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ABSTRACT
Citizenship Education has become a feature of education policy in many nation-states, including Small Island Melanesian States such as the Solomon Islands and education is postulated as a way of delivering this goal. The newly expected outcome for education and curriculum in the Solomon Islands is an example of this. It includes: “the promotion of the concept of unity in diversity, the need for equity, and inclusiveness... development of positive, moral and ethical values, with respect to others, based on personal integrity and social responsibility; focused on values education, civics and citizenship and the development of positive attitudes with the mind and heart to create peace, reconciliation and be able to live in harmony in a multi-ethnic diverse communities” (Solomon Islands Policy Statement & Guideline for the National Curriculum, 2009, p. 22).

This study was designed as mixed method triangulated research using interpretative and positivist paradigms to explore Solomon Islanders’ perspectives about values that are relevant and contextual for good citizenship. Taking a multiple case study approach, the study was ethnographically conducted with students, teachers, public officers, and rural village elders. Participants were selected from four case study secondary schools, four Government Ministries, and a rural community in the Solomon Islands, with unstructured, semi-structured, and structured questionnaires used to collect the data.

The findings show that the modern conception and values of citizenship education – regarding legal status that grants social, political, civil, and economic rights and other sets of rights, duties, and identities linking the citizen to the nation-state – is missing from the formal education systems of the Solomon Islands. However, the study also shows that, while the teaching of modern democratic values is important for Solomon Islands, due to the influence of local cultures and Christianity in the Solomon Islands context, this cannot be done exclusively. Conversely, the exclusive teaching of cultural values or church values may not work for Solomon Islands because of the influences of modern democratic institutions. In this case, what Solomon Islands needs for now is Citizenship Education that is inclusive of all three domains (democratic, cultural, & Christian values).
Further, pedagogies for the teaching of values for good citizenship must reflect methods and approaches that are effective to transmitting values relevant for Solomon Islands. Therefore, through the identification of relevant values and effective approaches, the study recommends and theorises a new Citizenship Education framework for the Solomon Islands.
## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS
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</tr>
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<td>OBC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMSI</td>
<td>Regional Assistant Mission Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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| SI           | Solomon Islands.
GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Active Citizenship A participatory form of citizenship that involves the development of citizenship as an active (rather than passive) process (Nelson J. & Kerr, D. 2006). Used interchangeably with concepts such as participatory citizenship and civic action in literature.

Citizenship Education The contribution of education to the development of characteristics of being a citizen.

Good Citizenship A citizen who has the ability to solve social problems and improve society; show good character; display honesty, respect, and responsibility; a law abiding member of a society. It is used interchangeably with responsible citizenship.

Melanesian The “Black Islands” (from Greek “melos” [black] and “nesos” island). The name given to the group of islands comprising New Guinea, the Solomons, New Caledonia, New Hebrides (now Vanuatu), and parts of Fiji.

Pijin A national language used by people of the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea for communication. It is adopted from English words mixed with Melanesian indigenous languages.

Wantok The word deriving from the two English words “one” and “talk”; used to represent Melanesian countries’ speakers of pijin (Solomon Islands & Papua New Guinea) and bislama (Vanuatu), a language adopted from English words and structured according indigenous Melanesian languages.

The terms below are highlighted in the literature by (Karen-Watson Gegeo, & Gegeo, 2014) to represent values that are considered important to people of Kwara’ae that represent a good citizen.

Adofiku’anga A Kwara’ae word for joined together, doing things together as one.

Alafe’anga The word means unconditional love, together with kin obligation in Kwara’ae.

Aliafu’anga A word meaning “being complete” in Kwara’ae language (Karen-Watson Gegeo, & Gegeo, 2014) – a person that is seen as having values that are needed in society.

Aroaro’anga A Kwara’ae word meaning peace, peaceful behaviour.

Babato’o’anga A Kwara’ae word for emotional and behavioural stability, dependability, settling down in one place.
Gwaumauri’anga Being at the head of life (Karen-Watson Gegeo, 2014) – someone who has developed to the fullest.

Enoen’onga A Kwara’ae word meaning: humility, delicacy, adaptability, gracefulness tranquility, gentleness.

Fa’amanata’anga A term that represents teaching and learning or education in kwara’ae dialect. It means shaping the mind (Karen-Watson Gegeo, 2014).

Fangale’a’anga The word means giving, sharing, receiving, gracefully, and manners – lit., “eat good”.

Kwara’ae A language spoken by the Kwara’ae people, the most populated language group in Malaita and the most populous cultural and linguistic group in the Solomon Islands (Karen-Watson Gegeo, 2014).

Kwaigwale’e’anga A word in Kwara’ae meaning welcoming, comforting, hospitality.

Kwaima’anga A Kwara’ae word meaning affectionate, amorous, and tender love.

Kwaisare’e’anga A word in Kwara’ae meaning feeding someone without expectation of return.

Mamana’anga A word meaning: truthfulness, spiritual power in Kwara’ae language.

Ngwae ni fuli A phrase meaning “person of place” – a person that is recognised among people and identified with the tribe, land, and community.

Tuafiku’anga A Kwara’ae word meaning living in unity in (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, pp. 174 – 179).

The terms and meanings provided below represent the values of good citizenship as conceptualised by people of Gula’alā (Sanga, 2014).

Abero lā A word meaning “care” in Gula’alā.

Abu lā A word in Gula’alā meaning “holiness”.

Gula’alā It is a living language spoken by the Gula’alā people, East of Malaita, Solomon Islands (Sanga, K, 2014).

Enoen lā A Gula’alā word meaning “humility”.

Fananau lā A Gula’alā term that represents teaching and learning or education, “learning and shaping” (Sanga, K. 2014, p. 5).

Kwaingengei lā A word meaning “sound judgement” in Gula’alā.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mamana lā</th>
<th>A Gula’alā word representing “truthfulness”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manatagado lā</td>
<td>A word representing “trustworthiness” in Gula’alā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rao mābe lā</td>
<td>A Gula’alā word meaning “industriousness”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro lā</td>
<td>A word meaning “obedience” in Gula’alā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To nuinui lā</td>
<td>A phrase meaning “avoid uncleanliness” in Gula’alā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ni mouria</td>
<td>A phrase meaning “purposeful living” in Gula’alā (Sanga, 2014 pp. 35 – 63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER ONE
OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Letter sent by a Principal of an American High School to his staff

Dear Teachers,

I am a survivor of a concentration camp. My eyes saw what no man should witness. Gas chambers built by learned engineers; children poisoned by educated physicians; infants killed by trained nurses; women and babies shot and burned by high school and colleges graduates. So I am suspicious of Education. My request is: help young people to become human. Your efforts must never produce learned monsters, skilled psychopaths, educated Eichmanns.

Reading, writing and arithmetic and all that schools seek to do, are important only if they serve to make children more human (Osman & Leibowitz, 2003, p. 12).

1.1 Introduction

The letter that leads in to this chapter clearly states the significance of educating for values that make students more human. The education that is preferred now in small island Melanesian states requires the preparation of students to face the current ever-changing social, political, environmental, cultural, spiritual and economic challenges. It is an important call for education to provide education on values that makes students more human and for students to value self, others, the environment, and the state. The education process in Solomon Islands (SI) has been producing children who can read, write, and pass exams (Lingam, Burnett, Lilo, & Lingam, 2013). This has missed the point of what it means to be educated and has shifted the focus from what the world needs to solve: discrimination, hatred, violence, and war (Glasgow, 2014). Education has to be a pathway for peaceful co-existence, unity, prosperity, good life, and continuity of survival (Lingam, 2011). It is not enough for education to produce individuals who can read, write, and count and then to expect society to be peaceful and stable (Thaman, 2009). Education has to cultivate values that brings people together in unity, love, sharing, and caring for one another. It must be transformative to bring shared values to life (Banks, 2004) and it must also be able to cultivate an active care for all that are within a nation-state (Wood, 2012).

The study explores the values of citizenship that are contextually relevant to Solomon Islands (SI). The intention is to examine the values that constitute good citizenship and the role of education in fulfilling the expectation. It explores common values in the citizenship education
programmes adopted globally, together with those from the Pacific Islands Country (PIC) region, and their relevance to people’s way of life, particularly in SI. The values found from the perspective of respondents may form the bases for a citizenship education (CE) framework and curriculum development for SI’s secondary schools and the nation at large.

1.1.1 Background
Apparently, recent studies and current education documents have postulated that SI society has features that conflict with the expected outcomes of education (Solomon Islands National Education Strategic, (SINES) Framework, 2007). For example, education does not take into account the expectation and desire of people to co-exist in peace and harmony with one another and live in harmony with their environment (Maebuta, 2010; National Curriculum Statement, 2011). SI needs an educational context that provides opportunities for students to think about and develop solutions to the issues that affect them locally, nationally, and globally in order to produce virtuous citizenries for an enriching, dynamic, and stable society (Glasgow, 2014).

CE is believed to be the subject that is missing in the education system of SI. Research on CE in the SI has concluded that education efforts can only be successful if students develop a personal commitment to values and behaviours that are addressed in the classroom (Mellor & Prior, 2004). These researchers pointed out that CE values, knowledge, and skills are considered important for most Melanesian developing and newly formed states such as the SI (ibid.) because values that develop a democratic citizen has not specifically been introduced at the formal school level. However, what and whose values are to be adopted in CE programmes of Melanesian countries – in particular, SI – is a question that triggered the interest of this study. Consequently, rather than dwelling specifically on values of citizenship of Western democratic societies, this study also examines values that are important to and reflective of the SI context.

CE is a new subject in SI; therefore, the intention of the study is to capture values that are contextual and significant for teaching and learning in the formal secondary education system of SI. The findings of this study may provide evidence for guiding the content, objectives, goals, and principles on values that may improve the current social, cultural, and political challenges that emerged so insistently in SI during the ethnic crises and the aftermath of the events. Further, under the guiding objective of this expected framework, pedagogies that are effective in transmitting the CE values will be identified and posed as a set of recommendations. Such
pedagogies would provide an avenue for selecting teaching approaches and strategies that may enhance teaching of citizenship values in the formal school system. Further, the study provides new insights into relevant values and pedagogies for CE for small island Melanesian states, in particular, adds new knowledge to the existing body of knowledge on CE in SI.

1.2 The rationale and contextual background to the research
Melanesian countries have been faced with many local, community, and national challenges, which require national innovative interventions (Aqorau, 2008; Koya, 2012; Mellor & Prior, 2004; Sanga, 2005). The unprecedented challenges of social, cultural, economic, political, civil, and community disparity issues have increasingly provided pressure for a review of education policies in the country (Sanga, & Walker, 2005). This is geared towards countering the call for far-reaching changes in how people in SI think and act for the peaceful co-existence and the dignity of all people and the safety of the environment. Education, which was postulated to help people to furnish more just, peaceful, respectful, caring, and inclusive societies and give people the values they need to resolve the challenges in their own communities, has not done so. According to SI experience, education has left people more disintegrated, separated, divided, and dysfunctional in terms of community and state affairs. This differs from the expected educational outcomes, which are conceptualised as the doorway to unity, prosperity, a good secure life, and the enjoyment of high living standards for all who go through the system.

The backdrop to this situation has always been a lack of policies to cater for citizenship and civic values that will counter the societal challenges. Obviously, CE has often been highlighted in the education documents of SI. For example, the ambitious key learning outcomes of the 2011 National Curriculum Statement are for all people to: become aware of their own culture; support the promotion of unity in diversity, and equity and inclusiveness in our community and societies; have positive moral and ethical values, with respect to others, based on personal integrity, leadership and social responsibility; focus on values education, both civic and citizenship education; have positive attitudes and values in their minds and hearts to create peace and reconciliation; and be able to live in harmony in multi-ethnic and diverse communities (Solomon Islands National Curriculum Statement, 2011). Those learning outcomes seem favourably convincing and noble – yet they are not reflected as goals and objectives in the curriculum documents and policy statements of the country.
A good example of the shortfall is the national education policy statement for Basic Education Primary to Junior Secondary (Class 1 to Form 3). The priorities identified in the statement are to: achieve a 100 per cent enrolment rate by 2015; reduce dropout rates and improve completion rates for children from year 1 to year 9; improve educational achievement for all students; improve the quality of teaching, instruction and learning; and ensure that all schools and education authorities adhere to the government policies for grants to schools and education authorities (SI Basic Education Policy, 2013). Such goals are also reflected in the Senior Secondary Education Policy and the Technical, Vocational Education and Training Policy (Solomon Islands Policy Statement and Guidelines for Senior Secondary Education, 2013). This throws into sharp relief the lack of alignment between the stated policy and the expected outcomes of education as they appear in the curriculum statement for 2011.

The approved policy does not mention objectives and goals that take into account the desire of people to live in harmony and celebrate peaceful co-existence with one another. This illustrates the need to rethink the values that are appropriate to the SI context. Now perhaps more than ever before the need is great for education in SI to capture new values and behaviour that take centre stage in the lives of youths (Aqorau, 2008; Sanga, & Walker, 2005). Young people become more disintegrated and violent towards each other and the state if they are not taught suitable values Aqorau, (2008), and was evidenced in such events as the ethnic tension between Guadalcanal and Malaita from 1998 to 2001, which resulted in loss of lives and property, innocent people dying without explanation, families being displaced, tension and ill feeling continuing to exist in the lives of those who are badly affected, and lawlessness coming down to its lowest point in the history of SI (Walker & Sanga, 2005). The tension has separated people to such an extent that they are still suspicious of each other and the trust and unity expected to follow from adoption of modern laws have failed to materialize. “There are serious undercurrents simmering and feelings of mistrust that still exist among the former warring parties. If those undercurrents are not addressed they could easily reignite another the tension” (Aqorau, 2008, p. 257).

The undercurrents produced the “Black Tuesday” event (Solomon Islands Broadcasting Cooperation (Solomon Islands Broadcasting Cooperation, April 19th 2006), in which there was mass destruction of properties such as burning down of business houses and government
properties in Honiara (Kabutaulaka, 2008). In other smaller-scale events, Honiara experienced the burning down of a sports administration centre at Lawson Tama Stadium because of decisions by a referee in the field, leading to a mass break-in and looting of shops in 2009; the burning and destruction of the Police Post building in one area of Honiara city in 2013 (Solomon Star, August, 2013); and more youth violence at social events, some of which resulted in fierce confrontation between police and youths in Honiara. In January 2014 youths stoned police officers providing security for a social event (Solomon Star, January, 9, 2014); many police officers were injured and hospitalised. Even more recently, properties in Honiara were burned when distribution of funds from Members of Parliament were seen to be not fair (Solomon Islands Broadcasting Cooperation, October 22nd 2014).

Such events reflect a breakdown of structures and systems because of a poor relationship between people and the state (Sanga & Walker, 2005), and the decline of active participation in institutions and the erosion of values and disposition from the society (Mellor & Prior, 2004). The decline in morality has created a vacuum in the social, political, and legal contexts within SI. It sets a precedent for new and often vastly different, even undesirable, values to creep in from every corner of society. The important call now for people of SI is to cultivate values of citizenship that foster positive ideals while targeting negative social behaviours and the democratic deficits found commonly among people and society (Kerr, 2006; Mellor & Prior, 2004). This indicates that there is a gap that the education system needs to attend to, hence the intended purpose of this study is to find answers and ‘fillers’ to the gaps.

Further, citizenship values provide the focus of this study and the national policy and education documents are expected to provide direction for which values for good citizenship can be promoted in the CE programmes. For education in the school curriculum of small Island developing states in the Pacific, much is yet to be explored in relation to citizenship (Koya, 2012). Research in this area has claimed that CE in the PIC was a global influence for the internalisation of education (Thaman 2004). PIC academics and researchers have mixed feelings and suspicions about values of education. Thaman (2004), for example, points out that PIC regional countries have currently experienced a push towards civic and human rights education under the banner of CE. This continuing push is largely, or in part, direct and indirect pressure from international development agencies pursuing their own agenda. The aim of such influence
is to ensure that “Pacific governments and people become good citizens by embracing the values of democracy, freedom, human rights and good governance” (Thaman, 2004, p.3). However, it may be argued that what is favoured by international agencies for PIC is irrelevant and incompatible with PIC peoples’ notions of good citizenship.

In PIC countries, the definition of a good citizen is different from that in Western liberal democratic countries, whose values, according to Thaman (2004) are irrelevant, uncontextual and incompatible to Pacific people. She claims that people do not really know the meaning of citizenship in a liberal democracy; therefore, the notion of CE is not straightforward:

The idea of the nation state, for example, so closely linked with citizenship, if one asks the question of ‘citizenship of what nation?’ is not yet fully understood among communities who were governed by foreigners who had different assumptions, values and beliefs. Fifty years ago, all of the people of Oceania (with the exception of Tonga) were under foreign rule, either that of Britain, France, the USA, Australia or New Zealand. Most gained their political independence in the 1970s and 80s, so the idea of an independent nation not to mention a feeling of belonging to one nation, with all that that implies, is a relatively recent phenomenon. (2004, p. 2).

The arguments posed highlight a contradictory view of a good citizen for PIC – including Solomon Islands – from a Western conceptualisation. This study is framed within this premise, with particular interest in the values that develop students to become good citizens; that is, the values that reflect the identity of people within the state and local communities.

Another call to promote citizenship values in SI comes from Sam Alasia (2003) who has criticised the Government for not installing programmes that work to construct national consciousness, common identity, and unity (Solomon Star, 2013). He claims that the:

Lack of national consciousness; identity and unity is something that Solomon islands is still struggling with today, even after 35 years of independence. Thus, a major priority for the nation at this point of time is a national dialogue or conversation on ways and actions to construct and build up this national consciousness, identity and unity (Alasia, 2013).

He adds that changing the political and governing system will not work for SI; rather, there needs to be a permanent division created in either the Ministry of National Unity or Home Affairs that deals specially with such questions as constructing a national consciousness, national unity and identity and including those values in the school curriculum of SI (ibid., 2013).
In view of these opinions, it is vital to consider seriously what good citizenship is for Melanesians countries – in particular SI – if CE is to be factored into their national education systems. In addition, the framing of what good citizenship means must be reflected from what people conceptualise as worthwhile and meaningful for them in their respective contexts (Mellor & Prior, 2004). In other words, curriculum goals and values have to be culturally inclusive (Koya, 2010). Among all this, a question to consider is: for CE to be accommodative of values that are significant for the local people, no matter what the Western perspective of democratic rights, freedoms and democratic responsibilities may hold, which values does SI need and where will they come from? This is the question that must be answered from the point of view of this research. From what has been found from the research, SI does not have any policy recognizing the teaching of democratic values in a way that reflects the modern democratic laws or the constitution; and fails to institutionalise cultural and Christian values through a policy that demands government priority in order that they become government activities. The mentioned values have to be recognised and adopted in the formal system in order to solve the challenges indicated earlier.

1.3 Statement of the problem
What has been experienced in SI raises a lot of questions. Commonly asked ones include: Does the education system meet its broad goals in developing good and better citizens? Are subjects taught in schools providing adequate knowledge that instils suitable values so that people can build positive relationships with one another irrespective of differences in culture, language, and ethnicity? Does the education focus on the challenge of giving birth to a nation created by colonial powers and conceived but never born, as former political leaders of SI have claimed?

On the basis of personal observation and knowledge of the current situation in SI, it appears that there is a decline in the practice of values required for good citizenship. With insights from research literature and based on the perceptions of education stakeholders from this study, key suggestions, propositions, and recommendations are offered for enhancing the design of a contextualised CE and curriculum for SI by Solomon Islanders.

1.4 Purpose of the study
The purpose of the study is to explore from the perspective of education stakeholders values that are expected to inform the CE curriculum for SI schools. First, the study explores the extent to
which the existing SI Junior Secondary School curriculum is offering CE. Secondly, the study seeks insights based on the perspectives of education stakeholders regarding the introduction of CE concepts into the Junior Secondary School curriculum. Thirdly, the study offers a policy framework on civic and CE for SI and provides key learning outcomes on CE that are appropriate for school programmes and for the SI context, challenges, and changing future. Fourthly, this study offers a CE framework and model that is relevant and contextual to the culture, religion, and contemporary SI institutions. When utilised, the framework may contribute to uniting people towards one common identity so that it gives birth to a nation that has been conceived but has never been born.

1.5 Aim of the study
The aim of the study is to explore the perceptions of key education stakeholders about the current CE curriculum in SI, especially the values it promotes in developing good citizenship - key conceptual knowledge, values, skills, attitudes, and action of good citizenship that are relevant to the SI context; indigenous knowledge and traditional forms of good citizenship in SI; the curriculum of SI schools in promoting values for good citizenship and examine the extent to which values for good citizenship are practised in SI society. The study further Investigate education policies for future curriculum development work relating to CE - social welfare policies, participatory policies, voluntary policies, and civic policies that provide the essence of rights and freedom, responsibilities and duties, and social cohesion that are relevant to all citizens of SI.

1.6 Research questions
In light of the study aim, two key research questions followed by sub questions are posed to guide the study. Each key question is further broken down to obtain the answers to the key questions framed.

1. What do Solomon Islanders conceptualise as good citizenship?
   i. What, according to Solomon Islanders, are the knowledge and values of a good citizen?
   ii. How do Solomon Islanders acquire those values of good citizenship?
2. To what extent is the current Junior Secondary School curriculum on CE culturally and religiously inclusive of the SI context in terms of good citizenship?
   i. How does the national Junior Secondary School curriculum teach the knowledge and values of good citizenship?
   iii. To what extent does the curriculum help to develop students’ behaviour to be more responsible for each other among the general diversity?
   iv. What curricular activities are there that develop the knowledge, values, skills, and actions for good citizenship?

1.7 Theoretical orientation
The present study takes note that CE is explicated more on the values of relationships people have with the state, neighbours, and the environment. Such relationship is grounded on the identity of individuals with the state for legal identification and the status of being citizens (Banks 2008; Engle & Ochoa, 1988). The status of citizen comprises sets of democratic rights, responsibilities and identities that link citizens to the nation state (Banks, 2008). This includes national identity, which relates to forming a nation state including the legal and political status of relationship within a context of the rights and freedoms of individuals and moral virtues, sense of belonging and rendered duties (Gilbert, 2005; Kiwan, 2005). Research in this area has highlighted core values of citizenship as including justice, equality, participation, truth, patriotism, freedom, diversity and human rights, popular sovereignty, majority rule, honest and open elections, economic opportunity, and limited constitutional government as expected outcomes to achieve democratic citizenship (Bahmueller & Patrick, 1999; Hoge, 2002). Similarly, “common human values” (Toronto, Ministry of Education, 1983, cited in Thaman, 2009, p. 15) that can be reflected in any curriculum irrespective of locality are: compassion, cooperation, courage, courtesy, freedom, generosity, honesty, justice, loyalty, moderation, patience, peace, respect for environment, respect for life, responsibility, self-discipline, sensitivity, and tolerance. However, how common is common? (ibid.) is another question that triggered further exploration.

Thaman, (2009) provides a perspective that the relevance and meaning of values depend on the cultural context in which they are manifested. Based on the SI context, Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo, (2014) conceptualise education for a good society for the Kwara’ae people as
Fa’a’manata’anga “which literally means shaping the mind … an equivalent to formal schooling … for teaching children about gardening, house-building and other skills; cultural values and behaviours and kin relationship and marriages (p. 176). Similarly, Sanga, (2014) conceptualises education for good citizenship for the Gula’alā people as Fananauliā which refers to “moral teaching, learning and shaping” (p.5) of children on values that sustain family and bring peace and respect in the homes and communities. Such contextual teaching does not exist in the current formal learning system. In SI, the values in the curriculum still reflect the curriculum of the colonial masters. As claimed, “even in post-colonial periods, the school curriculum in PI countries persisted with an academic-orientation and was generally based “on Eurocentric model” (Lingam, Burnett, Lilo, & Lingam, 2013, pp. 3-4).

The curriculum of SI also lacks the values of CE in the formal secondary curriculum system. Consequently, there is a need now for education to consider the values of citizenship for SI (Alasia, 2013; Mellor & Prior, 2004). However, research on CE has found the concept to be broad and complex (Crick, 1998; Deminelli & Mitha, 2014; Hughes & Sears, 2006) because it not only refers to values, but also includes knowledge, skills, and character in subjects like, citizenship, civics, social sciences, social studies, world studies, society, study of society, life skills, moral and character education (Kerr, 2012; Mellor & Prior, 2004). It also covers curriculum subjects like “history, geography, economics, law, politics, environmental studies, values education, religious studies, language, and science” (Kerr, 2012, p. 7) and the process, approaches, strategies, and pedagogies for teaching CE is added to the list (ibid.). The complexity has added challenges to establishing a definition, therefore, CE is open to varying interpretations based on the social, political, and historical context within which it is applied (Kennedy, 2008; Kennedy, Hahn, & Lee, 2007; Kerr, 2006; Nelson & Kerr, 2006). However, among the complexity, the study focuses only on values that are relevant and contextual to SI in terms of nation-building through CE.

The goal of CE is to create a good citizen who relates well to the state, other people, and the environment. Emerging research has found that the priority agenda of CE is to educate people to be good citizens of the country (Heater, 1999; Kelly 1989; Wesley, 1978). Being a good citizen does not necessarily reflect being actively involved in political and government activities only, but also acquiring values “constitut[ing] the standard or criteria against which individual
behaviour and group behaviour are judged, beliefs represent commitments to those values” (Zarrillo, 2004 p.29). Being a good citizen relates to rights, responsibilities, duties, and dispositions that are sometimes characterised as honesty, respect, and goodness and as having right knowledge, proper behaviours, and respect for authority (Wesley 1978). A good citizen is someone who carries out all their duties and responsibilities, a good member of the nation state, a citizen who obeys the law, pays taxes and attends school; good citizens are willing to defend their country (Wesley, 1978). A good citizen, furthermore, is the end product of the practice of CE for an ideal state.

1.7.1 Theoretical standpoint
CE consists of all the attributes that forms nation and state building. CE is, thus, multifaceted, relating to a range of domains and subjects including sociology, psychology, politics, government, history, religion, and culture and can be defined as everything for any country (Oswan & Leibewitz, 2003). Since CE is not committed to one thing, this study holds that it cannot be viewed through a single lens or from a single standpoint. This assumption is significant for this study in order to avoid approaching the reality in the study with a blank mind; “Reality is filtered through a conceptual lens” (Seidman, 2013, p. 59). As a consequence, this study makes sense of the world pertaining to values of citizenship education that are relevant to the SI context from three standpoints, drawing from socio-cultural theory, critical theory, and post-colonial theory.

The lens of socio-cultural theory is used to explore values for good citizenship in the context of schooling and society. The reason for viewing through the socio-cultural lens is to place the study in a social situation, not independent from the learning context (Bhashir-Ali, 2011). The importance here is to align the study with people – family, community – and behaviour – power, freedom, discrimination, and oppression, which are the fundamentals of CE. Socio-cultural theory is “about everything to do with the world – how we see it, understand it and explain it, as well as how we act in it and thus, what it becomes” (Wallace, & Wolf, 2005, p. 3). Importantly, socio-cultural theory provides insights into behaviours and working of societies (ibid.). Critical theory examines the changes in society, which occur from the political ideologies in nation-states that have caused inequality among people and the struggles against such inequality. This standpoint aims to reveal the sites of conflict and the prospects for social transformation (Seidman, 2013). For example, the ideals of democracy based on rights, responsibility, liberty,
equality, and justice are invoked to gain a good, active, and stable society. In achieving that, democracy requires people to give up some of their rights so that the state can control and then distribute fairly among people. It is an optimistic theory that needs to be considered critically. For Seidman (2013), the critical theorists’ aim is to “[c]larify the socially constructed character of society, to reveal the existence of the ruling social groups whose social world views justify an unequal and unfair social arrangement and to identify social agents who have an interest in bringing about social changes” (p. 122). This is the lens through which the study expects to make sense of the decline of stability in a democratic society, namely Solomon Islands.

Moving beyond this, the study uses the post-colonial lens to consider the influences of colonialism on the cultural structures and systems, and underscores the point that colonialism not only involves establishing markets, military, and puppet governments on non-sovereign territories but dominates the psychology and social lives of the colonised. The study considers the notion that what constitutes a nation and what role territorial space plays in the articulation of the notion of national sovereignty are central (Torre, 1998). Such influential understandings have contributed to what SI has become today: the political, legal, social, and civil structures are legacies of the colonial past. This is significant for this research as it interrogates the values relevant to people in their space that are significant for learning.

1.7.2 Educational theoretical framing
Another frame for the study is the claim that the education systems of PIC and their national curricula do not reflect the kind of person that the society desires (Lingam, et al. 2013; Koya, 2012; Thaman, 2009; Manu, 2009; Sanga, 2009; Nabobo-Baba, 2006; Taufe’ulungaki, 2002). From her research on PIC education, Thaman (2009) states that curriculum are found to be “largely Eurocentric in focus, donor consultant driven, culturally undemocratic with little consideration of students and teachers, socio-cultural context, gender … and nil stake holder participation in the development” (p. 14). In terms of values that are institutionalised in the PIC education systems and the curriculums, she finds them to reflect the core values of previous colonial masters and not the values of the people who inhabit the islands who have sent their children to school. This situation clearly raises questions an issues about the way forward for PIC and values that reflect the Pacific ways are needed in PIC curriculum.
1.8 Significance of the study

Since this study is a pioneering investigation into an important area of education – namely, citizenship education in a small island developing state in the Pacific – the research outcomes have the potential to be used by education authorities to inform development of new policies for CE in SI, and in other PIC countries that have experienced social disharmony and racial and ethnic discrimination in their contemporary history.

The findings of the study may contribute towards meeting the need for reconceptualisation and redesign of the CE curriculum in SI. The study could contribute to the development of a contextual and relevant education for good citizenship by proposing a model and framework to facilitate the development and achievement of the national curriculum statement by including indigenous and traditional, Christian, and modern democratic values necessary for good citizenship in SI. The findings also could inform curriculum development and teaching and learning development in SI on CE values: in particular, the SI Ministry of Education’s Curriculum Statement (2011) regarding ethics and good citizenship – one of the key learning outcomes for the whole curriculum – could be further refined and strengthened.

Finally, the study has the potential to contribute new knowledge about CE in general. The findings of the study may foster community awareness and engagement on the subject of CE. As different societal stakeholders have participated in the study and as the findings are reported, it may act as a catalyst to training institutions, communities, and even civil society and its organisations to develop their own competencies according to the values they prefer for their respective organisations.

1.9 Overview of Methodology

The study uses mixed methods and analyses the findings and information using triangulations from participants’ responses based on the values that make a good citizen and the pedagogies that facilitate the values in the formal school system. In gathering data and information, the study uses qualitative interviews based on focus group discussions and one-on-one interviews. The researcher himself recorded and transcribed all the interviews and analysed the information using the thematic qualitative approach (Weirsma & Jurs, 2009). The survey questionnaire was then distributed to support the qualitative findings. The questionnaires were answered using the three Likert scales and participants were able to place a tick only for their choice of answer (Bouma &
Ling, 2005). The qualitative and quantitative findings were acquired from participants in each of the six case studies. The data from their answers to the questions enabled the identification of values and pedagogies relevant and contextual to SI. The values discovered were by this means expected to inform the study through ascertaining a new framework on citizenship education for SI. Methodology orientation is discussed in detail in chapter four of this study.

1.10 Organisation of the thesis

Chapter 1: Introduction. This chapter introduces the study, outlining the rationale for conducting it. Included are an overview of some of the challenges and dilemmas SI has faced as a country, an overview of the study, an outline of a national vision of education and the expected outcomes of learning. The chapter extends to cover theoretical standpoints, the educational framing, contextual background to the research, the rationale for CE and the purpose of the study. It concludes with a presentation of the questions that guide the study and discusses the significance of the research.

Chapter 2: Context of study. In discussing the context of the study, this chapter begins with the importance of context, continuing with the geographical layout and historical events of SI, with support from the literature. The country’s location in the Pacific, its people, political structures, and governance system, the current social environment, economic status, and education systems, and the status of learning and teaching in schools are all sketched.

Chapter 3: Literature Review. This chapter reviews relevant bodies of literature to guide the study. It introduces the three themes that are covered in the literature including, conceptualization, citizenship values, and pedagogies. The citizenship conceptualization includes citizens, citizenship, and citizenship education; the citizenship values section covers domains, models, and paradigms used in the literature. It further reviews literature on CE and curriculum pedagogies and the conceptualization of CE by other significant theorists. This includes a range of ideas on citizenship education, civic education, theories, CE curriculum models, CE school pedagogies, and approaches used as contents of CE in other countries, as debated in the literature.
Chapter 4: Methodology. This chapter covers the philosophical and theoretical orientation of the research, methodological approach, and the methods employed to collect the data for the research. The research design is mixed method and includes interviews, document analysis, and content analysis (qualitative) and a survey questionnaire (quantitative). The chapter also includes sampling of case studies and how traditional focus groups were undertaken with teachers, students, and village elders. Further, it describes how the data were analysed, and it briefly discusses ethical considerations when working with case studies.

Chapter 5: Research Findings. This chapter presents the general findings of the study. First it presents the description of the four case study schools, followed by the outline of values from the data gathered from interviews, national documents, and media outlets in SI. Next, it presents findings from qualitative interviews generated from eight questions: conceptualisation of citizenship, conceptualisation of good citizenship, values reflected in the curriculum, its effective and adequate usage, values relevant for SI, the pedagogies used to teach the values, relevant methods and strategies and recommended approaches. Further, tables and figures describing findings generated from survey questionnaires are presented.

Chapter 6: Discussion of the Findings. This chapter discusses the findings in detail under themes that derive from the analysis of the data from the study. The themes include: conceptualisation of citizenship pertaining to birthright, status, identity, and active participation. This is followed by successful and adequate covering of citizenship values in the secondary school curriculum. The next theme covers obstacles in teaching citizenship values at the formal school level. This includes internal and external examinations, expected outcomes from stakeholders, teacher training, teacher attitude, the education system and the curriculum, teaching approaches, methods, and strategies, overcrowding, finance, and timing. The other themes in the chapter include good citizenship, values, character and virtues, modern institutional values, cultural values, and Christian values. Finally the chapter presents discussions on pedagogies, including approaches and strategies.

Chapter 7: Implications, Recommendations, and Conclusion. This chapter provides an overview of the whole thesis process. It presents a summary of the findings of the study, followed by a presentation of implications of the study, then suggestions for further research and
recommendations based on the study. Next, it presents the new CE framework and model for SI, “The Wantok-Centric trinity CE Framework and the wantok trinity model of citizenship education in SI. A summary of highlights that reflect the dissertation concludes the chapter.

1.11 Summary
As an overview of the whole study, this chapter includes the general perspective of the study and the reason for conducting such an investigation of CE in Solomon Islands. It provides arguments pertaining to gaps found from the social environment of the context and aligns it with education so that it generates a question and gap for the study. In addition, it presents the conceptual and theoretical bases for the study to guide the arguments and the questions used to gather data. It supplies the background, aims, and purpose of the study, a statement of the problem, significance, personal motivation, and a brief outline of the following chapters that report on the conduct and findings of the study.
CHAPTER TWO
THE STUDY CONTEXT: SOLOMON ISLANDS

2.1 Introduction
Following on from the overview of the study in the previous chapter, this chapter provides a summative overview of Solomon Islands and how it has developed as a nation. The focus is on the early establishment and creation of structures and systems that eventually became formalised into a legitimate institution, today’s sovereign state of Solomon Islands (SI). Coverage includes the historical, geographical, demographic, political, educational, social, and economic background of SI and its actual composition as a nation-state. Such historical overview and contextualisations are necessary, to establish the background context to the study of citizenship education (CE) in this research.

The chapter is structured as follows: Section 2.2 discusses the theoretical conceptualisation of the importance of the context in which the study is undertaken; Section 2.3 covers the geographical location; section 2.4, the early settlers; section 2.5, the colonisation of Solomon Islands; section 2.6, information about the people; section 2.7, the land tenure system; section 2.8, the cultures’ of people; section 2.9, politics and government; section 2.10, the education system and structures; section 2.11, economic development; section 2.12, religion and Christian mission; and section 2.13, the conflict in Solomon Islands. A brief summary in section 2.14 concludes the chapter.

2.2 Why context matters
Crossley (2010) claims that context matters in any development process. For instance, any development on the political economy of education research and education development needs to consider the influence of social factors and issues in the context. In this claim, the context of small island states remains an important aspect within each form of development as it contributes differently in varying ways and reasons to education and other development. This assertion maintains that context “penetrates to the heart of comparative education” (Crossley, 2010 p. 425). The claim on context here illustrates the importance of this study’s theoretical framework, which holds that education should be “context specific”, therefore, values in teaching and learning should embrace values from the local cultures (Thaman, 2009).
The literature shows that, over time, contextual issues have been central to many of the most prominent controversies and debates (Crossley, 2010). For instance, as early as 1900 Michael Sadler wrote, “In studying foreign systems of education we should not forget that the things outside the schools matter even more than the things inside the schools” (quoted in Crossley, 2010, p. 422). The literature suggests that the consequences of context insensitivity are that many costly, internationally-driven educational initiatives and reforms in low-income countries fail primarily because of their insensitivity towards the context. Kings (2007, cited in Crossley, 2010) observed that contextual and cultural factors are given insufficient attention in the policy development processes in the developing world. Such insensitivity towards context has become a catalyst to the problems commonly found in the implementation of projects in small island states. Crossley (2010) for example, claims that international organisations like The World Bank – the principle provider of foreign aid – have been insensitive towards the context in many projects funded in small island states. Certainly, this claim resonates with SI experiences of depending on foreign aid for development in the education sector, where many education projects have lacked sustainability because context has not been considered before the implementation phase. Similarly, Kerr (2006) argues that for any curriculum aim, it is important to consider the context first, especially when subjects or themes like CE are to be considered for inclusion. The reason is that citizenship is a complex, contested concept that is interpreted, defined, and therefore approached, in many different ways (Kerr, 2006).

For any CE programme to be successful, it has to take into account the unique historical, cultural, and social traditions of the context (Ichilov, 1998; Kennedy, 1997; Purta et al., 1999). This indicates that approaches and programmes in CE cannot be readily transported from one country to another. Therefore, a country cannot simply adopt a CE programme that is used by another and expect that it will work: “careful adaptation rather than wholesale adoption should be the watchword” (Kerr, 2006, p. 7). In small island states like SI where every sector is relatively small compared to Western countries, any wholesale adoption is likely to be problematic, particularly when it is not only a new, small, democratic state but was originally diverse – socially, linguistically, culturally, and religiously.

### 2.2.1 Contextual dilemmas

In the recent past, SI has experienced significant social inequality, corruption, crises in the legislative and bureaucratic system, and a general lack of respect for diversity (Sanga & Walker,
Such experiences have devastated the country and the state’s capacity to unite people from different ethnic groups remains a huge challenge. This occurs because people usually identify themselves according to ethnic and cultural affiliations (Mellor & Prior, 2004). In instances of great diversity, the contesting identities certainly would challenge the meaning of unity and as a result create weak national identity. This often results in disunity and a lack of respect by citizens for one another and their social environment (Mellor & Prior, 2004).

The SI has experienced such a situation that led to what was termed the “ethnic tension” – a crisis during 1998–2003 that nearly destroyed the country, killed at least 200 persons, and adversely affected many thousands more (Solomon Islands Peace & Reconciliation (SIPR) Report, 2013). The unpleasant event devastated national unity and traumatised the general population (Sanga & Walker, 2005). Other events, mentioned in Chapter One, were the destroying of public properties and the burning down of business houses of foreigners (Kabutaulaka, 2008). These events appear to be a direct result of the lack of confidence in one another and distrust of leadership that ordinary citizens held for their leaders (Sanga & Walker, 2005). Such challenges have triggered a number of reviews of the structures and systems of the nation. One sector that was targeted to solve the challenges was the education system, which has gone through several reviews since 2006 as a result of criticism and public debate in the media and national forums blaming it for the current social, legal, civil, environmental, and political challenges (Rodi, 2008).

