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1. Introduction

1.1 A Brief Overview

Globalisation and migration have given rise to questions and debates about the recognition of differences in the non-static construction of the overarching national identity that incorporates the experiences and the narratives of diverse groups (Banks, 2008: 133). The particular process creates a direct impact on the national communities providing the need for re-examination of the national identity and diversity in a state context. The diversity brought to the European nations, including France, Netherlands, and England has increased the ethnic, racial, and religious conflicts and tensions in respective societies (Koopmans et al., 2005: 33). In this vein, England has been one of the first European states introducing the mandatory citizenship education in secondary public schools since 2002 as a state tool to re-construct the national identity and diversity paradox (Ljunggren, 2014: 34). The particular paradox lies in the understanding of the contradictory elements of inclusiveness and exclusiveness of the English national identity in relation to its increasingly diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious identities. Based on this background, the thesis will investigate the current English national curriculum and foundational state documents of the Crick (1998) and Ajegbo (2007) Reports to examine how the national identity discourse is represented and problematised in citizenship education by the state of England.

1.2 Research Puzzle

The examination of the role of citizenship education policy as a ‘solution’ for the (re)-construction of the national identity discourse has become an interest of the recent scholarly literature. In this regard, citizenship education has been considered to create the connection between active citizenship participation and democracy, and the account of national identity containing itself the shared values and consensus (Joppke, 2008). However, while some scholars argue that the primary intention of the states in conducting citizenship education policy is to create global solidarity and inclusiveness of diversity in the national identity context, others consider that its implicit aim is to strengthen and maintain the exclusive national identity and ethnic and historical belonging within the traditional society (Osler, 2011: 1). Similarly, there is much disagreement among the researchers on how the citizenship education policy of the English state is developed for (re)-constructing the national identity
discourse. Some researchers heavily criticize English citizenship education in its failure to recognise England as a multicultural society of global immigration (Tomlinson, 2009: 122), others, on the other hand, argue for its positive development for greater inclusivity of diverse and multiple identities in the national identity discourse (Osler, 2008: 22). It, therefore, becomes intriguing for our study to identify how the identity discourse in England is represented and problematised in state’s citizenship education policy taken into account the influences of diversity, global immigration, and consequent societal change of the state of England.

1.3 Aim and Research Question

Consequently, the thesis aims to answer the following research question: **How is the national identity discourse constructed by the state of England in its citizenship education policy?** To examine the imposed research question, the thesis primarily focuses on the National Curriculum of 2014 as the latest published curriculum by the state of England aligning with the increasing ambiguity in diversity and national identity, and the concept of Englishness and Britishness (Osler, 2016: 26). In addition, we examine two foundational state documents of the Crick and Ajegbo Reports in our thesis. While the Crick Report plays a central role in outlining the citizenship education policy initiative in England, the Ajegbo Report reviews and evaluates the national curriculum based on the identity and diversity discourse.

Taking Foucauldian post-structural theoretical framework and discourse analysis key to the thesis, the paper utilises Bacci’s ‘What is the problem represented to be? (WPR)’ approach as a methodological tool to portray the problem representations, presuppositions, and assumptions, and the unproblematic elements presented in the particular policy. As there is no previous research on the construction of national identity discourse in English citizenship education using the Bacchi’s post-structural approach, it can be argued that the thesis will make a significant contribution to existing scholarly literature in Political Science, specifically in Citizenship and Migration Studies.
1.4 De-limitations

The thesis acknowledges several de-limitations that emerged from the aim and research question of our study. Investigating the state construction of national identity discourse in English citizenship education, the role and impact of various actors and agencies, including teachers, non-governmental and international organizations, and the public have not been taken into account. Therefore, rather than equipping the readers with comprehensive knowledge, our study provides the specific, however, detailed understanding of the particular perspective. Consequently, the thesis focuses on the National curriculum document and state reports on citizenship education, excluding the perceptions of students and teachers. It is, however, due to the reason that the selected methodological approach for the thesis, the WPR method, is central to the understanding of the government’s rhetoric and representation of the problem in texts.

1.5 Outline

In order to answer our research question, the thesis firstly starts with introducing the key concepts, including national identity and citizenship. This is done with the aim to briefly equip readers with the necessary knowledge for understanding the concepts, their links and further locating them in a specific case discussion. The thesis later examines the existent literature in English national identity and its representation in citizenship education in England. The findings in the thesis are framed based on the Foucauldian post-structuralism as a theoretical framework of the paper. The reason for choosing the particular approach lies in its consideration of the concepts as non-static, ever-changing based on the place and time and due to its emphasis on the government, power, and knowledge to construct the concepts (Halperin and Heath, 2012: 312; Arı and Çetindeşli 2019: 11).

By identifying the author’s epistemological and ontological positions and taking an interpretive stance, the thesis utilises qualitative research methods for data collection and applies the discourse analysis model proposed by Bacchi. As the thesis aims for constructing the diversity in national identity discourse in the English citizenship education policy, the research focuses on the National Curriculum as a foundational document and the citizenship education reports officially issued by the state as explanatory materials.
Turning into the analysis section of the paper, the thesis discusses the gathered data in three sections, respectively categorising the analysis based on the selected questions of the WPR method. Each of these sections then discusses the national identity discourse in English citizenship education by presenting the problem, presuppositions and assumptions, and unproblematic representations left in the particular policy documents. The thesis is concluded by re-emphasising the central research puzzle and describing the links between the presented puzzle and summarised findings.
2. Literature Review

The following section aims to explore the existing literature on the understanding of national identity discourse in citizenship education based on the case of England. To set the scene for further literature and to operationalize the terms for our study, it is, therefore, significant to look into the concepts of and debates on national identity and citizenship. They serve as a foundation for the analysis of English citizenship education policy in our thesis. The chapter is divided into four main sections. It starts with the examination of the previous literature to understand the ‘contested’ terms of national identity, citizenship, and citizenship education. Based on the various categorisations, the section later examines the contrasting views on the construction of the national identity discourse in English citizenship education as presented in the previous studies.

2.1 Understanding National Identity Discourse

Conceptual and multiple dichotomies surrounding the discussions on the nationalism, nations, and identity demonstrate a lack of theoretical consensus on the common understanding of the national identity concept (Nielsen, 2002: 53). It is, therefore, necessary to present the contrasting conceptualisations of the national identity and to define its meaning and selected elements within our study. In the scholarly literature, some advocate a primordial understanding of the nation and national identity, whereas others instead stress its modern character, partly related to the political revolution in early modernity, partly related to the transformation involved in the development of industrial society.

For primordialists, national identity is connected with the ethno-nation, a community uniting individuals based on their blood ties and common fates as an ancient concept (Bacova, 1998: 29). The particular type of understanding forms the national identity into an exclusionary concept with its ethnic and historical boundaries. Geertz (1963), for example, asserted that national identity is ‘given’ and ‘fixed’ by birth, identified as being born in a particular community, being confined to the particular form of ethnicity, religion, culture, and language (107). Aligning with the research of Geertz (1963), the study of Bacova (1998) conceptualised national identity as ‘historically developed givenness’ forming its members into an exclusive community, race, religion, and ethnic group assigned hereditarily (32-33). Arguing for the backward-looking element of national identity based on one’s national origins, Connor (1973), however, differentiated between the ethnonational and primordial understandings of national identity, linking the
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former to the loyalty to the nation-state (3). Dahbour (2002) essentially equated the primordial understanding of national identity with an ethnic identity where one can achieve ‘some political expression’, however, not necessarily (21). The particular form of strict understanding of the nations and national identity remains salient and fail to identify increasing levels of cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and religious diversity within the nations.

Taken the particular limitation key to their conceptualisations, some scholars disagree with the understanding of the national identity discourse in primordial terms as an exclusionary concept. They proposed a renewed, loose, and modern understanding of national identity abstracting away the heretical components while emphasising the rise of modernity, the role of the state project and political revolutions, loyalty to the political community, and inclusion of various identities in the process of conceptualisation (Storm, 2018: 114). In this regard, Gellner (1983), equating the modernity with the shift from an agricultural society to an industrial one, defined national identity as the ‘political legitimacy’ and the ‘primary principle that holds political and national units congruent’ (1). His understanding of national identity, therefore, was based on the society and state, and the key role of the state granting the protection to the ‘different’ and ‘small’ cultures facing the assimilationist threats by excluding the ‘ethnicity’ factor for political sovereignty purposes (ibid. 10-11). Similarly, Anderson (1989) defined the national identity as belonging to an ‘imagined political community that is both sovereign and inherently limited’ and stressed the leading role of nationalism and national identity founded on the decline of religious significance after the Enlightenment period (5). Hence, in the particular type of thinking, nation, and national identity are ‘imagined’: they are the social and cultural constructs re-constituted through the political, religious, and industrial changes over time (ibid. 6).

