of global states and elites – such as human rights – the moral discourse and practises of ordinary people centred on virtues. Ignatieff (2017: 26) explains that these ordinary 'virtues—trust, tolerance, forgiveness, reconciliation, and resilience—emerged as the common thread through all of [the] dialogues'. Ignatieff (2017: 27) continues 'what is common to human beings, we found, is virtue, defined as acquired practical skills in moral conduct and discernment, not shared values as such'. In a telling passage, Ignatieff (2017: 29) suggests that ordinary virtue 'believes... that ethics is not an abstraction but just what you do and how you live, and that displaying the virtues, as best you can, is the point and purpose of a human life'.

What can we take from Ignatieff's research on ordinary virtues which might be instructive for framing the moral in Australian state schools?

While there is some analytical merit in seeking to identify "shared values", educationally speaking such values can remain overly abstracted from the lived experiences of ordinary lives when they appear as lists on a poster rather than being ingrained in the everyday reality of school life. In concluding his book, Ignatieff (2017: 200) offers the following thought:

The individuals we talked to make up their moral life as they go along, with fewer authorities to guide or coerce them... The very purpose of moral life is less about obedience than about affirming the self and the moral community to which one belongs.

In our work with young people in Australia and elsewhere we have found the same to be true, and yet we would want to argue that this making up as you go along is not suggestive of a rejection or ignorance of moral frameworks, but rather that moral frameworks have become more ephemeral and implicit in the lives of young Australians. In this sense, it perhaps should be noted that we are more optimistic than Ignatieff seems to be about the possibility of universalised understandings of virtues – universalised in general meaning, that is, but understood and given substantive meaning in localised contexts. In

adopting his position, the educational task thus seems to be three-fold: to recognise this condition, to seek to understand it (including the role which ordinary virtues play), and to explore and deliberate on it alongside young people in and beyond the classroom. Our various, separate empirical research projects have informed us repeatedly that while school leaders and teacher prioritise formal, structured approaches to moral life within schools, young people themselves are far more cognisant of the moral nature of the informal, everyday experiences of their lives.

Two of these projects involved focus groups held between 2013 and 2016 involving young social entrepreneurs, volunteers participating in a local government civic leadership programme and Aboriginal young people participating in a leadership program (Walsh and Black 2018; Walsh et al. 2018). All participants were asked to identify key issues of concern and the enablers and barriers that participants felt affected their capacity to influence and shape their worlds. Discussions explored the degrees to which they felt agency to influence local, national and global issues. What became clear across all focus groups was a focus on the local and the everyday experiences of citizenship. There was an awareness of the national and global, but the global in particular seemed to participants to be distant and more abstract. This echoes other research that shows young people have strong views about what should be happening in their local communities (Black 2017; Black 2019; Mellor and Kennedy 2003; Osler and Starkey 2003; Vromen and Collin 2010; Goodwin and Young 2013). Walsh and Black (2018: 116) suggest that

The willingness of such young people to engage at a local level may be because they find it easier to identify with their local neighbourhood, and feel higher levels of trust for those groups and institutions with which they frequently engage in that neighbourhood, than with what may seem like more distant affiliations. It may be that for such young people, there is greater satisfaction, and more immediate rewards, to be had from enacting their citizenship in the 'everyday settings that are important to them' (Torney-Purta 2002: 208).

Their study of young Australian social entrepreneurs suggests that

even those young people who are clearly concerned about local, national and global issues, and who employ physical and virtual networks and spheres of influence to occupy 'a new space of citizenship that subsumes the local, the national and the global' (Desforges et al. 2005: 444), tend to feel that they have a greater degree of influence when working locally (Walsh and Black 2018: 116-117).