As a result, the newly-initiated SI education goals in the strategic plan document covers what was believed to be the need including the following: “individuals to gain fundamental knowledge, skills, competencies, attitudes, values, beliefs, and symbolic systems to enable them to live with their family, their community, the wider SI society and the world beyond” (Education Strategic Framework, 2007, p.10). These goals are intended to counter the behavioural issues of disrespect to families, neighbours, public properties, leaders, and a general lack of respect for diversity, commonly found in SI (Sanga & Walker, 2005). In addition, there appears to be a progressive decline in important moral and societal values, particularly among young people who leave school and join the masses. This is very disturbing and concerning and of central importance to the development of SI (Fakaia, 2005). The belief that formal education is the engine for nation building is seriously challenged when one compares the behaviours and
attitudes of young people with the goals of education in the country, finding direct contradiction between the actions of people and the goals documented (Solomon Islands National Curriculum Statement, 2011). The question to ask, from the review of the curriculum, is: whose values will be included in the curriculum and will this take into account the issues concerning negative behaviours and attitudes?

Solomon Islanders in general regard education as a key determinant for the benefit of the family and the community in terms of formal employment and the doorway to various other opportunities (Pollard, 2005). In addition, it is expected to develop people to become good citizens of the country. This expectation, however, is merely wishful as the education currently has no substance to fulfil the goals. The curriculum adopted in the country is purely academic, what Lingam (2011) describes as, “for workforce preparation … for economic development at the expense of good citizenship development” (p. 214). In such a system, it is difficult to move towards closing the gap between academic content (which is education for the transmission of specific supposedly ‘relevant knowledge) and education for the development of suitable personal values and in turn developing good citizenship. Unfortunately, this challenge is glaringly apparent in SI, where the school curriculum appears to have failed to prepare students adequately to become good citizens within the complex and dynamic national social environment.

Relationship is a fundamental aspect in CE. In SI, relationship among people is a huge challenge for the state to address. According to Sanga and Walker (2005), SI has been affected by division of all parts such as family, clan, tribe, ethnicity, and communities. For instance, in many villages, disputes and conflicts over land or sea rights often occur within clans, resulting in constrained relationships among blood relatives and family members, disputes, or claims from compensation and bride price resulting in disruptive relationship among villages (ibid.).

At the school level, teachers appear to promote divisions by organising students according to their ethnic or language groups. Such a practice affects not only secondary school students but also tertiary students. This practice has affected the social environment in many ways. People tend to relate well only with their own ethnic group members, seeing others as different. Negative effects have concluded in ethnic intimidation, hatred, and marginalising of certain ethnic groups. The schools, according to Porath (2012), which were assumed to be the best
vehicle available to unite the diverse citizenry under common ideas and goals to help forge a common national identity, have failed to do so. Ethnic division has deepened in SI society and created discrimination among people and institutions. An example was an incident where students who had been accepted to have their secondary education in schools in provinces other than their own were prevented from entering the schools and forced to return to their home provinces (Solomon Star, February, 2006). In another incident, a school experienced immediate closure because of conflict occurring between different ethnic groups. School property was destroyed as the tension escalated. It was the police who helped calm the situation (Solomon Star, May, 2012).

Such incidents indicate that SI needs to re-think its school curriculum. A question that needs careful thought is: in the context of a society that is jeopardized by social challenges associated with social disharmony, what is the role of education, and specifically of CE? What are the values, knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviours, and actions needed to be seen from citizens as well as to be included in the CE programme? In order to answer these questions it is important to discuss how SI became a nation-state and the factors that influenced its formation.

2.3 Geographical location
Citizenship is all about nation-state and its citizenry: people occupying a certain territory that is legitimised through legal means and recognised as a sovereign state among other nations. In this perspective, people living in the nation state may not really understand the meaning of an independent nation state; however, the imaginary boundaries are already there in paper and have been recognised by other nation states who share the same boundary/s. The nation-state of Solomon Islands is a chain of islands located in the south west Pacific ocean, spreading over 1.6 million square kilometres of ocean territory (Figure 2.1).
2.4 Early settlers

History is one theme of citizenship education (Howe & Kowel, 2009). As asserted, “Internal conflicts are often a culmination of actions precipitated by a social environment structured in the past” (Solomon Islands Peace Reconciliation, 2012). According to Engle and Ochoa (1988) social studies is a critical study of the social science and history. Both subjects engage directly in the
intellectual process by which students become instruments in the learning process rather than the ends of education. The purpose of teaching history in school is for students to recognise and accept the forces that shape and develop their society and for them to appreciate where they are from, to identify themselves with their country, and to have pride in where they belong. This teaching of civic competence is called the ability to use knowledge about one’s community, nation and the world (Tupper, 2007). The history of SI is part of the social studies curriculum and has been taught at all levels of the secondary education system. The value that underpins the teaching of history of SI is for students to appreciate their existence as Solomon Islanders.

According to written history, linguistics ascertains that SI was settled by people of two distinct language groups. The first were Papuan speaking settlers who arrived on the chain of islands around 30,000BC. They were followed by Austronesian speakers who arrived at around 4,000BC (Rukia, 2008). These people were believed to have come from the South East Asia region (ibid.). The non-Austronesians (or Papuan speakers) mainly occupy the western and eastern parts of Solomon Islands (ibid.). The Austronesian (formerly known as Malayo-Polynesian) language speakers are now the more numerous group of the two and occupy the central parts. Papuan and Austronesian languages are believed to be spoken in every Melanesian country (ibid.). It seems likely to have been between 1,200 and 800BC that the ancestors of the Polynesians arrived from the Bismarck Archipelago (United Nation Department for Political Affairs, 1978).

The chain of islands was later “discovered” in 1568 by a Spanish expedition under the command of Alvero de Mendana. The Spaniards, fueled by their hopes and dreams of wealth, named them The Islands of Solomon after the rich Biblical King Solomon because of gold they found on some of the islands. From the period of Mendana’s discovery, a series of voyages occurring mainly by French navigators – Philip Carteret, Louis de Bougainville, Bruni d’Extrecasteaux, and others – added to European consciousness of the group. The islands that were mapped out by later explorers have included those that were found by Mendana’s expedition. In the period between 1820 and 1870 contact between the islanders and foreign traders and whalers increased (SIPR Report, 2012). Some of the critical analyses of the arrival of Europeans in the 16th century conclude that it was the beginning of external exploitation of local resources such as timber, marine products, and human capital (SIPR, 2012). The latter, exploitation of humans, includes
blackbirding activities (brutal forced recruitment of labourers for the sugar plantations of Queensland and Fiji) (ibid.) during the 1850s, and the proliferation of labour trade in the South Pacific. Blackbirding was exploitative and uncontrolled and in many respects, closely related to slave trading. It started in New Hebrides (Vanuatu) and extended to the SI in the 1870s. The recruitment of islanders for Queensland continued until 1904 while recruitment for Fiji ended in 1911. Nineteen thousand Solomon Islanders were recruited for Queensland and ten thousand for Fiji. Many of these people never returned (SIPR, 2012). That history becomes an integral part of the social study curriculum of SI.

2.5 Colonisation
The experiences of the labour trade prompted the United Kingdom to declare a protectorate over the chain of islands in 1893, and in 1896 the islands were officially named the British Solomon Islands Protectorate (BSIP) (United Nations Department of Political Affairs, 1978). At this time, only New Georgia in the western part of the islands and islands in the south were proclaimed a protectorate by Britain. The protectorate was extended in 1897 and 1898 to cover the Santa Cruz group (ibid.). Further developments on this formal protection included the Samoan Tripartite convention in 1899, in which Germany ceded to Great Britain the central Solomon Islands of Santa Isabel, Choiseul, the Shorthand Islands and the remote atoll of Ontong Java (ibid.). The inclusion of those islands formed the new nation-state named Solomon Islands and was the beginning of the formal establishment of the legitimacy of the nation-state.

2.5.1 Formal activities
SI as a new nation-state introduced activities to begin formal administration and other basic services of the newly colonised territory after the conceding of protectorate status. In this early period, due to the labour trade and the introduction of modern laws, the important focus of the newly-formed administration was security, therefore, a large portion of the budget was for Police administration, leaving very little for social services such as education and health. In those days, education and health were allocated for the missionaries or churches to take care of; from 1916 to 1929, there was no medical doctor in the territory (United Nations Department of Political Affairs, 1978). A small economic sector was established by the colonial government through British and Australian plantation companies to finance the state. The colonial government sustained the activities through the acquisition of large portions of land from the islands for plantations.
One alarming experience during that period was the decline of the population numbers. This was the result of blackbirding and labour trade activities in Melanesia. Cambridge anthropologist W. H. R. Rivers opined that the depopulation of Melanesia could be attributed to the unintelligent and discriminating action towards native institutions (1964, cited in SIPR, 2012). Furthermore, the colonisation process, which continued until the late 20th century, seemed to have an agenda to eradicate local culture through the establishment of the “British code of Laws and the exploitation of local physical resource” (Mellor & Prior, 2004, pp.177-178). This was realised, later by peoples of the Pacific who claimed that their rich cultures had been replaced by rules of law that divide people (Fugui, 1978).

This can be related to the events such as the murder of the District Officer, Mr W. R. Bell on Malaita in 1927. The colonial government, in its attempt to exercise its laws on people, had come to experience fierce confrontation. This is not because people did not like the new rules but because the laws were foreign to them. People perceived and delineated such rules as distractive to their culture. Following the murder, the colonial government mobilised its strong police force and went to Kwaio on Malaita and instigated a massacre as though they were trying to wipe Kwaio people out in revenge (Kabutaulaka, 2008). Events such as this speak of local people’s lack of understanding of the new governing system and the colonial government’s ignorance of the people. Even today, people do not actually understand the government and its system and that underlies many of the political, economic, social, and environmental challenges that are currently experienced in the country.

Another important political and governing feature in the state-building of SI was the establishment of the Native Administration Regulation. This regulation was enacted to provide for the establishment of the statutory sub-district council, which was introduced in 1947, and to prepare for larger councils that were to be introduced later (Kabutaulaka, 2008). However, because of the demands of the Maasina movement (nationalist movement), larger councils were established earlier than expected. The Malaita Council was established unexpectedly in 1953 because of the movement (ibid.). Other councils were later established for other districts, which gave Solomon Islanders greater participation in government (ibid.).
In the 1960s Solomon Islanders began to participate as local council leaders and as members of the legislative council (Kabutaulaka, 2008). The work of the legislative government was to try and establish a transition from the introduced legislative council to another appropriate system of government that may work for people of the Solomon Islands (ibid.). The conception in that period was that the system introduced by the colonisers was contradictory to people’s expectations and way of life. In 1968, the legislative council paper (British Solomon Islands Protectorate, 1968) reported that the “Westminster system has failed to meet the political needs of developing countries in the commonwealth and needed to be modified” (Kabutaulaka, 2008, p. 99). Therefore, as a response to the paper in 1968, the legislative council proceeded to appoint a select committee to look at the proposal for an alternative to the Westminster model (ibid.). This has led to the British Solomon Islands Order 1974, which introduced a system of government by committee, whereby a single council known as the governing council, replaced the legislative and executive councils. This example confirms arguments presented earlier in relation to CE, which hold that any one size does not fit all. The SI, which had only adopted systems from outside, is prone to instability and injustice as experienced now among people and society. The issue was that the system is foreign to people. Therefore, for any system to be accepted by people, it must consider context and cultures.

2.5.2 Second World War: the first experience of globalization
Globalisation is now becoming part of CE. Moreover, CE is called for in nation-states because of the transfer of people, capital and goods across foreign borders. In the mid-20th century SI experienced a significant flow of people, goods and capital into the country, due to the global event known as the Second World War. Gegeo (2001) describes how the war shattered old beliefs about cosmology: “that is, how the world works ... the outside world, previously far away and little known, suddenly was seen to be connected to them in a drastic way” (p.31). It was a significant historical event that exposed the little-known colonised nation. SI, which was still hidden from most of the outside world, was a focal point for the Second World War in the Pacific. In 1942 the Japanese invaded the islands, occupying the central Solomons. For the next three years, SI was a scene of bitter conflict between the Western Allies and Japan (Sanga, 1989). This event brought thousands of people from the outside world onto the shores of SI to fight each other.
The Second World War has brought several positive impacts to SI. First, as a nation, it was the event that for the first time brought people of the Solomons together to meet each other as one people. Second, it brought new and ready-built infrastructure so that after the war, the capital was moved from the first administration centre located on Gela in the central islands province to Honiara on Guadalcanal. Third, the event changed the mindset of people from isolation and fragmentation of communities to new social integration of people into the tenet of unity and urbanism. Fourth, the Second World War brought new nationalism movements, one of which sprang up on the island of Malaita. This is an indication that citizens had begun to realise their rights in the new nation-state and the importance of being a citizen in SI. According to Worsley, (1964, p.33, quoted in Paia, 1978) “Nationalism is often associated with a struggle against an alien, occupying power”. They are movements that establish, or seek to establish, “independent states on the basis of common citizenship of entirely novel political and cultural entities” (ibid., p. 33). This kind of nationalism in most third world countries is called “liberal nationalism” because of its upholding of liberal democratic principles (Paia, 1978). The aim of such movements is to free countries from the cultural, economic, and political bondage under which colonial powers through their more effective technologies and skills have placed them (ibid.).

In the Colonial period, people did not experience a united SI and did not feel themselves as citizens of the SI. This resulted in the emergence of a national political movement called Marching Rule in the Post Second World War period which became popularly strong from 1946 to 1952 (Kabutaulaka, 2008). The movement opposed any cooperation with European authorities or churches, because of the harsh experience people had had with the colonial government, who had the upper hand on people’s resources and culture. The movement called for mass “civil disobedience by all people to withhold of paying tax and to work for Europeans” (Paia, 1978, p. 5). This is the kind of movement that is common to SI, the type of nationalism that Tinker called “Fork nationalism”, a sense of local loyalties: “this is my own, my native land” (p. 5). A Malaita man still regards himself as Malaitan, Western Islanders regard themselves as Western Islanders. Regionalism is a common characteristic in most nation-states (ibid.).

The national movement spread to several islands and within a year the colonial government had allowed the people to establish a kind of government over virtually all the island of Malaita (Kabutaulaka, 2008), with local councils, tax collecting agencies, independent courts, and its
own policing (Paia, 1978). It was in the 1950s that the colonial government conceded the need for local autonomy. The movement succeeded in having a local council established for the whole Island of Malaita in 1952. By 1964 elected local councils covered the great majority of the islands. Regional assemblies were introduced in the 1970s (ibid.).

In 1960, a legislative council was created as the protectorate’s policymaking body. In 1974, a new constitution was adopted, establishing a parliamentary democracy and ministerial system of government. In mid-1975, the name Solomon Islands British Protectorate was officially replaced by the name Solomon Islands. On 2 January 1976, SI became self-governing and on 7 July 1978, gained its political independence (United Nations Department of Political Affairs, 1978). Comparing the establishment of the previous formal governing system in SI under colonialism with the currently adopted system since independence, it is obvious that SI adopted the Westminster system, the legacy of the colonial past, with little adaptation. Small wonder is that many writers have characterised the system as being foreign to SI and unlikely to solve the country’s needs (Kabutaulaka, 2008).

2.6 The people
People are the most important subjects in a nation state, especially in the way they conceptualise and are conceptualised in the citizenship discourse. People are the point of discussion in the CE frameworks. In this understanding, CE is all about the role of education in educating citizens to understand the structures and systems of the country, the values, knowledge, and skills to contain citizens, and the relationship people have with each other and the state (Kerr, 2006). The values are particularly focused on democratic rights and active participation of citizens in state affairs.

The majority of people of SI are Melanesians, who comprise 95% of the total population, 4% are Polynesian while the other 1% are migrants of various kinds. This indicates that 99% of the total population is indigenous and holds customary land ownership status over the majority of land. In such situations, people are born, raised, and have their being on land and resources that they own and identify with; hence, they know little about what national identity is as they have their own interpretation of identity, largely derived from spirituality, genealogy and land. This is quite unlike the situation in developed nations who now experience complexity from population size and mobility, and from influxes of migrants who bring new religions, languages, cultures,
and traditions. Migrants have also entered into SI through legal transfer on bi- and multilateral agreements and other conditions set under the Law of the country. In the 1960s, the Colonial government transferred Micronesians from Kiribati and gave them citizenship. Other migrants entered SI through other means. Currently, the number of migrants in SI is still very low. Thus, most of the people of the SI are indigenous and their right to citizenship is recognized through birth and land ownership (Gegeo, 2001).

2.7.1 Population
The total SI population is 515,870 people, of whom 264,455 are male and 251,415 female. Most of the people, 413,940, are living in rural areas while 102,030 live in the urban areas (table 2.1; all numbers are taken from Solomon Islands National Population Census, 2009).

Table 2.1: Population statistics by province, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Solomon Islands</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Choi</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Isa</th>
<th>Cent</th>
<th>Ren</th>
<th>Guad</th>
<th>Mal</th>
<th>Mak</th>
<th>Temo</th>
<th>Hon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>515,870</td>
<td>102,030</td>
<td>413,840</td>
<td>26,372</td>
<td>76,649</td>
<td>26,158</td>
<td>26,051</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>93,613</td>
<td>137,596</td>
<td>40,419</td>
<td>21,362</td>
<td>64,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>264,455</td>
<td>53,596</td>
<td>210,859</td>
<td>13,532</td>
<td>39,926</td>
<td>13,261</td>
<td>13,261</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>48,283</td>
<td>69,232</td>
<td>20,789</td>
<td>10,466</td>
<td>34,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>251,415</td>
<td>48,434</td>
<td>202,981</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>36,723</td>
<td>12,790</td>
<td>12,790</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>45,330</td>
<td>68,364</td>
<td>19,630</td>
<td>10,896</td>
<td>30,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The population density of Solomon Islands is 17 people per square kilometer and the annual average population growth rate is 2.3% (table 2.2). The total population of SI occupies a total land mass of 29,000 square kilometres, from one thousand islands that make up SI (Solomon Islands National Population Census Report, 2009).

Table 2.2: Population density and growth rate, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Solomon Islands</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Choi</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Isa</th>
<th>Cent</th>
<th>Ren</th>
<th>Guad</th>
<th>Mal</th>
<th>Mak</th>
<th>Temo</th>
<th>Hon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average annual population growth rate (%)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density (number of people /Km2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Population Census Report 2009
The population indicators show a relatively young population for the country with a median age of just under 19 for both males and females (SI National Population Census, 2009). The population is predominantly Melanesian (95%) but also includes Polynesians (4%) and others such as Chinese, Europeans, and I-Kiribati (1%). The population structure of SI is as follows: the number of children aged 15 years and below is 209,284; aged 15–24 years (the youth population) is 96,631; aged 25–59 years is 182,894; 60 years and older is 27,061.

2.6.2 Language
Language is another indicator of citizenship. Most scholars recognise that monolingual nation-states are not complex to manage (Kerr, 2006). However, in multilingual societies, communication is a hindrance to understanding each other; therefore, such diversity becomes a hindrance to nation-building. When people misunderstand each other, they fail to relate well because of that misunderstanding and they may fight each other. Relationship is fundamental to citizenship; hence, language is important to integrating people in terms of national identity and social cohesion (Banks, 2004). Isin and Wood (1999) report that scholars have used two general ways to define national membership. The first is the ethnic-cultural-linguistic model to establish what constitutes a “normal” citizen. In this model, say the authors, national membership is based on where one is born or on being assimilated into a particularly defined ethnic group or culture. The second is the perception of fluency in speaking a particular national language. These models derive from the anthropological literature that focuses on group membership and how culture is passed down from generation to generation. Thus, in this sense, citizenship is best understood as a form of belonging to or membership within a nation state. The only unifying factor is simply that people identify with the pjin languages. The word that translates the unification is “wantoks” which means people who speak the same language.

SI has around 90 spoken languages – including pjin– indicating the complexity and diversity of the nation-state (Solomon Islands National Population Census Report, 2009). Such diversity is what CE programmes wish to address. However, the basic means of communication is English, which is the official language. Despite its national usage and the formal emphasis on English literacy development, only 30% of the adult population is literate in the English language (ibid.). Pjin is a hybrid language with a vocabulary and syntax deriving from English and Melanesian languages and it is the national language used on informal occasions and for internal trade and daily use. The vernacular languages spoken are associated with people’s ethnicity and where
they belong. The language diversity is such that Solomon Islands may be labelled as a very small but very diverse nation (Rukia, 1989).

The vast majority (80%) of the Solomon Islands population lives in the rural areas and still adopts a subsistence livelihood, only 20% being urbanised (Table 2.1; Solomon Islands National Population Census Report, 2009). In other words, the majority of the population still relies on gardening, fishing, and hunting for survival. The 95 per cent who are Melanesians occupy the larger islands while the Polynesian people occupy smaller islands. Ninety-five per cent of people are Christians (United Nations Department of Political Affairs, 1978). People live in clusters of tribal rural villages and they hold the majority of land under a communal customary land arrangement. In such an environment where there are issues of diversity, what it means to be a citizen is bound to be complex (Mellor & Prior, 2004, p. 177).

2.6.3 The challenges of rapid population growth
SI has one of the highest population growth rates in the Pacific; hence, there are serious implications and consequences for society. In an environment where there is an increase in population without control, such issues need to be addressed through the development of government policies for Solomon Islanders to have smaller families. In today’s environment, where families are very dependent on money, “it is vital that policies as such are initiated … a big family means bigger budgets for school fees, food and other necessities” (Aqorau, 2008, p. 260). The effects of population growth can be seen in social enterprises around the country. It is most obvious in the areas of health and education.

According to Aqorau (2008) a fundamental indicator of prosperity in any given society is the healthy life styles and improved education systems. A society having a healthy environment should indicate that life is better and prosperity is around the corner. Significantly, the government and every Solomon Islander has a dream of having a clean and healthy environment. However, in the area of public health, visitors can easily notice the stench and filth of betel nut stains and the piles of rubbish outside residential and commercial buildings in Honiara. The rubbish can remain in the streets for weeks without being removed to proper dumping sites. People do not take responsibility for their actions and expect somebody – generally the government – to do it for them. “The SI capital provides a good illustration of the public health
problems arising from the population explosion. There is generally poor sanitation drainage, with the dusty and dirty general environment not conducive for living” (p. 258). There are city council ordinances and laws but they are not respected as those who should enforce the laws do not have the capacity to do so.

The provision of quality education is expected to improve people’s lives. People view education in SI as having a “rasping education standard” (Aqorau, 2008, p. 260). Such rasping education may not meet the expectation and goals of education to provide better opportunities for citizens. It is important for the Government to ensure that education standards are at a level that enables Solomon Islanders to export their skills rather than exploiting and exporting cheap raw materials that damage the environment (ibid.). Currently, the increase in numbers of children attending school is noticeable by the ratio of fifty children to one teacher in a single classroom. Because of this overcrowding in schools, teachers who are supposed to provide good quality teaching focus only on what they can do to complete the syllabus within the scheduled time. It is evident also that most schools in the country are under-resourced, creating an unconducive environment for teaching and learning. This has resulted in students being pushed out from school and finding themselves involved in criminal activities: “there is an increase in poverty, especially in Honiara and other urban provincial centres and poverty fuels other social problems, such as stealing, ravaging in garbage dumps and prostitution” (Aqorau, 2008, p. 258).

The National Population Census Report (2009) finds that Solomon Islands has fast-growing urban populations. The annual growth rate of the rural population is 1.8% while for the urban population it is 4.8% (Solomon Islands National Population Census Report, 2009). Some of the urban growth is due to rural youths who leave school early and migrate to urban centres in large numbers to seek employment. The majority find themselves unprepared for available jobs because they lack the necessary qualifications. Furthermore, because of the very small economic base of the country, which has only a very small private sector, numbers of jobs are limited and cannot cater for all youths who migrate to urban centres in search of employment. This rapid urban migration, then, is becoming a threat to SI national development.
2.7 The Land

Land is the most important source of life and living for Solomon Islanders. Solomon Islander writers have termed it a mother to the children (Burt & Kwa’ioloa, 1992). It provides and sustains people for survival. Under the *Constitution of Solomon Islands* 1978, cap. 11, sn 110, the right to hold or acquire land shall vest in any person who is a Solomon Islander (Paia, 1978, p. 63). This law was adopted from the Westminster system and needs to be considered seriously as it has consequences and repercussions that need attention. The argument is that the “Westminster system adopted in the Solomon islands has little institutional and emotional connection to people in local communities” (Kabutaulaka, 2008, p. 101).

Most importantly, land ownership in itself is a contested issue within many small Pacific Islands states, particularly the Melanesian countries where much of the land is owned by tribes. There are three types of land ownership in SI: Crown, Alienated, and Customary Land. Eighty-seven per cent (87%) of the total land mass is owned by indigenous tribes through the traditional customary land tenure system and accommodates the majority of the population (Larmour, 1979, cited in Alasia, 2008). Another 8 per cent of land is owned by the Government, and the remaining 2 per cent is privately owned (Solomon Islands National Population Census Report, 2009).

This tribal ownership and the customary land tenure system is worrying as the changes caused by globalisation and modernisation have begun to have great impact on people’s lives. This is the common trend in Melanesia and other Pacific small islands states (Paia, 1978). In SI, land is often the source of major conflict. Some of these conflicts have devastated the lives of the people and destroyed the nation as a whole. From 1998 to 1999, for example, armed conflict erupted between Malaita and Guadalcanal. The reason for that is that land and land ownership have not been reviewed to address modern societies. These conflicts have resulted in national bankruptcy, large numbers of displaced youths, collective demoralisation, and a dramatic decrease in social services (Sanga & Walker, 2005).

In regard to land that is not customary, the government makes provision for people who may wish to acquire land for perpetual title or fixed term to do so (Paia, 1978). However, the 8% of land owned by the government does not meet the demand for such land. Therefore, people resort
to tribal leaders for purchase of customary lands of which the legal custodians are the tribe. This is lawful under the constitution of the country, which also provides for acquisition of land from crown to customary, subject to negotiation with the owners of the land (Paia, 1978, p. 63). However, it is a very risky practice for collective land owners as only the few who negotiate the deal may benefit while the rest of the tribe, in most cases, come to know of the sale only when the recipients move in to settle.

2.8 Culture
SI is a very diverse nation state. The diversity is because cultures, traditions, and social organisations are not uniform (Foanoaota, 2008). The social systems are complex and self-contained (Saunders, Gartner, & Waterson, 2010). In light of such diversity, there is difference, in both Melanesian and Polynesian societies, in how people relate to one another and how they conduct their affairs. Some groups practise a patrilineal structure following the male lineage and others, matrilineal, following the female line, in recognition of leadership (Saunders, Gartner, & Waterson, 2010). However, groups have broad similarities as well; for instance, communities are small and scattered, even within one language group, and people are often set apart from each other (Foanoaota, 2008). This separateness is intended to ensure privacy as well as for security.

In the early traditional SI period, people were commonly divided between bush and coastal settlements (Foanoaota, 2008). There were differences between the two types of settlements and because of that people restricted themselves from interacting with people of different groups. Some of the distinctions between the two groups can be noticed from how they interact with people. The “bush people were often reserved while the coastal people were often open for different people” (ibid., 2008, p. 69). The fragmentation extended the diversity to an extent that people became suspicious of each other and so they failed to relate well with each other. People became freer to interact when the Government and missions brought people together in larger mixed communities. Foanoaota, (2008) research has shown that when people began to acknowledge some benefits in education, colonial government, and religion, things started to change. The arrangement of houses changed, mobility of people changed, gender separation in occupation of houses changed from the earlier pattern of males and females living in separate houses. Despite the amount of change, diversity and separation remain issues even today.
According to findings and from the researcher’s experience, the essence of social identity is still the relationship with one’s relatives and wantoks (one-talk) those who speak the same tribal language (Foanoaota, 2008). Despite the arrival of migrants in some areas, each district still consists of many different clan groups, which distinguish themselves by using their clan name or by using the name of their ancestor (ibid.). A “blood relationship is regarded as unbreakable ties” (p. 71). The responsibility to support the extended family is seen as integral to the culture, impacting on commercial and domestic life (Saunders, Gartner, & Waterson, 2010). Solomon Islanders are “never short of support and shelter to wantoks” (p. 99). Although this is appreciated by the government, people, and society, it is becoming a challenge to developing a nation-state such as SI. People only identify themselves along ethnic groups and have a very low sense of belonging to the nation-state. The Government of SI has supported this ethnic identity in effort to provide support to vulnerable people in the community (Saunders, Gartner, & Waterson, 2010); in other words it had used the traditional wantok social safety net comprising, “traditional support systems of the church and family and other mechanisms to promote personal and family responsibility for vulnerable sectors of the society” (p. 99).

2.9 Politics and Government

SI was one of the territories in the Pacific that was administered by the British as a protectorate under the leadership of the High Commission for the Western Pacific, until 1973 when it was proclaimed autonomous by the British Government (National Department of Political Affairs, 1978). From the proclamation a new constitution was enacted in 1974, making provision for the establishment of a Council of Ministers. The office of the chief minister was established in 1974 and this provided for a larger elected legislature and an executive with a majority of elected members (Kabutaulaka, 2008). The council was presided over by the Governor and composed of the Chief Minister, three ex-officio members, and four to six ministers appointed by the Governor (ibid.). In November 1975, the 1974 constitution was amended with effect on 2 January 1976 to confer self-government on SI (National Department of Political Affairs, 1978). In 1977, there was an agreement from a conference held in London for basic principles of a constitution for an independent SI and the territory became recognised as an independent sovereign nation-state within the Commonwealth on 7 July 1978 (ibid.). The independent SI was established under the Independence Order 1978, which was a piece of British legislation. Under the State and the Constitution of the Solomon Islands, cap., sn 1.1 states that SI shall be a
sovereign democratic State. The constitution as stated in cap. 1, sn 2 is the supreme law of SI. The SI adopted a Provincial Government system under the constitution and it shall be divided into provinces. “The parliament shall make provisions for the establishment and governing of the provinces” (Paia, 1978, p. 63). On that day, SI joined other nations who had been colonised and freed. According to the United Nations Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization, No. 12, June (1978, p. 13):

The government shall be based on democratic principles, upholding the principles of equality, social justice and equitable distribution of incomes, respect and enhance human dignity and strengthen and build on communal solidarity, cherish and promote the different cultural traditions within Solomon Islands and ensure the participation of people for national unity.

However, the freedom referred to as independence was in reality a legacy of the colonial past; basically, SI simply adopted the governing system that was used by Britain. The creation of SI as a sovereign nation state was legitimated by the predetermined constitution of the country by the former ruler. Saemala (1983) claimed that a home bred government system would be preferable to the conventional Westminster system (Kabutaulaka, 2008). The reason given is that, It had no unifying feature needed to unite Solomon Islands’ diverse situation (ibid). The argument is that the Westminster system has features that are divisive to the structures of SI (Kabutaulaka, 2008). It is grounded on both the Government and Opposition who have differing political ideologies to argue about. This kind of government has the potential to divide people who are already culturally diverse, creating division along islands, district, or linguistic lines (Paia, 1975; Russell, 1970, cited in Kabutaulaka 2008, p. 100). In SI, discussions are conducted and differences are worked through until consensus is reached. This is different from how consensus is reached in the Westminster system where there is a lot of shouting and yelling at each other before decisions are made. Therefore, the Westminster system had no resemblance to the system that existed in SI societies before colonisation and that continued to exist (Kabutaulaka, 2008). As pointed out:

The institutional structures the Westminster system and the values and norms it espouses have been difficult to impose in nations such as the Solomon Islands. This is complicated by the fact that the British Colonial administration never attempted to blend the Westminster system with local cultures and traditions. This is different from countries such as Samoa and Fiji where the colonial administration recognized and included the traditional leadership system in the formal institutional structures of government, a practice that ensured the formal government was linked to local communities. (p. 103)

It has been argued that the Westminster system is adversarial and cannot contribute to solving local and group antagonism beyond Parliament (Kabutaulaka, 2008).
2.9.1 The Constitution of Solomon Islands
According to the Constitution of Solomon Islands people have the protection of right to life, personal liberty, from slavery and forced labour, inhuman treatment, deprivation of property, privacy of home and other property, secure protection of law, freedom of movement, discrimination on grounds of race, provision for periods of public emergency, compensation for contravention of rights and freedoms (Solomon Islands Constitution, 1978).

The constitutional provisions have set the pace and provisions for the country to formulate their programmes in alignment to the constitution. However, the rights and freedoms that are stipulated seem not to be understood by citizens who interpret rights differently. This indicates that this piece of the constitution does not reflect people’s culture and customs. This has extended to state building and nation building, which propose activities of citizenship education to teach democratic values for nation building. Such democratic values are also contradictory to SI values, particularly in the area of rights, freedom, liberty, and people having power. The recognition of peoples’ rights, freedom to express their opinion, and their power was applicable only within their own community and cultural group. This confirms the claim that “if someone claims a right, yet no one else believes the right deserved, then in actuality one does not have the right at all” (Tarrow, n.d., p. 7).

2.9.2 Politics in the Solomon Islands
SI has had some major problems in its political development. The political parties system has many gaps and weaknesses. Alasia (2008) finds that the party fluidity and instability has presented challenges to SI politics and will remain a major problem as there is no legislation to limit and control it. Members of Parliament can move from one party to another, from the Opposition to the Government or vice versa. This weakness in the party system was evident from political wrangling after the 2010 general election. In that scenario six Members of Parliament moved five times from the Government to the Opposition and vice versa. In another example, in the post–general election period in 2006, when newly elected members arrived in the capital Honiara to form a new government, there was no party with a clear majority. From the 16 parties contesting the election, seven failed to gain a seat in Parliament. The 50 seats were shared by 9 parties. This is common in the SI as only once, in 1989, did one party get a majority.
It appears that people of SI do not care greatly about who is elected to Parliament. In terms of National elections, of the 342,119 registered voters, only 192,775 (56%) cast their votes in 2006. In 2001 from the 280,790 voters, only 178,083 votes were cast, which indicated that less than fifty per cent of people registered to vote had cast their votes (Alasia, 2008). It is also found that free elections are undermined by society as well. For example, female voters are often influenced by male relatives and the husband always has the final say in who to vote for. In addition people can be lured by candidates with money and other material goods to vote for them (Alasia, 2008, p. 127). Thus, corruption is no barrier to being elected: “This can be noted from the 2006 election where those that are branded as corrupt leaders are all voted in” (Alasia, 2008, p. 123).

2.10 Education
It has been asked: in a society that is in danger of collapse associated with social disharmony, what are the roles of education and specifically of citizenship education in such a context? (Mellor & Prior, 2004). The education system of SI has been developing the citizens of the country through a variety of ways, particularly through the teaching of various academic subjects in different levels of education. Education in the SI has four major stages: early childhood, primary, secondary, and post-secondary, i.e. vocational and tertiary education. Early childhood education has a three-year cycle, primary education is a six-year cycle, while secondary education takes place over seven years, and vocational and tertiary types require two to six years of schooling. Ownership and management of secondary schools are of two major types: public and private schools. Nearly 98% of the primary and post-primary (secondary and higher secondary) institutions are controlled and managed by public and private education authorities. However, so-called private institutions are private only in name because 100% of salaries and wages, and the costs of their physical infrastructure development, durable educational supplies and equipment are provided by the government.

The purpose of schooling is very much similar to that in any jurisdiction: to help create an enabling atmosphere for the citizens to achieve the broad educational aims of the state. The overall aims of education in the SI are similar to those of many of the Pacific Islands countries. Education is defined particularly by the academic subjects taught in the formal education system. Such conceptualisation of education by people of PI nations is very narrow compared to the definition provided by Lawton (1973). Manu (2009) says, “current school curricula in most PI
countries are too academic and geared towards university study, and therefore most school leavers will have learnt little that is of practical value to them in the context of their own societies” (p. 50).

Taking a similar view, Benson and Openshaw (2005) point out that the aim of the curriculum concerns the values to be upheld, the characteristics to be fostered, and the content to be covered in subjects taught in the formal school curriculum. This may mean that formal curriculum should base its content on the values relevant to the society. The case of Solomon Islands is far from achieving those broad educational aims. The fact is that in its current form, education in the SI is very limited in its capacity to give students the understanding about values that is needed to affect their behaviour in order to make a positive change to the social, political, and physical environment. In the opinion of some, the curriculum does not enable students to gain understanding of the diversity of community and society and an awareness of equal opportunities, national identity, and cultural difference (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998, p. 19, cited in Demaine, 2004, p. 18). The difficulties in conducting research in education in the SI reflect the lack of reports on education and curriculum statements, goals and vision at that time. Most curriculum documents analysed were written in the 1980s. Recent revisions were small-scale, spasmodic, and usually initiated by outside donor financial support (Mellor & Prior, 2004, p. 178).

The education system in the SI is examination oriented. The examinations according to Mellor and Prior (2004) serve two purposes:

1. A test of numeracy and literacy skills, largely ignoring other aspects of learning, including social learning, the examinations dominate the curriculum and teaching pedagogies (p. 178).

2. Examinations determine who may take a place in secondary school and as a culling process, exclude students from continuing after grade six. The policies and practice result in social disharmony and unemployment and dissolution (p. 179).

According to Wasuka, and Kauwa (2008), education is important for SI as it is through education that society maintains itself and ensures the continuity of knowledge, skills, habits, and feelings from older members to the young (p. 94). This reflects Dewey’s (1950) claim that education is the continuity for survival of citizens.
Traditional societies are those that are organised on old established patterns of behaviour and practice. They are those where culture and customs remain unchanged by alien practices and philosophies, and education retains skills and knowledge for the maintenance of group identity and life. This education is not a progressive one, encouraging change or individualism. Rather, it enforces conservatism and conformity. It advocates adherence to group norms and uniformity in status, achievement, and success (Wasuka, & Kauwa, 2008, p. 94).

Modern education is generally associated with schools that have children with different ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds. It is also made up of a structured system that has different levels and age groups. In SI all five stages of education have a common curriculum specific for each level. The curriculum is determined and developed centrally and solely by the government department. Only government-approved values and themes are legitimate for use in formal schools.

2.11 Economic Status
Citizenship education is influenced and legitimised by the economic status of each nation state. The programmes that are initiated depend on the financial input of individual countries for their CE programmes, which, in turn, influence citizens’ active participation in political, social, and economic activities, and in the public and private sectors through formal employment, job creation, and support.

In SI, the number of individuals in paid employment is 81,240 (54,571 males and 26,669 females). The number of subsistence workers is 87,941 (35,255 males and 52,686 females). Unpaid workers number 41,204 is found from that status; 17,866 males, and 23,338 females. The unemployed number 4,331; 2,490 males and 1,841 females. The labour force participation rate is 62.8 per cent (Solomon Islands National Census Report 2009). These figures indicate that formal employment, which is perceived as the outcome of education and the doorway to opportunity, has not met people’s expectations. People may have been educated in numbers but no formal work opportunity awaits them because SI’s economic base to sustain its services is very small.
2.11.1 Chinese influences
SI economic development, from the 1890s and early 1900s, included only 10 Japanese and Filipinos employed in the Solomons’ pearl fishing industry. The Chinese were introduced via German New Guinea as cooks and gardeners and most stayed for only six to 12 months (Moore, 1978). Those workers and a very small population of nationals who worked as servants to colonial masters made up the small SI employed work force. By 1918, the number had swelled to 67 Chinese in Tulagi, the first capital of SI, which by 1920 was replete with trade stores and restaurants. Chinese were allowed to set up stores in other parts of the country like Isabel, Gizo, Shortlands, and Auki on Malaita. Chinese were also operating ships on trading circuits (Moore, 1978, p. 68).

Major merchant companies like W. R. Carpenters, Burns Philp, and Levers Pacific Plantations were, apart from the Chinese businesses, the first to establish the SI private sector. Those businesses did not like Chinese dealing in business, because they perceived the Chinese as corrupt (Moore, 1978, p. 69). The Chinese community increased during the Second World War and started integrating into colonial society in the late 1940s, 50s, and 60s, adopting Christianity, establishing a Chinese language school, and taking out British, and then SI, citizenship. It was asserted that they adopted Christianity in order to assimilate and for a sense of belonging and national identity as this was what was practised by the British (ibid.). Therefore, their British citizenship was easily transferred to SI citizenship because of British protectorate laws. One of the first signs of these changes to permanent residence was the establishment, in 1967, of the Honiara Chinese Chung Wah School, organised and financed by the Chinese community (Moore, 1978). The Chinese grew to control most of the retail shops in the country, and they controlled the private sector of Solomon Islands.