Partially aligning its understanding with the conceptualisations of Gellner (1983) and Anderson (1989), Hobsbawm (2012), however, emphasised the key role of political revolutions since 1789 in the construction of national identity and its primarily political use (102). Being the elitist-instrumentalist, he argued that national identity is purposefully abused by ruling classes and power elites relying on the Marxist traditions (ibid. 105). Doing so, Hobsbawm (2012) brought up two key elements into the understanding of national identity discourse: the social element, including the socially constructed practices of national identity and modern transformation of society, and the political-elitist element, including the political use of national identity by the state elites in a governmental perspective (80).
Consequently, the modern and instrumental type of understanding reveals that the idea of nation and national identity is a contemporary and recent phenomenon that is socially and politically constructed (Parekh, 2000: 251; Hanoli, 2015: 32). Modern construction of national identity, therefore, stemmed from the necessity to imagine new forms of nations based on the changing socio-economic and socio-political conditions, and the political identities in the states (Hanoli, 2015: 32) that create formal, intentional, purposeful and loyal community bonds among the individuals (Bacova, 1998: 33). As the examination of the existent literature in the previous paragraphs reveals, one of the key characteristics of such construction of the national identity is its use for exclusion and inclusion of certain elements and people. As part of modern understanding, Parekh (2000), therefore, combined the connotations of both approaches, developing an inclusive-exclusive approach to the national identity. Although defining national identity through a modern perspective, his study concluded that national identity is both ‘given’ concept as a historical product and constantly re-constituted one based on the time, space, and the role of the state (Parekh, 2000: 253). Similarly, Derrida (1992) asserted that such continuous construction of national identity emerges in relation to the ‘other’ identities, such as ethnic, cultural, racial, linguistic, and religious diversity by both including and excluding their particular elements (29). Therefore, the construction of national identity is an inclusive process with internalizing the same values of an identifier; meanwhile, it is an exclusive process with eliminating ‘not aligned’ elements of ‘other’ identities (Derrida, 1992 in İnaç and Ünal, 2013: 230).

2.2 Understanding Citizenship

The recent focus on citizenship education in European countries, including England has given a renewed rise to an academic discussion on citizenship as the contested, complex, and constructed concept. It has also lead to the recognition of citizenship education as a by-product of wide-ranging debates on the changing nature of citizenship and its influence on modern society (Kerr, 2005: 76). As a result, various scholars have identified the citizenship from the different perspectives, such as duties, participation, and responsibilities (O’Byrne, 2003; Delanty, 2000), set of attributes, feeling, practice and status (Osler and Starkey, 2005), ties, roles, and categories (Tilly, 1996), participation (Delanty, 2000) and identity (Tilly, 1996; Delanty, 2000) (in Leek, 2016: 51).
Traditionally, the concept of citizenship entails two dimensions: on the one hand, its understanding is based on the individual and state relationship, while, on the other hand, it is related to the belonging to a community of citizens. Starting with the former dimension, citizenship is understood as ‘the state of being vested with the rights, privileges, and duties of a citizen’ (Battiste and Semaganis, 2002: 93). In the particular dimension of the state-individual relationship, to be a citizen, hence, entitles one with a common identity and certain privileges, rights, and duties while implying the citizens to correspond ‘the responsibilities and duties embraced in values to state, government, and the loyalty’ (ibid. 93-94). In this regard, examining the national context of Britain, T.H. Marshall (1963; 1965) explicated the concept of citizenship based on three overlapping and interconnected civil, political, and social dimensions. He identified the civil dimension of citizenship as ‘the rights of individual freedom, freedom of speech, thought and faith, liberty to the person, and the right to own property and justice’ (Marshall, 1963: 74). While his political dimension entailed to vote for and hold offices, the social dimension, on the other hand, broadly, implied the ‘whole range of rights from the modicum of security and welfare to the right to share a social heritage and live the life of civilized in society’ (Marshall, 1965: 78). Linked with social rights, however, going beyond its scope, Pakulski (1997) additionally proposed the cultural dimension of citizenship. It refers to the ‘new breed of claims for unhindered representation, integration without normalising distortion, acceptance, and recognition without marginalisation’ (Pakulski, 1997: 80). The particular set of citizenship rights, hence, urge for the state-individual relationship that takes into account the cultural identity, acceptance, recognition of its individuals.

Similarly elaborating on Marshall’s understanding of citizenship, Benhabib (1999) in her study identified the citizenship composed of the political, social, and legal components, including the ‘privileges of political membership, social rights and claims, and collective identity’ (720). While privileges of political membership confer upon its holders the right of political participation, granting of social rights, on the other hand, refers to a status that entitles individuals with the possession of a certain bundle of benefits, entitlements, and obligations given rise after the Post-war era (Benhabib, 1999: 721; Kastoryano, 2010: 86). Although the particular dimensions proposed by Benhabib (1999) partially aligns with the conceptualisation of Marshall (1950), she also incorporated the legal dimension to her operationalization. Collective identity in citizenship, hence, implies being a member of a historically formed political entity that contains in itself ‘cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and religious commonalities’ (Benhabib, 1999: 720).
While such conceptualisations of citizenship are foundational, they, however, do not fully explain citizenship through the prism of the ongoing globalisation processes and consequent migrant flows.

Another traditional examination of citizenship is, hence, to understand the concept as belonging to a community of citizens rather than defining it in terms of the state-individual relationship. The particular form of understanding of citizenship, therefore, provide perspectives on who belongs to the particular community of citizens, inclusionary and exclusionary elements in such belonging based on the nationality, culture, ethnicity, and language, and the patterns in naturalization process (admission of foreigners into the citizenship). For example, in the scholarly literature of ‘patriotic’ and ‘liberal assimilationist’ conceptions (Banks, 2008: 129), citizenship is largely debated around the nationhood, national identity, and the territorialized notions of the community in a traditional and historical sense (Brubaker, 1990: 379; Smith, 2001: 73). In this vein, Brubaker (1990) proposed the ideal-typical model of citizenship in the nation-states (380) through which he also asserted that the state-membership should be based on the nation-membership (381). Individuals aspiring to membership in the state must become the part of the nation, therefore, if not acquired the membership through birth, one should only assimilate to become the part of a community of citizens (ibid. 381). Similarly, for Banks (2008), the particular form of understanding of citizenship assumes the individuals from various groups to abstract from their culture, ethnicity, and language to attain inclusion and effective participation in the national culture, community, and identity of the migrated state (129). Consequently, Bosniak (2001) argued that the notion of belonging inherently creates exclusionary patterns in the citizenship discourse to exclude some from the community for ‘we’ to exist (in Bloemraad, Korteweg, and Yurdakul: 2008, 156). Such conceptualization of citizenship is aligned with its historical and social construction rooted in the idea of national identity, majority culture, and ethnicity while providing the assimilationist belonging to a community of citizens.

On the other hand, the concept of citizenship based on belonging has also been inclusively analysed taken into account an increasing flow of migration, its impacts in the composition of modern states, changing patterns of demography, and increased state mobility (Smith, 2003: 24). The definition of citizenship proposed by Dimitrov and Boyadjieva (2009) as ‘the system of values, institutionalised practices and efforts to create and preserve the conditions for together-living in a complex society’ (156) set the scene for such understanding. In this regard, recognising modern societies with greater diversity, Miller (1995) proposed the conceptualisation of citizenship based on civic identity (1). The particular conceptualisation, hence, acknowledged the different ethnic, religious, and cultural identities of the members of the
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community, while uniting them under the stronger civic identity (ibid. 2). Further, Kymlicka (1995) coined the term of multicultural citizenship to refer to maintenance of values and sense of community among the racial, ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities ensuring their participation in national civic culture and community in the respective states. In this regard, conducting a study on multi-ethnic Britain, Parekh (2000) provided a similar approach by presenting citizenship as unitary and homogenous abstracting away the cultural and ethnic otherness and acknowledging diversity in the society, where one is the sole member and possesses equal rights and responsibilities (252).

2.3 The National Identity Discourse in English Citizenship Education: Previous Studies

Drawing upon the discussed concepts in the previous sub-sections, the following section presents the number of previous studies focusing on the national identity discourse in English citizenship education. Here we present the previous literature in three categorisations, which are the examination of state documents and program of study materials, understanding the perceptions of students, and teachers.

We start with the previous studies examining diversity and national identity discourse in English citizenship education through the perceptions of students and teachers. Based on the conducted interviews and questionnaires, Sant, Davies, and Santisteban (2016) found that English students rely neither on the sense of Englishness and Britishness nor on the explicit indication of global identity and citizenship (253, 255). The study explained such findings through the subjective identification of English students and their understanding of the national identity in a loose and modern expression (ibid. 256). The study of Andrews and Mycock (2008), however, showed that English students are not fully aware of the inclusive concepts of national and civic identity in citizenship education resulting with the immigrant students from the ethnic and minority groups to associate themselves as a British rather as an English (149).

Other scholars combined the teacher and student perceptions in their studies for a comprehensive understanding of the identity discourse in citizenship education classes. Conducting both student and teacher surveys in secondary schools and colleges for his longitudinal study, the findings of Kerr (2005), on the other hand, revealed that ‘learning of the various cultures and ethnic groups’ are the second most reported topic by the students when asked about the content of the citizenship education classes (80). Consequently, survey respondents frequently chose the boxes that explain identity and citizenship in terms of inclusiveness, fair treatment of all students, and belonging to the national community (ibid. 80). A
similar pattern can also be observed in the findings of Osler (2011). Combining curriculum and report analysis and teacher interviews, the research of Osler (2011) identified a positive development of ‘Britishness’ into an inclusive concept and a broad-based and cosmopolitan understanding of ‘British identity’ among the interviewed teachers (20). Her research, however, found that 50 percent of the interviewed teachers referred to the ethnic-nationalist, xenophobic and racist attitudes among some of their students linking racism and xenophobia to the identity (Osler, 2011: 8). Using classroom observations and semi-structured teacher interviews, the findings of Önal, Öztürk, and Kenan (2018) regarded the national values as the challenge for the delivery of citizenship education for the English teachers (254). In contrast to the research of Osler (2011), this study revealed that the particular challenge is based on the requirement to teach some universal values in citizenship education classes as the ‘fundamentally British’ despite England being a diverse society (ibid. 254).