The spatial is therefore a key lens through which matters of morality need to be considered in relation to young people. One such lens is the concept of a moral geography. When thinking about moral geographies, morality concerns "what people believe and what they do in pursuit of, or merely as a reflection of, their own conceptions of the right and the good" (Lee and Smith, 2011: 2). Neither solely universal nor static, morals are socially situated and are made and remade within, and shaped by, local geographical sites. Within these sites, actors and institutions such as teachers:

define what is possible and allowable within their boundaries. Places are thus fundamentally normative, concerned with what is right and good conduct and where. To say 'That's how we do things here' captures a form of place-specific moral justification which is subject to spatial differentiation (Lee and Smith, 2004: 181).

Lee and Smith (2011) characterise this as a moral geography. While they discuss it in the context of development and social justice, this concept has also been applied to areas such as education and politics (Walsh 2017; Walsh and Casinader 2018) and food and health (Pike and Kelly, 2014).

So far we have been focused on the ways in which young Australian's experience and interpret their moralities within the local. In what remains of this section, we would also like to offer some reflections on certain localisations in the moral geographies of teachers.

A 2017 study of teachers of the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme (PYP) in Canada and Australia, which explored teachers' attitudes to whether they could or should influence their students' moral outlooks, revealed such moral geographies in their attitudes and practices (Walsh and Casinader 2018). Despite working within a curriculum that promotes international mindedness and concern for issues of social justice (Castro, Lundgren and Woodin 2013), PYP teachers exhibited a spatial boundedness around their perceived capacity to inform and influence moral issues, ranging from local homelessness and climate change. These moral geographies typically ended at the school gates and did not extend to their students' homes, families and interactions beyond the classroom. For example, teaching about engaging the stranger were framed within a personal, moral geography that was typically localised within the school community. Rather than engage in substantial discussions about morality, teachers instead tended to focus instead on developing certain skills such as critical thinking and problem solving. A small-scale conducted by Peterson and Bentley (2017) examining education for citizenship in Australian schools reported similar findings. This is perhaps a lost opportunity, but one not ameliorated by the kinds of policy approaches adopted by Nelson above.

Consequently, our second reflection is the enduring importance and relevance of the local. Rather than commence from global abstractions – global human rights or global justice – it seems more appropriate to commence from humans interact in their local moral communities (shaped by families, peers etc.) and to abstract from these, making connections between the quotidian interactions to wider contexts and moral considerations. The educational task here is to connect to beyond the local, not to some abstraction but to see what does bind and connect humans beyond our immediate locality. As suggested above, in our various research projects, we have found that young Australians do look beyond their localities, and do care about distant others.

Conclusion

Following Ignatieff (2017), if ordinary virtue is derived from ethics that are not just an abstraction but are shaped and experienced through the everyday actions of people, framing the moral dimension in the Australian Curriculum, and within Australian public schools would benefit from starting at the site at which young people most identify: the local. As suggested above any articulation of “shared” values (whether universal or national) will remain abstracted from ordinary lives when they appear on posters or as overly generalised aspirations of a given curriculum. That is, ordinary virtues need to be ingrained in and connected explicitly to, the everyday reality of life, a key site of which is the school.

In making the case framing of the moral dimension around ordinary virtues and the local moral geographies of young Australian's lives, we are cognisant that some sobering and challenging questions

remain. Recent Australian political history is a sparse and uneven territory of education policy efforts to introduce substantive matters of values and morality into schools. This territory remains both disputed and bounded, whether at the level of policy or practice. Politically, the precise content of the values (or virtues) to be prioritised (or even shared) will remain heavily contested, and open to manipulation towards narrow purposes. This said, and as Ignatieff points out himself, recognising the importance of ordinary virtues and the local in the moral lives of various communities raised pressing questions about the extent to which these moral lives neglect, are ignorant of or are un/consciously shaped by larger moral (and indeed religious) traditions. That is, while moral actors may speak of personal, ordinary, local, every day, moral conduct within their immediate moral communities, such conduct does not occur within a moral vacuum. A key challenge, therefore, for educators is to interrogate and critique these localised moral geographies in more depth as a basis for pursuing in educational contexts, including within the Australian Curriculum.