Currently, there are around one thousand Chinese in the country (SI National Population Census, 2009). The children of the first generation began to branch out into other economic ventures: they supplied logging camps, marketed trochus shells and beche-de-mer, and set up specialist shops. During the 1980s and 1990s, a significant number of Chinese settled in the SI, adding to the already established Chinese community. Many were refugees of the communist ideology who wanted to set up businesses, and become citizens in order to move to Australia and New Zealand. They have worked hard and sent their children overseas for an education. Some are
regarded as very good citizens, in particular those who adapted to local cultures and Christianity. They provide support to the government and are involved in voluntary programmes helping disadvantaged citizens. Some of the new migrant Chinese from 80s, however, appear not to want to be part of the local community or to learn pijin, and are referred to as bad citizens by local people. Their shops are hot and dirty and lack comfort and they seem not to realise that donating to charities and so on is part of their obligation (Moore, 2008).

It was also found that there are obvious elements of disrespect for people, particularly their customers. Many Chinese are involved in small-scale corruption, such as bribing their way through customs through involving locals as shareholders in business. They run small businesses with indigenous people then move into bus and taxi service (Moore, 2008). Further, many Chinese want to become citizens before their 10-year period (for local advantage and a gateway to Australia and New Zealand) and foster a lucrative market in quick passports by buying bribes to members of the citizenship committee. Some, such as the Chan family of Chinese origin, the Sato family of Japanese origin, move into SI politics (Moore, 2008).

2.11.2 Logging
In the early period of development in the SI, the physical environment and its resources were carefully protected. This was done through the colonial government’s policies. Although SI had abundant hardwood, extraction was minimal. While extraction of logs began in the 1920s (Bennett, 2000, cited in Moore, 2008), it was not until the 1960s that the demand for hardwood timber picked up, and by the 1970s timber was a major component of the gross national product (GNP). However, while about 230,000 cubic metres were cut each year, this was well below the sustainable level of 325,000 cubic metres (Moore, 2008).

Logging carried out on government land in the 1960s was dominated by companies like Levers Pacific Timber, which was a subsidiary of the United Africa Company, and an Australian company, the Allardyce Lumber Company Limited (Moore, 2008). Customary land was preserved for Solomon Islanders during the colonial period as trees and forests were preserved as sources of building materials, herbal medicine, and other traditional needs. At that time, tribal communities were largely undivided and the social ills associated with logging were unknown (ibid.).
However, after independence in 1978, under the first Mamaloni Government, 1981–1984, the logging changed to Asian logging companies, mainly Malaysian, and extended onto customary lands, which made up 87 per cent of the total land area of the country. This was the beginning of corruption and extensive destruction of the natural resources in the country, including exploitation and pollution of water, soil, forest, and the biodiversity. By 1993–1994, timber provided 56 per cent of the value of exports from SI and 35 per cent of the gross domestic product (Moore, 2008). The biggest challenge in the SI has been to get rid of corruption. However, while successive governments have claimed to prioritise this, according to Aqorau (2008), none has kept its word: “Their policies are on paper only and not in action. All they did was the opposite of what they stand for” (p. 256). Aqorau further claims that corruption influenced by logging companies has affected the mindset of both ordinary people in the villages and government officials. He claims that the handout mentality has overwhelmed Solomon Islanders, even politicians, ministers, senior public officers, lawyers, and land owners (p. 256).

2.12 Traditional Religion and Christianity
Solomon Islanders are very religious people. Religious worship is part of their identity and survival; hence, it takes centre stage in their lives. Prior to the introduction of the Christian faith, people engaged in traditional worship practices (Fugui, 1978). The worship of the people of SI was translated orally by people and had to be informed to people through mediators who are the ancestors of people to the creator or the unknown one. The mediators can be named in a form of animal, bird, reptile, or fish: those become the emblem of the tribe or clan who can use it for the manifestation of good health, security, prosperity, and strength. The religions were believed to be in close attendance from the spirits and human beings. Therefore, claims Fugui (1978, p. 76) people have [at the time of his writing] a strong belief in magic, sorcery, witchcraft, shamanism, and other expressions of spiritual powers. Fugui stresses that people were:

confronted with both positive and negative religious needs. There were those needs which provided for contribution of life. Such were food production, fishing, trade and exchanges that made for communal cohesion. People turned to religion for assistance in obtaining positive and practical satisfactions.

Therefore, religion was an essential and intimate part of the life of the people. It was a religious belief that the land and fishing grounds were given by the ancestors. “It was religious belief that the living should look after for the unborn in the future” (Fugui, p. 77). Christianity was the first foreign religion to be introduced to the islands, so successfully that SI is now predominantly a
Christian country. Christianity is made up of many denominations, which are differentiated by how they approach and interpret the philosophies of Christianity. However, despite the diversity the different “denominations share the central and fundamental beliefs of the Christian religion” (Fugui, 1978, p. 73).

According to Fugui, the denominational diversity in SI makes it difficult for government to be involved in nation building. However, during the post-colonial period it was argued that religious education was part of SI culture, and must be promoted in the schools (Fugui, 1978, p. 74). This explains the creation of a policy that all secular schools must offer Christian education instruction; thus, Christian education became a subject in the school curriculum (Fugui, 1978, p. 73). However, there is concern now in the SI that due to the changes in society, Christianity no longer satisfies the demands of daily life, and people seek other means of satisfying themselves, therefore, they use education only for cash or having money as the end product.

2.13 Conflict in the Solomon Islands

Some of the arguments have linked the existence of tension to the colonial past, claiming that the systems introduced during this time are foreign to SI. Others have claimed that tension occurs because of the foreign nature of laws of the country. The systems and laws are claimed to be alien to the cultures of people. Some believe that the education does not do enough to educate people of their responsibility as citizens (Naidu, 2005). The most affected were those of Chinese origin. Some people conclude that it was connected to the social unrest from (ibid., 1998–2003, p. 97). Others are of the opinion that it was the result of poor policies and procedures in the electoral system. Others see it as ignorance of politicians to formulate sound development policies. Kabutaulaka (2008) assumes that the Westminster system contributed to the riots. He mentions two contributing factors:

1. The Westminster system is designed to be adversarial; it sets groups against each other and assumes that better decision are made through political antagonism.

2. The first past the post-election system adopted by Solomon Islands often fails to produce candidates who receive a majority of votes cast in the election, raising the question of whether the government that is ultimately elected by Parliament reflects the choice of a majority of the public (p. 97).
The occurrences had links to the goals and purpose of civic/CE aims, goals, and purpose of nation states to address such challenges. Researchers and educationists have asserted that CE is the solution to such a social and political environment.

2.14 Summary
In summary, the creation of SI as a nation did not occur as a result of any intention of the people. Rather, it resulted from the actions and intention of the colonisers of the islands of the Pacific, who were suspicious of each other and “took over” islands and territories in the Pacific in order to gain superiority. An examination of the history of SI confirms that the systems adopted and the types of structures used today are a legacy of the colonial past. As such, they were imposed from outside and the people were expected to adopt and accept this. It is not clear if the colonisers recognised or failed to realise that peoples whom they put together as a nation were different in many ways: languages, land ownership practices, religion, races, and ethnicities were diverse. Links may be drawn between what the people experience today – violence, corruption, hatred, marginalisation of others, abuse of governing and political systems, and diminished practice of good values – and the alien systems the colonial masters imposed. No wonder a former Prime Minister of Solomon Islands once articulated, Solomon Islands is a nation conceived but never born (Crocombe & Tuza, 1992). It is clear that SI has experienced many challenges and people are wondering what the future will bring. This thesis is based on the assumption that CE in formal education systems – integrating the teaching of values of rights and responsibilities, tolerance, national identity, as well as values, dispositions and moral values from SI cultures and Christianity – has the potential to contribute to solving those problems.
CHAPTER THREE
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

3.1 Introduction
I have discussed in the previous chapter the context in which this study is situated. This chapter examines three major fields of literature related to citizenship education (CE) namely, those covering the origins and conceptualisation of citizenship and citizenship education, citizenship values, and citizenship pedagogies. These fields provide background knowledge that informs and contextualises values for good citizenship in the education context of Solomon Islands (SI).

This chapter is structured as follows: section 3.2 gives an overview of the origins and history of the concept of citizenship and a discussion about its recent resurgence; section 3.3 discusses the non-Western and indigenous Pacific conceptualisations. Section 3.4 provides an in-depth exploration of theoretical debates about citizenship; section 3.5 covers discussion on values; section 3.6 discusses citizenship education and pedagogies, including approaches, methods and strategies, and section 3.7 concludes the chapter with a brief summary.

3.2 Setting the context
The arguments on CE postulate that curriculum aims, organisation, and structure of CE can only be fully understood when context is used as a guide (Kerr, 2006). According to Kerr (2006), the interpretation of the term is broad, complex, and contested and the context is used to define the CE approach. In this case, citizenship, as Wood (2013) argues, is clearly not a neutral concept. The term has proven to have a dynamic identity that can change according to the values each nation wants to promote in their CE programmes that are unique only to their own context (Faulks, 2000; Kennedy, 2008). Further, the approaches and programmes are also uniquely applicable only to the historical, cultural and social traditions of each context (Kerr, 2006). This means that “what works in one context cannot simply be transported to another; careful adaptation rather than wholesale adoption should be the watchword” (Kerr, 2006, p. 8).

A further conflict relates to the dominant, homogeneous vision of the “ideal” individualistic citizen (Kennedy, Hahn, & Lee, 2007). Citizens, according to the curricula, are encouraged to be personally responsible consumers and workers who will contribute to society but are unlikely to engage in forms of collective or transformative action (Olsen, 2002). In the SI, however, where
the majority of the population (80%) who live in rural settings still practise communalism, individualism is not popular. This, then, portrays the contradiction between the values that are determined in the curriculum and the context into which the curriculum is to be translated. According to SI academics such as Gegeo (2014) and Sanga (2014), communal culture and values have transformed society; therefore, it is important to set such values as bases for nation building, not only to improve the political and economic systems and structures but to transform the society with proper behaviours.

Olssen (2002) highlights that neoliberal regimes have become ascendant in many countries since the 1980s, and that collective understandings of citizenship have been fundamentally redefined in a more individualist sense. This is supported by Arnot (2009), who claims that the nature of CE in the United Kingdom currently favours a neoliberal, individualised learner citizen model. She describes how neoliberal governments in many income-rich countries have defined this citizen as a stakeholder of public and private educational provision, a beneficiary of the rhetoric of “voice and choice” through the process of individualisation and personalisation (Arnot 2009). Similarly, from a New Zealand context, Nairn and Higgins (2007) posit that the liberal state values young people’s “participation” in society for their ability to compete and contribute to global economies in the future. The argument is fundamental to the development of Western countries; but it must be asked how such individualism will work in developing countries like the SI who depend very much on support of everyone in the community.

The literature highlights that the level of influence in a particular society depends very much on the different variables in a certain context (Kerr, 2012). The variables are associated with people’s knowledge and understanding of citizenship, which also links to their attitudes, perceptions, and activities and to the context of a wider community that includes school, classroom, home, and work environments (Kerr, 2012). Such contextual variables include the overall school culture, the general school environment, and the instruction that the school provides or the context of home environments. The factors related to students’ home and out-of-school social environment include family background, such as parental occupation and education, immigrant status, and communication in the home about social and political issues and the context of the individual (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2009). Other variables to consider are the individual characteristics of the student, such as age and gender.
From the literature’s standpoint, then, the notion of citizenship is open to conflicting interpretations in light of the social, political, and historical context that it is applied within and the nature of the good citizen it aspires to develop (Wood, 2013).

3.2.1 Origin and History of citizenship concept
The notion of citizenship is an old-fashioned concept and has been a key aspect of Western political thinking since the formation of the classical Greek political culture (Turner, 1993). It is an ancient concept of Grecian origin depicting status held by male patricians enjoying political status (Shafir & Brysk, 2006) and later used in the early period of nationhood formation and nation building (Heater, 1999). Putting this in simple explanation, citizenship is simply the right to vote. In the classical history of the United Kingdom, only the rich land owning classes, the aristocracy and some clergy in the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries had the right to vote. Then the “general male working population in the mid-nineteenth country, then the women (1918, 1928) and more recently the younger people between 18 and 21 (1969)” (Britton, 2014, p.178).

The origin of the political concept in ancient Greece was based on the notion of political freedom (Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 2009). It was a tool used by nation states to acquaint their citizens with the rules governing the nation for the purpose of showing respect to authority (Heater, 1999) on the bases of freedom of being ruled and ruling in turn (Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 2009). It became more practical and obvious during the enlightenment settlement period when some of the European nations in the classical period were involved in revolutions; particularly, the English revolution of 1688 – a period when the autocratic monarch was replaced with a constitutional monarch – and during the French Revolution, an event implicating a society wanting to free itself from external constraints (Kennedy, 2004). The origin of citizenship in ancient Greece, particularly during the period of Greek and Roman civilization (Heater, 1999) influenced both the French and the American Revolutions of the late 18th century that replaced the hereditary king system with the sovereign will of the people (Castle, 2004). In that period, citizenship was adopted as a legal term used to reflect social status in order to create and rebuild a nation state (Crick, 2000; Heater, 1999; Kymlicka & Norman, 2000; Stevick & Levinson, 2007). In nation building, three elements have influenced the use of the term, the functions of the term, and how it is practised. Marshall (1964) explicates those elements as civil, political, and
social. The context for this evolution of citizenship to a system of civil, political, and social rights, dates from the rise of industrial capitalism (Castle, 2004).

The civil element of citizenship emerged in England in the 18th century (Kennedy 2004), although, it first originated from the institution of monarchy through social contracts (Samuel, 1030 BCE cited in Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 2009). This was later shaped by the writings of Locke, Rousseau, and Hobbes, and was based on the notion of obligation (ibid.). It is about individuals’ right and freedom and rights to ownership of properties, to free speech, and to assembly (ibid.). Dominelli’s (2014) perspective is that citizens have the rights and freedom to make themselves heard through freedom of speech, the right to own property and equality before the law.

The political aspect of citizenship was developed in the 19th century. This element gives citizens permission and the opportunity to exercise political power by participating in the political process (Dagger, 1997; Marshall, 1964) which, in turn, resulted in an emphasis on universal suffrage (Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 2009). The social aspect of citizenship arose in the 20th century. This emphasis is on providing citizens with the health, education, and welfare needed to participate fully in their cultural communities and national civic culture (Marshall, 1964). Thus, it focuses on minimum rights and standards of economic, cultural, and social wellbeing (Kakabadze & Kakabadze, 2009).

Marshall (1964) viewed the three elements of citizenship as inter-related and overlapping. The three elements now become the key part of modern and contemporary civilization (Crick, 2000). Citizens are people who have legal rights and the right to contribute in the affairs of the society through decision making and advice (Crick, 2000). They became known today as people of a community who share common ideologies and follow one common structure. The community requires “a bond involving a direct sense of community membership based on loyalty to a civilization which is a common possession” (Figueroa, 2004, p. 223). Citizens became people who have certain status conferred on them by the state in order to shape the society politically by fitting it with the kind of citizens the state wants (Heater, 1999). The political community within which one can be a citizen has three constitutive characteristics: autonomy of the individual
citizens, friendship or “concord”, and judgment or practical wisdom (Figueroa, 2004). The characteristics are further exemplified:

Autonomy means potential for self-determination or power for self-choosing. Concord means a sense of responsibility towards fellow citizens, a sense of mutual interdependence. Judgment refers to the decisions that people make about the rules that are to be authoritative in their community especially those which provide the community with its identity. (Figueroa, 2004, p. 224).

3.2.2 Resurgence of citizenship
The use of the term citizenship has become more prominent during its resurgence and upsurges in the 20th and early 21st centuries when new forms of structures, systems, and approaches to nation-state, and socio-economic and political development emerged (Figueroa, 2004). Its revival in European societies contributed to the revival of political and sociological theory (Turner, 1993). Subsequently, the reintroduction of citizenship came into the spotlight again because of the crises found common in European societies – disengagement of people from participating in civic life has become an issue to the nations (Kennedy, 2004). This was claimed to be common among young people, who are perceived by society as being “ignorant of basic information and ideas required to function as citizens … alienated from political activities and civic processes” (Sears & Morgan, 2007, p. 48). Young people became “agnostic about democratic values such as open mindedness, respect and appreciation of diversity” (ibid.).

In Eastern Europe, including the former Soviet Union, the complexities of the relationships between nationalism, political identity and citizenship participation was highlighted (Turner, 1993). Among the causes of the resurgence in the 20th century are the global refugee issue that has created a new crisis of stateless persons in contemporary political systems, and the institutional growth of the European Community, both of which raise issues about citizenship status because the traditional boundaries of nation states – particularly in Europe and elsewhere – have been challenged by global development, the concept now known as globalisation (Turner, 1993).

Globalisation is now a challenge to building a nation state (Castle, 2004; Kennedy, 2004; Ohmae, 1996). Traditionally, citizenship was associated with the formation and democratisation of nation states. This includes the educating of people about their rights and responsibilities in a nation state and their legal and political commitment to the structures and processes, cultures and
values (Kennedy, 2004). However, with globalization nation states are becoming more inclusive and open so that people and goods are transferred in and out of countries without control (ibid.). Kerr, 2006, p. 12) describes this process as:

The rapid movement of people within and across national boundaries; growing recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples and minorities; the collapse of political structures and the birth of new ones; the changing role of women in society; the impact of the global economy and changing patterns of work; the effect of a revolution in information and communications technologies; an increasing global population; and the creation of new forms of community and the lack of interest in and involvement of young people in public and political life; what has been termed a “democratic deficit.”

This situation is causing alarm not only in Western countries, but in non-Western countries as well (Kennedy, 2004). The pressure placed on capital, labour, and communication is now very profound and nation states may not be able to withstand it (ibid.). This growth of globalisation is now becoming a threat and challenge to rebuilding or forming new nation states, particularly in developed countries where international migration has reached levels where there is no control (Castle, 2004).

In addition, the economic imperative associated with globalisation has indicated that nation states cannot stand on their own to compete successfully in the world market (Kennedy, 2004). However, Kennedy argues that “those who have allowed themselves to join in the integration and have adhered to global patterns or activities and behaviours, have now expecting a risk of losing their values, culture and identity” (p. 10) because of globalisation. The risk is apparent on sovereign nation-states, who were supposed to be predominant sites to organise economic, political, cultural and social life (Castle, 2004). Consequently, CE programmes are perceived as alternative means used by nation-states to enhance and protect their individual national identity from activities such as globalisation and fundamentalism. There is evidence that the strategy is still important today and countries around the globe are relying on citizenship education programmes (Castle, 2004).

In Australia, the resurgence of citizenship is similar to the cause affecting people in Europe. There is a perceived fall in people’s engagement and participation in political and social activities, the disengagement of youth in civic life, or the “civic deficit” (Sears & Morgan, 2007, p. 132). In England the term “deficit” has also been used in reports to describe English students’ lack of knowledge of national history and government structures (Sears & Morgan, 2007, p. 48).
In other research conducted in European countries such as Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and England, it was found that the crises of alienation had created a low level of trust and a very high level of disengagement among young people (Hahn, 1998). This occurred as a result of the distance separating the people and state, and the people with their own citizens. The Advisory Group on Citizenship in England (1998) noted that a potential explosion of alienation is imminent and is now affecting young people from government institutions and the social environment. According to Sears and Morgan (2007), this disengagement poses a considerable threat to the health and stability of democratic societies. However, among all of this, there is widespread agreement that education must play a key role in addressing the problems (ibid.). However, how education will address these social and political challenges depends entirely on each nation-state’s initiatives.

In other findings, political trends had also sparked the renewal of citizenship debates (Lee, 2004). Such trends include political activities such as increasing voter apathy, resurgence of national movements, the impact of global forces on local traditions, the stress created by increasingly multicultural societies, and the declining of volunteerism in community activities (Mellor & Prior, 2004). These trends also depict the fact that the stability of democracy does not entirely depend on how well the basic structures and systems are organised and efficiently followed, but also on the qualities of values and attitudes of the citizens (Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999). Obviously, this presents a challenge to the Western liberal views of democracy; particularly in terms of the new emerging nations, who have varying perspectives or world views about what is good for them. Therefore, among all these perspectives and challenges, it can be claimed that the term citizenship is problematic and contestable (Mellor & Prior, 2004).

From the early part of the last decade until now, there has been a significant rise in what is now called “extremist fundamentalism” (Kennedy, 2004). This term is applied to what certain people believe, the ideologies that they seek to impose on nation states, and to make what they stand for known (Kennedy, Grossman, & Fairbrother, 2004). Some events used to exemplify the phrase are the attacks on World Trade Centre, the Bali bombing, many attacks on civilians and nation-state governments, and currently, movements such as Islamic State and Bokoharam. It is claimed
that these events have occurred around the world in order for people to show their existence, what they believe in, and the significance of their values (Kennedy, 2004).

According to Ong (2004), the belief in citizenship education as an alternative to the challenges to sovereignty faced by nation-states has triggered a resurgence in attention to citizenship with many countries formulating policies and programmes that are expected to counter development in their countries. In England, who was the master model of national formation, Ong, (2004) has move on to embarked on national initiatives such as the citizenship national curriculum (Kerr, 2000); the development and implementation of discovering democracy in Australia curriculum cooperation, 2005 and the publication of the civic mission of schools in the US Carnegie Cooperation of New 78 Circle; Centre for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement, Kerr, 2012). Such national initiatives for CE in developed countries have clearly portrayed CE values as important to the development of nation-states.

### 3.3 Conceptualisation of citizenship

The term citizenship is often explained as the position or status of being a citizen (Simpson & Weiner, 1989). It is a universal status that accords individuals human, civic, political, and welfare rights (Marshall, 1950); legal status that grants social, political, and economic rights (Dominelli & Moosa-Mitha, 2014); and a set of rights, duties, and identities linking the citizen to the nation state (Banks, 2008). Those links are organised around relationship with the state and the society (Figueroa, 2004). Citizenship refers to the legal rights and obligations within a nation state and more specifically to civil, political, and social duties (Marshall, 1950). Those rights according to Figueroa include “the right to liberty, justice, political participation, economic welfare, security and to sharing in social heritage” (2004, p. 223). Those rights and duties have emerged generally with the implication to form a nation state.

The term citizenship came into existence literally, through the integration of people to form a community; what modern Western thought has closely tied to the nation-state (Marshall, 1964). Later, nation-state was broadly defined as a group of people with certain beliefs and common characteristics; therefore it is based on status given to those who are full members of the community (Heater, 1999). All who possess the status are “equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed” (Figueroa, 2004, p. 223). Thus “a nation-state is a land,
a people, a citizenry function to guide the distribution of values of rights and duties that constitutes the citizens’ will to live peacefully together in the democratic model” (Ghasempoor, Yarmohammadzadeh, & Pishkarmofrad, 2012, p. 111). However, although it may relate to the historical relevance of local identities with the rights that citizens enjoy as conferred by citizenship (ibid.), these individual rights in a wider recognition are “still not clear among the growing reinforcement of the nation-state” (p. 111). The fact is that there is no distinction between state (political-institutional regulation of a specific territory) and nation (the sense of belonging to a defined and cohesive community), therefore, the link between the state and nationalism has to be reinforced by the practice of subjective rights, individual freedom and participation in collective decisions (ibid.). This leads to the conceptual discussion of citizenship as the set of practices (judicial, political, economic, and cultural) that is viewed as making a person a competent member of society (Turner, 1993).

From the sociological standpoint, citizenship is conceptualised as distinct from a legal or political notion (Turner, 1993). Through the sociologist’s lens, citizenship is a “debate on inequality, power difference and social class and bound up with unequal distribution of resources” (ibid.). This conceptualisation of citizenship underpins the following: the content of social rights and obligations, forms of obligations and rights, social forces that produce such practice, and social arrangements whereby benefits are distributed to different sectors of society (Turner, 1993).

Research on educational achievement carried out in 38 developed and developing countries concludes that citizenship is a complex discourse that is influenced by a wide range of variables relating to the extent of social settings, political systems and structures, and economic status of each nation state and community (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), 2010). The study found that the term is problematic in academic discussions because, although, they are all conferred as national citizens, people remain unequal through class, status, labels, and wealth (ibid.). Such inequalities prevent citizens from participating effectively and actively in state institutions. Further to this, Isin and Wood (1999) sum up this argument this way: “Modern citizenship conferred the legal capacity to strive for the things one would like to possess but did not guarantee the possession of any of them” (p.28).
This argument is obvious in developing countries like the SI, which has adopted foreign democratic systems with the hope and expectation that this would bring forth economic prosperity, and political and social stability similar to other countries that have initiated and adopted the system as part of their culture. In SI the results were otherwise: there was chaos in the whole system and the Pacific regional community stepped in to normalise and stabilise the country from bankruptcy and breakdown in law and order (Sanga & Walker, 2005). The reason for such failure in the system, as SI researchers Kabutaulaka (2008), Aqorau, (2008), Alasia (2013), and Sanga (2013) have claimed, is that foreign systems are irrelevant to people’s way of life.

Some writers refer to citizenship from a legal and social perspective (Banks, 2004; Castle, 2004; Kalu, 2009). Legally, citizenship is about rights or set of rights and responsibilities that are granted to the people by the state in recognition of their attachment or affiliation to a particular country (Banks, 2004). It is an important element of democracy and implies the sovereignty of the citizens and is associated with respect for the members of a community and their rights and duties (Lawy & Biesta, 2006).

Socially, citizenship refers to people’s active participation in their communities or formal institutions and engaging in activities that speaks of their rights and responsibilities as citizens (Heater, 1999; Lynch 1992). In other words, to be recognized as citizens, people have to actively participate in a democracy. This requires citizens to fulfill their responsibilities such as serving in the army, paying taxes, obeying laws, showing commitment to the democratic political community and state, and showing an effort to improve the quality of political and civic life (Patrick, 1999). Similarly, Engle & Ochoa, (1998) relates citizenship to the characteristics of the society. These include the process of making rational, considerate, well thought-out decisions by citizens. This conception was based on the assumption that people who live in a society are continually caught in complex situations, thus, requiring them to make decisions in morally ambiguous circumstances (ibid.).

The term citizenship, then, is conceptualised along the continuum of relationship (McLaughlin, 1992). It is perceived as a set of relationships existing between the individual and the state and among individuals living together in the nation-state (Engle & Ochoa 1988; Herbert & Sears
It is the representation of the whole of life which involves relationships, membership, decision making, participation, or action that in some ways affect others (Engle & Ochoa 1988). The actions of citizens may be noted directly or indirectly, knowingly or unknowingly, when they are acting as citizens.

Ultimately, citizenship is understood in terms of people’s understanding and acquisition of knowledge about public affairs, having attitudes of civic virtue, and skills to participate in the public arena (Heater, 1999). Consequently, states are expected to develop their own programmes designed to assimilate their citizens under the tenet of common identity. Most states use the education system through formal and non-formal education to transfer teaching and learning of citizenship values (Wood, 2012). In the case of SI, the country needs to use formal institutions to transfer citizenship values to its citizens, especially students at the formal school level.

3.3.1 Non-Western conceptualisations

The term citizenship is conceptualised differently because people remain polarised across social groupings; thus, there is no such thing as a “one-size-fits-all” model for practising citizenship (Wood, 2012). According to Lee (2004) Asians perceive the term citizenship similarly to Western conceptualisations based on the relationship people have with the state and the people living in the state. However, it also differs because in Asian contexts, citizenship is translated as apolitical (nothing to do with politics) rather than political as Westerners perceive it (Lee, 2004). Lee (2004) explains that citizenship is associated with morality and spirituality, the values that transcend Asian societies towards tolerance and peaceful co-existence among people, and are, therefore, intrinsically important to determining the direction of young people’s development.

Further to this, Otsu (2008) explains that in Japan, the terms for citizen and citizenship are shimin and kohmin. Shimin refers to civil society, while kohmin refers to citizens. According to Otsu, in courses of studies, kohmin (citizen) is the key concept, which is defined in the social studies programme as “an authorized member of the state (kokumin)” and a “member of a civil society (shimin)” (p.5). The two definitions of citizenship mean different things to people. This aligns with the study of Shigematsu (2004) who reiterated that being a legal citizen in Japan does not mean that the person will attain structural inclusion into the mainstream society and its institutions or be recognised as citizen by all people in society: “a citizen’s racial, cultural, language and religious characteristics often significantly influence whether he/she is perceived as
a citizen by the dominant group” (Banks, 2004, p. 5). In Asia, some of the focus in citizenship programmes is on the development of individuality (as far as self is concern) and relationship (as far as society is concerned) (Lee, 2004). A study conducted in Taiwan shows that citizenship is more on forming individual personality and life, value criteria and understanding the relationship between the individual and the nation, the relationship between careers and life and the method of self-discipline (Lee, 2004).

Non-Western countries have also related citizenship with religion. What is religion? The term religion derives from the latin word *religio* (Aldridge, 2013). Further, the word *religio* derived from the word *relegere* meaning “to read again or to retrace” (p. 2). This means “religion involves retracing, studying, cultivating and transmitting the customs, practices and tradition of one’s culture” (ibid.). According to Bhargava (2009), in Islamic contexts citizenship is a concept rooted in the idea of the secularity in its etymology of this worldliness of the state. Secularity is the product of the Protestant thinking in the West. In Western liberal societies, secularism “transfer religion, ethnic loyalties from religion and cultural groups to the state itself that empower nation-state and creating a national rather than sectarian identity” (Moosa-Mitha, 2014, p. 25).

The status of citizens relates specifically to fulfillment of this-worldly needs: rights acceptance, and capacity for participation in public life (Feanley, Muis, & Gistituati, 2004, p. 40). In this conception, citizenship, according to Islam, is organised around the religious sphere. The domains and activities of a citizen are organised around religious norms (Feanley, Muis, & Gistituati, 2004). The conception of the relationship between Islam and citizenship continues to come into consideration of whether Islam can differentiate human affairs into distinct domains of religious and non-religious life and obligation (ibid.). Therefore, the Western liberal conceptualisation of citizenship, which emphasises secularism, is often contradictory to conceptualisations in other contexts – including indigenous developing countries – which closely associate it with culture and religion (Green, 2014).

### 3.3.2 Citizenship for indigenous people of the Pacific Islands

Indigenous people do not separate religion from the state (Green, 2014). Therefore, citizenship is not separated from religion and culture; thus, spirituality is part of the state and not considered a separate entity (ibid.). This corroborates literature that holds that “religion implies cultural
identity, so religion and culture are inseparable” (Aldridge, 2013 p. 2). Likewise, Green (2014) points out that “Indigenous expression of spirituality is an intricate part of our everyday experience, seeped within our laws, governance, models, relationship to our environment, practice and philosophical outlook” (p. 34). Spirituality is linked to indigenous sovereignty and national autonomy that connects to clan, place, history, language, ancestral teaching, and ceremonial places (ibid.).

For indigenous people of the Pacific Islands, citizenship is conceptualised in many different ways. For example, Gegeo (2001) explains that what it means to be a citizen of Kwara’ae in the context of SI is referred to as Ngwae ni fuli, (person of place). The ngwae ni fuli symbolises *babato’o’anga* (stability), *aroaro’anga* (peace), and *tuafiku’anga* (living in unity) (p. 69); that is, a person who relates to the social, physical environment, cosmos, and spiritual world (ibid.). Gegeo (2001) uses the term “Ngwae ni fuli” person of place “strictly to explore the way in which people conceptualize and discuss their identity in the rapidly changing world” (p.3). The conceptualisation covers: first, one’s existential foundation that links to geographical and physical location. Second, genealogy; that is, one’s location in a kin group both in the present and reaching backward and forward in time. Third, having land through genealogy and marriage. Fourth, the unquestioned position, based on genealogy and marriage, from which one may speak on important issues without being challenged about identity. Fifth, being knowledgeable about culture, history, ontology and cosmology. Sixth, citizenship is accompanied by certain kin obligations and responsibilities that cannot go unfulfilled and from which one is freed only by death. Such responsibility includes contributing to bride price or bride wealth payments in marriage (Gegeo, 2001).

In the case of Fiji, Nabobo-Baba (2009), interprets citizenship in terms of the responsibilities of speaking the truth, being hard-working, and attending to customary and community obligations, explaining that “[the] people are known for their wisdom; they live well and work really hard” (p. 140). However, Nabobo-Baba stresses that education for citizenship for the indigenous people of PIC countries may vary from the content, pedagogies, and strategies of Western education philosophies and that children are given special education in order to acquire such important knowledge, values, and skills. Further to this, Koya, (2010) claims that while Fijians are proud of their nationality, consciousness of their racial and ethnic background has limited
and fragmented the development of national pride in Fiji. Therefore, there is still work to be done in PI education to include values that are relevant to their context and that unite and empower peoples.

3.4 Theoretical debates on citizenship
The theories of citizenship are highly contested (Torney-Purta, Schewille, & Amadeo, 1999; Print, Brown, & Baginda, 1999). Different people or groups perceive citizenship in different ways for different purposes. Some examples are: multicultural citizenship (Kymlicka, 1995), global citizenship (Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 2009), world citizenship (Kakabadse, et al., 2009) or cultural citizenship (Green, 2014). These are what citizenship philosophers call “essentially contested concepts” (Crick, 2000, p. 2). The description from Ghasempoor, Yarmohammadzadeh, and Pishkarmofrad (2012) holds that a sense of belonging today has different layers. For instance, recognition of people on the basis of equality without discrimination or prejudice, accepting differences, involvement of people based on lifestyles and everyday relations and accepting the interest of others in order to build a stable community. The concept according to Dominelli (2014) is contested because of the status and practice that link to nation-state. This is why the citizenship agenda assumes to have different meanings when discourses shift from one layer to another (Ghasempoor, Yarmohammadzadeh, & Pishkarmofrad, 2012).

Kerr (2000) argues that “citizenship” does not have any universally true meaning. It can only be meaningful when people who use the term in societies have accepted and acknowledged what has been morally transferred down to modern societies from history, including people’s culture and customs (ibid.). This indicates that the essence of citizenship is the relationship of a person to the state and others, or the responsibility one has towards the state and the surrounding social and physical environment. It is the understanding of what it is to be a human being and how human beings relate to themselves and to the state (Kiwan, 2005).

This relationship and responsibility is important to consider in building a nation state (Porath, 2005). There are three common factors that concern the debate on the relationship of the state and the individual in building a nation state. The national identity, which relates to forming a nation state; the legal and political status of relationship, which includes the rights and freedoms
of individuals; and moral virtues and a sense of belonging and rendered duties or responsibilities (ibid.). The national identity theme includes the diversity of the civic body (Reich, 2005). It is framed along ethnic, class, and other lines in society. The argument here is that development of a common identity would override other affiliations, moral commitments, and group memberships (Porath, 2005). Therefore, national identity is a property and attribute significant to building the nation-state. In other words, citizenship requires assimilation and acceptance in order that national identity can be affirmed (Porath, 2005). The legal and political status in the relationship includes the rights and responsibilities of the individual. It focuses on citizens with individual rights such as freedom of speech, the right to own property, equality before the law, and the exercising of the political power by participating in the political process (Banks, 2008). This explanation holds that the old fashioned legal definition of citizenship is narrow, territorial, and specifically related to allegiance to the government of the state (Rose, 2007). However, although the factors are debatable, they are important tools used in Citizenship Education programmes to stabilize society.

Lynch (1992), considers the term citizenship on three levels: local, national, and international membership. At the local level, the concept of education for citizenship is defined according to the domain of the knowledge of individual membership, family base, and cultural and ethnic affiliation. At the national and international levels the definition encompasses the ideologies of fundamentally universal recognition of basic rights and freedom. This has now been used as the goals of international instruments such as the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the Council of Europe for the Education of Human Rights. Yet still, as highlighted, generally such conceptualisation falls short of what is considered by Crick (2002) to be a citizen or citizenship.

Pearce and Allgarten (1988), explain citizenship according to three types of citizens: the liberal, the consumer, and the collective civic engagement. For the liberals, rights and responsibilities are balanced to give all citizens equal status. The consumer in this regard has consumer rights, is entitled to a certain standard of service provided by the state, and is empowered to seek compensation if the service is not satisfactory. Civic engagement refers to active citizenship. This activeness requires citizens to be prepared to see beyond their own interest and commitments and take a wider, more impartial view (Pearce & Hallgarten, 1988).
3.5 The citizenship tradition
The tradition or models used in citizenship are complementary and compatible (Dagger, 1997). For example, the liberals’ meaning of citizenship is the protection of individual freedom (Print, 2005). For the republicans, it is the protection of individual relationship, similar to national identity and social cohesion which concerns the relationship of individuals with the state and each other and for global citizenship and entrepreneurship (Dagger, 1997; Print, 2005). It is all about the extension of relationship and entrepreneurship beyond national boundaries (Print 2005). This has indicated that the values are complementary to each other but differ only when nations choose values they want to promote to meet the need of their social environment.

3.5.1 Liberal citizenship tradition
The liberal model’s origins are traceable to the Roman Empire and early-modern reflections on Roman law (Walzer, 1989). This tradition relies heavily on legal and human rights frameworks to guide and support the entitlement to rights of individuals (Wood, 2012). It is a tradition that developed strongly from the 17th century onwards that understands citizenship primarily as a legal status in which political liberty is important as a means to protect individual freedoms from interference by other individuals or the authorities themselves (ibid.). It is a “label most would use for a political philosophy that regards man as possessed of inherent individual rights and the state as existing to protect these rights, deriving its authority from consent exists … to protect these rights” (Dagger, 1997, p. 5). Furthermore, “to have a right is merely to be the beneficiary of a relationship sanctioned by law … there are no rights without law and government, law and government cannot possibly be justified by an appeal to rights” (Dagger, 1997, p. 19). This argument is questionable in indigenous societies such as SI, who only recognise rightful ownership and membership of citizens through relationship of individuals with indigenous tribes, land and kastom and not of the recognition by law. However, Print (2005) argues that citizens can only exercise these freedoms in the world of private associations and attachments, rather than in the political domain. This affirms the argument made by Marx, who asserted that none of these so-called rights of man goes beyond the egoistic man, beyond man as a member of civil society (Dagger, 1997). This, however, holds that those who set the individual against others, those who talk of rights against society and government, understand neither rights nor the order of things (ibid.).
Further, the liberal tradition is substantiated by the rights of citizens, and the significant factor in the tradition is the individualistic liberty of persons, which upholds freedom and practice of one’s choice: “The freedom is conceived in an individualistic term” (Moosa-Mitha, 2014, p. 26). The theories of individualism usually focus on the role citizens play in a just society (Sementelli, 2014). Such assumptions link justice and egalitarian notions with the discussion on liberty and citizenship that favours the autonomous self (ibid.). According to Abel and Sementelli (2007), this was similar to Dewey’s works connecting citizenship with justice, and to other earlier studies about prevailing communities of interest.

To understand liberalism better, close and detailed examination of rights, liberty, freedom, and autonomy is necessary. In contemporary liberal theory, individual rights and personal autonomy are associated with liberalism (Dagger, 1997, p. 24). This indicates that while liberty, freedom, and autonomy are closely related words, they are not interchangeable (ibid.). Liberty, as explained earlier, entails freedom of expression (Dominelli, 2014). Autonomy carries a connotation of consciousness, of the capacity to make choices upon reflection, that is absent in many uses of liberty and freedom (Dagger, 1997). This indicates that the liberty right, freedom, and autonomy right are different in their own rights.

Waizer (1989) highlighted that the Roman Empire's expansion resulted in the extension of citizenship rights to conquered peoples, having strongly and profoundly transformed the concept’s meaning. Citizenship meant being protected by the law, rather than participating in its formulation or execution. It became an “important but occasional identity, a legal status rather than a fact of everyday life” (Walzer, 1989, p. 215). The focus here is obviously the first dimension: citizenship is primarily understood as a legal status rather than as a political office. It now “denotes membership in a community of shared or common law, which may or may not be identical with a territorial community” (Pocock, 1995, p. 37). The Roman experience shows that the legal dimension of citizenship is potentially inclusive and indefinitely extensible (Walzer, 1989). At first glance, the two models in the tradition present a clear set of alternatives: citizenship as a political office or a legal status central to an individual’s sense of self, or as an “occasional identity”. The citizen appears either as the primary political agent or as an individual whose private activities leave little time or inclination to engage actively in politics, entrusting the business of law-making to representatives (Pocock, 1995). If the liberal tradition of
citizenship dominates contemporary constitutional democracies, the republican critique of the private citizen's passivity and insignificance is still alive and well (ibid.).