Further, we examine the previous literature identifying the national identity discourse in English citizenship education policy through state documents and program of study materials. Examining official speeches and public documents on citizenship, national identity, and multiculturalism in Britain, Joppke (2008) proposed a paradoxical perspective on the inclusiveness of identity and citizenship through the governmental perspective. His study argued that the British state is caught in ‘the paradox of universalism’ visible in government pronunciations of what it is to be British (Joppke, 2008: 538). Hence, the government perceives the need to include immigrants and ethnic minorities into the Britishness, but it cannot enforce or name any particulars that distinguish people with ethnic and cultural diversity from being British (ibid. 538).

Johnson and Morris (2012) also analysed the citizenship education discourse discussing the role of national identity in France and England by examining the citizenship curriculum in the respective states. Unlike Joppke who considered the governmental perspective as paradoxical, Johnson and Morris (2012) argued for the aim of the government to construct a new national identity in England which they label as ‘under the construction’ (289). Their study revealed that while the citizenship education in France integrates students to already-constructed national identity and citizenship due to its ‘strong tradition of republicanism’, English citizenship education aims to create a new society on a new national identity (Osborn et al., 1997: 377 in Johnson and Morris, 2012: 289). The findings of Johnson and Morris (2012) aligned with the results of Starkey’s study (2000) of citizenship education and practices in England and France. Starkey (2000) similarly argued for the intent of the English state to create new forms of society
based on a revitalized civic culture and inclusiveness of cultural diversity in the identity and citizenship discourse (53).

Osler and Starkey (2000; 2001; 2008; 2011; 2016) conducted several studies on the national identity and diversity in English citizenship education as the key scholars in the field. Using framing questions on national identity and social diversity from the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), their comparative research examined the extent citizenship education policy documents shape the inclusivity and exclusivity in national identity and citizenship in France and England (Osler and Starkey, 2001). The analysis based on the Crick Report (1998) and English program of study documents showed that the general intention of the English policy documents is to be inclusive, yet their representations are implicit and unclear, unlike in France (ibid. 302). According to the findings of Osler and Starkey (2001), the national identity discourse in England failed to present certain inclusive elements in the program of study: the exclusion of ethnic diversity, expecting minorities to assimilate into the Englishness and salience on racial diversity in national identity construction were among the unrepresented elements (ibid. 293 - 294).

Using the Foucauldian post-structural discourse analysis method, Osler (2008) conducted a further follow-up study to re-examine the changes in the national identity discourse based on ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity in English citizenship education as presented in the Ajegbo Report (Osler, 2008: 1). While her study showed the positive development in the inclusivity of cultural, religious, and ethnic diversity in the identity discourse, it, on the other hand, argued that the process is part of worldwide changing patterns of migration and globalisation, not unique to England (ibid. 22). Investigating the same aspects of the national identity discourse in English citizenship education as Osler (2008), Gholami (2017), in contrast, revealed that England still put a normative emphasis on the ‘nationalistic’ citizenship and identity despite the challenges of globalisation, and citizenship (798). His research also indicated that the state remains salient on ethnic and religious diversity entailing in England (ibid. 801). This view is supported by Maylor, Read, Mendick, Ross, and Rollock (2006) as their study similarly found that the National curriculum presented a narrow understanding of the diversity in the identity discourse (81-84 in Gholami, 2017: 801). The curriculum, therefore, was limited to the cultural differences and largely neglected the references to ethnic and religious diversity.
2.4 Summary

The previous studies on the national identity, citizenship, and national identity discourse in English citizenship education have shown that there are contrasting viewpoints and disagreements among the scholars on how the concepts and the discourse should be perceived. While some scholars advocated for the primordial, hence, ethnicity, blood ties, and history-based understanding of the national identity, others, on the other hand, connected the use of national identity with state, political revolutions, and social construction in modern terms revealing its inclusionary-exclusionary character. Respectively, citizenship has been understood in the scholarly literature as a relationship between state and individual and more inclusively, belonging to the community of citizens. Drawing from the different viewpoints on the national identity and citizenship, the understanding of national identity discourse in English citizenship education has been similarly contrasting. The examination of the previous literature based on the student and teacher perceptions, the program of study materials, state documents, and curriculum, hence, reveals different conclusions. Examining the elements of diversity in relation to the national identity, most of the studies, nonetheless, argue for the increasing inclusiveness of national identity in English citizenship education. However, none of the studies primarily and comprehensively focuses on the understanding of the rhetoric and power of government to construct the national identity discourse in the citizenship education policy of England. Selecting the few intriguing elements and perspectives from the literature review section, the following chapter will introduce the theoretical framework for the analysis and will elaborate on the major conceptual underpinnings for our study.
3. Theoretical Framework for the Analysis

3.1 Ontology and Epistemology

Many scholars view national identity as a historically constructed concept through the policies and practices, including that education. In a particular study, I follow the same approach by analyzing the construction of national identity discourse in relation to ‘other’ presented identities in English citizenship education as a socially constructed reality. In broad terms of ontology and epistemology, therefore, the study builds on the interpretivist approach.

Unlike the positivist tradition where the world is viewed separately of our knowledge, the interpretivist paradigm implies that reality exists dependently on the researcher based on the personal interpretation of it (Marsh and Furlong, 2002: 26-27). Adapting anti-foundationalism and relativism in ontological terms (ibid. 26), the researcher within the interpretivist tradition, therefore, argues for the discursively and socially constructed world, in which a single phenomenon has multiple subjective interpretations (Mack, 2010: 7). As a result, the interpretivist paradigm helps us to gain a deeper understanding of a phenomenon and its complexity in a unique social context (Creswell, 2007) by constructing the national identity discourse through utilising the official positioning of the state.

As with other paradigms in Political Science, however, interpretivism also has its limitations acknowledged in this paper. The most relevant shortcoming of interpretivism for the thesis is its lack to address political influences on social reality and knowledge (Mack, 2010: 9). Taken into consideration the particular limitation of interpretivism, the thesis utilises Foucauldian post-structural perspective on power, knowledge, and governmentality as a theoretical framework and WPR method proposed by Bacchi as a methodological tool to increase the accuracy and reliability of the findings.

3.2 Post-structuralism: Foucauldian Post-structural Perspective

To provide a valid and extensive framework that can explain the national identity discourse in English citizenship education, the particular section presents the theoretical background for the thesis. Considering the gaps of the previous chapters focusing on conflicting understandings of national identity and ‘other’ relational identities, their conceptualisations within the citizenship education policies, and unclear
representation of Englishness in citizenship education, the thesis is framed based on Foucauldian post-structuralism to explain the findings. Briefly introducing the post-structuralism, the section will elaborate on the Foucauldian perspective by justifying its applicability for the thesis and a significant role in shaping social reality.

Containing a set of theories on the interpretivist paradigm that is anti-foundationalist in nature, the post-structuralism assumes that social realities are dependent on their dynamic historical construction in social and cultural discourses (Halperin and Heath, 2012: 312). As the thesis has chosen the WPR method to examine the imposed research question, it bases its foundations specifically on the Foucauldian post-structural concepts for a comprehensive understanding of the methods presented in the following section. Foucauldian post-structuralist perspective focuses on the construction of social reality through discourse that aims to reveal how the development of knowledge is intertwined with the mechanisms of power at any given time (Edkins, 2007: 88; Halperin and Heath, 2012: 312) produced in a state-centric perspective (Devetak, 2005: 180). Foucauldian post-structuralism, therefore, examines how the concepts are identified and problematised in governmental practices assisting us to interrogate the deep-seated conceptualizations of ‘problems’ in the chosen policies (Bacchi, 2015: 8). Knowledge, power, and state-centricity (governmentality) are the key conceptual foundations upon which the particular way of post-structural thinking on discourse is constructed.

In the analysis of Foucauldian discourse, knowledge, and power are in a symbiotic relationship, knowledge (re)-emerging as the result of the power relations (Ari and Çetindeşli, 2019: 11). The power relations are exercised through the governmentality, the term that refers to the way of how social authorities manage the modern polities (Miller and Rose, 1990: 2). The particular process of governing shapes the discourses as the forms of power, while producing ‘dividing practices’ which function to separate groups from one another based on the inclusive and exclusive elements (Foucault, 1982: 208 in Bacchi and Goodwin, 2016: 23). Consequently, the identity is constituted and reconstituted in the discourses (Weedon, 1987: 32) and understood as a socially produced form of knowledge with the conceptual changes in its meanings over time and space (Bacchi, 2009: 35, 277).