References

- Australian Curriculum (2018a) *General Capability: Ethical Understanding*. [Online] <https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/general-capabilities/ethical-understanding/>; Accessed 01.12.2018.
- Australian Curriculum (2018b) *General Capability: Intercultural Understanding*. [Online] <https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/general-capabilities/intercultural-understanding/>; Accessed 01.12.2018.
- Australian Curriculum (2018c) *Civics and Citizenship*. [Online] <https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/humanities-and-social-sciences/civics-and-citizenship/>; Accessed 01.12.2018.
- Australian Government (2014) *Review of the Australian Curriculum: Final Report*. Canberra, ACT: Australian Government Department of Education.
- Black, R. (2017) 'Active Citizenship and the 'Making' of Active Citizens in Australian Schools', in A. Peterson and L. Tudball (eds), *Civics and Citizenship Education in Australia: Challenges, Practices and International Perspectives*, 119–32, London: Bloomsbury.
- Black, R. (2019) 'Making the Hopeful Citizen in Precarious Times', in P. Campbell, L. Harrison, C. Hickey and P. Kelly (eds), *Young People and the Politics of Outrage and Hope*, Amsterdam: Brill pp. 123-139.
- Bouma, G. (2013) Diversity of religion and freedom of religion and belief. Arthur, J. and Lovat, T. (Eds.) *The Routledge International Handbook of Education, Religion and Values*. Abingdon: Routledge. 55-61.
- Byrne, C. (2014) *Religion in Secular Education: What, in Heaven's Name, Are We Teaching Our Children?* Leiden, NL: Brill.
- Cave, L., Fildes, J., Lockett, G. and Wearing, A. (2015) *Mission Australia's 2015 Youth Survey Report 2015*, Sydney: Mission Australia.
- Castro, P., Lundgren, U., and Woodin, J. (2013) *Conceptualizing and assessing international mindedness (IM): An exploratory study*. Cardiff, Wales: International Baccalaureate Organization. (http://educationdocbox.com/Language_Learning/77417354-Research-report-conceptualizing-and-assessing-international-mindedness-im-an-exploratory-study.html accessed 6th December 2018)
- Clark, A. (2006) "Flying the Flag for mainstream Australia". *Griffith Review* 11: 107-112.
- Department of Education, Science and Training (2005) *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Desforges, L., Jones, R. and Woods, M. (2005) 'New Geographies of Citizenship', *Citizenship Studies*, 9 (5): 439–51.

Education Services Australia (2010) *Giving Voice to the Impacts of Values Education: The Final Report of the Values Education Project*.

(http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VASP_FINAL_REPORT_2010.pdf; accessed 14th October 2015).

Goodwin, S. and Young, A. (2013) 'Ensuring Children and Young People Have a Voice in Neighbourhood Community Development', *Australian Social Work*, 66 (3): 344–57.

Ignatieff, M. (2017) *The Ordinary Virtues*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.

Lee, R. and D. M. Smith (2011) "Introduction: Geographies of Morality and Moralities of Geography", in R. Lee and D. M. Smith (eds) *Geographies and Moralities: International Perspectives on Development, Justice and Peace* (pp. 1-12). Oxford: Blackwell.

Lovat, T., Dally, K., Clement, N., Toomey, R. (2011). 'Values pedagogy and teacher education: Reconceiving the foundations', in *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*. 36 (7). 59-72.

Maddox, M. (2014) *Taking God to School: The End of Australia's Egalitarian Education?* Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Mellor, S. and Kennedy, K. J. (2003) 'Australian Students' Democratic Values and Attitudes Towards Participation: Indicators from the IEA Civic Education Study', *International Journal of Educational Research*, 39 (6): 525–37.

Mergler, A. G. and Spooner-Lane, R. 2012. 'What pre-service teachers need to know to be effective at values-based education', in *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*. 37 (8). 66-81.

Ministerial Council for Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs (2008) *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*. Canberra, ACT: MCEETYA.