3.5.2 Republican citizenship
Republican citizenship is the main political perspective of a nation-state today (Pesqueux, 2009). The key principle of the republican citizenship tradition is civic self-rule, and practices like the rotation of offices and citizens having the capacity to rule and being ruled in turn (Dagger, 1997). This approach is characterised by “commitment to the political community, respect for its symbols, and active participation in the common good” (Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 657). The values associated with this conceptualisation relate citizens to collective participation in formal institutions, which Aristotle refers to as those who share in the holding of office (Aristotle, in cited Heater, 1999; Dagger, 1997). This includes active participation in processes of deliberation and decision-making to ensure that individuals are citizens, not subjects (McGregor, 1999). According to Pesqueux, (2009) citizenship is a synthesis between rights and political duties in the territory of the republic and includes an obligation to show obedience to the general will. In essence, another value that represents the republican model of citizenship is the emphasis on active participation in political processes and not just subjects who are influenced only to accept what is handed down as rules by leaders (ibid.). This represents the expression of sovereignty, “characterised by identification to a nation because of republican values (patriotism and the peaceful will, equality before the law, the protection of the weakest) republican symbols (the flag and the national hymns)” Pesqueux, 2009, p. 191).

Further, the republican tradition relates to the citizenship duty and responsibility, which particularly stems from the theories of Aristotle in the ancient Greece period. According to Aristotle, citizens’ character is an important facet that has to be considered carefully in relation to one another for the sake of mutual relationships between the citizens in order to make a common bond (Dagger, 1997). That would pave the way for citizens to share in the civic life of ruling and being ruled in turn (Dagger, 1997). In this situation, there should not be room for apathy as citizens are expected to be publicly active (Heater, 1999). Another value that is significant in this republican model is the ultimate focus on developing citizens to possess and display arête, goodness or virtue to fit in the society socially and politically (ibid. 1999). Virtue in this sense is related to quality. Aristotle claimed that these qualities are moral calibre or values that must be demonstrated by citizens before they can display maturity, so that benefit can
emerge for themselves and for the state (Heater, 1999). In this regard, the above perception could be summarised as the classic exposition of the civic republican form of citizenship, which can be interpreted as active participation, building relationships, and possessing values such as obedience, respect, and honesty.

According to McGregor (1999), the republican traditional model for citizenship stresses three main principles: “the sense of belonging to a political community, loyalty towards one’s homeland and the predominance of civic duties over individual interest” (p. 208). In order to create a stable and just society, it is necessary for individuals to “engage in a symbolic relationship with the state … and only then will the individuals enjoy freedom and the state can be created and sustained” (Heater, 1999, p. 45). Such a republican conceptualisation denotes that harmony and stability among citizens can only emerge through mutual agreement by the state and the citizens to work together. Such agreement is believed to influence the affairs of the nation state (Pearce & Hallgarten, 1988). Aristotle once said the nature of CE has often been disputed (Heater, 1999, p. 45). This is evident in how educationists, academics, and historians try to define the concept. Kerr and Cleaver (2004) use the term “contest concept” to represent this common dispute on Citizenship Education. According to Deuchar (2003); Engle and Ochoa (1988), and Lynch (1992), the contentions are sparked by the definitions of the terms citizenship and CE, the adequate model, the preferred approaches, and the models and domains that are used for the discipline.

3.5.3 Identity and social cohesion citizenship
According to Stoessinger (1990), national identity in citizenship is attributed to sovereignty (man’s relationship with the state) and nationality (people’s collective destiny). Identity was often referred to as the psychological dimension of citizenship (Kymlicka & Norman, 2000). In this research, the many things that have related to identity include individual and collective identity and social integration (Kymlicka & Norman, 2000). Early theories of citizenship place considerable recognition on national identity as central to creating a nation-state, and this perspective has remained. In Western countries such as the USA, Canada, Australia, and many European countries, national identity is increasingly vital to unify people of different ethnicities and cultures – particularly the new migrants who come from very diverse social and cultural backgrounds and educational levels – into the tenets of citizenship within democratic societies.
Kymlick and Norman, (2000) define identity as the politics of recognition that relate to the idea of difference and the principle of equal dignity. Recognition is the idea that others should be sensitive to the individual’s quest for authenticity (ibid.): “No one can do without official recognition of a nation state” (Stoessinger, 1990, p. 6). An individual cannot escape from a nation state as it is the highest secular authority (ibid.). While national identity has become the subject of much debate – for instance, “the conceptualisation of Citizenship Education was hidebound … it does not redefine to permeate some of the characteristics that describe citizenship” (Lynch, 1992, p. 9) – citizenship has continued to be equated only with nationality (Lynch, 1992). In fact, historically, that equation was neither the first definition of the term nor its predominant use until the age of nationalism. Nationality or nationalism, according to Stoessinger (1990), is “people’s sense of collective destiny through a common past and the vision of a common future” (p. 9). The author further explains the terms as the “nation’s personality”, which is the nation’s common past: “A nation is a group of people occupying geographical space” (Stoessinger, 1990, p. 9). In Western countries, the ability to unify people is possible because most societies are monolingual and mono-cultural in nature (Lynch, 1992). However, in non-Western countries, such attempts might be very complicated. For instance, a great majority of nation states in the developing world are in reality multiethnic, multicultural, multilingual, and multi-religious states. To produce cohesion and standardisation in such diverse national spaces would be a complex process. However, as Lynch (1992) points out, Western nations now have similar diverse complexities. Therefore, they should not be complacent and take for granted the force of tradition, ethnicity, and language in order to shape a nation. Many Western countries are now multilingual and multicultural. They face problems of their own, based on a mix of new demographics, growing prosperity and voter apathy (Print & Smith, 2002). This indicates that all countries have some reason to promote national identity. Porath (2005) portrays emotional attachment of citizenship to each other as basis for liberal patriotism.

3.5.4 The global citizenship tradition

The global citizenship tradition is not new. Socrates (469–399 BCE) claimed “I am the citizen of the world” (Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 2009, p. 27). This concept of citizenship and
cosmopolitanism may be traced back to ancient Greece. Beck (2002) suggested it as a reinventing of politic grounding on a new political subject – cosmopolitanism, referring to this phenomenon as a growing “cosmopolitanisation”, the “erosion of distinct boundaries dividing markets, states, civilizations, cultures, and not least of all the life worlds of different peoples” (p. 1). Recently, from the mid-1970s, the strict marriage between state, nation, and the recognition of rights began to be questioned (Ghasempoor, Yarmohammadzadeh, & Pishkarmofrad, 2012). This came about because of the intensification of the speed and reach of processes of globalisation, in particular the flows of people, ideas, and goods into different nation-states and the interconnections that seem more prevalent to uniting people and phenomena over great distances in complex systems of dependency and mutual influence (ibid.). Such phenomena have transformed the idea of citizenship by highlighting the contradictory link that binds belonging to a political community, protection of individual and collective rights (ibid.).

Belonging, participation and the recognition of rights reveal themselves to be aspects that are partially autonomous, never completely traceable to the idea of national identity (Ghasempoor, Yarmohammadzadeh, & Pishkarmofrad, 2012). Being a society no longer necessarily coincides with being a nation because, in certain aspects, society exceeds the nation: one can and one may wish to participate without feeling that one belongs “exclusively”, “completely” and “definitively”; one participates not because one identifies with the nation, but because one feels involved (because of personal interests, feeling “affected”, because in this way individuals can claim the recognition of their own particularity) (ibid.). With the rise of globalisation, the concepts of citizenship and Citizenship Education have been the subjects of huge debate. Globalisation is associated with the concepts of democracy, freedom, respect for cultural diversity, and interdependence. It signifies economic, political, and cultural interconnections which make political borders and economic barriers irrelevant (Steger, 2005). Resistance based on anti-globalisation movements argues that international institutions that focus on free trade and movements through adopting of Anglo-American, liberal working practice would enslave poor countries and working people in general (Fukuyama, 2006). This affirms that global citizenship is more concerned with the wider world order than with national political identity. The citizens, are considered to be part of global interdependence and cultural diversity (Davies, 2006).
3.6 Debate and perspectives of good citizenship
The resurgence of citizenship in the contemporary era was due to the need to create a society that seeks peaceful co-existence among citizens and for a common good. The emergence of citizenship from the classical republican and liberal notions of the early period was aimed at achieving that goal (Dagger, 1997).

3.6.1 Good citizenship
The good citizenship concept is referred to as an achievable value (Kelly, 1989). Osborne (2005) makes the distinction between being a good person and a good citizen, arguing that citizenship demands an investment in making a better society rather than a mere focus on individual behaviours. Kelly, (1989) defines values as entities that have some kind of existence of their own even in some metaphysical sense. Similarly, theories provided by Clark (1997) propose that “value has its origin in our genetic structure. We are born with an affective capacity to like and to dislike aspects of our experience” (p. 92). According to Kelly (1989) value is an activity, something people do. Zarrillo (2004) conceptualises values as “constituting the standard or criteria against which individual behaviour and group behaviour are judged, beliefs represent commitments to those values” (p. 29). For example, rights, responsibilities, duties, and dispositions are sometimes characterised as honesty, respect, and goodness: “The disposition itself is neuropsychological, acquired socially and displayed behaviourally” (Brower, cited in Clark, 1997, p. 92).

Good citizenship is defined as having the right knowledge, proper behaviours, and respect for authority (Wesley, 1978). Wesley sees a good citizen in relation to the following characteristics: a citizen who carries out all of the duties and responsibilities of the nation's citizenship; a good member of the nation state; a citizen who obeys the law, pays taxes, and attends school; and good citizens are willing to defend their country. The emphases in this definition are on participation, knowing what is expected of oneself, and fulfilling these expectations. Such conceptions when promoted put pressure on citizens to conform to national patterns. These national patterns are constructed to enforce patriotic virtues and bring individuals, groups, and communities to see the benefit of allegiance (Kerr, cited in Mutch, 2005). Such virtue provides a mark of a good citizen (Heater, 1999). The mark of a good citizen is described by Giroux (2005) as young people who fit in with society and conform to societal norms.
Virtue as a mark of a good citizen refers to a role that a person occupies – the role of a citizen (Dagger, 2007). To demonstrate civic virtue is to do what citizens are supposed to do that related to performance of some role and exercising certain skills (ibid.). Virtue derives from the Greek arete, or excellence, by way of the Latin virtus, which carried from its association with vir (man in the gender-specific sense) the additional connotations of strength and boldness (Dagger, 1997). These connotations persisted in the classical republican theorists’ use of civic virtue, who described men who lacked virtue as effeminate. The republican disposition holds virtue for those who manifested to a high degree the qualities of a good person. This good person is conceived of in terms of a role that one may play, complete with criteria for determining when one is playing it properly (ibid.). For instance, a virtuous person is “like a virtuoso musician, who does with great skill what a musician is supposed to do (Dagger, 1997, p. 13).

In such a conception, civic virtues represent disposition and active participation. The demonstration of both are marks of a good citizen. This is consistent with the conception that good citizenship requires a willingness and an ability to play an active and morally principled part in the public life of one's society (Osborne, 2005, p. 13). Take the examples of the Suffragettes, Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, or the student protestors at Tiananmen Square in China. These were all passionate, inspiring people with a deep commitment to developing a better society. With the benefit of hindsight, we might argue that they are all shining examples of good citizenship. At the time, however, many of them were publicly vilified and imprisoned by those in authority – and certainly not seen as good citizens (ibid.). From Osborne’s (2005) perspective, it seems important to remove the concept of citizenship from the potentially loaded terminology of being good. In such arguments, individual, group, and community allegiances are seen as beneficial (Mutch, 2005). Such allegiance, as claimed by Heater (1999), provides a mark of a good citizen.

Active citizenship as articulated does not imply an adherence with the status quo or equate with allegiance (Giroux, (2005). Citizenship is in itself a “radical term which must be removed from forms of patriotism designed to subordinate citizens to the narrow imperatives of the state” (Giroux, 2005, p. 6). To clarify this argument, the Suffragettes, Ghandi, Mandela, protestors outside St Paul’s, Quakers who withhold taxes and young people who choose not to vote could all be classified as active citizens – even if they are breaking the laws of the state. The issue is
about their engagement with political life and not about conforming to current political agendas. They might be active citizens without necessarily fitting in with what society regards as good citizens. For Giroux (2005) at least, citizenship entails a degree of criticality rather than mere conformity. In Britain, the term citizenship has been highly influential in terms of development of CE in schools. They have taken a clear stance on whether active citizenship and good citizenship are the same by arguing that CE is about enabling people to make their own decisions and to take responsibility for their own lives and their communities (Ross, 2012). It is not about trying to fit everyone into the same mould, or about creating model or good citizens (Citizenship Foundation, 2012). The Crick Report used the phrase good citizen or good citizenship on eight occasions. Some of these are in the same sentence as active citizen and at other points, the phrases appear to be used interchangeably (Citizenship Foundation, 2012). Neither term is explicitly defined and therefore it is easy for the reader to assume that they mean the same thing. The activeness discussed above is political engagement only and not about communal engagement, which is more profound for the context of this study for good citizenship.

For the people of Kwara’ae in the Solomon Islands, a good citizen and a good society is the achievement of “gwaumauri’anga (being at the head of life)” (Watson-Gegeo, & Gegeo, 2014, p.174). The traditional goal of developing people is to achieve ali’afu’anga (being complete) to achieve gwaumauri’anga (ibid.). The values that constitute ali’afu’anga as marks of a good citizen for the Kwara’ae people include, according to Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo, (2014):

* alafe’anga (unconditional love, together with kin obligation); adofiku’anga (join together, doing things together as one); aroaro’anga (peace, peaceful behaviour); babato’o’anga (emotional and behavioural stability, dependability, settling down in one place); eneno enanga (humility, delicacy, adaptability, gracefulness, tranquility, gentleness); fangale’a’anga (giving, sharing, receiving, gracefully, and manners, lit., eat good); kwaigwale’e’anga (welcoming, comforting, hospitality); kwaima’anga (affectionate, amorous, and tender love); kwaisare’e’anga (feeding someone without expectation of return); mamana’anga (truthfulness, spiritual power). (pp. 174–175)

A good citizen for the people of Gula’alā in Malaita, SI include, according to Sanga:

* kwaingengei‘lā (sound judgement); eneno lā (humility); abero lā (care); mamana lā (truthfulness); manatagado lā (trustworthiness); rao mabe lā (industriousness); ro lā (obedience); to nuinui lā (avoid uncleanliness); abu lā (holiness); to ni mouria (purposeful living) (pp. 35–48).

The values reflected are marks of good citizenship that people in society want their children to acquire, live with and practise in their daily contact with people. The values can only be facilitated by fa’amana’ta’anga for the people of Kwara’ae and fananau lā for the people of Gula’alā in Malaita, which are discussed later in this chapter. Such shaping of people is not about
equalizing people or to fit everyone in the same mould as asserted by Ross (2012), but more precisely about developing in girls and boys specific values that shall sustain and fit them in their communities. This indicates a differences between good citizenship for the Western democratic world and the indigenous people of SI.

3.6.2 Active citizenship

Literature on citizenship has claimed that active citizenship is a contested term with no single definition (Kennedy, 2007; Adeyemi, Boikhutso, & Moffat, 2003). It certainly implies a role where one is actively involved in community and political life but what does this mean exactly? Is it synonymous with being a good citizen or indeed, a good person? All of the examples in the above paragraph are likely to be classified as good citizenship but they also suggest a degree of non-compliance with existing political structures and processes. Would the Occupy London supporters who illegally camped outside St Paul’s Cathedral in protest at global capitalism be classified as active citizens? Would a Quaker who risks getting sent to prison for withholding taxes which pay for armaments be an active citizen? Would young people who decide not to vote but join several single-issue protest groups be active citizens? Those are questions from the literature that characterize differences between good and active citizenship.

The term “active citizenship” is a relatively new concept in policy and practice (Wood, 2013). There is a broad range of opinion as to what it entails (National Foundational of Educational Research [NFER], 2006). However, active citizenship refers to the active participation and involvement in activities that help people, including young people, to take an active role in their school communities and beyond. The active dimension in citizenship is driven by political, legal, and social spheres (NFER, 2006, p. 35). The main drive for the political sphere is the democratic deficit (Jowell & Park, 1998; Patman, 2000, cited in NFER, 2006). The values of democracy are embedded in the drive of the legal and social spheres to promote human and participation rights at local, national, and global levels (NFER, p. 35). Active citizenship is premised on taking active part in the affairs of the state, not on being passive or good, decent and law abiding citizens (ibid.).

Active refers to a sense of obligation to one another and willingness to undertake changes in local, national, and global scales (Deuchar, 2007). Generally, active citizenship is literally equated with active participation in political and social activities such as voting, joining political
parties, involvement in junior parliamentary activities, and involvement in voluntary work. Crick (2000) argues that, “active citizenship is an active moral value. It is not just the provision by the state but also what people can do for each other, working with each other and their communities” (p. 97). The dispositions of character such as respect, honour, and active participation are central to active citizenship (ibid.). Pearce and Hallgarten (1988) claim that active citizenship refers to someone who is actively shaping the way his community functions, and not only a rights holder or claimant.

**Forms of active citizenship**

There are several forms of active citizenship (Wood, 2013). First, any argument in response to democratic deficit in any democratic society that would require immediate actioning is the engaging in voting, in belonging to a political party, and in standing for office. This is aligned to Almond and Verba’s (1963) third type of citizen orientation, the participant, who possesses a sense of influence and confidence in understanding the domestic political system and who votes regularly in elections. Voting, though an activity, is, of course, a minimalist action, but these kinds of traditional conformity are nevertheless participation, and participation with a view to changing civic society.

The second form of activity lies in social movements, in being involved with voluntary activities either working as a volunteer with agencies, or collecting money on their behalf. This form of participation in civil society (as opposed to the former civic action) is essentially conformist and ameliorative in nature: it is action to repair rather than to address causes, or even to acknowledge possible causes: as Lister (2003) puts it, “an exhortation to discharge the responsibilities of neighborliness, voluntary action and charity” (p. 31). It could be argued that the activities described here fall into this form of activity. These, and the previous conventional form, constitute what is sometimes derided as the “voting and volunteering” approach to citizenship education (Ross, 2012).

The third form consists of action for social change, when the individual is involved in activities that aim to change political and social policies (Wood, 2012). This would range from such activities as letter writing and signing petitions to working with pressure groups and participating in demonstrations, and other ways of trying to influence decision making. This form would also have various illegal variants, such as taking part in occupations, writing graffiti, and other forms
of civil disobedience. Common to both legal and non-legal forms of activity is a conflictual model of civic and civil change. Ross (2012) describes this as local people working together to improve their own quality of life and to provide conditions for others to enjoy the fruits of a more affluent society; or, as Lister (2003) puts it, “active citizenship which disadvantaged people, often women, do for themselves, through for example, community groups, rather than have done for them by the more privileged; one which creates them as subjects rather than objects” (p. 32).

### 3.6.3 Democratic citizenship

Democracy is a “system of governing which is based on the version of popular representation and governance” (DeLeon, 1997, p. 1). It is a system of community government in which, “by and large, the members of the community participate or may participate, directly and indirectly in making decisions which affect them all” (DeLeon, 1997, p. 14). In democracy, the central emphasis is expected to be on the individual in a society. This includes activities the citizens have performed which reflect the elements of a democratic mode of participation (DeLeon, 1997). One popular reiteration was provided by Abraham Lincoln for American Democracy: Democracy is the Government “of the people”, “by the people”, “for the people” (cited in DeLeon, 1997).

### 3.6.4 National identity

Identity in citizenship is defined by Rose (2007) as an aspect of belonging rather than a legal term connected with national rights:

> Citizenship and civil identity can be construed in terms that do not necessarily relate to national identity … Citizenship is an important aspect of our identities: it is that aspect that involves our political engagement and participation in a community (p. 297).

According to Rose (2007), citizenship involves working towards a better community through participation and working together to improve citizens’ lives. In this perspective community is an important aspect of citizenship for cultivating a sense of belonging. However, there are rejections to this historical settlement of merging people into one during nation building processes (Dominelli, 2014). This argument holds that identity within nation building remains singular and cannot transcend the assimilation of difference within its borders (ibid.). However, there are still marked differences within nation states whereby the minorities, the marginalised, and the have-nots have been denied their basic rights (ibid.). In such instances, national identity is a property that is attributed, or to some extent, restricted to a limited group of people. Becoming a member
of a nation under this description of identity, to gain citizenship, requires assimilating people into the “attributes that are assumed to constitute the essence of national identity” (Porath, 2005, p. 384). Such identity is based on the emotional attachments of citizens to each other as the basis for liberal patriotism. In this understanding, civic relations connect people’s collective identity to the good of others through social ties. However, interpretation of both community affiliation and civic status as aspects of identity has the potential for tension. Consequently, citizenship education is the starting point for merging people to endure and accept pluralism in society and to develop democratic citizenship and its skills and habits. as a practice that informs education for membership in the nation-state (Porath, 2005).

3.6.5 Social cohesion
Social cohesion emerges from the tensions for recognition among minority groupings, wars, social and environmental chaos, the breakdown of law and order, and the demise of moral values in societies (Heater, 1999). For example, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, citizenship concepts were highly promoted to unify people of different ethnicities (Herbert & Sear, n.d.). In the mid-20th century, after the end of the Second World War, citizenship reemerged because of new trends of migration due to the surging demand for urban labour (ibid.). From the 1960s to 1980s, because of issues caused by multiculturalism, CE was promoted again to acknowledge the contribution of migrants as well as dealing with the reoccurrence of hatred and racism (Herbert, & Sears, n.d.). According to Lynch (1992), social acceptance was an important aspect for social unification of society. During the period from the 1960s to 1980, the notion of acceptance from the state distinguished the era from the time when the education system tried to homogenise people of ethnic diversity to create a durable civic culture from a mixture of different identities and interests (Lynch, 1992). This is what is missing in the context of this study. The education that brings people together as a nation under one common unifying symbol is missing.

3.6.5 Entrepreneurship citizenship
Entrepreneurship citizenship derives from the neoliberal conceptions where market and profit is the focus (Dagger, 1997). It is a form of enterprise citizenship, an essentially individualist model of citizenship action in which the individual engages in such self-regulating activities as the four components: achieving financial independence, becoming a self-directed learner, being a problem-solver, and developing entrepreneurial ideas. This is very much an economic model of citizenship activity, and individualistic in its range. The four forms comprise a hierarchy or
sequential form of development – the individual does not need to progress through one form to achieve the next – but the third form in particular (being a problem-solver) appear to be the type most closely aligned to what is meant by international organizations (Herbert & Sears, n.d.).

Most current education and curriculum goals were redesigned to promote economic agendas (Herbert & Sears, n.d.). The agenda was for competition and entrepreneurship in order to compete and survive in a globalised economy (ibid.). However, the challenge found was that, “schools did not succeed in preparing youths for an economic future” (Herbert & Sears, n.d.). Therefore, the resurfacing of CE in the 21st century is significant because of the reason that it can promote CE in educational, political, and public interest to compact the new emerging global, economic, social, and political constraints (ibid.). It is found from the literature that the planet and the human family are facing an unprecedented set of challenges, issues and problems including globalisation of the economy … deterioration of the quality of the global environment, and ethical and social issues (Mutch, 2005, p. 187). Consequently, the educational response to such situations has become a matter of national interest and CE is used as a contribution to solving the national challenges.

3.6.6 Summary of values for citizenship education
According to Crick (1998), values are at the heart of CE. The child first learns important values of self-confidence and socially and morally responsible behaviour early in life at home from parents, members of the family, and community before learning other values (Potter, 2002). Those values remain and they become the foundation of other values that can be acquired later in life such as from their work, participation in sports, and community work.

Crick (1998, cited in Potter, 2002) provides a list of values modern participatory democracies have adopted in their education programmes:

- concern for the common good
- belief in human dignity and equality
- practice of tolerance
- courage to defend a point of view
- determination to act justly
- commitment to active equal opportunities and gender equality
- commitment to active citizenship and voluntary service
- concern for human rights and the environment (p.61).
Those values were found to be relevant in England. In the case of Solomon Islands, some of the values may not reflect the cultures and religion of people and what they view as significant to social stability and inclusiveness, because of the diverse nature of the country.

3.7 Citizenship Education and Pedagogies
Through schooling, teaching, and learning, CE encompasses the preparation of young people for their roles and responsibilities as citizens (Kerr, 2012). It teaches students knowledge and particular values and attitudes about the nation in which they are living, and encourages certain behaviours, particularly, those deemed necessary for democratic living (Crick, 2000; Sears & Hughes, 1996).

3.7.1 Linking education with the teaching of citizenship
Earlier writers saw education as a way of developing individuals for their own sake and to fit them for life in the society into which they were born (Heater, 1999). To develop a citizen requires the acquisition of knowledge and the development of skills, and schools are expected to deliver this (Heater, 1999). According to Aristotle, the “citizens of the state must be educated to suit the constitution of their state”, and for Plato, education from childhood must be on virtue, “a training which produces a keen desire to become a perfect citizen who knows how to rule and be ruled as the justice demands” (Heater, 1999, p. 66). According Montesquieu (1949), education must inspire the value of love for the laws of the country (cited in Heater, 1999). For Dewey, education is the “art of giving shape to human powers” (Ryan, 1998, p. 397) to prepare humans for their future (Gilbert, 2005). Most early writers such as Aristotle, Plato, and Rousseau envisaged that for an ideal state, it is only through the transmitting of required knowledge that pupils can become accustomed to the rules, equality, fraternity, and to live in sight of and harmony with one another. Good citizenship is the end product of the practice of CE for an ideal state.

Education is equated with interaction of the individual with the social and natural environment to which he or she belongs (Hoghson, 2012). This type of education usually occurs in informal settings such as at home with family members and encompasses “activities that a human group transmits to its descendants as a body of knowledge and skills and a moral code which enable the group to subsist” (ibid., p. 1). The knowledge, skills and moral code influence daily living and
help to inculcate the social, cultural, religious, and philosophical values held by the particular community (ibid.). It is a process in any society where adults transmit their beliefs, culture, and other values to the young to change their behaviours in preparation to change their own world for the betterment of their own life in the future (ibid.).

Such education has been and remains part of SI culture. For SI, children gain worthwhile knowledge from their parents and from family interactions and peer socialisation. These are context-based influences (Sanga, 2004). Learning of important values, skills, and knowledge is influenced by the immediate social setting and knowledge is acquired through the child’s generalisation of what is seen, touched, heard, felt, and smelt from the family unit and the community (Gegeo, 2001). This type of teaching and learning is called fa’amanata’anga for the Kwara’ae people and means “shaping the mind” (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 2014, pp.175–176). It is an activity that is carried out by the family, kin group, tribe or village level to change individual and group thinking and behaviour (ibid.). Sanga (2014), refers to such teaching and learning as fanaua lā for the Gula’alā people, meaning, “moral teaching, learning and shaping” (p.5) and it is carried out by adults in the family to infuse moral values that will shape children (ibid.). This learning is acquired through listening, watching, imitating, and doing things. Again, this is an obligatory act accompanied by the narration of fairytales, stories about battles and important characters, singing of songs, chants and dances about the environment, love, and relationships, all carefully guided by the parents (Gegeo, 2001).

Formal education is conceptualised as a social system that is expected to change along with the changes found in societies (Ross, 2006). It has to respond appropriately to the increasing understanding of education processes and that should be the central concern, especially with the curriculum (ibid.). It is referred to as the formal or professional instruction where teaching or instruction in particular is for transmission of knowledge for intellectual development (Hoghson, 2012). The preparation requires children to be put in complete possession of all their powers, a complex process which requires teaching and learning to be considered carefully (Gilbert, 2005). In this process of child empowerment, the interaction of teachers and significant others is significant (ibid.). Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (2014) assert that in the West it is the distinction between counselling and teaching and is “undertaken by separated specialists, the psychologist or trained counsellor and the school teacher” (p.175). For the indigenous people of Kwara’ae, it
is an activity that is taken on a daily basis in the family to put *falafala* (culture) into the centre of children (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 2014).

### 3.7.2 Curriculum and education

Formal education is facilitated by a curriculum. A curriculum is “planned, sustained and regular learning which is taken seriously, which has distinct and structured content and which proceeds via some kind of stages of learning” (Winch, & Gingell, 1999, p. 52). It is a document that contains planned activities for implementation of the educational aims: “Activities which are designed to implement a particular educational aim or set of such aims of what is to be taught and the knowledge, skills and attitudes which are to be deliberately fostered” (ibid.). The literature describes curriculum as a selection from our cultures, emphasising that the values of our cultures are central to understanding and participating in it and are expected to be found in schools (Gilbert & Hoepper, 2004; Winch & Gingell, 1999). It comprises the determined curriculum, the adaptive curriculum, and the determining curriculum and is purposefully arranged to transfer the stock of knowledge, whether academically or behaviourally to the next generation (Winch & Gingell, 1999).

The knowledge and values are planned activities in the curriculum that has been systematically written. Importantly, the curriculum must reflect the needs of the society (Demaine, 2004). In an attempt to encourage certain behaviours and that of citizenship, the curriculum is an important document in the education process as this is where important knowledge and values required to change society are situated and formally transmitted. Importantly, it is vital to consider that any curriculum model, framework, approach, and domain developed and used by any one country is likely to differ from the purposes, aims, and objectives of curriculum planning and development of another (Demaine, 2004). In this regard, this study embraces the notion that the curriculum is a dynamic document, able to change according to changes in content of education and in teaching and learning processes following the needs of the social environment (OECD, 1991). Further, any curriculum construction should first consider the factors and forms of difference that marginalise groups and individuals from the society (Demaine, 2004). In other words teaching and learning need to provide the understanding to see clearly the impacts of these differences if not addressed properly.
Thaman, (2009), however, challenges this description, suggesting that in PIC countries the school curriculum is culturally undemocratic because it fails to take learners’ culture into consideration: the aims, goals, and objectives of the schools and the teaching points contained in PIC schools’ curricula are not aligned with the cultures of students and teachers (Thaman, 2009). Rather they are largely Eurocentric (Lingam, et al., 2013; Thaman, 2009) and purposely geared towards advancing state priorities to meet the economic and social goals of each particular country (OECD, 1991). As Thaman notes, the learning the school emphasises is abstract and book-based learning while in learners’ homes, “learning is utilitarian”, with real life experiences (p. 15).

CE programmes of particular countries, then, must consider the approaches, domains, and models that provide the most effective learning for students to meet the demands for a stable and caring society. In order to address societal changes, any changes in the education system require some corresponding modification of the curriculum that is reflective of context (Adeyemi, et al., 1999). Without curriculum change, modifications to the structure of the system make no sense and have little point. However, if educational change is to keep pace with and match changes in society, and at the same time maintain the standards and values in the particular society, it must be deliberately managed and not merely left to change by chance (ibid.). Clearly, the curriculum, particularly citizenship education programmes, is a useful tool for this important undertaking for nation building.

3.7.3 Discourses of citizenship education
CE is the preparation through schooling, teaching and learning of young people for their roles and responsibilities as citizens (White & Openshaw, 2005). It implies a mutual understanding by the state and the individual (Iyamu & Otote, 2000). CE focuses on knowledge and understanding opportunities for participation and engagement in both civic and civil society where citizens interact with and shape their communities including schools and societies (ibid.). It is a programme of study adopted by recognised governmental or professional organisations that aims to develop “good”, “active”, “effective”, or “democratic” citizenship (Ross, 2006).

Herbert and Sears (n.d.) represent CE as “preparation of individuals to participate as active and responsible citizens in a democracy” (p. 1). In this discourse, the relationship between the
individual and political society, and between the self and others, is vital. It is the understanding of relation that people have with the state through the teaching of values that are relevant and contextual to people (Iyamu & Otote, 2000). The concern here is that the individuals understand both their own identity and the nature of society, and how to engage actively with the complex relationship of rights and responsibilities that exists between the two (Audigier, 1998). It is a conscious process of developing certain values, habits, skills, and attitudes that the society considers desirable and essential for its survival as a unit and its development; this is done through the forms of education and training that each nation-state adopts (Iyamu & Otote, 2000).

Westhermer and Kahne (2004) see CE as developing personal responsibility through individual acts such as obeying laws, shovelling sidewalks, and paying taxes; and participatory citizenship that promotes understanding of the workings of social and political organizations, such as organising a fundraiser to combat homelessness, mounting a poster, campaigning to draw attention to existing social problems, or even campaigning for political candidature (ibid., 2004). Such a conception is challenged by authors, like Tupper (2007), who see participation as only a form of training people to become good citizens for a good society. The author claims that such a form of CE is inextricably linked to programmes that are shaped by ideologically conservative conceptions of citizenship embedded in efforts of teaching for democracy only (Tupper, 2007). It was contested on the basis that it fails to acknowledge the causes of social inequalities, therefore, Justice-oriented citizenship that advocates analysis and understanding of the interplay of social, economic, and political forces as well as teaching about social movements is favoured (ibid.). Justice-oriented citizenship education encourages students to become community activists (Tupper, 2007).

The literature, then, aligns CE programmes with preparation of individuals to live with certain rights and privileges in a nation state, and to participate as active and responsible citizens who fulfil their duties to the state (Banks, 2008; Hebert & Sears, n.d.). CE includes the formal curriculum, teaching and learning, students’ active participation in formal and informal school activities and the policies that are formulated to guide which values to teach. In this respect, it is not only about understanding existing socio-political structures, but concerns identifying and transmitting the values that shape and form society (Tupper, 2007).
3.7.4 Theoretical orientation of citizenship education
The theories and framework of CE related much to concepts, themes, and social theories that were relevant to the need of each particular nation-state (Banks, 2004; Kerr, 2006; Kymlicka, 1995). The current debate about the influence of education on young people’s social development is imbued with the concept of citizenship (Turner, 1997). This includes the development of young people to make a difference in society by transferring knowledge on democracy, its institutions, and the structure of society (Leenders, Veugelers, & De Kat, 2012). Literally, that is the dominant feature in the citizenship education programmes of most nation-states including developing Island nations in the Pacific. Another dominant feature is the promotion of particular social norms or active construction of moral values that are significant to citizens (ibid.). This latter approach concerns the individual’s social performance, which links to participation in society (ibid.). In such a perspective, the moral values to be developed are “justice,” “autonomy,” and “social and moral commitment” (Leenders, et al., 2012, p. 2). In this claim, citizenship is not restricted to the political domain only, as traditionally implied, but it also relates to the civil society, which includes the everyday relations between people, and to individuals’ identity development (ibid.).

Further, Leenders and co-authors (2012), argue that if CE is concerned with explanation of rights and duties, or behavioural conformity, it has to be anchored in moral development. The relationship between CE and moral development is based on the understanding that the value development guides the citizenship development (ibid.). This link is exemplified by the Dutch policy on CE, which holds that educational objectives for active citizenship and social integration must address the cultural diversity in society (Leenders, et al., 2012). For instance, the cultural and ideological diversity with values such as “tolerance” and “respect for differences” should be dealt with in education (ibid.). The formal Dutch policy focuses on social cohesion and social integration in citizenship education that is based on power relationships.

Porath (2005) claims that citizenship commitment is fundamental to sustaining democracy: this requires citizens to understand the basic principles of liberal democracy that transcend countries’ cultures and historical eras. One of the basic principles of liberal democracy is the inculcating of certain core values and ideas. It means teaching the philosophy of politics in its broader sense that includes appreciation for freedom, constitutionalism, respect for law, restraint of power,
political choice, and accountability of rules to ruled (Larase, 2000). The assumption for this prospect is to secure other basic values common to all religions and civilisations: peace, security, political and social justice, respect for the physical environment, and human dignity for all people, no matter their colour, culture, or faith. In recent times, many common values are shared around the world. Therefore, it is important for citizens of newly emerging democracies to know that values are increasingly shared around the world (Diamond, cited in Porath, 2005). Porath (2005) explains that CE starts with facts of enduring pluralism in society and continues by developing democratic citizenship and its skills and habits as a practice that informs education for membership in the nation-state (p. 382). According to this argument, if the CE programme is grounded in social and moral realities it will connect individuals who share the same fate by virtue of their membership (Porath, 2005). Alluding to the previous arguments on membership, CE that acknowledges and promotes visions of shared industries, struggles, institutions, and commitment require a form of education for patriotism. In this case, using the idea that citizenship is a shared fate as a framework for obligation and responsibilities can inform the vision of patriotic education (Porath, 2005).

Porath, (2005) divides the values theorized into three components of CE:

1. An introduction to a corpus of knowledge such as governance structure and procedures
2. Facilitation of certain skills such as deliberation and effective communication
3. Development of attitudes and dispositions such as respect, tolerance and public mindedness (p. 392).

Research has portrayed those values as a minimal part of citizenship education that is defensive to liberal democratic citizenship (Porath, 2005). Some researchers refer to this as teaching social actioning while others see it as education for active citizenship. Despite those varying arguments CE is the “the finest way to encourage the development of the individual being’s personality and potential” (Heater, 1999, p. 165). From the outset “students who learn CE in school are more likely to become active citizens in tomorrow’s democracy” (Print, 1999, p. 83). Therefore, the decision made now for CE to be taught in school will have a profound impact on how citizenship is understood in the future (ibid.).

The literature also recommends the concept of citizenship be learned in order for the public to be aware of what families, communities, and the state expect from them (Kerr, 2000; Print, 1999). Further, the “future of all countries lies partly in the education of their youths therefore, if that
education ignores CE then the country’s future will be less influenced by its political heritages and values that mold the society” (Gore, 1999, p.75). In that sense, it is important for the general population to gain access to the values, knowledge, and understanding of the social, legal, and political systems in which they live and operate. Not only that, they need to be endowed with the values and dispositions that would put their values, knowledge, and skills to beneficial use (Heater, 1999). Civic and CE, as Gore (1999) further explains, is all about values and about the programmes that make a difference in schools and in the wider community. This leads us to focus on debate pertinent to CE and curriculum.

3.7.5 Debates in citizenship education
The debates on CE are numerous. Most of them are centred on what should be included in the classroom as knowledge and values that will shape students’ behaviours. The literature affirms that the “school house is perhaps the best vehicle available to the state to unite a diverse citizenry under common ideas and to help forge a common national identity” (Rob Reich, in cited Porath, 2005, p. 384). Debates on citizenship in the school setting variously place CE along a continuum of versions, elements, domains, models, and approaches (McLaughlin, cited in Kerr, 2002). Each of these is discussed below.

Citizenship education minimal version.
The minimal version of CE is interpreted as a narrow definition of citizenship which only focuses on particular exclusive interests (Kerr, 2002). These interests include the narrow formal approach to citizenship that is labelled “Civic Education”. This includes the teaching of geography and history of the society which is argued to be largely content and knowledge-led (Kerr, 2002, p. 215).

The minimal version of CE concerns the teaching of values on governance, rights, and responsibilities (Deuchar, 2007). This includes promotion of a good citizen who is law abiding, works hard, and possesses a good character. Lynch (1992) suggests the teaching of such values to be the fundamental principle of schooling if the state or individuals want to see a harmonious life among citizens. The unifying theme in this suggestion is the teaching of acknowledgment of basic rights and freedom among citizens. Deuchar (2007) affirms that teaching CE for knowledge about rights, personal identities, and the values of law abiding citizens would unify people. However, according to the early history of citizenship, such a position is linked to the
original definition of citizenship which concerns individuals giving up their allegiance to the church or the state through certain religious convictions and education. Philip (1999), citing the work of Rousseau, describes the concept of citizenship as, having ramification in later years (cited in Ireland, Kerr, Lopez, Nelson & Cleaver, 2008). Rousseau pointed out that educating children to appreciate the values and procedures that are beneficial to society had a vital role to play in fostering a sense of nationality and national pride. That has changed as many now desire to shift from an understanding of education for citizenship based on the promotion of the rights of the learners, towards one based on the idea of mutual obligation and active citizenship (Kymlicka & Norman, 2000). The argument here is that citizens can claim their rights only if they carry out their duties more diligently in society (Kerr & Cleaver, 2006). Kerr and Cleaver (2006) interpret the mutual obligation as, “something for something … mutual responsibility by all stakeholders” (p. 36). They argue that skills/values should be internalised and constitute the inner character of the learners and must be reinforced across the school. Such a description is perceived as a reinforcement of the old, conservative, republican tradition which defines CE in terms of duty.