Post-structuralism and its Foucauldian perspective, hence, allow the researchers to problematise the subject of identity (Vroblevska, 2016: 2; Ari and Çetindeşli, 2019: 7) while emphasising the significance of representation, the role of discourse and language in the meaning construction and the relationship
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between knowledge and power in such problematisation (Hansen, 2006: 16; Arı and Çetindeşli, 2019: 8). For post-structuralists, identity is a social and relational concept. The identity construction, hence, is only possible when it is formed in relation to the ‘Other’ (Vroblevska, 2016: 3). Language as an ontologically significant element in the post-structuralism is a tool through which the meanings are given, subjectivities and identities are inclusively produced while excluding the others (Hansen, 2006: 21). Therefore, utilising the post-structuralism, specifically, the Foucauldian approach as the theoretical framework for the analysis will assist us to produce socially constructed knowledge of national identity by analyzing the state documents founded on power relations, governmentality, discourse, and ‘dividing practices’.

3.3 Major Conceptual Underpinnings

Examining the theoretical approaches and previous literature on the national identity, citizenship, and national identity discourse in citizenship education in England, here we present the major conceptual underpinnings of our thesis. The major elements of analysis have been selected based on the intriguing and contrasting focus-of-study elements of previous literature aligning with the aims of our research. Hence, we define a national identity based on the modern understanding taking the elements of Anderson’s (1989), Derrida’s (1992), and Hobsbawm’s (2012) conceptualisations as key to our paper. That includes social construction, the use of national identity as a modern state project, and as a tool of inclusion/exclusion in relation to ‘other’ identities. Similarly, based on the discussion of the citizenship literature, we depict the elements of citizenship rights presented by T.H. Marshall (1963; 1965) as part of the individual-state relationship. Primarily, however, our study examines the policy documents based on the belonging to a community of citizens in terms of the inclusive/exclusive understanding of citizenship aligning with the understanding of Parekh (2000).

Coming to the review of specific literature in English citizenship education, the thesis depicts the categorisation of the program of study materials and state documents for its data collection and analysis method. Meanwhile, examining English national identity discourse and identifying widely discussed and contrasted identities in the specific literature, our study defines ‘other’ relational identities as the ethnic, religious, racial, and cultural identities presented as the elements of diversity in the English society. For the purposes of the thesis, we will not straightforwardly define the introduced concepts. It is due to the reason that the thesis aims to understand their representations as presented in the policy texts.
4. Research Design

After defining ontological and epistemological stances and the theoretical framework of our thesis, the following section turns to an explanation for the use of particular data and methods to conduct the thesis research. Since the thesis is based on the understanding of national identity discourse in the governmental context, the collected data examines the discursively constructing meanings of national identity in relation to the elements of diversity presented in the English citizenship education policy. The research design section is divided into four sub-sections that firstly introduce the discourse analysis as a general method, later focusing on the WPR approach as the selected methodological tool to examine the data analysis in our thesis. Further sub-sections present the data selected for the investigation of the research question also noting the limitations of the study.

4.1 Discourse Analysis

The discourse analysis aims at revealing the meanings that the political world has for its agents and that direct people to behave and act in particular ways (Halperin and Heath, 2012: 311). Being interpretive, constructive, and qualitative in nature, the discourse analysis examines the meaning through the language, discourse, and construction in the written texts (Hardy, Nelson, and Harley, 2004: 20; ibid. 311). Discourse analysis not only reflects on the social order and constructs social realities, but it also shapes the individual’s interaction in the society (Milliken, 1999: 229; Jaworski and Coupland, 1999: 3). Taking all the elements into account, the particular form of analysis is useful for our study on the construction of national identity in the citizenship education policy documents.

4.2 WPR Method

The thesis utilises the Bacchi’s ‘What is the problem represented to be?’ (WPR) approach to the policy analysis as the method of the paper. Based on the Foucauldian post-structural perspective, governmentality tradition, and discourse, the WPR method assists us to critically scrutinise the problematisation in governmental policies and practices (Bacchi and Goodwin, 2016: 13). Consequently, problematisation is the key concept and starting point for the WPR method referring to ‘the way of how problems are produced, constructed, and represented’ (ibid. 13). Rather than conventionally considering governments
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as ‘problem solvers’ for the problematisation, the WPR method presents them as the ‘problem producers’ (ibid. 14). Therefore, by applying the WPR approach to the post-structural policy analysis, the thesis explores ‘the unexamined and unconventional ways of thinking’ through the problem-questioning technique (ibid 16). Bacchi proposes six questions for the post-structural and discursive policy analysis to examine the problematisation and its representation in detail. Figure 1 presented below lists the questions of the WPR policy analysis approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WPR Chart: What is the Problem Represented to be? (WPR approach to policy analysis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong>: What’s the ‘problem’ (e.g. of ‘gender inequality’, ‘drug use/abuse’, ‘economic development’, ‘global warming’, ‘childhood obesity’, ‘irregular migration’, etc.) represented to be in a specific policy or policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2</strong>: What deep-seated presuppositions or assumptions (conceptual logics) underlie this representation of the ‘problem’ (problem representation)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong>: How has this representation of the ‘problem’ come about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4</strong>: What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the ‘problem’ be conceptualised differently?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 5</strong>: What effects (discursive, subjectification, lived) are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 6</strong>: How and where has this representation of the ‘problem’ been produced, disseminated, and defended? How has it been and/or how can it be disrupted and replaced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 7</strong>: Apply this list of questions to your own problem representations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: WPR Approach to the Post-structural Discursive Policy Analysis

Source: Bacchi & Goodwin 2016: 20

As the questions of the WPR method are introduced briefly, the thesis will now explain each question separately and their role and application in analyzing the data.
**Question 1: What is the ‘problem’ represented to be in a specific policy?**

The first question serves as a starting point for further analysis and clarification. The WPR approach considers policies as problematising activities arguing that policies contain implicit problem representations (Bacchi, 2009: 2). Therefore, the aim of the first question is to identify the implied and implicit problem representation(s) in specific policies (ibid. 3). Rather than regarding the policy-makers as ‘problem solvers’ based on a conventional approach, the particular question set the new perspective on the problem-questioning to perceive the representation of the problem. As policy texts are complex constructions, the policy documents, therefore, can involve more than one conflicting problem representations (Bacchi, 2009: 4; Bacchi and Goodwin, 2016: 20).

**Question 2: What deep-seated presuppositions and assumptions underlie this representation of ‘the problem’?**

Examining the implied problem representations in the previous section, the second question identifies what presuppositions and/or assumptions underlie the particular problem representations (Bacchi, 2009: 5). The term presupposition refers to the background ‘taken-for-granted’ knowledge: therefore, analysing the presuppositions assist the researcher to understand conceptual premises underpinning specific problem representations (ibid. 5). The conceptual premises include deep-seated cultural and unconscious values in the core of the problem representation (ibid. 6). In order to uncover the deep-seated presuppositions that emerged in the policy document, the WPR approach engages in the form of discourse analysis identifying *binaries, key concepts, and categories* operating within the specific policy (ibid. 7). The following paragraphs will briefly introduce the concepts.

Binaries or dichotomies in the policy documents attach ‘A/not-A relationship’ for the concepts meaning that what is on the one side of binary is assumed to exclude from the other side (Bacchi, 2009: 7). Therefore, the binaries are considered hierarchical creating an imbalance between the sides as privileged and undervalued. Our goal to examine the binaries in the policy document, hence, is to identify where they appear and how they function to shape the understanding of problem representation (Bacchi and Goodwin, 2016: 21).
Key concepts, on the other hand, are the foundations of the policy document. They are labeled with the various meanings and deeply embedded within the governmental practices (Bacchi, 2009: 8). Taken into the consideration contested nature of the concepts, our aim as a researcher is to identify key concepts in the policy document and examine which meanings are given to the particular concepts.

Finally, categories are the central concepts defining how governing takes place, according to Bacchi (2009: 9). In the WPR method, categories are based on the people (such as youth and citizens) due to their centrality to the governing process (ibid. 9). Therefore, by applying the categories, the researcher aims to examine how they function to label meanings to the problem representations rather than accepting the categories as fixed and given.

**Question 3: How has this representation of the ‘problem’ come about?**

The researcher analyzing the particular question aims to reflect on the specific development and decisions contributing to the formation of problem representation (Bacchi, 2009: 10). Another objective here is to recognise the competing problem representations existing over space and time (ibid. 10). For the purposes, Foucauldian genealogy is taken into account to understand how the problem is formed into the particular shape while providing insights into the unequal power relations influencing the problem representation (ibid. 11; Bacchi and Goodwin, 2016: 22). Therefore, this question assists the researchers to examine the history, origins, and mechanisms of the specific problem representation.

As the documents of our study do not present the historical information on the discourse, we exclude the particular question from the analysis due to the purpose and scope of our research.

**Question 4: What is left ‘unproblematic’ in this problem representation?**

The particular question provides us with the critical potential of the WPR method. By applying this question, the researcher aims at considering the limitations and inadequacies in the underlying problem representation and the failures in problematisation (Bacchi, 2009: 13). Therefore, the objective here is to reflect on the silenced perspectives for the identification of problem representations not presented in the policy document.
Question 5: What effects are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’?

The particular question directs attention to the effects accompanying the specific problem representations so they can be critically examined (Bacchi, 2009: 15). The question helps the researcher to examine how identified representations of the problem limit what we think and say, shape our understandings on the problems and people, and influence people’s lives materially (ibid. 16). As a result, the WPR method categorises the effects in three interconnected and overlapping forms, including discursive effects, subjectification effects, and lived effects (ibid. 15).