Nelson, B. (2006) "Values in Education". *The Conservative: A Journal of Reform*. 2: 7-10.

Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2003) 'Learning for Cosmopolitan Citizenship: Theoretical Debates and Young People's Experiences', *Educational Review*, 55 (3): 243–54.

Peterson, A. (2016) 'The Contested Place of Religion in the Australian Civics and Citizenship Curriculum: Exploring the secular in a multi-faith society', *British Journal of Religious Education*. 39 (2). 207-222.

Peterson, A. and Bentley, B. (2016) 'Securitisation and/or Westernisation: dominant discourses of Australian values and the implications for teacher education', *Journal of Education for Teaching*. 42 (2). 239-251.

Peterson, A. and Bentley, B. (2017) 'Education for citizenship in South Australian public schools: A pilot study of senior leader and teacher perceptions', in *The Curriculum Journal*. 28 (1). 105-122.

Pike, J. and Kelly, P. (2014) *The Moral Geographies of Children, Young People and Food: Beyond Jamie's School Dinners*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pusey, M. (2017) *Economic Rationalism in Canberra, 25 Years On*. Sydney: Whitlam Institute

- Reid, A., & Gill, J. (2010). In whose interest? Australian schooling and the changing contexts of citizenship. In A. Reid, J. Gill & A. Sears (Eds.), *Globalization, the nation-state and the citizen: dilemmas and directions for civics and citizenship education*. New York: Routledge.
- Reid, A., Gill, J., and Sears, A. (2010) *Globalization, the Nation-State and the Citizen*. London: Routledge.
- Rose, N. (2014) *From Risk to Resilience: Responsible Citizens for Uncertain Times*. Public Lecture, 28 August 2014, Ian Potter Auditorium, Kenneth Myer Building, Royal Parade, Parkville, Australia.
- Sanghera, B. and E. Satybaldieva (2009) Moral sentiments and economic practices in Kyrgyzstan: the internal embeddedness of a moral economy. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 33, 921–935
- Sayer, A. (2005a) *Agendas for Moral Economy*, Paper presented at Perspectives on Moral Economy: An International Conference, 25–27 August, Lancaster, UK (http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/doc_library/sociology/moraleconomyabstracts/Perspectives_on_Moral_Economy.doc accessed September 28th 2015)
- Sayer, A. (2005b) *The Moral Significance of Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sayer, A. (2007) *Moral Economy as Critique*. *New Political Economy*. 12(2), 261-270, DOI: 10.1080/13563460701303008
- Torney-Purta, J. (2002) 'The School's Role in Developing Civic Engagement: A Study of Adolescents in Twenty-Eight Countries', *Applied Developmental Science*, 6 (4): 203–12.
- Vromen, A. and Collin, P. (2010) 'Everyday Youth Participation? Contrasting Views from Australian Policymakers and Young People', *Young*, 18 (1): 97–112.
- Walsh, L. (2017) 'Treading water? The roles and possibilities of adversity capital in preparing young people for precarity.' In Kelly, P., and Pike, J. (eds) *Neo-liberalism and Austerity: The Moral Economies of Young People's Health and Wellbeing*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Walsh, L. and Black, R. (2018) *Rethinking Youth Citizenship After the Age of Entitlement*. London: Bloomsbury Academic Publishing.
- Walsh, L. and Casinader, N. (2018) Investigating the moral territories of international education: a study of the impact of experience, perspectives and dispositions on teachers' engagement with difference in the international Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme, *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10382046.2018.1529715>
- Walsh, L. and Leach, M. (2007) 'Recognising Diversity: The Challenges of Multicultural Education', in J. Connolly, M. Leach and L. Walsh (eds). *Recognition in Politics: Theory, Policy and Practice*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 115-27.
- Walsh, L., Zyngier, D., Fernandes, V. M., and Zhang, H. (2018) 'Engaged but ambivalent: A study of young Indigenous Australians, and democratic citizenship', *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2017.41>