In England, active citizens are viewed only as a function of social control (Deuchar, 2007). The description is limited to those who pay taxes, obey the law, and take care of their neighbours (Deuchar, 2007). However, that has been challenged by the fact that the changing nature of the world requires consideration of an approach that encompasses a commitment to participate in public life (ibid.). Such a view does not support a citizenship approach that promotes decent, law abiding citizens. It is claimed that the minimal version of Citizenship Education that stresses knowledge of the legal system, state, elections, functions of central and state governments, and state welfare matters produces passive/functional citizenship (Mamat & Singh, 2008, p. 89).

**Citizenship education maximal version**

The maximal version of CE also has content and knowledge components of minimal interpretation, “but actively encourages investigation and interpretation of the many ways in which these components are determined and carried out” (Kerr, 2002, p. 215). Commitment and participation are core to the maximal approach (Deuchar, 2007). In this version, a sense of obligation is recognised, particularly the willingness to take charge of the responsibility entrusted to the individual and the duties expected by society concerning undertaking change on a local,
national, or even a global scale (Osley & Starkey, 2002, cited in Deuchar, 2007). This encourages and promotes pupils to become agents for social change, developing enquiring minds and skills for participation (ibid.).

Lynch, (1992) does not support citizenship promoting ideological domination based on the argument that students were indoctrinated by CE to accept the inequalities in wealth and power among the dominant groups nationally and internationally while ignoring the core societal and environmental needs. The concern here is the support to enhance the capacity of “learners to reconstruct their communities and societies according to the principles of human sensitivity and reciprocity, social justice, wise environmental stewardship and greater economic equity” (p. 31). Further argument on this level highlights that changes are inevitable because of uncertainties of the times. The question of appropriateness and relevance of values to citizenship is critical in both national and international contexts (Mutch, 2005). The fact that “human families are facing an unprecedented set of challenges, issues, and problems related to globalisation of the economy, deterioration of the quality of the global environment, and ethical and social issues are critical dilemmas nations have been faced with” (Cogan, cited in Mutch, 2005, p. 187). Consequently, the maximal approach to CE holds that development of critical, reflective, and independent thinking among individuals regarding social issues is important (Mamat & Singh, 2005). The goal of this version is to produce citizens who play active roles in matters concerning social, economic, and political issues or produce citizens that are active.

**Elements of citizenship education curriculum**

Citizenship involves a number of interrelated skills and beliefs that influence outcomes typically represented in curriculum. Osborne (2005) identifies five elements that constitute CE as follows:

- national consciousness: sense of identity as a national citizen; awareness of multiple identities, such as regional, cultural, ethnic, religious, class, gender; sense of global or world citizenship
- political literacy: knowledge of the political, legal, and social institutions of one’s country; understanding of key political and social issues, necessary skills, and knowledge for effective political participation
- observance of rights and duties: understanding of and belief in basic rights and duties of citizenship; understanding of how to deal with, and if possible resolve, conflicts.
- values: understanding of societal values; knowledge and skills to deal with conflicting values in acceptable ways.
• general intellectual skills: literacy and intellectual competence.

The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) describes the above elements as the teaching of civic/citizenship education on democratic rights, freedom, responsibilities, government systems and structures, political associations and nation state civil structures (Schulz, et al. 2010). CE also includes the knowledge and understanding of formal institutions and processes of civic life such as voting in elections. Similarly, further translation provided by the International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS) is based on four civic values: civil society and system, civic principles, civic participation, and civic identities. Each of these is made up of a set of sub-domains that incorporate elements referred to as “aspects” and “key concepts” (Kerr et al., 2010). These aspects and key concepts form the basis and standard of assessments for CE.

Citizenship curriculum domains.
All these elements have been translated into domains that constitute the curriculum for citizenship. According to Herbert and Sears (n.d.), the four most adopted domains are: civil, political, socioeconomic, and cultural or collective domain. The civil domain includes freedom of speech, expression, and equality before the law. The political domain involves the right to vote and to political participation (political citizens) and is referred to in terms of political rights and duties with respect to the political system. The socioeconomic domain refers to the relationship among individuals in any given society and the right to participate in a political space (Gilbert, 2005). The cultural or collective domain refers to how societies take into account the diversity due to global migration. This includes minority groups’ quest for recognition of their rights and certain conceptions of human dignity and the affirmation of legal equality against all forms of discrimination (Herbert & Sears, n.d, p. 2).

According to the arguments, CE is based on the civic engagement of citizens and how successfully the values that are important to the development of the society have been inculcated in them (Kerr, 2006). Such civic engagement includes participation in national elections, involvement in political campaigns, joining political parties, and actively participating in school civic programmes (Kerr, 2006). This active and passive participation and involvement of citizens is called civic education. Civic education is defined as a study of local, state, and federal government and the rights and responsibilities of the citizenry (Feldman & Doug, 2007). They
are part of the elements and domains of citizenship education highlighted earlier, which includes citizens’ rights and responsibilities in political and social domains and teaching of rights and responsibility, the political literature and government structures and systems (Potter, 2002).

**Citizenship education curriculum model/strand**

Herbert and Sears’ (n.d.) study of curriculum models of citizenship points out four components: “national identity; social, cultural and supranational belonging; an effective system of rights; and political and civic participation” (p. 2). Those models, although attributed to the Canadian context, are also recognised among other developed countries. For example, in the Crick report, the models that are favoured by England are: social and moral responsibility, community involvement, and political literacy (Potter, 2002). Social and moral responsibility focuses on children’s learning to build self-confidence and develop socially and morally responsible behaviours. Community involvement targets learning to be helpfully involved in, and show concern for, the life of the community through service. Political literacy is concerned with children’s learning about how to make themselves effective in public life (Potter, 2002). The models that are debated for CE in England also encompass “the nature of the community, the roles and relationships in the pluralistic society; duties, responsibilities and rights of being a citizen; the context of a family and the political system” (Gilbert, 2005, p. 143). This model of citizenship in England is now on the statute books: it is part of the national curriculum and teachers in England are working to make it a daily reality in schools (Potter 2002).

**Models and strategies in teaching and learning**

In teaching citizenship, teachers use techniques that help students to acquire knowledge, skills, and values effectively. The implication is that citizenship education has to be delivered via practical activities to make it more meaningful to students (Diamon, 1997). Concrete presentations have to involve students’ projects, demonstrations, dramatisations, guest speakers, teachers as examples. However, the teacher as role model is an important aspect of teaching and learning. In the literature, some argue that while teachers may place high expectations on students to follow what they say, teachers’ own practice does not always reflect their words (Evans, 2006). This is serious in teaching and learning, particularly in countries like SI, where great trust is placed in teachers, who are the most influential people in school communities and are expected to act like parents of students in the school environment.
The other aspect is demonstration and it is an important strategy in teaching citizenship themes. Traditionally, in Solomon Islands, the art of teaching and learning revolved around teacher demonstration and student hands-on imitation for learning. Similarly, dramatisation is favoured for teaching citizenship education values. However, teachers fail to utilise these teaching strategies because of the challenges and pressure for results in the national examination.

In the traditional SI context, personal discovery is a significant value of maturity. If someone wants recognition for their leadership in the community, they have to seek advice from the elderly people. This important knowledge and values is referred to as secret knowledge (Gegeo, 2001). In the modern contemporary context, students are expected to follow the same process for class projects. In such a teaching strategy the students are given a topic to research; for example, What are the characteristics of a good leader in traditional and modern societies? In the traditional settings knowledge is built and acquired around the family, tribe, and the whole community. Teaching and learning is not an individual responsibility, it is the obligation of the whole community. Younger people are expected to be taught by people of specialised skills and knowledge and values, aside from their immediate family. Next, excursions are part of people’s traditional learning. Obviously, modern classroom teaching, in which students are kept in class, is contradictory to people’s understanding of learning and the process of learning. In Solomon Islands contexts it is an offence to culture if one remains in the home and is expected to learn only from their father and mother. It does not happen that way. In the SI traditional setting, skills, knowledge, and values that are considered worthwhile to develop for younger people to become good and active citizens are transferred through excursions.

**Citizenship curriculum approaches.**
The literature on CE has highlighted several approaches that are commonly used in teaching values for good and active citizenship. However, the approaches that are most familiar and commonly adopted are the segregated approach, cross-curricula approach, extra-curricula approach, and social study curriculum and whole school approach. In a recent study Dorovolomo conducted in Fiji (2012), according to students’ and teachers’ views, four approaches are important for CE in formal settings. First, the teaching of CE through the formal curriculum of primary, secondary and tertiary institutions. Second, dissemination of information through workshops, seminars, and conferences, and taking student and school interests and contexts on
board through extra-curricular activities. Third is integrating CE in all fields and subjects of the school, or taking a cross-curricular approach (Dorovolomo, 2012). The fourth is teaching CE values through the social studies curriculum (Xiao & Tong, 2010). That finding is similar to what was earlier articulated. However, how relevant those approaches are to SI is the focus of this study that is expected to be examined in detail later.

**Segregated curriculum approach**
Teaching CE via a segregated approach concerns having CE as a separate subject. This is favoured because it eases the burden for teachers in other subject areas (Kerr & Cleaver, 2002). Obviously, it is easier for those who are responsible to teach the subject to handle it rather than to expect every teacher to teach it. It becomes “someone else’s problem”; that is, it is properly the province of those who are specifically trained to teach the subject. For those who favour this approach, developing CE as a segregated subject is perceived as a prerequisite for the effective implementation of the subject in school (Kerr & Cleaver, 2006).

**Cross-curricula approach**
The cross-curricula approach implies factoring CE themes in all subjects that are prescribed for teaching in the school curriculum. It is implemented through the formal curriculum (King, 1997). Advocates of this approach contend that many prescribed subjects have elements of citizenship in their teaching themes (Wilkins, 2003). However, many see the development of the cross-curricula approach as difficult because only some values are delivered through certain subjects in the formal school curriculum. Further, citizenship will be most successful where it becomes a unifying element within the curriculum and where schools use it to further their existing aims as well as appreciating how it can empower young people (Kerr & Cleaver, 2006). However, another limitation in dissemination through the formal curriculum is that information is disseminated only for rote learning and for memorisation of facts (Karsten, Cogan, Grossman, Liu, & Ptiyanuwat 2002). A vital counter argument stresses that CE should not be passively disseminated, via reading texts, listening, completing worksheets, and examinations. It must be about programmes and activities that are specifically designed to enhance cooperation, critical thinking, and tolerance.
**Extra-Curricular approach**
The extra-curricular approach is the most favoured approach, under which CE is promoted outside of the formal school curriculum. Off-campus learning experiences help develop moral reasoning of students (Pascarella, 1997). It is promoted through civic engagement (Banks, 2004; Kerr, 2006,) activities such as flag-raising, singing of national anthems, arranged inter-school sport activities, and other activities like volunteerism and active involvement in community works (Banks, 2004). The activities are assumed to promote national consciousness and to unify people of different backgrounds. Some researchers view this as a very appealing and effective means of promoting CE because of how it is practised. This approach is situated outside of the school academic timetable. Students need to put the right principles into practice, as being a good person is more than simply knowing what is morally right. No matter how much knowledge one has gained about being a good citizen and no matter how one is impressed and touched by certain moral values, it becomes useless when it is not practised in everyday life. The ultimate goal in CE is acting rather than merely knowing (Lee, 2001). Ehrlich (1997, p. 59) suggests that that citizenship education processes should engage students in reaching beyond the walls of the classroom and into the surrounding community and focus on problems to be solved. Dorovolomo (2012) relates it to community-service learning. It is a promising pedagogy for CE, which can appear in various forms: direct aid or token to an identified need area, education and outreach activities or simply doing policy analysis and research. It should also be collaborative between students and students, and students and staff. This is an important realisation, according to Dorovolomo (2012), because the child is obviously influenced by life at home, life at school, and life in the community. When there is alignment between the values taught at school, in the home, and in the child’s host community, the values are more likely to be internalised with a long-term effect on behaviour and conscience (Lee, 2001; Levine, 2010).

**Social Studies curriculum approach**
The Social Studies approach is commonly used in teaching values of citizenship. The subject is compulsory in all formal education systems globally. It is widely considered as an essential and appropriate approach to deliver and promote the concept and values of CE (Allen & Stevens, 1998; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Hill, 1994; Kerr, 2000; Marsh 1991; Massialas & Allen, 1996; Zarrillo, 2004). In the literature, it is appropriate because it has the potential to transmit knowledge and understanding about people, environment, moral values, political structures, and government, and how to deal with issues and conflicts of the contemporary period (Heater,
1999). As a subject, it teaches about people to help them acquire knowledge and master the process of learning to become active citizens (Ross, 2006). In other related literature, Mutch (2005) notes that, “Social Studies is a discipline that teaches about people, women, men, and children. It teaches about how and why in diverse cultures, and in different times, and places they think, feel, and act, and organise their way of life” (p. 192).

Furthermore, “Social Studies teaches about how people interact with others and their environments, initiate their responses to changes and meet their political, social, economic, legal, and spiritual needs” (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 1994, p. 7, cited by Mutch, 2005). In discussing the relationship between education for citizenship and Social Studies, Reley and Wofford (cited in Adeyemi, Boikhuto & Moffat, 2003) have asserted that students should be challenged to apply civic knowledge, skills, and values as they solve real problems whether in school, their community, nation, or the world. The CE concept seems to be the driving force in education that will promote the values considered important for good and active citizenship (Zarrillo, 2000). Social Studies is a subject that is believed to teach children to value themselves by nurturing positive self-esteem and learning (Mutch, 2005). It should help students adopt healthy values toward school and learning, the social and physical environment, and the political and legal propositions of the state (Zarrillo, 2000). The values that need development and promotion should constitute the standard or criteria against which individual and group behaviour are judged; beliefs represent commitments to those values (Honesty, for example, is a value) (ibid.). A set of values that Social Studies emphasise is civic and citizenship values and beliefs that lead to good and active citizenship.

3.8 Summary
Since the topic of this study, CE, is new to SI, it has been necessary first to review several aspects of citizenship: the context, the history, and the resurgence of the concept in the contemporary world. Further, this study explores the values associated with citizenship and citizenship’s relationship with education, with the intention of providing a broad perspective from literature covering knowledge, skills, and values that are used by other countries in their citizenship education programmes. This chapter has presented the literature about the origins, emergence and resurgence of theorising about citizenship, various conceptualisations, values,
themes models, and domains associated with the practice of CE, and different pedagogies that are adopted by different nation-states in their education systems.

The literature further identifies features of citizenship values that have emerged and been practised in different times and places, and the ways in which education is used as a tool to acquire values that the society desires. The varying conceptualisations, theorising and practice of citizenship education that the chapter has highlighted have informed and shaped the exploration in the review of values that provoke good citizenship. Much of what has been reviewed historically, conceptually and theoretically, on citizenship is summed up as: values that have emerged and been endorsed in society in certain times and places and have been expected to have a profound effect – that is, to change society – and education is used to transmit those values to people. This proposition holds that CE is interpreted, defined, and theorised according to what particular needs the society is grappling with at that particular time.

The domains, models, approaches, and strategies used in national CE programmes have to be determined by the needs of each country, so they are necessarily different from each other. In SI, the values assumed relevant to the current context include a range of cultural, Christian and democratic values. In so far as the literature on the three domains has relevance to SI society, it has to be considered. The next chapter, four, presents the methodology adopted for the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction
Chapter three presented the review of literature on citizenship education (CE) values for good citizenship. This chapter provides the methodological orientation of the study, comprising the research design, approaches, strategies, and methods employed to gain insights from school stakeholder participants, the primary focus of this study. The aim of this research is to explore school stakeholders’ perspectives and experiences with citizenship values for good citizenship taught in the school curriculum and practised outside of the school curriculum of Solomon Islands (SI). The particular focus here is to collect information through unstructured and semi-structured interviews, and structured survey questionnaires, in expectation of collecting perspectives and “thick” descriptions from participants using unstructured and semi-structured open-ended questions that stimulate discussions. Using this process, the participants were invited/encouraged to share their stories, realities, and aspirations, to identify the values that they prefer to be learnt from school and at home. To achieve this, the research design was chosen to help provide spaces for school stakeholders to present their perspectives about the curriculum.

The structure of the chapter is as follows: section 4.2 expounds the methodology, section 4.3 the theoretical orientation and research processes, and section 4.4 the design of the study, including the rationale for choosing to use mixed methods for it. Section 4.5 discusses the qualitative and section 4.6 the quantitative approaches, along with questions of validity and reliability. Section 4.7 is devoted to the research paradigms and section 4.8 to the qualitative strategies of inquiry. The site and sample selection is discussed in section 4.9, the quantitative research methods in section 4.10, and section 4.11 covers the analysis of the chapter. In section 4.12 some ethical considerations are noted before section 4.13 concludes the chapter with a brief summary.

Research questions
This study uses two main questions to explore the preferred values for SI. They are:

1. What do Solomon Islanders conceptualise as good citizenship?
2. To what extent is the current Junior Secondary School curriculum on CE culturally and religiously inclusive of the SI context in terms of good citizenship?
4.2 Methodology
The term methodology is used to refer to the nature of acquiring knowledge (Denzin & Lincoln, 2007). It is the “philosophical underpinnings and assumptions embedded on how researchers constructed knowledge” (Conrad & Serlin, 2006, p. 377). It provides an understanding that construction of knowledge depends on the decisions the researcher takes to approach the research project (Creswell, 2009). This understanding recognises that there is no definitive method to conducting research. Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003) clarify the understanding that no research method is seen as better than another: “research is not a one size-fits-all enterprise … All can be used well or poorly … Each has its own strengths and weaknesses … Each is more or less appropriate to use in any single research exercise” (p. 3).

However, it is claimed that good-quality research is that which employs the most suitable method in a thoughtful and careful way (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003). To set this study in a linear context, a philosophical overview is offered so that “readers can understand the context in which the study is undertaken, the circumstance or their unusual or restricted meanings” (Caster & Heisler, cited in Creswell, 1994, p. 106). The nature of this study on CE favoured a mixed method approach, because the data from both designs (qualitative and quantitative) can complement each other. For instance, the qualitative data contributes to the generation of hypotheses and building a theory while quantitative results test the theory. That is the significance that this study embraced. The sequential exploratory mixture of methods adopted is explained in detail in the discussion that follows. However, to select a design depends upon what you are trying to do” (Silverman (1993: 22).

4.2.1 Theoretical orientation
Research is often conducted to explore a new concept (Creswell, 1998). CE is a new concept for SI; therefore, it is necessary to study this concept systematically so that the findings of the study are authentic and the results can be used confidently for educational purposes. It is imperative to incorporate the review of scientific literature and the theory in the research design (Hennink, Hutter, & Bailey, 2011) for exploring new topics in a national context, such as the case of this study, for a number of reasons. First, it provides a space for researchers to base their research in a wider scientific literature. Second, it helps researchers to refine their questions further and link them with concepts from findings of previous studies. Third, it helps researchers to justify their research; to explicate why it is important to conduct the research. Fourth, the existing literature
on scientific research will inform the inquirer about the possible data that can be collected and the methods that can be applied (Hennink, et al., 2011).

A theory is a relationship between concepts (Liampuntong & Essy, 2005; Maxwell, 2005). It is an explanation about the way things are (Bouma, 1997). It is a “set of interrelated constructs (variables), definitions and propositions that present a systematic view of phenomena by specifying relations among variables, with the purpose of explaining natural phenomena” (Creswell, 1994, p. 82). The systematic view, according to this interpretation, can be an argument or discussion that can help to explain phenomena (Creswell, 1994). The purpose of theory in research, according to Weirsma, (1995), is to help the researcher to establish a framework from which to start and then proceed with the study. Its function in research designs is to provide a model or map of why the world is as it is and to provide a conceptual view of what the world looks like (Hennink, et. al., 2011). It identifies important factors that need consideration, provides guidance for different parts of the research, and identifies gaps, weak points, and inconsistencies that may require further research (ibid.).

This study explores the extent to which the SI Junior Secondary School curriculum is adequately preparing students for good citizenship. To gain relevant information, and to form a theory and provide validity and reliability to the research, the study design uses a mixture of methods, including both quantitative and qualitative paradigms. However, to justify the paradigm choice, this chapter first sets the scene by discussing the three research designs (qualitative, quantitative and mixed method) separately and to make comparisons between qualitative and quantitative approaches. The purpose is to justify mixed method as an appropriate choice for this study. However, to delve further into the design part of this study, the significance of the research process is first clarified.

4.2.2 Research as process
Research is a process for obtaining data. It requires the inquirer to be familiar with the series of linked activities involved in the research, particularly in moving the study from a beginning to an end (Bouma, 1996; Wiersma, 1995). It is not absolutely rigid but it will be difficult if the first steps are not carefully planned and executed (Bouma & Ling, 2005). The researcher has to select carefully and understand the purpose of the study clearly before any systematic collection of data can proceed. Therefore, both quantitative and qualitative researchers need to “engage in a
systematic process of collecting and analysing information (data) for a clearly articulated purpose to research validity and reliability” (Weirsma, 1995, p. 3). In this study, the purpose is to obtain the perceptions of school stakeholders about values that are relevant and necessary for the citizenship CE programme for SI schools.

In qualitative research, a theory is developed during the process of research. However, if no theory is generated, the study may change focus, or be dropped or be refined as the study progressively unfolds (Weirsma, 1995). If the theory is based on data, it will form a grounded theory: “A theory grounded in data rather than one based on some apriori constructed ideas, notions or systems” (Weirsma, 1995, p. 13). If no theory emerges, the research is atheoretical (ibid.). On the other hand, quantitative research is deductive and tends to be more theory-based from the outset. Likewise, “if theory based testing is done, it is quantitative research” (Weirsma, 1995, p. 13).

Scientific research is a “systematic, controlled, empirical and critical investigation of natural phenomena guided by theory and hypotheses about the presumed relations among such phenomena” (Weirsma, 1995, p. 30). It is the attempt to gather evidence in such a way that others can see what was done, and why it was done that way, so that people can draw their own conclusions about the evidence (Bouma, 1996). Burn (2000) sees research as a systematic investigation to find answers to problems. It is also a means by which people appreciate their surroundings. Research has connections with the objective scientific endeavour to enhance knowledge and wisdom. It is an “application of the scientific approach to studying a problem” (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2006, p. 18). The purpose is to find answers that provide meanings to questions posed when scientific procedures are applied. It is a universal, systemic, and objective search for reliable and valid knowledge (Ary, et al., 2006).

Educational research is the application of the scientific approach to the study of educational problems, from which dependable and useful information is acquired about educational processes to find solutions that give insights to issues that need clarification (Ary, et al., 2006). Ary, and colleagues (2006) point out that the general goal of educational research is to “discover general principles or interpretation of behaviors so that people can explain, predict and control events in educational situations” (p.19). Bouma and Ling (2005) outline three common steps
involved in the research process. The essential first step: the researcher clarifies the issues to be researched and selects a research method. Data collection: the researcher collects evidence about the research question. Analysis and interpretation: the researcher relates the evidence to the research question, draws conclusions about the question, and acknowledges the limitations of the research.

This study systematically followed these steps: first, with the unfolding of the literature and methodology review, it identified that relevant values for good citizenship were missing from the education system of SI. Having identified the issue, the researcher selected a method that was judged best to be effective in drawing rich data for the study. Second, the researcher went into the field (four schools, four government departments, and one rural setting) in SI to collect data using interviews and survey questionnaires. Third, the researcher grouped the data, collated them according to themes, and made conclusions about the values required for good citizenship in SI.

4.3 Design of the study

The research design is a plan that details the methods used to collect data or information on a topic of study. It is an important area in the planning of research processes because it makes it possible to answer the research questions posed and to control the procedures (Flick, 2011). Such control keeps the conditions of the study constant, particularly as research is about difference in participants with different perspectives (ibid.). The expectation is that a well-designed study will generate data and information that are rich in detail and new knowledge will be generated from the research.

Researchers approach their work with three types of designs: qualitative, quantitative and mixed method (Creswell, 2009). The three research designs are not very different from each other: the distinction between qualitative and quantitative can be identified only on philosophical assumptions that researchers use. For example, the research strategies in qualitative may be case study, while for quantitative, experiments or specific methods are employed: in collecting quantitative data the researcher uses instruments, while collecting qualitative data the researchers use observation (Creswell, 2009). Mixed method is a combination of both qualitative and quantitative approaches and the strategies used are either concurrent or sequential with method use as that of qualitative and quantitative (Johnson & Onwuegb, 2004). Another distinction is on
the framing of the study. Qualitative is framed using words and open-ended questions, while quantitative is framed using numbers and closed questions (Creswell, 2009).

4.3.1 Mixed Method Design
This study used mixed method to collect data. The approach of inquiry combines both the qualitative and quantitative forms. According to Creswell (2009), mixed methods involve the philosophical assumptions, the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches and the mixing of both approaches to the study. As claimed, “it is more than simply collecting and analyzing both kinds of data: it also involves the use of both approaches in tandem so that the overall strength of the study is greater than either qualitative or quantitative research” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007, cited in Creswell, 2009, p. 4). However, for this study the strength of this study is qualitative and not so much in a tandem approach. The dominant status is “QUAL – quan” which Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) refer as; “for sequential, capital letters denote high priority or weight, and lower case letters denote lower priority or weight” (p.22).

In mixed method, the position about worldview comes from the pragmatist (Creswell, 2009). This worldview has many philosophical forms; however, pragmatism as a worldview arises out of actions, situations, and consequences rather than antecedents, condition or what works or solution to problems (Patton, 1990, cited, in Creswell, 2009). Another reason for the use of mixed method is that it is claimed to broaden understanding by the use of one approach to understand better, explain, and build on the results from the other (Onwuegbuzie & Turner, 2007, cited in Creswell, 2009). Pragmatism is appropriate for conducting research in contexts like SI, a country that has experienced a withdrawal of people from public activities. In such contexts, researchers use all approaches available to understand the problems (Rossman & Wilson, 1985, cited in Creswell, 2009). In this study, the problem needing to be studied is the unprecedented situation whereby values practised by youth in the society appear to contradict what is learned in the classrooms of SI schools. The school system appears to breed violent youths, which resulted in the ethnic tensions during the period of 1998–2003. The aftermath of the social unrest caused a chaotic environment resulting in closure of schools, breakdown of law and order, a rise in social problems, and the demise of morality in society. Such a range of problems is best approached by using a combination of both qualitative and quantitative approaches. In other words, pragmatism – which does not commit to any one philosophy or
reality, and draws liberally from quantitative and qualitative assumptions when engaging in research – is the best approach for this study (Creswell, 2009). However, since qualitative is the weight or priority, the study is more interpretative than positivist.

The rationale for mixed method research design
Using both the qualitative and quantitative design is expected to inform the study appropriately, thereby, leading the study through a research process that is clear, consistent, and easy to follow. The weight of this mixed method design is qualitative and has resonated from the exploratory mixed method strategy (Creswell, 2009). As the weight is qualitative, this study uses the social constructionist philosophical world view to acquire the knowledge that this research wishes to attain. This study further, describes the multiple-site, qualitative research design employed with selected participants that aimed to increase levels of active participation among sensitive localities and differing perspectives.

The data collection in mixed methods included the use of group discussion and one-on-one discussion and answering research survey question as a support for the qualitative discussions. The steps the study took to analyse both these data types are outlined. For the qualitative approach, it starts with explanations and clarification of the methods used to collect data. This includes focus group discussions and one-on-one interviews. The chapter further provides justification for the use of unstructured and semi-structured interview questions as tools to elicit data from participants. It includes a brief description of the procedures involved in the study, description and analysis of the data, discussion of the ethical considerations, understanding that ethical decisions “permeate every phase of the research process” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p. 30) and this study describes measures taken to ensure that ethical care of participants and their data throughout this study is upheld.

Planning of mixed method
Planning is very important in mixed method as it involves several aspects that influence the design of procedures. According to Creswell (2009) there are four aspects: “timing, weighting, mixing and theorizing or transforming perspectives” (p. 208). Researchers must ensure that they plan their timing consistently, whether the collection of data is in phases (sequentially) or concurrently. It depends on the researcher’s intention for how to conduct the research (Creswell, 2009). In this research, data were collected sequentially or in phases. First, qualitative data were
collected from the participants on the site, then later, quantitative data were collected. The quantitative data helped support the qualitative data, which for this study were the main data.

Debates about data collection have argued that collecting data sequentially can be unworkable, especially in the health sciences, where medical personnel have no time to go back and do another collection of data. In addition, it is argued that collecting data concurrently will make the implementation simultaneous, and data collection more manageable (Creswell, 2009). For this research, however, the researcher conducted the research in phases and revisited the site twice, which proved beneficial in terms of validity and reliability of data.

In terms of weighting, this study prioritised qualitative above quantitative approaches to collecting data. The reason is that qualitative data would provide the rich detailed data required for the study. Data were analysed inductively, and after that, when a theory had been generated, the deductive approach was used to test the theory (ibid.). In terms of mixing the data, the researcher was very much aware of the implications and complexity of using both quantitative data based on numbers and qualitative data based on text or narrative (ibid.). In this study, the mixing of the data occurred at the data analysis stage. Both sets of data were analysed separately but stayed connected and were then mixed or combined in the interpretation and discussion stage.

From a number of alternative mixed method strategies, this study used the sequential exploratory strategy (Creswell, 2009). This strategy “involves the first phase of qualitative data collection and analysis, followed by a second phase of quantitative data collection and analysis that builds on the results of the first phase and the data are mixed through being connected between the qualitative data analyses and quantitative data collection” (Creswell, 2009, p. 211). In other words, the strategy is “to use quantitative data results to assist in the interpretation of qualitative findings” (Creswell, 2009 p. 211). In terms of data collection and analysis, since the study employed mixture of methods, the data collection procedures and the data analysis and validation procedures were adopted from the qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, which are discussed more fully in the following sections.
4.4. **Quantitative Research**

Quantitative research is a means for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables (Cresswell, 1994). Typically, these variables can be measured using instruments so designed that numbered data can be analysed using statistical procedures. The final report has a set structure consisting of introduction, literature and theory, methods, results, and discussion (Creswell, 2008). Like qualitative researchers, those who engage in this form of inquiry have assumptions about testing theories deductively, building protections against bias, controlling for alternative explanations, and being able to generalise and replicate the findings.

The quantitative approach is “termed the traditional, positivist, the experimental or the empiricist paradigm” (Creswell, 1994, p. 4). The thinkers that established the empiricist tradition are, for social theory, Comte (1975), Mill (1965), Durkheim (1938, cited in Clark, 1997), while in philosophy, the logical positivists were Carnap, Feigl, and Neurath in the 20th Century (Clark, 1997). Quantitative research can be classified as experimental and non-experimental enquiry which uses objective measurements and statistical analyses of numeric data to understand and explain a phenomenon (Ary, et al., 2006). It originated in positivism. The positivist researcher emphasises measurement to gather data with objective techniques to answer questions. It is research that is systematic and open to replication by other investigators (ibid.).

### 4.4.1 Post-positivist paradigm

Both social constructivist and post-positivist paradigms are used to guide the present study. According to the literature, the post-positivist tradition derives from 19th century writers like Comte, Mill, Newton, and Locke (Creswell, 2009). In the post-positivist paradigm, the cause may determine the effects or outcome of the study (Creswell, 2009). Therefore, the problems studied by the post-positivists reflect the need to identify the cause that influences the outcomes (ibid.). It is reductionist in that the intention is to reduce the ideas into small discrete sets of ideas to test. According to Clark (1997), “positivism has its origin in the enlightenment ideal of the rejection of philosophical, religious or civil authority … The clearest expression of this ideal is found in the work of Hume’s (1888) treatise on human nature” (p. 12). Hume sought to ground knowledge in sensory experience, distinguishing knowledge from metaphysics (Clark, 1997).

The results generated from quantitative research are portrayed as reliable. Reliability concerns the “consistency of the research and the extent to which studies can be replicated” (Weirsma,
1995, p. 9). Reliability in education research such as this study also concerns the consistency of the research and the extent to which studies can be replicated (Weirsha & Jurs, 2009). According to Weirsha and Jurs (2009) there are two forms of reliability, internal and reliability. For internal reliability, the data collection, analysis, and interpretation are consistent with each other and are given the same conditions. This study considers all of these as important; therefore, participants from four selected schools that answered the survey questionnaire were expected to provide consistent data to support the qualitative findings. External validity concerns issues of whether or not independent researchers can replicate studies at the same time or in similar settings (Weirsha, 1995).

4.4.2 Instruments
The instrument that is generally used in quantitative studies is a survey questionnaire. A questionnaire is an important research tool for generating data. In the research process, instruments or tools for data collection, such as questionnaires, have to be prepared beforehand (Weirsha & Jurs, 2009). Types of questionnaires include postal questionnaires, group or self-administered questionnaires, and structured questionnaires. A questionnaire may contain checklists, Likert/attitude scales, rating scales, and questions, both open-ended and supply-type (Oppenheim, 1996). The several possible pitfalls that can sabotage the survey (Weirsha & Jurs, 2009) could include not having enough time and resources, breakdown of sampling procedures, not enough resources to test the items, poorly constructed questionnaires, failure to provide follow-up, and inadequate procedures for assembling and tabulating the data (ibid.). The survey questionnaire used in this study was first piloted with five students and five teacher trainees at the University of the South Pacific to test the adequacy of the questions and the understandability of the instrument. As a result of that pilot study minor changes were made to the instrument. During the course of fieldwork and after the six months of fieldwork in SI, the researcher, made follow-up visits to all the sites to ensure that data remained unchanged or to identify changes may have occurred.

4.5 Qualitative Research
This research project places the weight of the study on the qualitative aspects. Qualitative research has its origins in anthropology and sociology but is a field of inquiry that cuts across disciplines and subject matters (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). It is a research process for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem
(Creswell, 2009). It is an approach that allows researchers to “examine people’s experiences in detail by using a specific set of research methods such as in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, observation, content analysis, visual methods or life histories or biographies” (Hennink, Hutter, & Bailey, 2011, p. 9). The process involves emerging questions and procedures, data typically collected in the participants’ setting, data are analysed inductively building from particulars to general themes, and the researcher making the meaning of the data (Creswell, 2009). This approach allows the researcher to identify issues from the perspective of study participants and understand the meanings and interpretations they give to behaviours, events or objects (Hennink, et al., 2011, p. 9). Those engaged in this form of inquiry support a way of looking at research that honours an inductive style, a focus on individual meaning and the importance of rendering the complexity of a situation (Creswell, 2007).

According to Denzin and Lincoln (2008), qualitative research is a process that involves activities that locate the observer in the world. It consists of a “set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible” (p. 4). This research takes on the qualitative paradigm from a constructionist perspective, which states that the realities of the world in which we study are social products of the actors, of interactions and institutions (Flick, 2007). For example, in this research the researcher wanted to understand the participants’ experience of teaching and learning of values for good citizenship, their experience of values learnt from the curriculum, and to understand their social or cultural norms. This is called the interpretative approach (Hennink, et al., 2011).

Furthermore, “qualitative research is rooted in phenomenology” (Ary, et al., 2006, p. 25). In this theoretical view, the substance, social reality, is unique; the individual and the world are viewed as interconnected and cannot be separated or function without each other (ibid.). The researcher can only understand human behaviour through the meanings of events that people are involved in (Ary, et al., 2006). The constructivist researcher considers people and how they think and feel and the experiences that have happened to them (ibid.). Such practices have transformed the world from the positivist position to constructivism. The worldview have changes into representations such as field notes, interviews, conversations, recordings and memos. This sort of such significance of qualitative research triggered the adoption of the constructivist paradigm for this study.
There are merits to qualitative research, which this study considered vital as compared to a quantitative approach. First, qualitative research examines a phenomenon in rich detail and not as a comparison of relationship, as in quantitative approaches (Ary, et al., 2006). This study required such close examination so that rich detail could be obtained from the social environment. Second, the design of this qualitative study on citizenship values evolved during the study process and not prior to the study. Third, the study is approached inductively to generate the theory, not deductively whereby tests are done to generate a theory. Fourth, the tools used require face-to-face interaction rather than standardised instruments (ibid.).

Next, in qualitative research samples are smaller and manageable, and analyses are informed by narrative descriptions and interpretations. Importantly, qualitative research is “holistic …, interpretative and empathetic … It is holistic in its concern with the process and context rather than simply outcomes and experiments research” (Conrad & Serlin, 2006, p. 407). The intent of qualitative research is to understand a particular social situation, event, role, group, or interaction (Locke, Spirduso & Silverman, 2007). It involves an interpretative, naturalistic approach to the world. Researchers study things in their “natural settings, attempting to make sense of or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meaning people bring to them” (Creswell, 2009, p. 3). Consequently, the study of citizenship can only make sense of the world when the views of people are taken into consideration. Therefore, the strength of this study lies within that narrative and interpretative process.

Qualitative research involves the study, use, and collection of a variety of empirical materials – case study; personal experience; introspection; life story; interviews; artifacts; cultural texts and productions; observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts – that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives (Creswell, 2009). According to qualitative researchers (Bazeley, 2013; Creswell, 2009; Lancy, 1993), it involves the deployment of a wide range of interconnected interpretative practice, hoping always to get a better understanding of the subject matter at hand and requiring to be analysed. In most cases, the qualitative researcher begins with the question: what do I want to study? This is known to be a critical beginning regardless of the researcher’s point of view. Because of that, the researcher contracts a question for inquiry. When designing qualitative research it is important to select the
right techniques to be used for the study. In this case, the researcher reflected on how schools in SI operate in relation to citizenship education and in doing so, decided that interviews, observation, and document analysis were the best techniques to use.

4.5.1 Qualitative triangulation
Flick (1998) claimed that, “Qualitative research is inherently multi-method in focus” (p. 230). This study understands that the use of multiple methods or triangulation reflects an attempt to secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomena in question – in this study, the values of citizenship that are relevant to SI. It is also noted that objective reality can never be captured but things can be known through its representations. Some are emphatic that triangulation is not a tool or a strategy of validation, but an alternative to validation (Flick, 1998 p. 230). In that regard, the combination of multiple methodological practices, empirical materials, perspectives, and observers in a single study brings complexity, richness, and depth to the inquiry (Flick, 1998). Qualitative research as a set of interpretive activities privileges no single methodological practice over another, therefore, it is difficult to define clearly. The reason is that it has no theory or paradigm that is distinctly its own. This means that qualitative researchers “consider, studying things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of, the meaning people bring with them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 4).

4.5.2 Qualitative validity and reliability
Validity refers to the extent to which the information can be regarded as “true” and holding factual substance that is confirmed through evidence. This study required a qualitative approach to collect “information rich data” (Patton, 2002). In order to measure data that are rich, validity has to take centre stage. To ensure validity, research has to consider the accuracy of the variable that fits the concept (Bouma & Ling, 2005). Furthermore, to ensure validity, qualitative researchers have to be aware of their own biases, and, to maintain the integrity of research, trying to meet challenges they encounter along the way (Gay, & Arasian, 2000). Validity involves the following concepts: construct validity, internal validity, and external validity. Internal validity is ensured when results can be interpreted accurately. For external validity, results can be generalised to a population, situation, and condition (Weirsma, 1995). For this study, I used Yin’s (2005) measure of validity, construct validity, internal validity and external validity criteria test. In this study, they were used as follows:
1. Construct validity was used to ensure that “correct operational measures” were clearly established (Yin, 2005, p. 34). One way of making sure this happens is by applying the use of triangulation of information, in this case by observations of behaviours, audio-recordings of interviews, and document analysis. Internal validity was applied to establish clear relationships between possible themes or concepts that may emerge during the analysis period. One way of making sure this happens is by applying “pattern-matching” (Yin, 2005, p. 34). In this study, the researcher addressed the issue of internal validity by matching the patterns and themes that emerged from responses to questions in all four case study schools.

2. External validity was addressed by attempting to generalise the findings of the study. One way of ensuring that is by using replication. In this study, the plan to conduct the same study in all four case study schools was for the purpose of finding out if the same results emerged (Yin, 2005). The result would be generalised as representing all 140 schools in Solomon Islands that offer secondary education.