Discursive effects are the effects shaped by the problem representation and discourse that impose the limits on what can be thought and said (Bacchi, 2009: 16). Following the discursive effects, subjectification refers to the forms of political subjects produced through and in the discourse (Bacchi and Eveline, 2010: 115). Therefore, it assists us to understand the ways of how ‘subjects and subjectivities are constituted in the discourse’ (Bacchi, 2009: 16). Based on the subjectification process, the effects produced by the problem representation influence members of one social group more than the others. Lastly, lived effects examine the material influence of problem representation in the lives of people (Bacchi, 2009: 16).

As identifying the possible effects and influences requires us to conduct the student/teacher interviews and/or class observations, we exclude the particular question from our data analysis due to the limited availability of the resources and the scope of the thesis.

Question 6: How and where has this representation of the ‘problem’ been produced, disseminated, and defended?

Briefly introducing all the previous questions on the problem representation, the final question, hence, explores how and where the particular problem representation is produced, disseminated, and defended. It creates an opportunity to understand how the particular problem representation identified in the policy documents reaches the intended audience by sharpening awareness and increasing legitimacy (Bacchi, 2009: 19). Therefore, the researcher analyzing this question explores the increasing awareness of the contestation surrounding ‘problem representation’ and the forms of power involved in shaping it (Bacchi, 2012: 22). The aim of our thesis is to understand the problem representation in governmental context,
while the final question urges the researcher to go beyond that scope and examine the dissemination of the problem representation in a wider audience by sets of actors. Due to the limited scope of our study and our key focus, we, hence, exclude the particular question from the data analysis.

4.3 Data Collection

The thesis utilises qualitative research methods that generate data by analysing the documents, reports, and other written materials for the relevant data collection. The reason for choosing qualitative research lies in the fact that the key aim of our thesis is to disclose the state construction of national identity through its inclusive and exclusive character, therefore, we focus on the publications issued by the state of England that are the written texts. For the purposes of the thesis, selected sources in the form of official state documents contain only primary data. Unlike the secondary data that are commented and analysed by the scholars, the primary data is not interpreted previously (Halperin and Heath, 2012: 329).

The selected data is categorised into two types: key and explanatory documents. The primary document for data analysis is selected the ‘National Curriculum in England: Key Stages 3 and 4 Framework Document (2014)’. Explanatory documents consist of the official state reports of England, including ‘Crick Report: Education for Citizenship and Teaching Democracy in Schools (1998)’ and ‘Ajegbo Report: Diversity and Citizenship (2007)’. The reason to involve the explanatory documents to the research study is due to provide comprehensive understanding and explanations for the findings in the primary document. National Curriculum in England and Crick Report have both been obtained from the official website of the UK Government, www.gov.uk, under the section of ‘Education and Learning’, while Ajegbo Report has been acquired from www.educationengland.org.uk under the section of ‘Major Reports on Education in England and Wales’. The website features as the largest educational archive for British, as well as, English state documents issued since the 19th century with more than 600 historic documents, including reports, papers, and acts of Parliament.

The selected data provides specific, yet valuable information for the thesis. Starting with the explanatory documents, both Crick Report and Ajegbo Report are considered the foundational documents based on which the four strands in English citizenship education, including the social and moral responsibility, community involvement, political literacy and identity, and diversity, are formed (Önal, Öztürk, and Kenan, 2018: 246). In 1997, the English Government established the Advisory Group on Citizenship to
strengthen citizenship and teaching democracy in English secondary schools that produced the Crick Report of 1998. We have chosen to include the Crick Report (1998) to our data analysis due to the fact that it is considered a milestone document for the establishment of English citizenship education (McLaughlin, 2000: 541; Gholami, 2017: 800). Although citizenship education has been introduced to the national school curriculum in 2002 as mandatory classes, the Government largely adopted the content and detailed proposals of the Crick Report for National Curriculum purposes (McLaughlin, 2000: 542). The document contains 86 pages in three parts and eleven chapters, including how citizenship is understood in citizenship education in England, recommendations on the content of future National Curriculums, teaching process, principles, and assessments. Therefore, the analysis of the Crick Report as the explanatory document allows us to understand how the state is intended to represent the Englishness in the official report that later used as the core for the citizenship education curriculum.

The second explanatory data of analysis is the Ajegbo Report: Diversity and Citizenship (2007). Examining diversity in English citizenship education within the National Curriculum and proposing the conceptual changes and revisions, the particular governmental report was published in January 2007. The issuance of the Ajegbo Report corresponds with the 7/7 London Bombings, which influenced the refocusing of the social and cultural debates on diversity and integration and the changing general state policy in England (Osler, 2008: 12). The reason to choose the specific report as the explanatory document for our thesis is to examine the impacts of the report on the lastly revised national curriculum based on diversity. The report contains 124 pages, including the understanding of citizenship, Englishness, diversity, and provision of new recommendations for the curriculum change on citizenship education in England. The analysis of the particular document, hence, allows us to not only understand how the national identity discourse is constructed but also to examine how it is (re)-constructed in relation to the Crick Report.

Consequently, the key document of the thesis is the National Curriculum in England: Key Stages 3 and 4 Framework Document of 2014. The analysis is based on the lastly revised version of the national curriculum that is valid in English public schools today. Therefore, our findings are relevant for the present time, while constructing its justifications and possible explanations based on the previously issued state reports on citizenship education and diversity. The citizenship education classes are only taught in the key stages 3 and 4, hence, the national curriculum is selected in a way that covers the specific stages while excluding the others (key stages 1 and 2). Issued by the Department for Education in England, the
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The curriculum contains 105 pages in seven sections. As the focus of our thesis is on citizenship education, the data analysis excludes the sections and subjects of the National Curriculum that is irrelevant for the purposes of the thesis. Our key focus within the publication is on the ‘Section 4: Inclusion’ and ‘Section 7: Programmes of Study and Attainment Targets – Citizenship’. The selected documents demonstrate the possible vision of the state on identity and diversity construction, curriculum recommendations, and priorities. It allows us to constitute the particular discourse and problematisation in the citizenship education policy for secondary schools aligning with the aims of selected methodological and theoretical approaches.

4.4 Limitations

The particular section will introduce the challenges that emerged during the data collection and analysis process, as the thesis acknowledges that the research provides limited rather than absolute knowledge. Firstly, de-coding the meanings presented in the state documents may become challenging, as the government does not directly provide its position on the meaning construction process rather frequently aim for implicit understandings of the concepts. It can create a space for personal interpretation and understanding of the problems during the analysis process. To avoid any possible subjectivism and to increase the reliability of the findings, the state documents have been chosen in a way that they to some extent contain the intended position of the government represented in the documents. Secondly, the geographical area of research is narrowed down to a single case study of England. Such a study provides us with a detailed analysis and specific focus and creates an opportunity for unexpected findings that are not anticipated, yet crucial additions to the study (Ridder, 2017: 2). On the other hand, however, the findings from the case of England may not be generalizable for the other cases studying the same matters due to the context-specific elements of identity, diversity, citizenship, and government. Thirdly, one should note that individual and longitudinal representation of each year through state documents issued during 1998-2014 is not presented in the paper due to the limited scope of the thesis. Rather the thesis analyses specific sets of data of various years that are the most relevant for our purposes. Finally, revisiting previous literature, the paper also examined the possibility of incorporating the teacher/student perceptions to the state document analysis for the comprehensive understanding of the discourse. Due to the resource, time, and geographical unavailability, we cannot conduct the surveys among the students in English secondary schools. In addition, there are no previously conducted surveys for individual years, while the
content of available survey questions is not aligning with the aims of our thesis. On the other hand, the documents identifying the perceptions of English teachers are required membership access that is only granted to the teachers and public officials working in the field of education in England. Due to the unavailability of the existing relevant data on the student perceptions and inaccessibility of teacher documents, the thesis, hence, only incorporates the public documents into its data analysis.
5. Analysis

The following section presents the analysis and the findings of the thesis. Various scholars attempted to explain the national identity discourse in English citizenship education policies applying constructivist, post-structuralist, and discursive approaches (Osler and Starkey, 2001; Kerr, 2005; Osler, 2008; Johnson and Morris, 2012). However, none of them explored the governmental construction of national identity discourse in English citizenship education through analyzing the current National Curriculum (DfE, 2014) together with Crick Report (QCA, 1998) and Ajegbo Report (DfES, 2007) while applying the WPR method of post-structural policy analysis. In doing so, the particular chapter aims to analyse the national identity discourse in relation to ‘other’ ethnic, cultural, racial, and religious identities presented in the citizenship education policy of the state of England.

The analysis section is structured in four sub-sections respective to the selected questions presented by the WPR method. For the purposes of our study and with the aim to provide specific yet comprehensive analysis, the particular section will elaborate on the closely connected questions of 1, 2, and 4. As previously mentioned in the research design section, the questions of 3, 5, and 6 have been excluded from our analysis due to their unrepresentativeness in the presented documents and the scope going beyond the examination of the governmental perspective. The thesis regularly refers to the direct quotations presented in the key and explanatory documents of analysis to increase the reliability and transparency of the possible findings.

5.1 What is the ‘problem’ represented to be in the policy?

The particular section aims to examine the change government wants to construct through the policy documents, namely, the National Curriculum of 2014 and the Crick and Ajegbo Reports based on the national identity and diversity discourse in the English citizenship education. We firstly present the relevant problematisations of the government made in the current curriculum, further turning to the explanatory problematisations in the foundational reports presented in separate sub-paragraphs.
5.1.1 The National Curriculum in England

As the National Curriculum in England is a program of study material, the particular document provides us with general knowledge mainly focusing on the content and aims of the curriculum, including citizenship education. Therefore, the problem representations provided in the curriculum are implicit and non-explanatory. That being said, a few main problem representations in the National Curriculum related to the purposes of our study are presented in the following paragraphs.

The National Curriculum sets a foundation for problem representations starting with its ‘Aims and Curriculum’ section (DfE, 2014: 4). The goals of the document implicitly reveal the problem representations as an unbalanced curriculum in terms of the lack of moral and cultural development of students, and their unequal preparation for future societal responsibilities, experiences, and opportunities (ibid. 4).

“Every state-funded school must offer a curriculum, which is balanced and broadly based and which promotes the moral and cultural…development of pupils at the school and of society and prepares all the pupils at the school for the opportunities, responsibilities, and experiences of later life” (DfE, 2014: 4).

As the reference presents the aim of the curriculum document and uses ‘must’ in a demanding tone, one, hence, can expect that the English government wants to change the particular ‘problems’ in the program of study for the secondary schools.

Aligning with the previous problematisations, the curriculum similarly problematises the exclusion of certain pupils in detail. It becomes evident through the separate chapter dedicated to the inclusion in the National Curriculum and the key goals and aims of the citizenship education curriculum. The particular problematisation assigns responsibility for teachers to create a class atmosphere where every single pupil is felt welcome and has no barriers to succeed in their studies and future life despite their first language, and religious, ethnic, and cultural identities (DfE, 2014: 8).

“Teachers have an even greater obligation to plan lessons for pupils…coming from disadvantaged backgrounds. Lessons should be planned to ensure that there are no barriers to every pupil achieving” (DfE, 2014: 8).

“Teachers should take account of their duties under equal opportunities legislation that covers race, religion or belief…..” (DfE, 2014: 8)
In this regard, the document also acknowledges the immigrant students settling in England whose first language is not English. Although implicitly, one can assert that the aim of the government is not to assimilate those students into Englishness, rather assist them in their integration to wider English society.

“Teachers must also take account of the needs of pupils whose first language is not English…Teachers should plan teaching opportunities to help those pupils develop their English” (DfE, 2014: 8).

Similar to the stance on teachers, the citizenship education curriculum urge for the need for mutual respect among the classmates by acknowledging the existing diversity in the respective society and stressing the plurality of national, regional, religious and ethnic identities in the United Kingdom (DfE, 2014: 84).

“Key stage 4: Goals for citizenship education curriculum

Acknowledging the diverse national, regional, religious, and ethnic identities in the United Kingdom and the need for mutual respect and understanding” (DfE, 2014: 84).

The references made in the curriculum document, hence, implicitly acknowledge the historically exclusionary nature of national identity representation in the UK/England and aim to re-construct the inclusive national identity discourse considering the diversity of identities in the citizenship education and their integration to the English society.

5.1.2 Crick Report

As the foundational report for the introduction of the citizenship education curriculum in the secondary schools in England, the Crick Report (1998) sets a base for understanding the aim of the government to conduct the citizenship education policy. In general, the document is based primarily on the active citizenship, teaching of democracy and civics, social and moral responsibility, community involvement, political literacy, and the recommendations for teaching citizenship classes (QCA, 1998: 7, 8, 9). Consequently, the discourse on national identity is not an explicit aim of the Crick Report. The document, however, implicitly and contrastingly refers to the national identity issue and clarifies its stand in the identity discourse based on the examination of ‘other’ identities. Hence, a few problem representations emerge from the policy document aligning with our study.
Firstly, the state report problematises the *passive approach to citizenship* urging for a renewed thinking referred to as a ‘participative’ or ‘active’ citizenship (QCA, 1998: 7). Based on the perspective, the documents categorise active citizenship in three interconnected strands of social and moral responsibility, political literacy, and community involvement (ibid. 8) in the framework of Marshall’s dimensions of citizenship (ibid. 9).

> “Active citizenship is our aim throughout [the report]” (QCA, 1998: 25).

> “So a working definition [of citizenship] must be wide…specifically identify and relate all three of Marshall’s dimensions, not to call any one of them on its own true ‘active citizenship’. Active citizenship must be a habitual interaction between all three” (QCA, 1998: 11).

In this regard, the document presents students as having a lack of experience and knowledge on the active citizenship that citizenship education classes should address as a primary goal.

> “We believe that the most important issues facing young people as citizens are their lack of knowledge about society, its democratic process and their actual rights and responsibilities as citizens” (QCA, 1998: 20).

The Crick Report implicitly and broadly links the success in participatory citizenship with the identity in the society in its concluding remarks. The document stresses its goal as ‘to create a nation of able, informed and empowered citizens’ through the citizenship education that will assist the individuals to understand and enforce their rights and recognise ‘the active involvement and inclusion for strengthening their society’ (QCA, 1998: 61).

> “A healthy society is made up of people who care about the future and who willingly contribute to its development for the common good…Before this can happen, they need to have a sense of belonging and of identity within the society and community around them” (QCA, 1998: 61).

Consequently, the *exclusion of diversity in the national identity and citizenship discourse* is another problem representation presented in the report. The Crick Report presents the exclusion from society and identity based on the factors of colour, bullying, and other forms of ‘difference’ that need to be considered
when preparing the curriculum (QCA, 1998: 19). However, ‘other’ forms of ‘difference’ are not explicitly identified in the document: they are occasionally referenced through cultural diversity, ethnicity, race, and religion.

The document initially acknowledges the complexity of national identity discourse in British society.

“The increasingly complex nature of our society, the greater cultural diversity, and the apparent loss of a value consensus…cultural diversity raises the issue of national identity” (QCA, 1998: 17).

Following the problematisation, the Crick Report urges attention to ‘the matters of national identity in a pluralist society’ rather than to define the identity without critically questioning it (QCA, 1998: 18). In this regard, the document is generally and implicitly inclusive of multiple identities into the national identity and citizenship discourse while presenting the citizenship education as a tool creating a common ground between diverse religious and ethnic identities (ibid. 17) and for student learning and awareness in that perspective (ibid. 19).

“We all need to learn more from each other. This should entail learning not only about the United Kingdom…but also about the European, Commonwealth, and the global dimension of citizenship, due regard being given to the homelands of our minority communities…” (QCA, 1998: 18).

Relying on the mutual learning and understanding, the Crick Report aims ‘to find or restore the sense of common citizenship, including national identity that is secure enough in the plurality of nations, cultures, ethnic identities, and religions long found in the United Kingdom’ (QCA, 1998: 17). While the intention is to be inclusive in general, the detailed review of the report reveals intriguing statements and phrases indicating that national identity discourse is not understood purely as an inclusive concept rather with the exclusive elements in relation to the few ‘other’ identities. Aligning with the aim of Question 4 of the WPR method, the ‘unproblematic’ elements of the particular problematisation are further presented in the section of 5.3.

5.1.3 Ajegbo Report

As the foundational document issued for the evaluation and consequent re-construction of the existing national curriculum, the Ajegbo Report (2007) provides renewed and explicit thinking on identity matters
in citizenship teaching. In doing so, the report critically examines the diversity and ‘other’ identities in relation to the national identity discourse in citizenship education. Hence, there are few problematisations emerged from the examination of the particular document.

The document primarily problematises the lack of an explicit link between diversity and national identity starting with its ‘Key Findings’ section. Although the particular element has been subtly and implicitly brought up both in the National Curriculum and the Crick Report, the Ajegbo Report, however, is straightforward and explicit in its aim to re-construct the inclusive citizenship through problematising the overarching concepts of diversity and national identity.

“…to develop a notion of citizenship as inclusive, it is crucial that issues of identity and diversity are addressed explicitly. Inherent in the relationship between the citizen and society is the role that identity, or sense of belonging plays within this relationship” (DfES, 2007: 8; 95).

Therefore, the Ajegbo Report recommends re-examining the form of teaching and including the classes on the link between citizenship, and national identity and diversity.

“The full GCSE [General Certificate of Secondary Education] should comprise a range of topics that link Citizenship to other relevant subjects. We suggest these be developed to include explicit issues of identity and diversity…” (DfES, 2007: 11).

However, the report acknowledges that it is not only the relationship between identity and diversity that should be problematised and re-constructed but also the mere representation of the diversity itself.

“There is insufficient clarity about the flexibility within the curriculum and how links to education for diversity can be made” (DfES, 2007: 7).

By problematising the representation of diversity, the Ajegbo Report, hence, proposes its recommendations on re-constructing the understanding of diversity in the national curriculum and citizenship education. That includes the exploration of ‘the origins of the UK and how different cultures have created the United Kingdom’, and ‘the representations of different racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious groups in the UK…’ (DfES, 2007: 23). In doing so, the particular state report aims to mark a transition from constructing the singular national identity to the acknowledgement of multiple identities in the particular discourse.
“More and more people have multiple identities – they are Welsh Europeans, Pakistani Yorkshire women, Glaswegian Muslims, English Jews and Black British” (DfES, 2007: 29).

“In addition, [British] identities are typically constructed as multiple and plural” (DfES, 2007: 90).