This study considered important three considerations regarded as noteworthy within a qualitative research framework. The research took place in a natural setting where the researcher was able to access sites and participants, using methods that are “interactive and humanistic that build rapport and credibility with the individuals in the study” (Creswell, 2003, p. 8). It focused on observing a variety of perceptions to allow for multiple sources of evidence to be obtained from participants (Creswell, 1994). The evidence came from 56 participants from six case studies.

The researcher was also able to explore the phenomena in their natural settings (Anderson, 2002) and to make sense of, or interpret, the phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring with them (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). It is a “field of inquiry in its own right” (Creswell, 2009, p. 2). It can be used with other fields of inquiry such a “foundationalism, positivism, post-foundationalism, post-positivism, post-structuralism, and other qualitative perspectives and methods that link with culture and interpretative studies” (Creswell, 2009, p. 2). The methods and approaches used under this category of qualitative are “case study, politics and ethics, participatory inquiry, interviewing, participant observation, visual methods and interpretative analyses” (Creswell, 2009, p. 2). Qualitative locates the observer in the world and with the set of interpretive, material practice and it makes the world visible. It “turns the world into a series of
representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self” (ibid., p. 2). This study used most of the stated representation and cross-checked with participants for accuracy of interpretation during the fieldwork to gain validity and reliability for the study.

4.6 Research Paradigms
A paradigm can be referred to as an interpretative framework (Creswell, 2009). It is a “model or framework for observation and understanding which shapes both what we see and how we understand it” (Barley, et al., 2011, p. 11). It is a “perspective for looking at reality and they are the frames of reference we use to organize our observations and reasoning” (ibid.). It is a basic set of beliefs that guide actions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Creswell, 2009). A paradigm is a net that contains the researcher’s epistemological (nature of knowing), ontological (nature of reality), and methodological (nature of acquiring knowledge) premise (Barley, et. al, 2011).

4.6.1 Social Construction/Interpretative Paradigm
According to Denzin and Lincoln (2008) social construction/interpretive is aimed to produce and reconstruct understandings of the social world. It is social constructivism, by which individuals seek to understand the world they work and live in (Creswell, 2009). Individuals are believed to develop subjective meanings of their experience: meaning directed towards certain objects or things and the meanings are varied and multiple, leading the researcher to look for “the complexity of views rather than narrowing meaning into few categories or ideas” (Creswell, 2009, p. 8). The goal of the constructivist researcher is to get participants’ views of the situation being studied. The researcher expects to gather various data through questions that forge discussion so that meaning can be constructed and interpreted according to the participants and the situations they associate with. The questions are always open-ended to cause the researcher to listen carefully for what participants do and believe in their life settings (ibid.). This indicates that the researcher’s intention is to make sense of the meaning others have about the world around them. The inquiries are expected to generate or inductively develop a theory or pattern of meaning. Creswell (2009) describes this process of meaning making as follows:

1. Meanings are constructed by human beings as they engage with the world they are interpreting.
2. Humans engage with the world and make sense of it based on their historical and social perspective. Qualitative researchers seek to understand the context or setting through visiting participants’ context and gathering information.

3. The basic generation of meaning is always social, arising in and out of iteration with human communities. The process of qualitative research is largely inductive, with the inquirer generating meaning from the data collected in the field (pp. 8-9).

4.7 Qualitative Strategies of Inquiry

In qualitative research strategies, inquirers use ethnography, grounded theory, case study, and phenomenological and narrative approaches. This research used ethnography and case study approaches to provide specific direction for the study. The selection of these approaches was based on their appropriateness to the nature, the context, and the direction of the research.

4.7.1 The Ethnographic Approach

The term “ethnography literally means the description of an ethnic group” (Hennink, Hutter, & Bailey, 2011, p. 46). It is an approach to research that provides descriptions of the way of life of a culture and is often done with communities (ibid.). Ethnographic research relies very much on observation, description, and interpretation of whatever phenomena are studied (Weirsma & Jurs, 2009). Engaging in this approach, the research aim is to get a holistic picture of the community. For example, when the researcher conducts research in a community, he/she will not only collect data on certain behaviour but try to understand the economic, social, and cultural contexts as well (Hennink, et. al., 2011).

In this study, ethnography is used as a strategic approach to gather data. It was chosen because this study involves an in-depth analytical description of a specific cultural situation (Weisrmer & Jurs, 2009); that is, the perceptions of a variety of school participants on citizenship values. The researcher’s observation includes working with staff and students and participating in activities of the school. This study aimed to dialogue with participants, and to observe the behaviours and actions of students and staff in selected schools, as well as observing and dialoging with villagers in the communities. The literature considers this approach as a hallmark of cultural anthropology, which aims to understand the world from the perspective of participants (Hennink, Hutter & Bailey, 2011; Silverman, 2005; Weisrma & Jurs, 2009). Based upon scientific research literature, ethnographies are based on observational work in particular settings. The implication is that if one wishes to study a group of people one has to spend time with the people to
understand routines and language, or participate with people in their daily activities (Silverman, 2005) and this was done in this study.

In schools, there are certain cultures of values and behaviours that emerge among the school population and that distinguishes them from other school contexts. The purpose of ethnographic research is to describe the whole school culture. In this type of research approach, what is sought by the ethnographic inquirer is the key informants and their perspectives (Silverman, 2005). For this study, the culture is the education context and its stakeholders, including Ministry of Education officers, Education Authority personnel, four high schools in SI, and one selected community involving elders. Participants from these organisations, institutions, and community were informants for the study. Their voices and actions comprise the data for the study.

Another important aspect of ethnographic research is the length of time taken to conduct the research. According to research literature, ethnography involves the study of cultures for a long period of time (Grbich, 2007). The notion of having a long period of time to conduct the research is purposely to learn about the people, the setting, and the language in order to gather data that can be described as “thick description” (Grbich, 2007; Hennink, et. al., 2011). In addition, having a length of time to conduct research enables the researcher to establish a good relationship with the people they are studying. This is an important aspect in ethnographic fieldwork as it requires time to build relationships and get the trust of people who do not relate to the ethnographic researcher (Hennink, et. al., 2011).

However, for the data gathering purposes of this study, the researcher did not need to spend a long period of time to understand the culture of the people, the setting, or the language. The six months of research, September 2013 to February 2014, was considered enough time to get rich information, because the researcher is from the setting, part of the culture, and speaks the language of the setting. The researcher’s twenty years of teaching in the cultural setting after growing up as a child in the same environment is deemed enough to satisfy the required purposes of ethnographic research. Therefore, in this research, the ethnographic researcher entered the field of study with knowledge of the community, social framework and personal identity, indicating that that researcher was not completely ignorant of the settings. This corroborated well
with the claim by Spradley (1980), who states that “ethnography starts with a conscious attitude of almost complete ignorance” (p. 46).

4.7.2 The Case Study
Another research inquiry method used here is case study, which is defined as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within a real context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Merriam, 1998, p.27). In studying the case, inquirers expect to gain knowledge of “individuals, groups, organizational, social, political and other related phenomena (Yin, 2003, p. 1). It is both a process of inquiry about the case and the product of that inquiry” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Qualitative case study is an “intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single instance, phenomena or social unit” (Merriam, 1998, p. 27). The term “case study” comprises two words, “case” and “study”. According to Stake (2000), case is explained as a process of inquiry and study is the product of the inquiry (ibid.). The case can be a child or student in a classroom, a school, or an issue affecting people (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). The case can be a general phenomenon involving a population or a mere individual or single case (ibid.). In this study the selected schools, participants, site, historical background, and political and legal context were the case, and the study was the product including the findings about attitudes, behaviours, values, skills, structures, and systems.

In this research case study was used as a strategic approach to gather data that would richly inform the study. Case study fits well with the interpretive qualitative research approach and was regarded as the best approach to obtain as much information as possible from the students and teachers about their teaching and learning experiences in their respective schools. This is what Cronbach called “interpretation in context” (Merriam, 1998, p. 29). Case study research aims to uncover the significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon (ibid.). Second, was to get the perceptions of participants by means of extensive interviews and questionnaires, in the second phase of the study. Third, the researcher was the key person who generated and analysed the study’s research data. This enabled the research to do preliminary analysis of the data during the fieldwork, and to cross-check with the data gathered from students and teachers for accuracy of the information that was obtained through the questionnaire and interviews.
In case study, the inquirer seeks to find what was common and what is particular about the case. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Silverman, (2005), identifies three types of case study that are commonly used by researchers: the intrinsic case study, the instrumental case study, and the collective or multiple case study. In the intrinsic case study, the inquirer focuses more towards understanding what is important about that particular case. This design is perceived to be the “case’s own issues, context, and interpretations of its thick description” (Stake, cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 439). However, one obvious limitation is that, “no attempt is made to generalise beyond the single case or even to build theories” (p. 27). In an instrumental case study, the researcher is drawn towards illustrating how the “concerns of researchers and theories are manifest in the case” (Stake, cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 439). In this method, a case is examined in order to provide insight into an issue or to revise a generalisation. Although in-depth studies are conducted the main focus is on something else. In multiple case studies, a number of cases are studied. This is to investigate some general phenomenon.

4.7.3 Case Study Design
Yin, (2003) identifies two types of case study in a research design: a single case study and a multiple case study. From the two types of case study, there are several sources from which data can be generated: documentation, archival records, interviews, participant observation, direct observation, and physical artifacts (Yin, 2009). The designs are distinctive in various ways so it is imperative that the researcher makes a decision prior to data collection about which design approach to take (Yin, 2003). This study also took into account important considerations about the methods to be used in case study. For example, in using both qualitative and quantitative approaches to generate data, this study utilised methods – interview, observation method, survey questionnaires – that are often used in case study (Yin, 2003). This reflects the choice of mixed methods to collect data to maintain the chain of evidence (Yin, 2009). Further, in case studies, “detail of qualitative methods derives from a number of case studies, too small for confident generalization” (Patton, 1987, p. 18). However, it is a valuable approach if someone wants to have information or obtain information and data. Using case studies as suggested by Yin (2003) is useful in building understanding of a complex social phenomenon such as CE. Further, the strategy allows the investigation “to retain the holistic characteristics of the real life events” (p.46) while dealing with a full variety of evidence.
**Single Case Study**

Single case study, according to Yin (2003), is an appropriate design to use for case study research. There are five rationales given to justify its robustness. One is its representation as a critical case in testing a well-informed theory. In this rationale, a theory can be clear in the minds and the proposition can be true; however, that can only be confirmed, challenged or extend the theory if a single case study is used in testing the theory (Yin, 2003). The second rationale is when the case represents an extreme case or unique case, such as in a situation of clinical psychology in which a disorder may be rare and only one single case is worth documenting and analysing. In such a case a single case study is an appropriate design (ibid.). The third is the representative or typical case. In this design, a case may represent a typical project that appears to be different from others. What is required here is the experience learned from those typical projects. The fourth is the revelatory case, in which the investigator observes and analyses a situation that has not been previously studied by researchers. Fifth, there is a rationale for single longitudinal case studies where the single case is studied a number of times for a period of time (Yin, 2003). Although a single case study has a number of positive attributes, it also has limitations and weaknesses in research. For example, a single case studied may turn out differently from how it was anticipated or “turn out not to be the case it was thought of at the outset” (Yin, 2003, p. 42). In such cases, the researcher may decide on other alternatives to pursue, which can be time-consuming. The study tried to avoid this limitation as much as possible because of the time constraints.

**Multiple Case Study**

A multiple case study is a study of more than a single case. The use of multiple cases has increased in recent times for studies of issues affecting schools. An example Yin (2003) gives is based on the study of schools’ “innovations (the use of new curriculum, rearranging of school schedules or new educational technology) in which schools adopt some innovation” (Yin 2003, p. 46). The school taken as a case is usually a single school; however, it becomes a multiple case when it involves several selected schools. Yin (2003) considers a multiple case studies strategy to be more compelling and more robust with the ability for “direct replications” (p. 47). Yin further points out that conclusions can independently arise from two cases as two experiments are particularly powerful. In addition, the contexts of the three cases are likely to differ to some extent. This is significant as a case study is intended to obtain differing perspectives according to the geographical locations of the case sites and the varying opinions from different cultural
views. The selection of case study in this research arose from the desire to understand and get the perspective of selected participants on what is a good citizen in the SI context and how education can produce such good citizens. Using this strategy helps the researcher to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life (Yin, 2003).

The multiple case study approach is chosen to fit the phenomenon being studied and to gain the “information rich data” (Patton, 2002) or the “thick description” of data portrayed by (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The phenomenon to be studied in this research is the values for good citizenship required for inclusion in the citizenship education programmes and the formal curriculum of SI. The general question of what makes a good citizen as perceived by participants from selected schools is examined and compared in order to identify the values this study is looking for. In such a study, the researcher examines information gathered from participants and chooses the information that provides useful data that will generate knowledge for the study.

The study uses the multiple case study approach to ensure that the research questions posed are answered well, bearing in mind that the researcher is constrained by time. Multiple case study approach helped develop in-depth understanding of the values of citizenship education in SI. It is expected to provide a means for replication, a process that will improve the external validity of the study (Creswell, 1994; Weirsm & Jur, 2009; Yin, 2003). Based on the literature, multiple cases are often use for issues in schools or classroom with students, teachers, or school structures (Yin, 2003). The use of multiple case studies helps to select the sites and participants. In addition, presentation of the findings after analyses are completed is straightforward as selection is not random and data are compared among several varieties (Silverman, 2005).

The discussion of the two approaches has indicated that documentation, archival records, interviews, participant observation, direct observation, and physical artifacts are tools that can be used to gather data in case study (Yin, 2009). This study also used survey questionnaires as instruments in the selected case studies to generate data for the study. The responses from the survey questionnaires formed part of the data for the study and confirmed the results from the data gathered. This reflects the mixed methods use in the study to collect data and to generate data that is reliable and valid for the study to maintain a chain of evidence (Yin, 2009).
4.8 Site and sample selection
In any given study, there are numerous sites that could be visited, events or activities that could be observed, people who could be interviewed, and documents to be read (Merriam, 1998). The researcher’s job is to consider where to observe, when to observe, whom to observe, and what to observe (ibid.). This study considered the analytic inductive model based on multi-site ethnography as the most relevant. In this approach the researcher started in the first case study school with teachers and students, and moved to another case study school looking for similarities and differences in perspective and situation to develop an analysis and build a theory (Bogdan & Biklin, 2007).

In selecting from the two general types of sampling – probability sampling, which concerns random sampling, and nonprobability sampling, which is purposeful sampling (Merriam, 1998) – this study used purposeful sampling to select the sites and the study participants. For purposeful sampling, the researcher wants to discover, understand, and gain insight into the cases studied. Therefore, it is necessary that the researcher selects samples from which most is likely to be learned (ibid.). LeCompte and Preissle (1993) prefer the term “criterion based selection” instead of purposeful or purposive sampling (Merriam, 1998). What is powerful in purposeful sampling lies in selecting information rich cases in order to have an in-depth study (Patton, 1987). The information rich cases are those that provide issues of central importance to the study from which researchers can learn a great deal (ibid.).

In such a method, sites and participants are not randomly selected; rather, they are selected according to differing characteristics (Wiersma, 1995). Such inquiry guides how the people, site, and data are selected. There are several strategies for selecting information rich data in purposeful sampling. One of them is “maximum variation sampling” (Patton, 1987). The logic behind the strategy is to find common patterns from the amount of sample variations that are of particular interest and valuable to capture core experiences central to the programme. The rationale for selection that reflects maximum sampling is presented in the next section.

4.8.1 Rationale for selection
In this study, samples and sites were selected from secondary schools that were offering substance of citizenship in the Junior Secondary Curriculum in SI. The dispersion of schools across a wide geographical area makes it difficult to access every school. In such difficult
circumstances, one has to maximise variations in a small sample. This means that although, schools are located in remote places, their nature and characteristics are not totally dissimilar so the researcher can choose one that is accessible and from that basis can generalise to represent other such schools. By doing that, the researcher begins by selecting diverse characteristics to construct samples (Patton, 1987). In SI, the 140 secondary schools offering the junior secondary curriculum hold the status of national secondary schools, provincial secondary schools, or community high schools.

Several characteristics have attracted this study selection, which notably helps the researcher to generate a specific concept within the theory (Creswell, 2008). The common one is the geographical location of schools, which are referred to here as urban schools and rural schools. Generally, secondary schools in SI are located in both the rural and the urban areas, and all schools are either day or boarding schools. Another distinction is whether they are private or public schools. Bouma (1997) suggests that when such distinctions exist it is necessary to select the best site, people, or group to study. For example, if a typical rural school is selected it will be generalised to represent rural schools in the country or vice versa.

Four schools were selected to represent the number of schools in the country, two rural schools on Malaita Island and two urban schools in Honiara, the capital city of SI located on Guadalcanal. In both the selected rural and urban schools, one is a boarding and the other is a day school. Other factors were also brought into consideration; for instance, one of the boarding schools is a national secondary school that enrolls students from all over the country and the other enrolls students from all over the province. Such differing characteristics are assumed to satisfy the criteria for obtaining “information rich cases” (Patton, 1987, p. 51), qualitative case studies and the quantitative survey questionnaire from which the researcher could collect data of central importance. Rural and urban students display different behaviours. That is the reason why those characteristics and contexts were considered vital for this research, the assumption being that similarities and differences found between rural and urban populations in boarding and day schools would greatly inform the study. The richness of such perspectives is based on the fact that experiences that influence students in boarding schools vary from those of the day school students. Thus, the identified characteristics were expected to inform the current study.
4.8.2 Procedure for participant sampling

The participants for the study are students and staff selected from the four case study schools, public officers from four different ministries, including the Ministry of Education, and one focus group from a rural local community. Importantly, however, the researcher needs better understanding of the students of the four schools, to give him an opportunity to create a sampling frame (Conrad & Serling, 2006). In this study, selection in all case study schools was restricted to the students of Form One. Limiting student participants to Form One only was based on a number of considerations. First, there were themes of CE in the Form One syllabus. Secondly, under the country’s new reform initiatives, basic education begins in Class One primary and ends at Form Three secondary; therefore, Form One is a transition from primary to secondary, and a bridge to higher education, and this group is located at the beginning of the upper limit for all school-going children of SI. Thirdly, the group would face elimination when they reach Form Three as they would sit the national examination. A sample frame was used to identify the participants out of the total Form One students who were generalised as being representative of all Form One students in SI and the students who have learnt from subjects in the secondary schools curriculum.

Another important group in this selection is the teachers. Teachers were regarded as very important, in fact critical, in this study (Gillham, 2000) because it was expected that what they provided during the interview would reflect their wealth of knowledge and experience about teaching the curriculum and syllabus that contain citizenship values in the SI context. According to Rodi (2011), who did research on teachers in SI, teachers can provide rich data for research about schools because they are the ones that implement the policies and who have the final say to choose what is taught in the classroom, despite what is recorded in the curriculum. It is important to note that the teachers of both urban and rural schools were selected on the basis of their teaching of Form One students. In the case of teachers, gender equality was not considered as a criterion for selection because gender representation in secondary teaching in SI is uneven. For instance, some schools in urban centres only have female teachers. The reason is often because their spouses have employment in the urban centres so they have to be posted where their spouse works. The richness of the data is facilitated through questions that are constructed based on the values citizenship that teachers taught and the impact it had on students. Most
importantly, their perspectives of the values of citizenship in the junior secondary school curriculum and their relevance on the SI context is what matters in this study.

**Case Study (CS) One – rural boarding school**

In case study one, a rural boarding school, fourteen participants were selected. One of the considerations for selection of the site is that it is a boarding school located in the most populated province in SI. It enrolls students from all around the province. In this case study, selection of students was representative of the region the students came from. It has similar categories to all other case study sites: six students and six teachers with the principal and his deputy to make it fourteen. Therefore, the only differences are its status as a rural, provincial, boarding school and selection of students in rural areas as representative of the region.

However, many in the province and the country as a whole considered this particular school the most problematic school. A lot of criminal activities and social problems have occurred at the site, including vandalism, arson, teenage pregnancy, and suicide. Significantly, identification of rural schools for the study was based on students’ daily contact with things at home, their families and church beliefs, peers, and other socialisation from the social and physical environment, which, of course, has influenced how students see and judge things. Not only that, but even the food they eat, the clothes they wear, their living environment, and after-school activities reflect the behaviours they display at school and outside of school, which have influenced their perspectives as well. However, an important consideration in this selection is the responsibilities that were entrusted to students especially in terms of leadership (form captain, prefect, sports captain, and religious group leadership). The other consideration is active participation in the organised school activities and good behaviours among students. “Good’ in this regard refers to caring, respect for fellow students, teachers, and school property. Selection of students was done by the principal and social study teachers.

**Case Study (CS) Two – rural day school**

In case two, a rural day secondary school, a total of fourteen respondents have participated in the interview discussions: three male and three female teachers, three male and three female Form One students, and the principal and his deputy. They were arranged only into focus groups discussion including the two principals. In this school, gender was equally distributed. The Form One students were selected according to chosen criteria, deemed to be representative of the total
enrolment of the class. To provide balance of opinion, to represent the views of rural males and females, and to avoid “bias”, students were selected to allow gender equity (three male and three female). The gender equity representation formed one focus group.

The identification and selection of the rural school for CS Two is similar to the CS One process. It was based on behaviours of student that were reflected from their daily school practice. Further, it was selected based on students’ daily contact with things at home, their families – similar to characteristics identified in CS One. What they had been in contact with was believed to have influenced their perspective. Therefore, selection of students in rural areas varied to a certain extent from urban students. The selection criteria again for this case study had been similar to those in CS One: students who were entrusted with some leadership responsibilities, (form captain, prefect, sports team captain, and religious group leader), active participation in organised school activities, and good behaviour among students.

Case Study (CS) Three – urban boarding school
In CS Three, the urban boarding school, similar numbers and categories of respondents participated. Three male and three female students were selected and organised into one focus group. The other participants were six teachers and the principal, a total of thirteen. The selection of participants in the group was made according to provincial representation. This is the primary criterion in the selection to ensure that the provinces were represented. The urban experience and influences are different from those of the rural school populations. Therefore, significant to this selection criterion is the behaviour demonstrated among students of differing ethnic backgrounds (respect, caring, individual relationship, etc.). The responsibilities that students perform at school (from captain, prefect, and leadership roles in various organisations) which were considered in previous CS were not considered in this selection. However, the principal was advised to select students that had demonstrated some kind of leadership quality. The other group of informants for this study was the teachers.

Case Study (CS) Four – urban day school
In CS four, the selection was representative of students from different ethnicities living in Honiara, the urban centre, and those living in informal settlements. In total, thirteen participants at this school were selected for qualitative interview. This case study has similar categories to CS
one, with six students and six teachers, with gender equity, and the principal to make it thirteen. However, the difference is its status as an urban day school.

The difference also considered the different food they eat, the clothes they wear, their living environment, and afterschool activities they engage in that influence their perspective. Therefore, selection of students in urban areas varied to a certain extent. Important considerations for selection were also based on students’ leadership responsibilities at school (form captain, prefect, sports team captain, and religious group leader). Selection of students for this study was done by the principal and social studies teachers.

**Case study (CS) Five – Ministry of Education officials and government personnel**

Another group of respondents comprised Ministerial and Departmental officials totaling up to nine participants. Five participants were from the Ministry of Education of SI. One was an officer responsible for formal education policy initiatives and implementation of policy programmes for the formal education sector of SI, which includes all secondary schools; two were senior curriculum officers responsible for the whole curriculum development unit, and the other two were education officers responsible for education authorities. The other participants in this case study were selected from four different ministries and departments that have civic and CE programmes in their activities. One participant was selected from each of the following government ministries: National Parliament of Solomon Islands, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Women, Youth and Children’s Affairs, and the Ministry of Peace and Reconciliation. Those selected were officers who are responsible for making decisions on national civic or citizenship programmes.

**Case Study (CS) Six – community elders**

CS Six comprised six elders in a local rural area setting. The selection of the elders was based on the responsibilities they held in the community, their influence, leadership roles, and their education background. In addition, the status of the community in terms of population was another selection criterion. The selected community is the biggest in the area and also has the highest population number compared with other communities around the area. The community has leaders who have had experience in leading tribes and clans, leaders in the church, and leaders of youth and sport activities. They have been recognised for their experience in
controlling the vast population and the effective handling of social issues that have arisen among people in the community.

4.9 Qualitative Research Methods in the study
This section describes how the stated methods were used in the study with the participants discussed earlier. According to the literature, research methods refers to the logic that the researcher uses in conducting a study, which includes “how research questions are stated, sampling strategy, data collection procedures and ways of structuring, analyzing and interpreting data” (Conrad & Serling, 2006, p. 377). The methods commonly used in qualitative research include interviewing; group discussion; direct observation; analysis of artifacts, documents, and cultural records; the use of visual materials; and personal experience (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). This study used interview, group discussion and document analysis. Each is described in detail in the subsections that follow.

4.9.1 Interview
The most common method used in qualitative research is interviews. Interviews are purposely used “to gather descriptive data from the subject’s own words so that the researcher can develop insights on how the subject interpreted some piece of the world” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 102). Interview, as explained by Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003), is not an easy option, because it involves a conversation between two people. The vital aspect of interview is the way it obtains information about a topic or subject. Although a lot of instruments focus on the surface of the elements of what is happening, many researchers find interviews give the researcher more of an insight into the meaning and significance of what is happening (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003). Others view it as one of the most common ways of generating data in qualitative research because the conversation is purposeful between two or more people (Merriam, 1988). Usually interviews are in small numbers. Having a small number of interviewees will mean less time is needed for transcription and analysis (Gillham, 2000).

Interview is regarded as both a science and an art. According to Rubin and Rubin (2005), “in science, there are general rules and normative standards that should be followed … in arts, techniques are modified to reflect the individual style of the artist” (p.15). It is a method of collecting data employed by both quantitative and qualitative methodologies and can be used in conjunction with other data generation techniques to get useful data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). In
qualitative interviews the importance is the depth, detail, and richness expected to be gained from the conversations – what Geertz (cited in Rubin & Rubin, 2005, p.13) calls “thick description”. The process requires the researcher to pay attention to the important information that the study wants to gain from the interview (Gillham, 2000). Furthermore, interviewing is one of the most important sources of information in case studies (Yin, 2009). An interview embodies a person-to-person encounter wherein the researcher elicits information from the participant(s). An interview is a conversation with a purpose; the interviewer wants to find out things that cannot be directly observed, such as feelings, thoughts, and intentions (Merriam, 1988).

Rubin and Rubin (2005) see interview as an extension from the ordinary conversation, building from the conversational skills that already exist. Such a bridge is pivotal in research as pre-understanding and experience of conversational partners (interviewer and interviewee) would ignite the free flow and unthreatening space in the interview. Interviews can be explained as conversational exchanges that involve exchanges of information among individuals and groups. An interview has a social nature that makes it more attractive for qualitative researchers to select as a research option (Ruane, 2005).

Whilst much has been mentioned in favour of interview, it also has its limitations. One is the cost and timing (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Merriam, 1998). In order to obtain data, one has to be systematic in following the process of arranging, conducting, transcribing, and perhaps even translating one language to another into text form. That process is time-consuming, costly, and challenging as the more time researchers spend in conducting research, the more money they will spend, including transportation, accommodation, communication, and transcription and translation costs (Marshall & Rossmann, 2006). In addition, the biases of the researcher can be very obvious in an interview as interview data are interpreted subjectively. This means that what is said by a participant can be modified to meet what the researcher wishes to obtain (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). To reduce the risk of this, the researcher ensures that the interpretation of interview data is verified with participants to ensure what they mean in the interview transcripts is written (Cohen, et. al., 2007).
Models of interview
The three models for interviews are most generally categorised as the unstructured interview, the semi-structured interview, and the structured interview. The unstructured interview can be extremely flexible but needs control by the interviewer and interviewee, while the structured interview is more highly controlled by the interviewer with predetermined questions and order of questioning (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003). Interviews in case study research are conversations that are guided by the researcher in order to pursue a line of inquiry but the questions asked must not be rigid. Interviewers must employ effective personal skills to produce a respectful, nonjudgmental, and nonthreatening environment (Merriam, 1998). In this case the researcher performs two roles in the interviewing process. One is to follow the line of inquiry as reflected in the case study procedure; and the second, to ask questions that serve the purpose of their inquiry in an unbiased and non-threatening manner (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003).

Ordinary conversations and interviews are similar, but there are also distinct differences. In interviews the discussions are more focused, in-depth, and detailed than ordinary conversations. In contrast, interview is less balanced than conversation as the interviewer does most of the questioning and the informant does most of the answering (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). In trying to balance the conversation, the researcher in this study adapted the responsive interview model which is known to be more flexible in conversation, but more insightful.

Responsive interviewing model
According to Rubin and Rubin (2005) the responsive interviewing model relies on the interpretative/constructionist philosophy. The model was important for this study because it recognises the people involved in the interview have feelings, personal interests, and experiences. Those feelings, interests, and experiences were assumed to be the rich data that this study wanted to obtain. However, the researcher is mindful of the fact that such interview techniques are not expected to be neutral, thus, what this study expected was who the informants were in terms of the interview. This is significant for this research, particularly, the context and participants who were involved in the discussions. The culture of the social environment, in this case SI (cultural and religious affiliation), has a strong influence on how informants respond to interview questions. In addition, the status of being either rural or urban influences the conversation and the information gathered.
The researcher understands that the style of interviews varies from person to person (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). This understanding is important for research on indigenous societies because how participants’ views and responses to concerns are likely to be different from those in mainstream societies. In responsive interviews, using a variety of styles does not matter, an argument that is significant for this research. It depends on what style the researcher is more comfortable using and, importantly, how well the style is able to obtain rich data to inform the study. As noted, “none of those stylistic variations are inherently right or wrong. What works is a style that makes the conversational partners comfortable” (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). This study used a gradual approach. An interview would start with the building of relationships among conversational partners and informal talks on non-related matters before getting into the formal discussions (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). This style required more time in order to get to know one another.

**Unstructured interviews**

Unstructured interviews can be referred to as in-depth interviews in case studies. In such an interview the researcher asks the participants about facts, as well as their opinions about the phenomenon under investigation. In some instances the researcher may ask the participants to propose their own insights into certain events, and may use these to inform further inquiry. In-depth interviews usually take place over an extended period of time and happen more than once. Focused interviews, on the other hand, may occur only once, and take a shorter period of time (Yin, 2009). This study sees the importance of this model and adopted it with rural community leaders. The discussions on indigenous societies can only be meaningful when they take place in a relaxed, free, respectful, and non-threatening environment or space where participants can speak their mind.

**Semi-structured interviews**

This study also used the semi-structured interview approach to collect data. Semi-structured questions fit well with how the researcher conducted interviews and the setting of the sites as well as the purpose of the study. Semi-structured interview questions have less flexibility than unstructured interviews. The interviewer directs the interview closely as questions are predetermined but there is flexibility to allow the interviewee an opportunity to shape the flow of the information (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003). The semi-structured interviews were preferred for this study because the questions could be prepared in advance, based on the participants’ responses to the questionnaire and subsequent interviews. This is important because
it meant that appropriate questions were asked of each participant. It also provided for consistency in the types and number of questions being asked. Using the semi-structured interview technique also gave the researcher freedom to ask additional questions and to probe deeper into the participants’ responses to questions, in order to substantiate previous responses and obtain additional information (Kervin, et al., 2006). Semi-structured questionnaires were used with teachers, students, education officers, and government personnel in both focus group discussions and one-on-one interviews.

**The interview process**

In each case, the first interview conducted was a one-on-one interview with the principal of the case study school, followed by focus group interviews with the students, and then with the teachers. In all interviews, as traditionally accepted by students and teachers, the discussion was opened with a prayer by the interviewer. Following that, consent forms were signed by participants. The researcher then proceeded to make welcoming remarks and to acknowledge participants for being part of the research. Before the interviews, the research first of all asked introductory questions to get the attention of interviewees while slowly placing the recording device in position. The researcher introduced himself before outlining the purpose of the research. In focus group discussions the researcher posed questions and then waited for the participants to respond.

**Focus groups**

In case studies, a focus group discussion is a useful tool for the researcher for several reasons. It is naturalistic because it offers an opportunity for the participants to construct meaning among themselves, giving them power to participate (Krueger & Casey, 2000). In indigenous societies like those in SI research using focus group discussion is more favourable than the typical one-on-one interview because it is more natural. Lancy when conducting research in Liberia and Papua New Guinea found that “informants often found reluctant as individuals to response to queries about general aspects as they lack sufficient authority to speak on those matters” (Lancy, 1993, p. 18). Interactions among participants, as claimed by Cohen (2003), lead to useful data outcomes. Similarly, the method allows the researcher to use group synergy to maximise, recall, and highlight the diversity of perspectives thereby providing a richer qualitative perspective (Anderson, 2002). In addition, focus group discussion creates a context in which participants are free to express their opinions and make judgments for themselves on the questions posed by the
researcher. It is crucial to note that in case studies, proposed questions for focus groups must be carefully worded so that the researcher appears genuinely naive about the topic (Yin, 2003). The role of the researcher is generally to facilitate discussion through directives, to encourage participants to express their opinions, and to ask carefully worded questions (Cohen, 2003).

Focus group discussions, using semi-structured and open-ended questions, were held with the twenty students and twenty-four teachers of the four case study schools and the six rural community leaders. The reason for semi-structured questions is to build confidence for getting comparable data across subjects and a free flowing discussion in the case of open-ended questions (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The important factor in semi-structured and open-ended questions or unstructured questions is to get the general understanding of a range of perspectives from participants before offering structured questions to get comparable data across a large sample (ibid.). This is consistent with the exploratory mixed methods strategy this study used whereby the weight is on the qualitative data, with the quantitative used just to confirm and affirm the qualitative findings.

In the focus group interviews, the researcher used the same procedure for all schools. In the interview, the subject is usually a stranger. Therefore, a good part of the work has to involve building relationships to acquaint the researcher with the subject and getting to know each other before the interview starts (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Before the researcher conducted the interviews, he visited the schools and held talks with principals, who were very supportive. He explained the purpose of the study, who would be involved, what was needed, and the procedures involved. The principals of case study schools assured me they would prepare the site and those who were to be involved before the interview. They did as they promised and arranged for a student meeting and a teacher meeting before the interviews were conducted.

The researcher carefully considered the physical setting for meetings as it is important to host the meeting in an environment that would help to get what the study wants. In all schools, the teachers’ interviews were conducted in the staff rooms. The student interviews were conducted in classrooms where they were more comfortable. The student interviews were conducted after academic timetables were completed for the day. The principal and the researcher together arranged the site and organised the context. The researcher heeded Wilkinson and Birmingham’s
(2003) advice – they point out that very formal settings, where the interviewer sits in front facing the interviewees, can be confrontational and may intimidate the interviewee – deciding that to put the parties at ease, the site would be arranged less formally. This allowed the interviewer and the interviewee to sit alongside each other. The audiotaperecorder used for the discussion was placed discreetly, where it did not distract the interviewees.

In focus group discussions the researcher posed questions and then waited for the participants to respond, allowing participants to think over the question before speaking. Where necessary, the researcher posed questions to direct some discussions. It was obvious that some respondents were vocal and active and often dominated the discussion, edging those who were slower to reply out of the discussion. In such circumstances, the researcher might call on a particular interviewee by name to respond. Similar tactics guided the discussion until the end of the session. At the end of the interview, the researcher thanked the interviewees again for their time and contribution.

**One-on-one interview**
One-on-one interviews were conducted with principals, education officers, and public servants from other ministries. The one-on-one interview has the following advantages: the researcher can “easily follow up ideas, probe responses, and investigate motives and feelings from the interviewee” (Bell, 2006, p. 157). Anderson (2002) noted that it places value on the individual subject, and allows for in-depth analysis and pursuit of details geared to each respondent. The one-on-one interview enables the interviewee to describe and interpret his/her experience. It was used with a semi-structured format and open-ended questions.

Before conducting the interviews, the researcher met with the Undersecretary of the Ministry of Education, who is responsible for all research conducted in the country to do with government ministries and formal and informal schools. This meeting on 17 September 2013 discussed the research fieldwork and from it, assurance was given that he would liaise with the heads of departments of Education and Human Resource Development (MEHRD) and Education secretaries of Education Authorities concerning my research fieldwork. The Undersecretary who is responsible for academic research in the SI had a lot of experience in this work and, therefore, knew exactly what should be done. He first provided a support letter to endorse my research. The researcher submitted the letters seeking permission with the endorsement letter from the
Undersecretary. I followed up the letters with a visit a day after they were issued just to check on the approval of the selected officers in the Ministry of Education. The officers all kindly offered to participate in the study. We agreed on a date for the actual interviews and that was agreed by all involved. During that first contact period, formal consent forms and approval forms to the interviewees to read and, upon acceptance, they signed the agreement forms before the start of the actual interviews. The first interview was held with the Director Secondary of the (MEHRD). The interview was conducted on the 20th of September, 2013, starting at 2:30pm and ending at 4pm.

The second interview, with two curriculum officers separately – the ministry’s Director of curriculum and the Chief Education Officer – was conducted on 24 September 2013, 3:30–5:30 pm, in the Directors’ offices. Each interview began with some small talk while the researcher set up the recording device. When all was relaxed and ready, the researcher started the interview by introducing the research and explaining the purpose of the study. The interviewees were allowed to talk as freely as possible to answer questions, the researcher putting in probes when necessary. The interview ended with words of appreciation.

Similar procedures were used with the other government officers of ministries that the researcher had selected to participate in the study. The public officer outside of the MEHRD was the Director of Civic programs in the National Parliament of the SI. This meeting was held on the 8th of October, 2013 from 9am to 10:20am. I interviewed the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Home Affairs on the same day, 8th October, 2013, from 2:30pm to 3:10pm. The under secretary and Director of Women of the Ministry of Women, Youth and Children were interviewed on the 11th of October, 2013 from 2pm to 4pm. The last officer to be interviewed was the Director for Peace in his office in the Ministry of Peace and Reconciliation. It was held on the 12th of October, 2013 from 3pm to 3:50 pm.

The second group of one-on-one interviews was with the education secretaries of Education Authorities. The first was the Honiara Town Council Education Authority Education Secretary. The reason for selecting the interviewee was because he was the officer responsible for the selected urban case study schools. Generally, the same procedures outlined above were used in the interview. However, the researcher met the Education secretary of the Honiara City Council
Schools and had a chat with him about the interviews and the schools that the researcher preferred to work with and interviewed him straight away because he was free at that time. The interview was held on the 25th of September, 2013, from 2pm to 4pm. The second Education Secretary was interviewed on the 1st of October, 2013 from 2pm to 3:30pm in his office at the Malaita Education Authority, Malaita province. The researcher made a visit to the Authority’s office to make an appointment with the officer and we fixed a date and time for the interview. He was free at that time so we proceeded with the interview, starting at 2pm and ending at 3.30pm. He also contacted schools to be visited to inform them about the research and advised them to make time for me. The other one-on-one interviews were held with school principals from selected schools. Similar procedures were adopted. The one-on-one interviewees were conducted at the school before group discussions. All the school principals of participating schools were involved in the one-on-one interview study. They were very supportive and had no major challenges that may have affected the research.

4.9.2 Document analysis

Document analysis was another method of gathering information. Document analysis has the potential to inform and structure the decisions that are made by people on a daily basis (May, 1997). Relevant documents constitute the readings of social events, goals, purposes, and aims. It informs readers about the aspirations, requirements, and intentions of the period referred to, describing ideas, places, and social relationships (May, 1997). Different sources of documents are relevant for research. Primary sources include historical documents, laws, declarations, and statutes (May, 1997). Other, secondary, sources include people’s accounts of incidents or periods in which they were involved.

Documents consulted for this study include the country’s constitution, the Education Act of SI, Education policy statements, and educational strategic plans, Secondary School syllabuses including curriculum documents, particularly the syllabus for Forms 1–5. The secondary source documents include journal articles on education and citizenship written by Solomon Islanders. Use of such documents in this research contributed to a fair understanding of the aims, objectives, purposes, goals, mission, and vision of education in SI. It also collected information valuable for consolidating data gained from the interview method. Finally, it provided the basis for critical analysis of the documents, general arguments about the issue of citizenship and CE.
from public opinion by comparing views of respondents of the study with the documents, purposively, to justify the validity of the questions and statement of this project.

4.9.3 Data recording
An audio recorder was used to record the focus group discussions and one-on-one interviews. Burns (1994) suggests audio recording to be the best method as “raw material will remain for later studies while not taking notes enables the researcher to take part in conversations in a natural way” (p. 284). The researcher transcribed the recording from Pijin (a national pidgin or creole language or lingua franca made from a variety of languages, including English and SI mother tongues) to English.

4.9.4 Data analysis
The audio recorded scripts were analysed using certain coding systems and stored on the computer according to coded files, for easy analysis and access. Coding, according to Charm (cited in Ezzy, 2002), is a process of defining what the data are all about. It is an attempt to fix meaning, constructing a particular vision of the world that includes other possible viewpoints (Barbour, 2008). In this study the coded identities are set as “sign posts” (Barbour, 2008). The sign posts assumed here are “indexes that represented some of the data and not merely a final argument about the meaning” (Seal, 1999, cited in Barbour, 1998, p. 196). The codes were placed under themes for further analysis with other data received from the document analysis source. According to Wiersma (1995), in qualitative research a preliminary data analysis begins soon after transcribed scripts are systematically recorded.

Preliminary data analysis
Preliminary data analysis (Grbich, 2007) involves checking and tracking of the data from information collected. The purpose is to find themes that form the base of the analysis. It gives the researcher clear direction. As Grbich (2007), points out, it will provide “deeper understanding of the values and meaning that lie therein” (p. 25). The purpose of this preliminary analysis is to highlight and identify emerging issues important for the study. In this study’s preliminary analysis, the researcher went through the interview recordings soon after the interviews were completed, to confirm the validity of the information. If insufficient information to provide useful data had been gathered, the researcher could have returned to the site for further data collection. Early data analysis also provides clear systematic placement of coding.
under relevant themes, as actually happened in this study. The researcher went back to the site a second time to verify the data before they were systematically placed under relevant themes.

**Post–data analysis**
The post–data analysis occurs after the preliminary analysis is completed. This stage involves the reduction of data; the researcher is more likely to have a fair idea of what he/she is looking for and what the “database contains in terms of issues that are being evident” (Grbich, 2007, p. 31). The data are then processed using a coding process that identifies themes and concepts through certain comparisons, categorisations, interpretations, descriptions and syntheses (Ezzy, 2002). The process is intended to create meaning out of the text data, examining codes for overlaps and redundancy, and collapsing the codes into broad themes, in an inductive process of narrowing data into a few themes (Creswell, 2008). In line with Creswell (2008) suggested coding guidelines, the following coding steps were used. To obtain a sense of the whole picture, the researcher read all transcripts and noted ideas as they came to mind. The researcher chose one document, considered its meaning and wrote it down in words and drawing a line to highlight its distinction. The process of coding then began by identifying text segments, bracketing them and assigning a code word. The codes were grouped together into patterns to provide results for the study.

4.9.5 Content analysis
According to Leavy (2006, p. 286), “content analysis traditionally referred to the examination of written text”. It is often used to study difference. For this study the main content analysed was the transcribed scripts from the interviews. Other important texts considered and used to support the interviews’ survey questionnaires were the SI Education Strategic Plan, Curriculum statement, Junior secondary school syllabus, the secondary Social Studies syllabus, media newsletters, journals about SI state of affairs, and education policies. The process involved identifying themes through information from the scripts. These themes were derived during the preliminary and post-analysis stages, by induction, and highlighted as headings for the categories. The categories were specific ideas, concepts, and phrases.

In analysing the documents, the researcher referred to the method that Weber (1990) and others (for example, Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003) used for qualitative content analysis. Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003) specifically refer to a technique that is used in analysing qualitative data.
or documents called “relational analyzing” (p. 77). This technique involves a sequence of steps including: 1) deciding on the question; 2) framing the analysis; 3) deciding which types of relationship to examine; 4) coding and categorising the text(s); 5) exploring the relationships; 6) coding the relationships; 7) analysing the relationships; and 8) mapping the relationships (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003, p. 78). Such method provide the researcher a clear set of data that may inform that study.

4.10 Quantitative research methods in this study
The design of this study, as explained earlier, employs mixed methods, a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods. It is a sequential exploratory study where weight is on qualitative findings. In such a method the quantitative results – in this case, from the survey questionnaire – are used to assist in the interpretation of the qualitative findings (Creswell, 2003). The quantitative aspect is used as an element to test emerging theories from the qualitative phase (ibid.). This study developed a closed question survey to elicit that were expected to inform the study and to confirm the qualitative findings. The purpose of the survey in this study was to confirm the validity and reliability of the qualitative findings.

4.10.1 Survey Questionnaire
As a written form of questioning, a questionnaire is used to collect facts or to assess something such as personality (Thomas, 2013). A versatile tool, it can be used in different kinds of research designs. The questions on the questionnaire can be read out by interviewers, or interviewees can complete it themselves (Thomas, 2013). The purpose of the survey design is to generalise from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about characteristics, attitudes, or behaviours and perspectives of the population (Creswell, 2003). The survey questionnaire was appropriate for data collection for this study because the perspectives of a large group of people can be identified from a small group. The small representation who answer questions on questionnaires would determine the results that will validate and confirm qualitative results. The procedures adopted for this study first considered the population and samples for the purpose of forming a sample group (Creswell, 2003). In doing so, the study identified the population from the selected case study and the size expected to participate in the study. Since this is a case study and the population and samples had already been purposefully determined, selection of participants did not need to be considered. All form one students of selected case study secondary schools were expected to participate in the study along with all teachers of the
school. The researcher first met with the principal and the form masters of form one classes and asked the principal to meet the students to further explain the questions to students in order for them to understand the concepts and purpose before actually answering the questions.

**Case Study (CS) One**
In the CS One school, all Form One students were expected to be issued with questionnaires to be filled out and returned. However, from the 106 enrolled students in Form One only 75 were in attendance that day and were given questionnaires; questionnaires returned also numbered 75. The reason for the one hundred per cent return rate was doubtless because the principal and the form master administered the questionnaires, during school hours. The form master collected the completed questionnaires and delivered them to the principal, who kept them for the researcher to collect. Of the twenty eight-teachers of the school, twenty-four were issued with questionnaires, and seventeen teachers answered and returned them. Some of the teachers were not present at the time when questionnaires were issued and others failed to return them to the principal. This is obvious in Solomon Islands schools, where teachers can be difficult to control and manage because their welfare is not really taken care of by the responsible institutions. Nevertheless, ninety-two participants (students & teachers) responded to the questions.

**Case Study (CS) Two**
For CS Two, the 63 Form One students who were issued with questionnaires were those who were attending class when the questionnaires were issued, out of 87 students enrolled for Form One; 63 questionnaires were returned. The one hundred per cent return rate was because the the Social Studies teacher administered the questionnaire, which was filled out during school hours. Of the thirty teachers of the school, only twenty-two were issued with questionnaires; others were not present at that time because of an issue between teachers and students. From the twenty-two teachers, only sixteen returned the questionnaires to the principal, meaning that a total of seventy-nine staff and student participants out of 117 responded to the questionnaire.

**Case Study (CS) Three**
The sports master of the school issued the survey questionnaires to Form One students and he also volunteered to manage the questionnaire by following up with students. Thus 65 out of the 71 Form One students at the school filled out and returned the completed questionnaires. As with Case Studies One and Two, the high return rate was associated with the survey’s administration
during school hours. Out of the thirty teachers, only twenty-three were issued with questionnaires, and of that number only fourteen returned the questionnaire. The reason for that low return rate seems to be because they were advised to return the questionnaires themselves by putting them in their pigeon holes. The sports master was responsible for collecting them as well. As mentioned earlier, management of teachers is an issue in SI schools. A total seventy-nine students and teachers responded to the questionnaires.

Case Study (CS) Four
The principal issued the questionnaires for this study to Form One students and followed up with them to ensure that they answered the questions appropriately. The total number of students in Form One at the school was 103 and out of that number, 70 were issued with questionnaires. They were the only students present at that time and all 70 returned the questionnaires, the excellent return rate reflecting the fact that it was answered in the presence of teachers. Of the twenty-eight secondary teachers, only twenty-four received questionnaires and only sixteen returned them, apparently again because they were advised to return the questionnaires themselves to the principal’s office for the researcher to collect. The total of staff and student responses to the questionnaires is thus eighty-six.

4.10.2 Data recording
As soon as the researcher collected questionnaires began recording the answers using the three-point Likert scale. A Likert scale can be used in situations where beliefs and attitudes are being measured, and just asks for agreement or disagreement with statements provided (Thomas, 2013). For this study the students were asked to rate the statements as follows: yes, a bit, or no. For each question, the number of ticks against each response was recorded and then later converted to percentages and entered on to a spreadsheet.

4.10.3 Data interpretation
Interpretation of numbers can be difficult for qualitative researchers. However, as Thomas, (2013) explains, it is just putting what you already know in numbers; for example, putting categories of gender in numbers, such as male 1 and female 2 (ibid.). In this study the data were interpreted according to the tallies on the three-point Likert scale. The numbers according to categories of yes, a bit, and no were interpreted with numbers, 3 for yes, 2 for a bit and 1 for no. The summary by categories was then summarised using cross-tabulation. As mentioned, the data were presented in categories as well as basing them on “the standard, common sense approach to
Such presenta

4.10.4 Data analysis
This study uses the first rule of analysis by numbers, which Thomas (2013) explains as “eyeballing” (p. 249); that is, looking at the numbers to see what the look tells you (Thomas, 2013). This study proceeded to analyse the data by using the most simple technique of summarising and describing numerical data. The process involved editing to ensure that all questionnaire responses were recorded in a consistent way and immediately recording the responses into a coding scheme. For example, this study only looks for ticks against three answers to the closed questions: no ( ), a bit, ( ) yes ( ). The three were represented with the following numbers: no = 1, a bit = 2, yes = 3. The tracking was only on the number of times the codes 1, or 2, or 3 appeared. The recorded total was then converted into percentages based on the independent and dependent variables (Singh, 2010).

For this study, the independent variable is the citizenship education curriculum in Solomon Islands. The dependent variables are cultural, spiritual, and modern institutional values and themes, or concepts and pedagogies of citizenship highlighted by the questionnaires. The survey used eleven questions, which were regrouped under three themes: (1) the conceptualization of citizenship and citizenship education, (2) citizenship values, knowledge and skills, and (3) citizenship pedagogies. The numbers analysed were placed according to those broad themes of the study.

The numbers were first recorded using Microsoft excel and then downsized into frequency variance using the SPSS for psychologists, 5th edition. This study analysed the data with the Analysis of Variation (AVONA). According to Brace, Kemp, and Snelgar (2012), ANOVA is a useful tool for analysing data as it tests for difference in experimental designs involving two groups, tells us whether scores significantly vary across the condition, allows for investigation of more than one independent variable, and allows investigation on the independent variables combined to affect dependent variable.
4.11 Ethical considerations

Ethics in research refers to the principles of rights and wrong that a particular group accepts at a particular time (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). According to the Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (1988, p. 426, cited in Morris, 2008), ethics indicates “what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation” (p. 2). Three meanings are usually associated with the term “ethics”. According to Newman and Brown (cited in Morris, 2008, p. 2):

the first focuses on fundamental principles of moral behaviour that should apply, at least in theory, to everyone. The second refers to principles of conduct developed by, and for, members of a particular profession. The third involves the systematic study of the beliefs people hold, and the behaviours they exhibit relevant to morality.

For this study, all three meanings are relevant and relate to ethical challenges found in the process of this research. For example, careful ethical consideration is required for research on human subjects. Ethical consideration includes “paying attention to the way in which the research is presented to potential participants, the likely impact of taking part in the research, the effects of sampling strategies, engaging with the researcher and dissemination sessions” (Barbour, 2008. pp. 78–79). This research was subject to the requirements of the University of the South Pacific Research Ethics Committee and followed the ethical guidelines, protocols, and processes of the University of the South Pacific. Furthermore, each society has unique values that need to be carefully observed. People are bound by ethical regulations, designed to govern within well-defined principles that are embedded in people’s values. This conceptualisation relates to the meaning provided; Morris (2008) states that ethics is associated with moral behaviour, the beliefs people hold, and the behaviours they exhibit. Therefore, to meet those requirements, this research adhered to the following ethical considerations. To ensure that the study did not cause harm to participants, prior approval was sought from appropriate authorities and institutions, as well as the local communities. The approval and protection of human subjects was provided for by the information forms in which the researcher described what would be done with the findings, possible dangers to the subjects, and other pertinent information (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007): “The subject’s signature on an informed consent letter is taken as evidence as informed consent” (ibid., p. 48). The researcher also ensured that the aims, objectives, and guidelines of the study were thoroughly explained to the participants. The researcher gained access and entry to the sites through pre-contact sessions. This accomplished what Becker (cited in Silverman, 2005) advises researchers to take note of: “When studying an organisation we are dependent on the whims of gate keepers. Such people will usually seek to limit what we can
study assuring us that if we need to know more they can tell us about it” (p. 125). This approach of building relationships was important to ensure that the participants knew me. In societies like SI where traditional values are dominant, building relationships is an important factor to gain people’s trust and acceptance. Further, it was necessary for the researcher to be briefed on local ethical requirements so that the study could be conducted according to the school and local community’s ethical standards. As the researcher, care was taken to ensure that, throughout the duration of the study the researcher was ethical with research on respondents in participating schools and communities.

4.12 Summary
This chapter has presented and explained the design of the research and the selection of methodological approaches. The chapter explains how interpretative/constructivist and post-positivist paradigms underpin the study. The ethnographic and the case study approaches were justified and prove to have provided rich data. The processes used for selection of sites and participants for the study were fully explained. The ways in which the mixed methods approach – utilising qualitative interview methods (semi-structured questionnaires applied to focus group and one-on-one interviews) and quantitative survey questionnaires to support the interviews – proved to generate valuable rich data were presented. Processes of data recording and analysis are described. Lastly an explanation of ethical aspects of this research was highlighted. The next chapter, five, presents the finding of the study.
CHAPTER FIVE
DESCRIPTION AND FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction
The previous chapter presented the methodological orientation and research design adopted for the study. In particular, a mixture of methods was used to gather the data needed to answer the research questions posed for the study. This chapter presents the analysis of the data obtained from one-on-one interviews, group discussion and questionnaires.

As mentioned earlier, the recorded interview responses were transcribed to ensure that their views were captured exactly, retaining as much as possible the respondents’ actual words. This allowed the flavour of views from respondents to reflect the predominant social, physical, economic, cultural, political, and environmental factors that had affected them, adding the richness that the study was expecting. The findings provided here are representative of what was gathered from the fieldwork, with general exemplification of themes and variables that require strong emphasis. The respondents are represented by codes and their actual utterances are recorded specifically under each question and selected case studies.

The chapter is organised under the following sections: 5.2, descriptions of the selected schools; 5.3, case study school participants’ responses to interview questions; 5.4, responses of government bureaucrats; 5.5, rural village elders’ responses; 5.6, survey questionnaire findings from four case study schools; and 5.7, a chapter summary and brief conclusion.

5.2 Description of Selected Schools and codes representing respondents

Solomon Islands Schools Demographic Profile
Student respondents were representative of students in schools offering secondary education (as shown in Table 5.1). The total number of students who participated in the study was 27.
Table 5.1 School demographic profile 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten School</td>
<td>7993</td>
<td>8512</td>
<td>16505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>33934</td>
<td>36397</td>
<td>70331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community High School</td>
<td>37447</td>
<td>40293</td>
<td>77740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Secondary School</td>
<td>2540</td>
<td>3299</td>
<td>5839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Secondary School</td>
<td>2159</td>
<td>2539</td>
<td>4698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Solomon Islands Education Sector Wide Programme, 2013

The teacher respondents were representative of teachers from all categories of schools. Table 5.2 shows the total number of teachers in formal schools in SI. The number of teachers who participated in the study was 63.

Table 5.2 Total Number of teachers Solomon Islands 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total No. of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not registered)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Solomon Islands Education Sector Wide Programme, 2013

In total, 336 participants from case study schools have participated in the study, with 9 additional participants from case study five (Public officers) and 6 from case study six (Rural elders), bringing the total to 351 participants.

5.2.1 Case Study One (CS1): Rural Boarding Secondary School (RBSS)

This case study site was chosen on the basis that it enrolled students from all over Malaita Province, the most populated province in SI, and is located among the most populated ethnic group in the province. It also has certain reputations that are interesting to this research. One is the reputation related to behavioural challenges found commonly in the particular case study.

The views from the qualitative interviews in this case study derived from students and teachers who were selected from the lists outlined in tables 5.3 and 5.4 respectively. Students interviewed were selected from form one with ages ranging from 12 to 14 years. The age group reflects the recommended age set in the Education Act of SI for Form One level. The number of students interviewed in this school was six; three male and three female.
Eight teachers, five male and three female, and including two principals, from the total number of teachers listed below were selected to be interviewed and are assumed to be the representative of all teachers teaching in Provincial Secondary schools in Solomon Islands.

5.2.2 Case Study Two (CS2): Rural Day Secondary School (RDSS)
The Community High School was initially selected as a case study because it is located in the rural area and secondly, it has both primary and secondary classes. Other features considered are that the school is owned by a rural community and is administered and controlled by a Christian church organization. This indicates that the rules and regulations of the school are formulated according to church beliefs and doctrines.

The number of student respondents is sixty-three. The number was assumed to be representative of the total number of students in the school as outlined in Table 5.5 and was also assumed to represent the views of all students in rural Community High Schools in Solomon Islands. The number of students selected for qualitative interview is six, three male and three female.
Table 5.5: Population of CS2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Case Study Two</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Form 1</th>
<th>Form 2</th>
<th>Form 3</th>
<th>Form 4</th>
<th>Form 5</th>
<th>Form 6</th>
<th>Form 7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Solomon Islands Education Sector Wide Programme, 2013

The number of teachers selected from this school was eight – five male, and three female, including two principals. These teachers were assumed to represent all teachers and principals teaching in rural Community High Schools in Solomon Islands.

Table 5.6: Total number of teaching staff, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Two</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Solomon Islands Education Sector Wide Programme, 2013

5.2.3 Case Study Three (CS3): Urban Boarding Secondary School (UBSS)

This National Secondary School was purposefully selected for this study because of its status and location in the urban centre. Another feature of interest to this study is that it is one of the only secondary schools that enrol students with no restriction according to church affiliation, province, or ethnic affiliations and language attachment. The level and age grouping is purposely selected. The case study site was purposefully selected to represent urban boarding national secondary school students and teachers in Solomon Islands. Tables 5.7 and 5.8 show the student enrolment and the number of staff of the school. The number of students selected for interviews is six: three male and three female.

Table 5.7: Total number of students (UBSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Case Study Three</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Form 1</th>
<th>Form 2</th>
<th>Form 3</th>
<th>Form 4</th>
<th>Form 5</th>
<th>Form 6</th>
<th>Form 7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Solomon Islands Education Sector Wide Programme, 2013
The number of teachers participating in the qualitative interview is seven, four male and three female.

Table 5.8: Total number of teaching staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Three</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Solomon Islands Education Sector Wide Programme, 2013

5.2.4 Case study Four: Urban Day Secondary School (UDSS)

This case study was selected from urban Community High Schools to represent schools of that type in the country. The age group and the level of education, as for other case study schools, were purposely selected. The interview respondents were selected from the total number of student shown in Table 5.9. In total, six students, three male and three female, participated in the interview.

Table 5.9: Number of students in the school, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Level;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td>Form 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Solomon Islands Education Sector Wide Programme, 2013

The teachers to be interviewed were selected from the total number of teaching staff in 2013. Three male and three female staff participated in the interview discussions. The respondents were assumed to represent teachers in urban day community high schools in Solomon Islands.

Table 5.10: Total number of teaching staff, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Four</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Solomon Islands Education Sector Wide Programme, 2013
5.2.5 Codes representing respondents
Individual respondents are represented by codes as shown in Figure 5.1 and the descriptions of data from their interviews have been internalized using the simple coding shown in Figure 5.1. This is done to protect their anonymity and confidentiality; interviewees’ names have been replaced appropriately with the codes shown.

Figure 5.1: Respondents and Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boarding Secondary School – Form 1 Students</td>
<td>UBSS - F1S 1,2,3,4,5,6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Day Secondary School – Form 1 Students</td>
<td>UDSS – F1S 1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boarding Secondary School – Teachers</td>
<td>UBSS – TS 1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Day Secondary School – Teachers</td>
<td>UDSS – TS 1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Boarding Secondary School – Form 1 students</td>
<td>RBSS – F1S 1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Day Secondary School – Form 1 students</td>
<td>RDSS – F1S 1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Boarding Secondary School – Teacher</td>
<td>RBSS – TS 1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Day Secondary School – Teacher</td>
<td>RDSS – TS 1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boarding Secondary School – Principal</td>
<td>UBSS – Prin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Day Secondary School – Principal</td>
<td>UDSS – Prin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Boarding Secondary School – Principal</td>
<td>RBSS – Prin 1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Day Secondary School – Principal</td>
<td>RDSS – Prin 1,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ministry Of Education and Human Resource Development:
- **Director**                                                                 | MEHRD – DS
- **Senior Curriculum Officer 1**                                            | MEHRD – SCO 1
- **Senior Curriculum Officer 2**                                            | MEHRD – SCO 2
- **Chief Education Officer – Provincial Education Authority**              | MEHRD – CEO

Other Government Officials – Ministry of Home Affairs – Senior Officer      | MHA – SO

Solomon Islands National Parliament – Civic Program Official               | SINP – CPO

Ministry of Peace & Reconciliation – Senior Official                        | MPR – SO

Ministry of Women Youth & Children Affairs – Senior official               | MWYC – SO

Rural Village Elders -                                                     | RVE 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

5.3 Participants Responses to Interview Questions
The responses provided in this section (sub-sections 5.3.1–5.3.9) were gathered from the focus group and one-on-one interviews held in the four selected case study schools in SI.

5.3.1 Conceptualisation of citizenship and citizenship education
Citizenship and CE is conceptualised differently across social and political spectrums as noted from this study. Respondents conceptualised the term in a variety of descriptions according to their own interpretation based on the context and their understanding of the term. However, the
conceptualisation of the term (citizenship) as provide in the study is through certain forms of formal identification from national documents such as identity cards or passports that imbue certain rights and responsibilities granted by the state. Others interpreted it in terms of certain features such as how people should behave and respond to societal or national inference.

Teachers who were educated with modern knowledge and also critical in their interpretation and conception of the term citizenship found it difficult to align the concept with a traditional equivalent. According to one CS1- Principal, the term has no resemblance to any traditionally or culturally used word in SI:

I see the term citizenship as irrelevant to Solomon Island context. It does not have an equivalent word with Solomon Island and, in this regard, my society. In my society, we do not judge and recognise people according to how outsiders or the West recognise and judge citizens. We judge people according to cultural norms, values, and ownership – the way we see people in our society is through the upholding and demonstration of values acceptable in society and the traditional ownership of resources as land, that only has connection through indigenous tribes and the values that guide action (custom). I myself cannot emulate others (RDSS – Prin 2).

The same principal depicted citizens as “people of place or locality” which is wider in scope compared to citizenship:

For me, the way we identify people of the society as citizens is only through certain obligatory status, which is broader than the individual identification through certain modern legal means. It is communal identification where you have been recognised among people to share with all communal and tribal obligations through indigenous ownership of resources and mandatory participation. In the Western societies, it is the protection of the rights of the person under the rule of law, but in the Solomon Islands, it is the rights of a person through certain indigenous obligatory processes, particularly in rightful ownership and participation under cultural guardianship…the right to cut down trees without question, the right to till the land, the right to claim the land and share with obligation that must go unfulfilled, the right to lead people (RDSS–Prin 2).

This response reflects the complexity of the term with regard to the diversity of perspectives held by people, the nature of development and limited exposure of people to the definition of citizenship and democratic ideals from outside.

The meaning of the right to the locality referred to kinship and tribal identity, ownership of resources and leadership status. As one CS1 Principal pointed out:

I am a citizen here because this place is rightfully mine … people in the community know me. I hold communal identity, I am free to participate in communal activities and take up a leadership role as well. I also have a responsibility to care for others and having an interdependency space to be cared for and protected (RDSS-Prin 1).
I see a citizen as a person that is recognised by indigenous birthright, and for a naturalised citizen, status recognised by the modern laws of the country. Importantly, the recognise are validated only when values and norms of society are respected and observed (RDSS- Prin 2).

When Principals were asked about the values they consider important for citizens, they claimed that people can only be recognised when values they demonstrate reflect the culture and Christianity:

The values I think are important are values from culture and church … the dress code or how people dress, participation, demonstration of skills, thinking, attitudes, behaviours, certain foods to eat, and observation of cultural and church ethics and dispositions that show you are from the place and the community of people (RDSS – Prin 2).

The other conceptualisation of the term extended to reflect the behavioural and linguistic characteristics of people and those who adapted to certain societal key indicators or criteria based on standards of the society. As pointed out:

For me, the recognition of citizens includes respect for the laws of the country, hospitality, inviting, sharing, communal, and speaking pijin language (RDSS-Prin 1).

The respondent made comparison with other races that have migrated to SI and become citizens, who are perceived to:

Use bribes to obtain citizenship status and avoid doing charity work. Those people should not be called citizens of Solomon Islands (CS1-Prin 1).

According to CS2, teachers’ conceptualisation of citizenship is described in the following ways:

A person who has good attitudes, and behaves appropriately according to rules of the society. The person has to participate exceptionally in all activities organised by the society. He performs and participates in activities important to society (RBSS – TS1).

A process of acquiring values to be recognised by others in the community. It is how people see themselves against the values of society; for example, leadership in society. People who lead are those who are recognised among society as “people of the place” who have lived and demonstrated the ethical values of leadership among people (RBSS – TS5).

The CS2 conceptualised citizenship with the process of acquiring values that reflects an individual’s freedom of participation among kin groups or community. In addition, they expressed that peoples’ engagement in society – in activities such as reciprocity (giving and receiving or sharing and receiving) and ethical leadership – shows that they are citizens. In this regard, respect is fundamentally significant in this conceptualisation.

For CS3 the conceptualisation of the term citizenship is perceived as follows:
A citizen is a person that is recognised for his active and free participation in society. He/she has to have the knowledge and practise the values of local culture, church, and the modern rule of law. The person must show responsibility to the welfare of all people in the society. He/she has to respect all people and is able to reciprocate in kind to people as somebody from the community relationship (UBSS – TS1).

The CS4 respondents refer to citizenship as this: “I am a citizen here because I was born here and my parents are from here as well” (UDSS-F1S 2). In other words, citizenship is seen as the heritage of people of the place by birth, whose parents are people of the place as well. People of place, as interpreted by respondents, are those who have land attachments, genealogy, and attachments to indigenous kinship and tribal groups. A student illustrated this as: “People of place are those who take care of things of the society and its citizens” (UBSS- F13).

This statement defines citizenship with reference to people who care for things in the environment and their own society. They are people who respect those in their kin group, tribe, and other people they are associated with. As shown, conceptualisation of the term citizenship varies according to the status, locality, and political and social context. In this study, the respondents related themselves with what they are in contact with – how they socialise with people and the environment. The location, environment, and socialisation have an effect on how they see their world. In the school case studies, teachers conceptualised citizenship as the birthright of a person who is born to a country and is recognised as a rightful person of that locality. The majority of respondents indicate that since it is people’s understanding that local cultural values are important to SI society, it is vital for all who claim to be citizens of SI to uphold, practise, or show respect to those values.

5.3.2 What is your conceptualisations of good citizenship?
Respondents’ answers to this question are provided below, illustrating that to be good in Solomon Islands is to demonstrate values from the culture of the place and values of Christian practices. For example, the CS1 students described a good citizen on the basis of cultural values of sharing and support provided by extended families and the recognition of status a person has in the community. A typical response illustrates this:

A good citizen is someone who has the capacity to offer advice on cultural and church values and live up to the norms and values of society. A person of integrity and honesty, who observes and practises shared cultural and Christian values (RBSS – F1S3).
It is natural for rural students to equate good citizenship with values of culture and church because the only impacts they have felt are from the practice of culture and Christianity. Most of the CS1 student respondents highlighted relationships among people of a community, family, kin group, and tribe as the concrete translations of values of good citizenship. For CS1 students, the citizenship practice of values of caring and obligatory support for all people in the community was identified as good citizenship. Again, according to student respondents, a good citizen is a person who provides help for others without expecting to be compensated, who is obliged to fulfil the role one is expected to exert towards family and relatives. A typical response was:

A good citizen is a person that relates well with everybody in the family, kin group, and community, who has caring attitudes like our parents who look after us, feed us, clothe us, pay my school fees, and keep me to become who I am (RBSS – F1S5).

The teachers’ description of good citizenship made reference to respect for the law, custom and relationship. For rural teachers, a good citizen is someone who lives according to the laws of the land, respects their neighbours, and has a good relationship with everyone in the community. Some of the characteristic asserted by rural teachers include: living according to the rules of society, custom of the place, and the values that are important to people’s culture and have certain ethical standing in community. The respondent further suggested: “a person of such calibre has to walk the talk. He says it and lives it; improves society by working hard to improve it and participate in activities that positively affect others in the community” (RBSS – TS4). Another teacher conceptualised a good citizen as one with love for the country; with ethical leadership, ownership, and stewardship of resources. He says:

A person that puts his country in his heart. He ensures that what he does benefits people. He owns the land and shares his resources with those that are in his vicinity. A person that demonstrates ethical leadership among the social and physical environment shows that he truly cares (RBSS – TS5).

A more profound articulation of a good citizen that teachers highlighted was respect for the culture of the place and observation of the custom rule that one has observed since birth. This reflection of recognition among people was based on values of family, kinship, tribal and community ownership, and distinctive leadership qualities.

A good citizen is someone who is passionate about promoting values that change the society. The values recommended are those that people recognise in society, especially the ones that reflect people’s way of life. I believe that any development for nation building needs the stability of society and obviously, what stabilises Solomon Islands is the values of culture and the church (RBSS – TS4).
When teachers were asked to assess or evaluate themselves against the standard they endorsed for good citizenship, most claimed they were good citizens. The features of measurement most teachers provided include: Demonstrated values of peaceful co-existence or living in peace and harmony with everybody in the local community, school community, including teachers and students (RBSS – TS3): living a Christian lifestyle that is based on Christian values and principles (RBSS–TS6) and service to the Government as teaching children in formal setting (RBSS–TS2). One describe him as:

I am still not qualified if I measure myself according to values of culture, church, and society. However, I am still working on some of the values that are important to society. No one is perfect but people are striving to be good citizens (RBSS – TS5).

Considering teachers’ conceptualisation of a good citizen, their description and depiction of people were based on their observations and practical living along Christian values, service to the government, upholding values of culture and creating, facilitating and predestining peace with everyone in the community.

Interpretation and conceptualisation of a good citizen by CS2 respondents were similar to rural boarding school respondents. Their conception was based mainly on what they saw, heard, and experienced in their own society:

A good citizen is kind and helpful in things of the community. They are people that help others in times of need or those who cannot help themselves, like the disabled people (RDSS – F1S3).

He is a person that has good manners, and displays good attitude and behaviour in his contact with people in and outside of the community (RDSS – F1S2).

The person of that calibre has humility, and is helpful and supports people – [for example] helping to make gardens for people that are disabled (RDSS – F1S5).

Teachers described a good citizen as someone who was responsible for teaching younger people to become good citizens. One teacher mentioned:

A good citizen is someone who observes the standard expected of the community and the country, which includes the culture of people and Christian principles (RDSS – TS4).

The other teachers rated themselves as good citizens according to the service they render to people as a teacher:

I think I am a good citizen because I serve the Government and people through teaching children of values that can help them when they leave school (RDSS – TS3).
I am a good citizen because I help others. Respect the rule of law and people of the country. I also teach people of the country how to live as good citizens (RDSS – TS2).

Teachers here interpreted a good citizen as someone who displays honesty, respect, care, and has leadership ability. Also, they interpreted a good citizen as someone who is helpful and participates actively in community affairs and national obligations, has vision and foresight, and a person with moral and ethical standing in society. According to the teachers, a good citizen is a respectable person in community:

Someone who has the capacity to lead as well as having leadership roles in the community, and to build cooperation, and good relationships with people. At the village level he is a law-abiding person, a useful member of the community with foresight about what will happen to people in the future (RDSS – Prin1).

Being a “useful member of the community” refers to sharing of food, labour, accommodation, being helpful, and actively participating and taking the leading role in village activities. The person of such calibre lives according to ethical principles and is trustworthy and ethical in his/her dealing with society.

Students of CS3 see a good citizen as someone who obeys people in the community, teachers, and people in authority. They have to be people who display good behaviours in the society, help people that are in need, the elderly, disabled, and weak people like children. They are people who like to see the environment clean and tidy. Those people help to “care for public properties, support people that are in need in terms of labour, as well as material things” (UBSS-F1S2).

They are people that work hard in society ensuring that people’s lives are safe and secure. They provide help and always tell the truth. Good citizens are people who respect the laws of the land, participate actively in organisations in societies. They are responsible people that care for the families, community, and society (UBSS-F1S 4).

A good citizen is a person that has wisdom – who performs and acts upon what is right and fair for all; a person that lives according to values of society and culture of the place; who works against or tries to prevent violence, criminal activities and immoral activities in society (UBSS-F1S 5).

Many of the responses on good citizenship relate to values of cleanliness and keeping the environment clean, observing the rule of law and honesty in their dealings with people, and observing Christian values.

Student respondents of CS4 interpreted a good citizen as someone who relates well with everybody in the community or someone who is a peacemaker. They are people who are kind
and have demonstrated the value of sharing in material things including, labour, money, food, and clothes. Students described a good citizen as someone who stands for the right of young people, particularly, organising young people on things that will involve them positively in the community. He provides advice and rebukes people who are involved in criminal activities. He builds relationships with people. He always helps people with the small things that are important to people’s lives (UDSS – F1S4/UDSS – F1S3). The response on where they learned the values is as follows:

I have learned about values but the values that shape my behaviours are not learned at school. The values that I learn are from the home, from parents. Subjects I learn at school are not specific about values that develop relationships, unity, sharing, or helping others. Those values are learned from parents and church leaders (UDSS – F1S5).

Another student expressed:

In the Social Studies syllabus, we learn about family relationships and community relationships but those are emphasised only for examination (UDSS – FS6).

Students are emphatic that the values discussed are important to Solomon Islands. They claim that if values are properly planned and disseminated this will reduce hatred, instability, discrimination, and bullying at school and in communities. They suggest that all people should uphold those values and must learn them at school so that everybody can care for each other.

5.3.3 What values are considered important to people?
The values outside countries conceptualise as important to nation building and progressive development (see chapter 3) differ from those the CS1 participants identify as important for SI. These respondents spoke in favour of building relationships with each other in the community and building on values that generate unity, love, and respect as crucial to nation building. The respondents also highlighted working hard to earn a living as an important value for good citizenship. The value of working hard may have resulted from earning money, assisting the immediate family and other extended family members, to have an increase in food supply, or a surplus of clothing to give away for the needy, in particular, the elderly and the disabled. Participants claimed the value of respect as fundamental to good citizenship for nation building, pointing out that a nation whose citizens do not value others through respect for human dignity will always create instability and chaos. The apparent absence of those values from SI society in past decades had resulted in instability and chaos. According CS1 teachers:
If we are looking for a better Solomon Islands, we must embrace and promote values from our local cultures (participation, respect, unity) and our Christian values (love, respect, relationship) (RBSS – TS1).

You see, we have no care aptitude in our society, more violence and disrespect so if we fail to address this in schools, it will affect our country. In the next ten years if we don’t start now we will incur problems bigger than those we experience now (RDSS – TS 2).

Values that create peace among people, values that promote relationship among people, and values that uphold unity among people are those that must be promoted in our school system. They are of course what we are looking for (RBSS – TS4).

I think the values that are considered important are those that we practise from our culture. It is also important to consider values that are relevant to Solomon Islands because the values currently promoted in the curriculum are not relevant to Solomon Islands. What Solomon Islands needs is a citizenship programme that promotes the missing values from society (RBSS – Prin 1).

In terms of the values of individual rights the student participants claimed:

How can I talk or boast about my individual right among people when my survival is only guaranteed by my immediate family and extended family? They build our house they help in the garden they give me some money to take me to hospital when they are sick. They share whatever, they have with me although it is small. They help pay my school fees and the list goes on. How can I exercise my individual right when all my support is from those people? (RBSS-F1S5)

Further, rural teachers highlighted the importance of cultural and Christian values as significant for SI, believing that it is through those that peaceful co-existence emerges:

The values that appear to be missing from Solomon Islands’ society ... people have become individualistic and this has caused them to be disintegrated and dysfunctional to nuclear and extended family and communal activities as they are concerned only about themselves (RDSS-TS2).

For students, typical responses are:

I thinking relationship and love is important. The reason is that, we can have what we want if we have good relationship with our families and communities and people can love us only if we relate with love to them (RBSS-FS1/RBSS-FS4).

Values I see important are those that demonstrate caring, and respect for one another. If we care and respect we may not have problems we see in our current societies (RBSS-F1S2/3).

The CS2 respondents have identified values that are summarised in figure 5.2. Respondents here have identified values that they perceived as important to them based on what they saw from their daily contact with the social environment; in particular the students, who had little exposure to urban areas. The teacher respondents indicated values they saw as important to cover national consciousness. The values student respondents considered important are those that facilitate unity, cooperation, and care for each other. According to the respondents they do not have those
kinds of values in the curriculum and had never been taught to them at school. This is a typical response from a student:

The topics we learn from the curriculum do not help us to respect and care for others. We were taught with subjects that will give us employment. The topics learned do not provide the basis for respect. It is important to emphasise that in the school programmes (RDSS–F1S3).

In terms of application of values, students mentioned that students display good values from church and culture, but they are learned from home teaching: “We learn about good values from home but never practise them at school” (RDSS-F1S2). Similar concern was raised by the teachers, who claimed that what has been reflected in the school environment causes marginalisation among students. They argued that the government lacks innovation to make the education of the country more reflective of the needs of society.

We are so complacent [about] of all the ethnic discrimination, division among races, and instability in the Government. We should teach students about unity, national identity, activities participation, and being law-abiding citizens, and even teach students about our constitution (RDSS-TS5).

In terms of monitoring, teachers assess student performance only on academic work and not on any social behaviour demonstrated in school. They claimed they only teach topics that reflect information for knowledge and not on values, although the expectation is for students to demonstrate good values and character. As stated “It is a bit crazy as we want students to display good character but we teachers never teach or assess character building among students” (RDSS– Prin 2). One teacher pointed out:

For me, the dominant culture of teacher-centred approach to learning is viewed as the easiest way to teach. It is not expensive, so countries like the Solomon Islands continue to embrace for its education system (RDSS-TS3).

A teacher of CS3 suggested that “sharing among neighbours and respect for one another are values that must be harnessed among communities as they produce stability in traditional societies and continue to be maintained today in rural areas” (UBSS-TS5). Those values may also complement the values of helping others, providing ethical leadership among families, communities, and societies. According to a student respondent the substance of those values are not learned at school:

Good values I live with and that create good relationships with different students were acquired from home and church I attended (UBSS-F1S6).

The students asserted that it is precisely because those values are so important that they have to be promoted at school. Students claimed that the values are now missing in society. “There is no respect, people mind their own affairs without considering each other and people practising individualism
and discrimination see others as different” (UBSS-F1S2). When students were asked about values that show concern for public property and acting with good manners towards the social and physical environments, they answered:

Sometimes when another student does something that is not right I rebuke him. For example, throwing rubbish in the school compound (UBS-F1S3).

According to students:

Teachers did not teach us to respect our country including public or Government property. However, they often put their eyes on us to punish or rebuke us when we offend them or put them in awkward situations (UBSS-F1S5).

Teachers also highlighted values they considered significant for people and their community, similarly to CS3 respondents, but made reflections about what they regard as significant according to the urban context:

Having values that focus on conflict resolution and peaceful co-existence will improve Solomon Islands … currently our country is an unpredictable society (UBSS-TS6).