Hence, it can be concluded that unlike the previous documents examined in our ‘Analysis’ section, the Ajegbo Report explicitly refers to the primary role of cultural, ethnic, racial, and religious diversity in creating an inclusive and integrative national identity discourse for the citizenship education.

5.2 What presuppositions or assumptions underlie the representation of the ‘problem’?

As we analysed the problem representations in the curriculum and policy documents, the particular question will assist us to understand the rationale behind such representations of the problem. The section, therefore, discusses the documents in three sub-sections based on the binaries, key concepts, and categories implied in the policy texts.

5.2.1 Binaries

The main binary presented in our policy documents is one of the majority/minority. In the state reports that we examined, the majority presents the English people if referred to England, and English, Welsh, Scottish, and Northern Irish people if based on the United Kingdom. The minority, on the other hand, refers to the people historically and ethnically coming from elsewhere, however, settled in England or the UK and contributing to the cultural, ethnic, religious, and racial diversity in the society. The state reports and curriculum acknowledge the multinational identities in the UK, referring to the Scottish, Welsh, and Irish people as part of the majority.

“Contextualised understanding that the UK is a ‘multinational’ state, made up of England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales” (DfES, 2007: 12).

While the National Curriculum is silent on the binaries, the foundational state reports, on the other hand, problematise the minorities immigrated to the UK or England. In this regard, the Crick Report, specifically and explicitly, implies the hierarchical relationship between majorities and minorities.
“This should entail learning not only about the United Kingdom – including all four of its component parts [referring to England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland] – but also about the European, Commonwealth, and global dimensions of citizenship, with due regard given to the homelands of the minority communities…” (QCA, 1998: 18)

“Majorities must respect, understand and tolerate minorities and minorities must learn and respect the laws, codes, and conventions as much as the majority – not merely because it is useful to do so, but because this process helps foster common citizenship and identity” (QCA, 1998: 18).

The particular quotations set a division between majorities and minorities in several respects. The former quotation explicitly stresses that the minority communities are not conceived as an integral part of the United Kingdom rather they should be learned about at a global level. While requiring the majority to understand and tolerate the minorities, the statements urge the minorities to learn and respect the laws, codes, and conventions in a demanding tone. Implying the phrase of ‘as much as the majority learn and respect’, the report sets a hierarchy where native British people are viewed in an upper level as exemplary citizens. Hence, it requires the minorities to change and adapt for the common citizenship and for creating a sense of national identity in the wider community making them the part of the ‘problem’ rather than a solution. Then one can conclude that the statement implicitly implies the assimilation of the minorities and depicts the cultural paternalism in English society.

A similar division is also evident in the Ajegbo Report. Although the document intends to support the education for diversity in citizenship teaching and to construct the inclusive national identity discourse of multiple identities, there are, however, explicitly defined majority/minority binary based on the race. Consequently, another binary presented in the policy documents is the ‘white’/‘non-white’ division.

“If we want community cohesion and for the UK to be at ease with its diversity, as much thought and resource for education for diversity need to be located with the needs of indigenous white pupils as with pupils from minority ethnic groups” (DfES, 2007: 32).

“Teachers need to be able, in different contexts, to promote the identities and self-worth of indigenous white pupils, white working-class pupils, and minority…” (DfES, 2007: 66)

Despite acknowledging the plurality of identities in the construction of the citizenship and national identity discourse including that of ethnic minority groups, the particular quotations explicitly differentiate
between the ‘white’ pupils and the ‘non-white’ minority. The Ajegbo Report also coins the terms of the ‘white’ British (DfES, 2007: 42), ‘white’ community (ibid. 56), and ‘white’ schools in England, when referring to the Knutsford High School (ibid. 33) and schools in Derbyshire (ibid. 49). Additionally, the report makes a distinction between ‘non-whites’ implying to the ‘black’ Africans and Asians in its policy text.

“The schools are in contrasting areas, one school almost entirely Asian, the other white” (DfES, 2007: 62).

“The Trust also runs discussions and training workshops, organized by young people from Northern Ireland, for schools in Oldham that are facing problems between Asian and white young people following the 2001 riots” (DfES, 2007: 63).

Similar references are made regarding the ‘black’/ ‘white’ binary in English citizenship education.

“Too little attention is given to the black and multiethnic aspects of UK history” (DfES, 2007: 41).

“To raise the profile of the Black and Asian presence in Northamptonshire, in a largely white area…, [the school] has done excellent work alongside the School of Education at University College Northampton to enhance the inclusion of black British…” (DfES, 2007: 59).

Hence, one can argue that while aiming for the inclusion of the diverse racial identities into the national identity discourse, the Ajegbo Report, contrastingly, sets underlying divisions between the races by labeling them as ‘white’ and ‘non-white’ (‘black’ and ‘Asian’). Similar to the previous binary, however, there is no mention of the particular binary in the National Curriculum document. Providing general and non-explanatory statements on citizenship education, the curriculum, consequently, has no identity-related binaries presented.

5.2.2 Key Concepts

As the key concepts of the policy documents are aligning with their problem representations, we have already examined the overarching terms, such as diversity, national identity, and citizenship, and the implicit concepts, including the ‘other’ racial, ethnic, religious and cultural identities in the presented
texts. All the mentioned concepts, however, are linked through the key concept examined in the state reports and the National Curriculum, namely that of *inclusion*.

Examining the documents of analysis, one can argue that inclusion is not depicted identically in each of the documents of our examination. In this regard, the Ajegbo Report has an explicit stand on the inclusion that is understood as *integration* throughout the text. For the purposes, the report refers to the ‘promotion of integration’ (DfES, 2007: 19), and ‘integration education for diversity’ in citizenship education (ibid. 33) Hence, the document defines the British/English national identity as plural consisting of the multiple identities abstracting away from its historical nationalistic roots into the acceptance of multiculturalism (ibid. 106).

“By ‘education for diversity’ we mean teaching and learning – in both the formal and informal curriculum – that address issues of ethnicity, culture, language, and religion and the multiple identities Britain inhabits” (DfES, 2007: 15).

“In addition, [British] identities are typically constructed as multiple and plural” (DfES, 2007: 8)

On the contrary, the inclusion presented in the Crick Report contains both the elements of *integration and assimilation*. The overall intention is to be inclusive and integrative:

“…main aim of the whole community should be to find and restore a sense of…the 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” (QCA, 1998: 17).

However, the report also expects the assimilation of certain identities into the national identity discourse creating an inclusive approach with the exclusionary elements. As previously discussed in the ‘Binaries’ section, ‘urging (ethnic) minorities to learn and respect laws, codes, and conventions as much as majority’ (QCA, 1998: 17-18) do to foster the common citizenship and identity is an indicator of such assimilationist character towards the ethnic identities.

Following the state reports, National Curriculum is explicitly for the *inclusion* of all pupils into the citizenship education regardless of their race and religion (DfE, 2014: 8), while acknowledging British society as ‘a pluralist one consisting of the various ethnic, cultural, regional, and religious identities’ involved (ibid. 84). Hence, it reveals that the government aims to re-construct the largely inclusive national identity through citizenship education teaching in England. However, it should also be noted that while
inclusion is explicitly referred to in the curriculum, it is complex to examine the integrative or assimilationist nature of such inclusion. No references besides the superficial statements have been provided, in this regard.

5.2.3 Categories

The National Curriculum and the state reports present several ‘people’ categories in their policy texts. The primary categorisation made in this vein is one of the pupil/teacher. In our policy texts and the curriculum, teachers are portrayed as the key facilitators and influencers concerning the construction of national identity through citizenship teaching. Hence, there is an acknowledgement within all examined policy texts that delivery of state aims regarding the identity construction in citizenship education largely lies at the discretion of teachers making them the key actors in ‘decoding’ the perspectives of government in the classrooms. The Crick Report explicitly stress the particular point:


Therefore, the report urges teachers to ‘have the knowledge, understanding, skills, and confidence needed to be successful in the interactive teaching approaches which underpin effective learning in the citizenship education’ (QCA, 1998: 30). Similarly, the curriculum assigns teachers with a greater responsibility acknowledging their discretionary power in such process:

“The national curriculum provides an outline of core knowledge around which teachers can develop exciting and stimulating classes to promote the development of pupil’s knowledge, understanding, and skills as parts of the wider school curriculum” (DfE, 2014: 5).

The Ajegbo Report, on the other hand, raises concerns regarding the effective delivery of state aims presented in the documents problematising the lack of training and knowledge of teachers concerning the diversity construction in the identity discourse.

“…still much to be done in providing teachers with appropriate resources and training” (DfES, 2007: 5)

“Some teachers lack confidence in engaging with diversity issues and lack the training opportunities to improve in this area” (DfES, 2007: 6).
Unlike the teachers, however, students are generally presented as the ‘passive accepters’ of the citizenship education policy whose voices are not evenly heard.

“Pupils’ voice is not given enough consideration in this [diversity] area” (DfES, 2007: 6).

“All schools should have mechanisms in place to ensure that the pupil's voice is heard and acted upon. Schools should consider the use of forums, school councils, pupil questionnaires, or other mechanisms for discussions around identity, values, and belonging” (DfES, 2007: 9).

While the Ajegbo Report presents all pupils as ‘passive learners’, the National Curriculum further categorises the students under the label of *advantaged/disadvantaged pupils*. Although the National Curriculum does not explicitly refer to the advantaged pupils, it coins the term ‘students coming from the disadvantaged backgrounds’ for whose ‘the teachers have a greater obligation to plan lessons’ (DfE, 2014: 8). Unlike the binaries presented in our thesis, the particular categorisation is not aiming to create a hierarchy among the students rather try to help the disadvantaged ones to advance in their studies. This categorisation is further elaborated in the National Curriculum in England where the introduction of the ‘disadvantaged’ students are followed by the ‘race, disability, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation, pregnancy, and maternity, and gender reassignment’ (DfE, 2014: 8). The particular curriculum also includes the students whose first language is not English to the group of ‘disadvantaged’ pupils implicitly setting the language as ‘a requirement’ for successful integration to the respective nation, identity, and citizenship. In doing so, particular students should be linguistically assisted by their teachers to advance in their classes.

“Teachers must also take account of the needs of pupils whose first language is not English…Teachers should plan teaching opportunities to help pupils develop their English and should aim to provide support pupils need to take part in all subjects” (DfE, 2014: 8)

One can assume that the general intention of the government is to be inclusive by providing the necessary assistance to the disadvantaged pupils and making awareness in the policy documents. It, on the other hand, creates an implicit division among the students based on their race, religion or belief, and nationality.
5.3 What is left unproblematic in this representation?

In this section, the thesis will analyse the elements presented in the policy documents that are left either unexplained or unproblematic, while their mere references need to have further clarification.

5.3.1 Representation of Englishness and Britishness

One of the unexplained points left in the all examined policy documents is the representation of Englishness/Britishness. The National Curriculum, our focus of the study material, contains the essential chapters on the school curriculum and the national curriculum in England. Contrastingly, however, there are few mentions of England and Englishness in the document text. Englishness is frequently replaced with Britishness, while England is synonymously referred to as the United Kingdom. The citizenship education curriculum of the National Curriculum, hence, entails numerous such examples.

“Acknowledgement of diverse national, regional, religious, and ethnic identities in the United Kingdom…The precious liberties enjoyed by the citizens of the United Kingdom…Local, regional, and international governance and the United Kingdom’s relations with the rest of Europe, the Commonwealth, the United Nations, and the wider world” (DfE, 2014: 83-84).

Although the Crick is exclusive to the construction of the English citizenship education classes, the same pattern can also be observed in the particular policy text. Indeed, the Crick Report continuously refers to the ‘British subject’ (QCA, 1998: 10), ‘British citizen’ (ibid. 10), ‘British democracy’, and ‘British history’ (ibid. 52) throughout the document, while there is no mention of the Englishness. Ajegbo Report, on the other hand, provides few insights into the particular unproblematic representation. The report explicitly defines its approach to the Britishness from the initial pages:

“We have used the term ‘British’ or ‘UK’ throughout our report when referring to identities across the UK. However, our remit is such that our recommendations apply solely to education in England” (DfES, 2007: 15).

Presenting the various identities within the UK, and equating Britishness with multiple identities, the Ajegbo Report also acknowledges the problematic representation of the British identity.
“The term British means different things to different people…Throughout our consultations, concerns were expressed, however, about defining Britishness, about the term’s divisiveness and how it can be used to exclude others” (DfES, 2007: 8).

While there is the acknowledgement of English, Welsh, Scottish identities within the state document (DfES, 2007: 19), the particular quotation, however, raises the concern on the exclusionary character of British and English identities. Hence, it can be argued that presenting England as the UK and equating British identity with Englishness set a dominant English identity in the whole UK contrary to the multiple national identities of the Scottish, Irish, and Welsh population. On the other hand, representing Englishness as Britishness can also indicate the inclusive intention of the government aiming for a broader context of various identities. The curriculum and the policy documents, nonetheless, fail to explicitly and fully clarify the element within the examined texts.

5.3.2 Representation of Ethnic and Racial Identities

The Crick Report provides another unproblematic representation in its policy document, namely the unrepresentativeness of the ethnic and racial identities in the national identity discourse. While the general intention of the policy document is inclusive of the diversity, it, however, fails to fully integrate the ethnic and racial identities, in this regard. As a result, the document perceives certain ethnicities as ‘other’ when focusing on the cultural diversity that consequently stems from racial backgrounds.

“Minorities must learn and respect the laws, codes, and conventions as much as the majority – not merely because it is useful to do so, but because this process helps to foster common citizenship” (QCA, 1998: 18).

The particular quotation is significant not only because it provides the hierarchical relationship between native British and immigrant minorities, but also because it unproblematises the ethnic and racial diversity of the minorities. Examining the whole context of the Crick Report, one can argue that minorities presented in the quotation implicitly refer to the ethnic minorities of black descents living in Britain/England by subtly indicating its colonial history. In doing so, the government aims for the
adaptation and assimilation of ethnically black minorities tracing the elements of ‘unproblematic’ racism in the policy document.

Similar to the Crick Report, the National Curriculum in England provides no explanation of the particular element. Unlike the ethnic identities that are referred once for mutual respect and understanding, the curriculum is similarly silent on the acknowledgement of the racial identities into the national identity discourse as the goals of citizenship education.

“Diverse national, regional, religious, and ethnic identities in the United Kingdom and the need for mutual respect and understanding” (DfE, 2014: 84).

On the contrary, the Ajegbo Report separately and explicitly acknowledges the ‘unproblematic’ representation of ethnic and racial diversity in national identity discourse constructed by the Crick Report in its ‘Foreword’ and ‘Key Findings’ sections.

“I [Sir Keith Ajegbo] believe issues around ‘race’, identity, citizenship, and living together in the UK today are serious matters” (DfES, 2007: 4).

“The notion of racial hierarchies has not altogether disappeared and stereotypes still abound in society” (DfES, 2007: 6).

Therefore, the report reveals the concern of students based on their ethnic and racial backgrounds, however, not that much of religious one.

“Issues of ethnicity and ‘race’, whilst often controversial, are more often addressed [by students] that issues relating to religion” (DfES, 2007: 7).

Noteworthy to mention, racial diversity is the only type of ‘other’ identity in the nationality discourse that the Ajegbo Report stresses particular attention in the ‘Key Findings’ section. The Ajegbo Report, hence, adds the fourth strand to the citizenship education teaching, ‘Identity and Diversity: Living Together in
the UK’ (DfES, 2007: 97), in addition to the three strands presented in the Crick Report. The particular strand explicitly incorporates the three new conceptual components into citizenship education, also including the ‘critical thinking about ethnicity, religion, and race’ (ibid. 98). Although acknowledging the urge to include ethnic and racial identities into the national identity discourse, the Ajegbo Report, however, does not explain how racial and ethnic diversity can be practically achieved in the citizenship education teaching.
6. Conclusion

The particular section aims to initially summarise the key findings to answer the imposed research question: How is the national identity discourse constructed by the state of England in its citizenship education policy? The chapter later links the findings with the aim of the thesis and research puzzle, while providing several suggestions for further research.

Conducting qualitative primary document analysis and utilising Bacchi’s WPR method on the Foucauldian post-structuralism, the thesis aimed at the examination of national identity (re)-construction of the state of England through its citizenship education policy. In doing so, the general findings from the examination of the National Curriculum, and Crick and Ajegbo Reports all reveal that the state of England aims to construct the largely inclusive and integrative national identity discourse through the participative citizenship education and recognition of plural identities, primarily acknowledging the religious and cultural diversity within the English society. The thesis, however, contrastingly finds that the presentation of the Britishness and Englishness, and the ethnic and racial identities are left unproblematic and silent in the examined policy texts providing an implicit need for the minorities to assimilate into the dominant national identity. In this regard, our study identifies that the English government successfully uses the ‘dividing practices’ to establish hierarchical division stemming from the unequally expected roles of the majority and minority in fostering the common citizenship, and the portrayal of ‘white’ and ‘non-whites’ in the respective society. Therefore, our thesis concludes that while English national identity discourse has increasingly become more inclusive and integrative of diversity and ‘other’ presented identities since the issuance of the Crick Report, it still has the exclusionary and undefined elements left in its problem representation both in the Ajegbo Report and in the National Curriculum. In this vein, we, hence, acknowledge that the government plays a central role in implicit, explicit, and superficial construction of the meanings of the national identity, diversity, and citizenship over time as integrative, assimilationist-exclusive, and inclusive concepts.

Consequently, our results largely align with the previous studies conducted in the field arguing for progressively inclusive character of the national identity discourse in English citizenship education policy. However, unlike the previous studies, our key findings are generated by utilising the Bacchi’s WPR method assisting us to present the government as a problem-producer rather than as a problem-solver and critically question the policy texts instead of searching for the definite answers. In doing so, the thesis
contributes to the field of global politics and societal change due to its case study examination of national identity discourse in an increasingly diverse society of England resulting from the global migrant flows. Finally, the thesis acknowledges that our research provides limited rather than absolute knowledge due to the confined nature of our study. While the thesis primarily examines all key documents in the citizenship education policy in England to generate the valid findings for the comprehensive analysis of the state perspective, it also acknowledges that the delivery of the understanding of national identity discourse can be further re-constructed in the classroom atmosphere. Therefore, it is suggested for the future studies on the English citizenship education to incorporate the perceptions of students and teachers into the understanding of the national identity discourse through utilising the classroom observations, interviews, and surveys in addition to the state documents.
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