The following illustrate how teachers perceive that missing values caused the breakdown of relationships among urban societies comprising different ethnic groups living together:

In our current society we have diverse groups of people with different cultural and church backgrounds. However, the issue of differences has not been seriously considered against how we live and participate together as citizens of one country. Just look at how we responded to our political environment, our social relationships, and the laws of the country. We citizens fail to understand how they work for us so we become suspicious, then continue to destroy our own systems (UBSS–TS4).

Our society needs values that create political stability, social and physical development, peace building, active participation in communities, and respect for others in society. (UBSS TS1)

Values that establish relational progress and stability are important because only then will our nation be respected among other nations. It is important to have the values to create a nation that lives peacefully (UBSS – TS3).

If our country wants to achieve its development goals we must work together to develop the values that are missing in society. Values that generate cooperation, unity, and active participation. (UBSS – TS5).

We must try to add more work on values for the sake of our current generation or else we will lose them all and resort to values that will destroy our nation morally … [T]he curriculum may have those in subject syllabuses but it is the teachers that must be given some kind of training that will empower them to teach on values. It is important that values must be reinforced again in the curriculum or at the school level so that they are effectively promoted in the country (UBSS – TS3).

One teacher strongly emphasised that integrated approaches to CE are a limiting factor to the promotion of values at the school level. He claimed:
It is much better to have citizenship education as a separate subject. So that teachers who teach the subject can get specific training in teaching the subject. The subject must be included in all levels of education from ECE, primary, secondary, and vocational schools (UBSS–TS2).

Some of the teachers who experienced and witnessed the deteriorating values of helping those in need as practised by traditional societies suggested:

More emphasis on voluntarism, participation in outdoor activities, healthy moral life styles, and reintroducing cultural values in schools (UBSS–TS3).

Use of social media for communication is now popular so we have to create standards that will control behaviours in schools, if not, Solomon Islands could go through some crisis again in future. There must be standards that will control life of students at school (UBSS–TS5).

The values summarised later in this chapter are considered important. The CS4 respondents see values that unite people and stabilise the society as important for SI, as they have stated:

It is important for schools to organise activities that enable students to live together and be actively involved and participate in school programmes together (UBSS-TS1).

It is also important to organise activities that challenge students’ attitudes and behaviours. The values like respect, honesty, obedience, faithfulness, and unity are important. The values are not promoted in schools; therefore, they have to be included in school programmes and must be compulsory (UDSS – F1S3).

Other students pointed out:

The value of respect and tolerance of other peoples’ difference and ethnicity is missing – especially those who are different by race. It is important that values of respect for others, unity, and building relationships must be included in the curriculum (UDSS – F1S5).

Schools that protect the needs of students and teach values that reinforce unity among diversity, a community that respects each other, and grounded its rules on culture of people is needed in the Solomon Islands (UDSS – F1S6).

We need those values very much as it is only then that we can live peacefully with each other. It is also important for schools to organise activities that cause students to be involved in school programmes, for example sports activities, helping others, cultural dances (UDSS – F1S4).

Respondents of this study recognised the promotion of values at school as very important because only the homes and churches promote values that target attitudes and behaviours. The values that were summarised were vital for SI if it is to move forward as a nation in unity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Values considered important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>relationship, unity, love, and respect, hardworking, supportive, caring, helpfulness, compassion, peace, active participation, community works, humility, identity, willingness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>cooperation, unity, sharing, love, patience, goodness, faithfulness &amp; honesty, hospitality, care and respect, compassion, relationship, identity, art works, language, ethics, moral values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>obedience, respect, responsibility, caring, hospitality, helpful, stewardship, sharing &amp; giving, relationship, hardworking, safety &amp; security, truthfulness, sincerity, wisdom &amp; knowledgeable, right &amp; responsibility, fairness &amp; generosity, non-violence &amp; peaceful co-existence, leadership, conflict resolution, peace and justice, identity, peace building, active participation, cooperation, unity, voluntarism, healthy lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4</td>
<td>unity, relationship, respect, honesty, participation, sharing (labour and material things) helpfulness, voluntarism and communal support, willingness, faithfulness, love, power, hospitality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3.4 Values reflected and adequately covered in the Junior School Curriculum

According to CS1 respondents, good values taught at school from the curriculum had little impact on people’s behaviours. This was a typical response from a teacher:

> If children learn about good values, people won’t fight each other, discriminate against other peoples’ culture. We cannot expect the society to be peaceful and safe if those values are not taught at school (RBSS–TS5).

Teachers of CS1 confirmed that values were not covered well, although they were documented in the school syllabuses for all levels of secondary school and were set as learning outcomes in national educational documents. Teachers provided a number of reasons for not focusing on values; for example:

> If we fail to teach students in class because of other reasons, we have to ensure that time is allocated for them outside of class. It has to be emphasised somewhere at the school level or at home. (RBSS – TS2)

> In schools we teachers just mention the values and expect students to live them. It won’t happen that way. We have to emphasise it and the Government must put it as priority in its activities. (RBSS–TS3)

> Students are not assessed in values they display so values are overlooked. They are not expected to apply or if they do that does not matter to us (RBSS–TS1).
Teachers made claims that values were not properly covered and practised at all in schools because values learning and teaching have not been prioritised by the Government policies:

Elements of values are in the formal system [but] they are often overlooked because the goals and objectives to teaching lessons are for passing exams, not to change behaviours and attitude. In some instances they do not exist at all in the curriculum, however, it is taught indirectly (RBSS–TS5).

According to principals, too, the values are not adequately covered for reasons beyond the capacity of teachers, implying it is a matter for the national government to solve by policy formulations and endorsements to legitimate institutions. Furthermore, rural teachers say they believe that people who live together in urban societies have limited national consciousness that is supposed to unite people as a group. They see themselves as different, so it becomes very difficult to control their behaviours:

Lack of citizenship or civic programmes at school causes people to be passive and stagnant and remain ignorant of what is required of them in society. People remain disrespectful to people and the environment and more so their relationship with the state is bad. There is no respect for public property. That is common in urban centres where the people are from different places coming to live together. Just look around – they burnt down the police post in Honiara last week. They throw rocks at hospital trucks that carry sick people and shift medical workers. Our society is not stable, we need more civic citizenship programmes that emphasise societal values (RBSS–Prin 2).

According to the responses, some of the peace programmes initiated for SI are ineffective and un-contextual to people’s way of resolving conflicts. People consider cultural and church approaches as more effective to Solomon Islanders. A CS1 principal claimed:

It’s a waste of time to write about peace, respect, unity, and pride of the country. People attend training on those programmes to eat food that is provided by the workshop and collect allowances for attendance (RBSS – Prin2).

This principal further articulated:

Our peace and reconciliation programmes do not touch people’s lives. We must work at the level of culture and Christian values. We must work with the people at all levels and all situations just like the churches do. It must be a daily practice to changes lives. Not only at the Government level and the media (RBSS – Prin 2).

Teachers suggested that promotion of a citizenship programme and the inclusion of values from societies is a must. The values to be included are unity, respect, assisting people in need, and offering labour for free for others, particularly the vulnerable ones in the community.

When students of CS2 were asked about the values they learned at school, they mentioned that they learned about values but for a different purpose.
We learn about sharing from the social study curriculum but it’s only for examination. We never have the thinking to practice as a good value that will positively affect the social environment. (RDSS – F1S5)

As for values that help them to become good citizens according to the standard they refer to as good, students disputed that values focusing on their behaviours have been promoted at school.

There was not emphasis on values in our lessons, however, sometimes teachers randomly advise us on values that are significant in society. We may not demonstrate it but we have heard from the teachers and significant others (RDSS–F1S1).

Students claimed that they learned about relationships in Social Studies lessons, including learning about family relationships, community relationships, and relationship with the government. However, the goals and objectives do not focus on changing behaviour. Instead, they focus only on examinations. According to a student and a teacher:

we learn about good healthy living from home economic subjects. Those are important values that should be practised by students, however, we didn’t practise it because we see it as not important. What is important is examinations because that will take us to another level in school (RDSS – F1S)

It appears then, that the lessons planned by teachers do not reflect much on students’ behaviours and attitudes, but rather what will come in the external and internal examinations. The motivating factor is examinations and going on to higher education and having a good job. This was illustrated by a teacher: ‘Students acquire the good values through their involvement in religious activities and commitment to church activities at home, not in schools.’ (RDSS – TS2)

Another teacher pointed out,

I teach about littering and biodegradable substances but that did not change students’ behaviours. There is littering all over the place. This indicates that although students pass the exam questions concerning the lessons, it is taken not for change of behaviour but for exams only (RDSS – TS1).

Teachers confirmed that they failed to introduce activities that produce good citizenship among students. When asked about teaching of values that influence students’ active participation, teachers mentioned that there were none. This was illustrated as follows:

Although our expectation as teachers is for students to be active at school through participation in school activities and upholding the values that develop relationships and unity, we didn’t actually emphasise them at school (RDSS–TS3).

CS2 teachers reiterated that values mentioned earlier were very important for the school children. Therefore, schools must focus on developing programmes that contribute towards students’ active participation. Teachers also confirmed that they have failed in their duties as good and effective teachers:
We are so conscious about exams that we forget to involve students in activities that develop active participation and engagement. That is why we have passive and stagnant students. The Government only focuses on today and not what will happen in the future (RDSS – TS4).

Another teacher claimed:

In today’s society, people are not passionate about participation and voluntarism. This is missing the mark of a communal society as what we have live with to sustain people. Now people are individualistic in their approach and so we now fail to respect others and when we fail to respect others, the society becomes chaotic and unstable (RDSS–TS6).

Another teacher pointed out:

People are not secure as well because relationships are broken. The security that was once a kingpin in society has now ceased and people become suspicious of each other. (RDSS–TS5)

The government’s expectation as noted from CS2 teachers for a secure society is missing as decisions made are only to benefit themselves. There is not commitment to the goals and principles of democracy. According to one teacher:

In today’s environment people are not passionate about participation and are only waiting and expecting the Government to do everything for them. The reason for that is because the Government has promised to take care of all their needs, even to give them money to use for their families (RDSS–TS3).

Rural principals confirmed that values are promoted at school, but the values are not specific. Again, it is the teachers who would determine what to teach or where to place strong emphasis. Most of the teachers and principals admitted that they only planned lessons toward the goal of passing exams:

We teach only what is recorded in the syllabus and plan of lesson for the day. What is outside of the syllabus will not be taught even though it is important. (RDSS – Prin 2).

When a question was posed about whether students reflected the values learned at school, most of the principals responded with a “No”.

maybe a few but it’s very rare to see students practising what they learn at school. It is not good to learn about good values and never practise it. The learning of values only as knowledge is demeaning to the social environment (RDSS-Prin1).

When interviewed, the principals admitted that values were not properly taught and covered in school.

Just look at the attitudes and behaviours of students exhibited at school. Most of what they demonstrated are values learned from home and not at school. The reason is that parents emphasise values to children and also parents live the values as well (RDSS-Prin 2).
According to CS3 respondents, the values that are reflected in the curriculum do not solve the problems of social behaviour currently experienced in the country. Values reflected in the curriculum focus on higher education attainment, economic prosperity, modern development, and government functions. According to student respondents, values that control their behaviours are shaped from home and not at school. For example:

Values are learned at home from parents and relatives. Not so much from the teachers in school. According to them teachers didn’t even practise the values. They always do the opposite. They say do what I say but don’t do what I do (UBSS-F1S 3).

When asked if there is need to teach values, all of the respondents said “yes”.

Currently documented for teaching and learning on values looks good in books only. However, it is not to improve behaviours, rather, it was for increasing knowledge for examinations. We need to the on values specifically (UBSS-F1S 6).

When respondents were asked about promoting values at school, most of them responded in favour of recognizing the need to include values that focus on students’ behaviours and character. A teacher responded:

Important values are not reflected in the school curriculum. Our society needs the values that contain people’s attitudes and supplement changes to people’s behaviours as only then we can expect development in our society as aspired to by the Government. Just look at what happens in our society, hatred, division among ethnic groups, breakdown of law and order, corruption at all levels of life, and violence among young people (UBSS TS3).

The CS4 students believed that values are not reflected at all in school because they are not taught. For example, a student illustrated this as follows:

Those values are not reflected in schools because they are not taught to us by teachers. What is seen here is they are teaching and preparing us for exams. The values are hidden away from us students. We hear about good behaviours during school assemblies only (UDSS – F1S2).

Another student stated:

They maybe there in school books but it may be that the teachers do not teach them in school lessons (UDSS-F1S4).

The students pointed out that values of citizenship may be there or not, but it was the teachers who decided on whether they planned for a lesson on values or not.

The teachers claimed:

We can teach on the values that are prescribed in the curriculum but the exam system and timing does not allow for that (UDSS-TS2/4).
It was clear from these responses that some important values are not reflected or prescribed in the curriculum, and therefore are not taught in class. The reason as indicated by respondents is that teachers did not bother to teach them because they are not included in examinations and also there was no time for teaching on values.

5.3.5 Effective and adequate covering of values at the school level

It was found from CS1 students that much of the content in the curriculum and the methods and strategies to disseminate important values, knowledge, skills, and other useful information were there but have not been fully utilised by practising teachers and the focus was on passing examinations. Students said:

Values are not effectively covered as much of what is in the curriculum is information for exams only (RBSS–F1S1).

We learn about some values but never act it. The reason is because that does not come in the exams. For example, we learn about giving in school in the New Testament Subject but we never act it in public (RBSS – F1S2).

Teachers also have their own reasons as to why the values are not adequately covered. For example:

I think the values are not effectively covered because they are not promoted in the syllabus. I often teach what is laid down in the syllabus to teach. Those are what I see as important because it will come in exams (RBSS-TS3).

Therefore, whatever values are practised by students must be acquired from home. I think those values must be promoted from the homes before it is demonstrated by students at school (RBSS–TS2).

In another argument on this subject, teachers blamed the lack of prior knowledge and appropriate training for their limited potential to cover values teaching effectively at school. They suggested that training on the subject must be organised and facilitated at the school level as citizenship education brings new philosophies to SI whereby teachers themselves are victims of the standards and values recommended by CE.

I think people are not really made aware of what values they are supposed to demonstrate because the system does not promote them in formal systems. Subjects like NTS and Social Studies teach some important values discussed but they are not taught because the topics are not covered in school exams, they are taught because there is a policy for church values to be included in the curriculum. (RBSS – TS4)

When teachers were asked about whether they regarded themselves as good citizens, they answered yes. However, teachers admitted that their practices did not always reflect their
conceptions of good citizenship although they see themselves as good citizens: “We do not necessarily do what we say ... you can see that from how we appear at school” (RBSS-TS1).

When teachers were asked about the need to emphasise values in school, most teachers said “yes”. For example:

Values are important for Solomon Islands, so they need to be emphasised at school and also I must display those values too. How can we survive as a nation if we do not practise those values? We have to be realistic. We must not live a dream life of wishful thoughts (RBSS – TS6).

Most teachers blamed the teaching methods, examinations, and other factors as barriers to teaching values in schools. According to RBSS teachers:

I think the teaching methods are the problem. They are not effective enough to teach values. The talk chalk board is dominant, which are not really effective for teaching of good values (RBSS – TS2).

In terms of examinations, we in this school have achieved a good pass rate from students, however, not on attitudes and change of behaviour. This school is the worst compared to other schools in this province. Just yesterday we sent home a dead body of a student who committed suicide because of disagreement with one teacher’s decision (RBSS – TS6).

I think the factors that cause teachers not to teach values effectively is because we teachers supervise very big classes which makes it to be very difficult to teach specific themes on values (BBSS-TS3).

Teachers in CS2 see the financial state of schools as an obstacle to improving their methods of teaching to cater for values learning:

Values were not covered because schools in rural areas do not have money to facilitate values learning which requires out of class activities (RDSS-TS1).

The other CS2 teacher claimed:

Values are not adequately and effectively covered in the school programmes ... in addition, the teachers who should teach values see it as unnecessary because they are not covered in exams (RBSS-TS5).

When teachers were asked about the effect of their teaching, they said:

We have seen students pass out for higher education and most of them returned and held senior positions in the Government and private sector (RBSS-TS4).

In terms of adequate covering of values this is what teachers have to say:

I see that values are not promoted in schools. It is not in the curriculum but we often speak of its importance to students, so that it can help to control students’ actions in school. (RDSS – TS1)
In the Social Studies curriculum we teach topics like family relationships, community relationships, and the importance of the state to people. Those are citizenship values that are in the curriculum (RDSS – TS3).

Teachers also claimed that the non-covering of important values in class lessons or other programmes in school did not mean that they were not included in the curriculum; rather, it was the teachers who failed to plan their lessons properly to address values that were important to society.

We teachers expect students to respect one another and the environment, and to relate well with teachers, students, and the community they live in. They have to demonstrate values of culture and religion and they have to participate in society in activities that build respect, integrity, and leadership. I want to see students working hard at school. I don’t want to see lazy students in school (RDSS – TS4).

Teachers also confessed that they did not adequately cover values learning and teaching because their goal was to increase knowledge. The more students pass with high marks, the more teachers would be recognised:

We try to initiate activities and in some activities we found that students enjoy the participation but that is not important to us. We also have neglected an important value in school. (RDSS–TS4)

Also teachers in CS2 mentioned that they tried to involve students in activities that would generate activeness but often it was themselves that failed to plan students’ tasks. Teachers also claimed that they failed to be innovative on many occasions:

You know, we teachers often think that what we advise and plan is better than what students will initiate. That attitude has caused students to be passive. We should allow students to plan their own activities (RDSS – TS3).

One student, when asked about adequately covering the values, stated that teachers covered a bit but in learning and teaching the emphasis is on examinations.

Values are not emphasised like what we experience from our churches. So it is not expected to be practised, it is only for information for exams (RDSS–F1S5).

The study indicates that good values are not learned at school. The values are learned from other sources, especially the home and the church. This claim was confirmed by rural school principals, who mentioned that values are not adequately covered because they are not promoted at school:

Good values are there in science lessons but teachers fail to cover them because the goals for teaching are different according to teachers’ perspective. Teachers fail to plan and implement what will change students’ behaviours. They only plan for what will come in the exam (RDSS – Prin 2).
Another teacher pointed out:

The values are emphasised strongly when students break school rules. For example, New Testament Studies teachers emphasise the values but at the back of their minds exams are the priority (RDSS – Prin1).

Considering the above views, it is obvious that values for good citizenship are included in the curriculum; however, it is the teachers and particular situations external to teachers that prevent them from teaching the values prescribed in the curriculum.

The CS3 respondents believed that values were not effectively covered because of timing for lessons, the agency of priority concerns, and the limited knowledge of teaching values. These were concerns that should not be addressed by teachers only but by all education stakeholders. A teacher claimed:

We teach values in some subjects in the curriculum but those values are acquired only as knowledge for examination and not emphasised as values focusing on the changes to students’ behaviours. The teacher will determine what he recognises as important for the children. Mostly teachers see passing exams as important and not values that children will live with when they leave school (UBSS TS4).

Another teacher asserted:

I often overlook values because of the timing of the lesson. If we have to teach lessons and concentrate on knowledge and values at the same time it will take a lot of time. Values teaching require hands on activities and cannot be taken as notes (UBSS – TS3).

According to one teacher, teaching of values was not effective in schools or classrooms because teachers have different opinions about priority focus and attention:

Teaching must consider who takes in knowledge and for what purpose. The purpose for Solomon Islands schools today, as I note, is for examination. I have to prepare students well for exams because only then can I be competitive among other teachers (UBSS – TS5).

The current success in education in SI is measured by examination results. Another UBSS teacher commented:

Values of good citizenship should not be measured by examination results. This issue has caused teaching of citizenship values to be ineffective and unsuccessful because of the dominant examination-oriented education system (UBSS-TS3).

Teachers also indicated that they believed that success in teaching should be measured by what is reflected in people’s attitudes and daily practices:
When we notice that the environment is clean, people live peacefully, there is tolerance among people, and there is active participation in society then we can say that the teaching and learning or education is successful (UBSS – TS1).

Another pointed out:

in school, when punctuality by both teacher and students, and active participation in all activities at school are seen, then we can conclude that the school has achieved a lot in its programs (UBSS – TS2).

Most of the respondents mentioned that values are not adequately covered in the curriculum. For example, if external examinations are the immediate priority, focus would be on knowledge not attitudes and skills. As one science teacher remarked:

for us science teachers, we must follow the rules, in order to achieve the content or find answers to the problems. In order to teach the lesson, there is a guideline that guides teachers to reach results. Therefore, in order to teach on values it is important for teachers to have special training that targets teaching of values so that teachers can follow the rules and be confident about teaching on values that are necessary for Solomon Islands (UBSS – TS1).

Most of the respondents favoured hands-on activities to be emphasised in school:

It is important to have materials that advise teachers to teach using hands-on activities. For example, the current Outcome Based Education requires students to learn to acquire knowledge and also must reflect the knowledge from their actions as well. The reflection of their attitude shows that they acquire the knowledge and demonstrate the values. (UBSS – TS2)

One CS4 teacher pointed out the saying “Man talem duim” (You say it and you do it or practice and act it out) as an important component in teaching and learning. It is the dilemma of teacher as role models:

We teachers must take the lead in all activities at school … we participate before students can participate. It is bad to organise programmes or activities and allow students to work unsupervised. That is wrong (UDSS – TS5).

These responses on adequate covering of values demonstrate that the values are not successfully and adequately covered in the present school curriculum and out of class activities.

5.3.7 Activities recommended to add to school programmes
When students were asked on activities that should be added to the school programmes they pointed out that important activities were missing from school programmes. The student respondents of CS1 said this:

We have not been given any activities in and outside of school that emphasise unity, peace, relationships, and love for others (RBSS – F1S4).

This student further pointed out:
Activities [could be such] as sport carnivals between schools, cultural dance performances in school and among different schools, and inter-school quiz competition (RBSS – F1S4.)

Another CS1 student suggested:

We need to add religious gatherings among schools and cultural exchange schemes among schools (RBSS – F1S6).

Yet another responded:

We respect each other and relate well with people who are of our ethnicity and language only and not of different people. It is not promoted elsewhere that we can learn from; thus, they are missing – that is why we have so much violence and social problems (RBSS – F1S1).

From what has been reported from students, it was found that most schools failed to introduce activities in the school programme that promoted unity and relationship building. They claimed that they only learn about different people of Solomon Islands from school lessons in terms of their differences, and not about them as one family or people. They only learn about what is supposed to come in examinations.

The current values taught at school, according to CS2 students, are ineffective to meet needs of societies. What is required, according to them, is to provide activities that influence their active participation and respect for diversity. Students have highlighted that they were bored with passive programmes and wanted to get out of them. One CS2 student stated:

We were programed to work in maintenance in school all the time but not activities like sports and cultural activities. We need to engage in activities that stimulate our passion to learning. We were given class activities at all times because we have to prepare for exams (RDSS – F1S3).

Teachers claimed that the reason why activities that focus on important values are missing nowadays is the external examinations. People see passing examinations as important so when parents put pressure on teachers for their students to pass examinations, they ignore the teaching of values and concentrate on information for examinations only. This was illustrated by a principal as follows:

School environment which was once an active place is now static and uninteresting. In addition, participation is missing in all levels of society. People now depend on the Government to do everything for them. In the past only communities built schools and teachers initiated programmes that involved student participation (RDSS – Prin.2).

According to CS3 respondents, schools are expected to promote the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and actions of citizens to become good citizenship models, as prescribed in the goals and outcomes statement of national education documents. However, the teachers’ observations suggest that many of them do very little to achieve those national goals in education. Most of
them highlighted that values seen and demonstrated as good values are those that are promoted, emphasized, and advocated by church and cultural values and virtues. According to one teacher:

I think children adopt good values from home. If children fail to display good character and attitude from home, it may be that parents lack those values or lack the innate knowledge of them, especially parents who fail to appreciate culture and church values. That ignorance is also reflected in their children (UBSS – TS3).

It is common that young people who demonstrate good values are always appreciated by people around their school and communities. Often in SI people will say:

We adults often say, this child is like his parents; he/she shares and participates actively as his parents did. Not everybody is the same; some may come from good family background and display attitudes that are practised at home and vice versa. This kind of comparison depends on where the children come from, how they are raised, the level of the family in terms of good values, and the way they interact with the social environment (UBSS – TS2).

In another similar assertion, teachers of CS3 disagree with the assumption that education can change children’s attitude. They argue that information in values documents cannot change children’s attitudes, behaviour, or character. It rests solely on teachers who may have the conviction to teach values needed in society. In addition, it depends on the level of understanding of the teacher and his way of teaching children. Some teachers did not bother to teach children values of society but concentrated on topics they wished to teach during the day, especially lessons that do not require much work on the part of teachers. A CS.3 teacher lamented:

Here in our country good values are now missing and young people are now imitating what they see from movies, TV, and other social media of communication. This is really a challenge to society. Even people in authority are not displaying good values. This has affected children a lot as good attitudes are now forgotten and the values displayed are borrowed from social media (UBSS – TS5).

Schools are learning institutions where children are expected to learn about values from lessons taught to accomplish the goals and objectives of lessons. However, considering students’ current behaviours, it is obvious that what was learned in class contradicted the behaviours exhibited by students. The CS4 respondents claimed that they learned a great deal of knowledge but little about practical skills and values that should pave the way for responsible citizenship. As described by a CS4 teacher:

Children learn about cleanliness and the effects of littering but the towns are very dirty. The problem is that teachers didn’t emphasise practical lesson or hands-on activities that actually is bringing rubbish bins to school and advising students to throw rubbish in the right places. Children don’t care much about cleanliness because it is not being emphasised. What is emphasised is the knowledge for examination (UDSS – TS1).
When students were asked about activities that motivate them to like school, they said “none”. For example a student said:

All activities that we participated in at school were for exams and not for influencing our skills and behaviours (UDSS-F1S4).

5.3.8 Values favoured to add to the curriculum for good citizenship

When CS1 students were asked about which values needed to be added to the school programmes, they recommended the values that had already been discussed (Figure, 5.2).

According to a CS1 student:

I think respect, helping others, caring for each other, living according to virtues of culture and church are important values for Solomon Islands (RDSS-F1S2).

They claimed that in order for Solomon Islanders to live peacefully with each other the government must introduce and promote values learning and teaching in schools. This was explained by a CS1 student as:

Solomon Islanders are always suspicious of each other, causing people not to come together as one people. Therefore, we need to learn of values that breed unity among people so that we can come together as one people (RBSS – F1S2).

CS1 respondents saw taking responsibility for affairs of community and society at large as a significant value that needs continual harnessing and practice. They claimed people look for the responsibility and obligation of citizens in a given society. In this case someone’s right is everybody’s responsibility. In contemporary SI society, people try to prove themselves as good citizens to people during national elections and campaigning in order to be elected to Parliament. The values they try to display are those that people see as relevant and contextual to them and reflect their way of life. The following responses illustrate this:

From what I see, people chose people not for the knowledge they have in their education and status in the Government but the values they demonstrate among people. The value of sharing, the giving of goods, the building of relationships with people and the popularity with cultural and church values are what people considered as necessary (RBSS–Prin1).

it is more appropriate to put values in the school system but values that are missing in society. It is obvious that our society is fragmented and diverse, therefore, our citizenship programme has to be compulsory and not done on a piecemeal basis (RBSS–Prin2).

Teachers of CS1 strongly suggested that a citizenship programme must not be merely a reaction to the ethnic tension. It should not be to target diversity but to prepare people for the life they will live in the future. In such a way the country will avoid further tension or the behaviours
commonly found among people. The citizenship programme must be compulsory in the school system as a discrete subject that teaches about cultural values, church and civic values, political values, and social values. As illustrated by the CS1 principal:

We are different in a lot of ways. The difference that we have naturally added with the difference that colonial powers introduced in terms of modern wealth and education, it becomes more complicated nowadays. Therefore, it is important that we start citizenship programmes now to erase the ignorance that is with people. We must make people to feel responsible towards things of the society and towards people and the government and not just to solve issues that emerged from the ethnic tension (RBSS–Prin.1).

The CS1 participants see that programmes that should unite people according to the principles of the modern constitution – the values and virtues of cultures and society – are not part of the formal curriculum. Therefore, people became ignorant of good values because they did not learn them at school and because of that they practised attitudes that contradict modern laws and values of people’s culture.

In another claim, the CS3 respondents argued that the SI education system is continuously promoting values in schools that address economic and political sustainability as means to achieve real economic and political prosperity, but values that should address social behaviours have not been emphasised. According to one teacher:

We teach about values that address social behaviours randomly, not compulsorily. It is the teacher who has the upper hand to decide on whether to teach on the area or not. When the teacher sees actions that can destroy students’ future behaviour, they quickly step in and try to stop the behaviours by providing advice that will help students (UBSS – TS2).

The teachers of CS3 suggested that values that need to be added to the school curriculum include: respect, peace building, helping others or voluntarism, sharing, giving, leadership and stewardship, or values of the culture that promote a lending hand through sharing, communal support for the needy and values from the churches and culture.

The CS4 students claimed that teachers did not teach them values such as the importance of living with others and respecting others’ differences, nor did teachers demonstrate the values in class or school that positively affect them as well. A student lamented:

Teachers’ chewing of betelnut, smoking, drinking alcohol in school has caused students to get into the habit of smoking and drinking alcohol as well. Again teachers must be role models. They have to demonstrate what is good in front of students. Teachers seem as though they don’t care about the lifestyle they live (UDSS – F1S3).
When students were asked about the good values they acquired at school, they claimed these were not acquired at school but acquired from home and churches which they attended. Their response on this is as follows:

I learn to obey and respect the school and its rules because of the teaching I received at home and church and not because of the discipline in terms of punishment I received for the offences I might commit at school. Sometimes we were caught in activities that broke the school rules, but that was because of the circumstances in which we found ourselves such as lateness for school because of traffic jams (UDSS – F1S1).

we learn a lot of the values when we are in primary but not in secondary school. Some subjects have them but not all subjects (UDSS – F1S6).

the good values are not really demonstrated at school because many times we are not mindful of how we live our lives. We see things differently and live unclean lives by throwing rubbish all over the place (UDSS – F1S6).

5.3.9 Methods and strategies recommended for teaching citizenship
The SI national secondary curriculum already has themes representing values that are associated with citizenship. Teachers in CS1 claimed that the curriculum is already overloaded; therefore it may not be possible to include extra citizenship education values in the school curriculum.

For CS1 teachers, there are too many things to cover and quite a number of methods are recommended for use but never utilised. A CS1 teacher suggested:

We need the values to be added in the curriculum. One way is to put them as extra-curricular. [Which] will work parallel to what is in the curriculum. That will be another effective way of teaching citizenship education values (RDSS – TS6).

Another teacher posited:

The fact is, our curriculum is overloaded so we need to teach citizenship values as extra-curricular so that we can make time for it (RDSS – TS3).

According this school’s principals, it is necessary to include citizenship education at school. However, they expressed different ideas about how to do this:

I prefer putting it across curricula for all teachers to teach. However, the difficulty here is that some teachers may not train for it and the second teachers will leave it as they will see their own subject as very important for them (RDSS-Prin.2).

Another Principal asserted:

I think putting it as a subject of its own is important because teachers will train for it and will have a specific time for it. We can either put it as extra-curricular as well [where] it will go parallel with the formal curriculum. The values taught at schools are not enough (RDSS Prin.1).
The CS2 participants claimed that curriculum may provide strategies to teach the themes that include important values but it was the teachers who failed to utilise the teaching strategies. A teacher describes this as follows:

> Currently from my observation, schools promote values that are seen as relevant to Solomon Islands. I teach on similar topics on values but my aim is for knowledge only and not for good citizenship. At the back of my mind when teaching lessons, I focus on exams. Those topics are covered in the exam and can be taught and practised for good citizenship as well (RDSS – TS3).

Another teacher claimed:

> For students to behave according to the values and knowledge they learn at school, it depends on them whether they will practise the knowledge outside of class to reflect the good values that society respects or not (RDSS – TS).

When students were asked about whether they learned about being good students who respect the government and others at school, they said “no”:

> We learn about different things. We need those values to merge people as one nation as they are very important for us but that was not happening (RDSS – F1S6).

One student suggested:

> We need to learn about a lot of things outside of class. Flag raising, singing the national anthem and helping others, we need to have those activities so that students respect their country. Even sports activities are not planned for as. We like to play but they always say that we have no time for that. (RDSS – F1S2).

Citizenship values for CS3 were traditionally part of formal curriculums of nation-states and each nation-state has their own strategies and methods for teaching and learning of CE. In SI, from what has been described by CS3 respondents, methods and strategies are only prescribed as a guide for teachers. The teachers who planned and taught the lessons had discretion over what they wanted to teach and how to teach it.

> If we need to focus on values we need to change the way we teach the lessons. The reason is that, knowing the themes for exams will destroy society but learning about the themes and demonstrating it as values will stabilise society. Just look at our society today – the knowledge is used to destroy the society. Citizens leaving schools abuse alcohol that now has destroyed society. It is now become the cause of new social problems emerging in society today. A lot of young people also die from those inventions as well (UBSS–TS1).

Another teacher of CS3 stated:

> We can be knowledgeable but very destructive to society because of bad behaviours that destroy relationships. We need to use teaching pedagogies that are effective and practical in teaching. (UBSS – TS3)
As reported, there was no focus on values and how the values from themes in the curriculum were disseminated was not of concern. Students’ education prioritised on going to university and getting jobs after leaving school as the prime goals.

5.3.11 Methods recommended for teaching good citizenship

The methods that were favoured to use in teaching were provided in the outlines of the curriculum. However, teachers often go for those which are less complicated, not time consuming, and easy to follow. According to CS2 teachers, the most used method is “teacher talk, chalkboard and note-taking” because it is easy and not time consuming. One CS2 teacher recommended this:

Other methods and strategies used are “think, pair, share” “look and learn”, especially in practical subjects like agriculture, industrial arts, and home economics (RDSS – TS4).

The limiting factor to teaching methods that are effective is timing. Timing has become very challenging as effective teaching methods need more time and resources. In terms of the need for teachers to change the teaching method, students support the idea to alter the methods. They found that teachers always teach with the same methods. For example:

Teachers do the talking and writing on the board while we students listen and take notes. We need to change those methods now because they are too boring (RDSS – F1S2).

Students complained that not only were the methods destructive to value learning, but the teachers’ attitudes also affected students’ learning of values. As one student asserted:

Teachers are expected to be role models. Sometimes their attitudes and what they display or even their appearance affected the students (RDSS-FS4).

The principal of CS2 recommended the following methods and approaches:

- to use elders in the community to teach values that are important in society is necessary in the Solomon Islands … including “hands on activities” to be used in teaching of lessons in class … that would be very important for demonstrating of values that will change people’s attitude (RDSS Prin.2).

The principals claimed that teachers were the ones who should take the initiative to use the practical methods. For the successful teaching of values using methods that are recommended, most teachers honestly and regretfully said that they failed to use methods that produce effective learning. This was illustrated by an RDSS teacher as follows:

I would honestly say that, for the teaching of values that people recognise and value in society, I would say no. My teaching does not focus much on values of the society but concentrates more on topics that will come in exams. Those are knowledge based teachings only and not value based (RDSS – TS3).
The failure to teach values of society is not because they are not prescribed in the school curriculum; rather, it is because of what teachers view as easy for them, topics and methods that are not time consuming and that focus on examinations.

The respondents in CS3, like other cases, have reiterated similar responses to the question of teaching pedagogies. They claimed that the documents used for teaching subjects in the curriculum have values that focus on behavioural changes; however, it is the schools – particularly the teachers – who failed to utilise the strategies to create effective teaching and learning of values. According to teachers’ responses, it is clear that their priority for teaching does not embrace values targeting students’ behaviours, attitudes, and characters, although, they acknowledge the importance of suitable methods and strategies to use in determining effective learning of knowledge, skills, and values.

Referring to respondents’ answers to the question on methods and approaches to use, a UBSS teacher commented:

I think the methods and strategies used for teaching are very important in teaching of knowledge skills, and values. However, the method currently used by teachers in the Solomon Islands is the traditional use of teacher talk, chalk, and board. Students listen and take notes. Methods and strategies required for active participation focusing on hands-on activities are documented in the syllabus but have not been used by teachers (UBSS – TS1).

When they were asked why the methods recommended have not been utilised, another teacher responded:

It consumes a lot of time if we employ the methods of teaching. There are a lot of topics to complete for the semester for one year so if we use all teaching methods we will not catch with topics to cover before the exams (UBSS-TS3).

Another teacher claimed:

Many of the methods used in teaching are not good enough. Although they look attractive on paper they are not specific for teaching on values. It is the teachers that would choose the method to transfer important knowledge and values (UBSS – TS3).

The respondents in this case study highlighted several methods, strategies and approaches that are assumed to be effective if used in teaching values for good citizenship. One CS3 teacher respondent mentioned students’ own discovery learning as a good method to introduce in classroom activities.
Teachers develop lessons that advise students to work out the answers to the problem. This will prompt critical thinking. When students were given a task concerning cleanliness in the community they had to find what produces cleanliness. What are the values that people must have that can result in cleanliness? (UBSS–TS3).

Outdoor activities were also highlighted in the discussion. As one UBSS teacher stated:

Students must be involved in field trips in order to see for themselves the reality of what they have learned about. Having field trips will also motivate students to appreciate their status as students (UBSS–TS1).

Guest Speaker is one strategy in teaching that is favoured as well by teacher respondents. As one teacher of CS3 highlighted:

Inviting prominent people in the community to present talks on issues affecting young people allows students to work out the importance of the state of affairs in the community and the benefits of appreciating in the community (UBSS – TS4).

One teacher describe hands-on activities as important for effective learning of good citizenship:

I think the Outcome Based Education provides an opportunity for students to acquire the knowledge but also discover the values that are important from the knowledge. That will change their behaviours and attitude. Values in curriculum are very important, so in order to translate them, it needs teachers to emphasise values using practical and hands-on activities (UBSS-TS7).

Teachers acting as role models for students is another approach teachers recommended:

Teachers teaching in class should cover both the knowledge and values. Therefore, it is important that teachers, too, must have those values. They must demonstrate the values to students so that students trust them on what they teach. How can teaching be effective when teachers don’t demonstrate those values? (UBSS – TS2).

The CS4 teachers compared the society they lived in when they were students with the current society where they were practising teachers. What they noticed different was the reduced respect that children and all people had for each other and people in authority as well as the environment. One teacher lamented over the days when he was a student, remembering that students respected school rules and followed the orders of teachers:

Schools need to step up in teaching of values. This is very important for students as they spend a lot of time in schools with teachers. In the early days when I was a student we didn’t have the kind of behaviours that students have nowadays. We respected each other, we respected the Government, you would not see rubbish around the town and everybody was happy. Now children develop attitudes that do not respect things around them (UBSS – TS4).

Teachers of CS4 admitted that they were responsible for determining methods and strategies for teaching values in their lessons. However, the teaching is ignored by students if it does not focus on knowledge for examinations.
we only go for teacher teaching and students listening and taking notes methods because this is the easiest method of teaching. It does not require a lot of preparation. Secondly, students taking notes will help them in their revision for exams. (UDSS-TS 2).

When teachers were asked about methods that are effective for teaching values in SI schools they recommended methods that involve practical and hands-on activities; one teacher commented:

There are teaching methods and strategies that are recommended for use for each lesson, for example, field trips, guest speakers, and hands-on or practical activities that target important values (UDSS – TS4).

5.4 Case Study Five (CS5): Government Bureaucrats
Case Study Five consisted of senior government officials and a total of ten participants were selected. The ministries and departments selected were those that administered civic or CE programmes in one way or the other. Most of the selected respondents were from government ministries in Honiara. Only one senior government officer from the province participated in the study. The participants were assumed to be representative of government officials in SI.

5.4.1 Conceptualisation of a good citizen
The conceptualisation of a good citizen, according to government officers is illustrated by the following:

For me a good citizen remains professional in his or her attitudes. For example, a good teacher has attitudes of commitment to his/her professional and civic work. (MEHRD – CO1)

A good citizen is ethical in his approach to work and relates ethically to others. A person that is ethical has to demonstrate moral values, practise respect to others, and be committed and faithful to what they are responsible for (MEHRD – CD2).

5.4.2 Values considered important
Government officials responded with a lot of strong arguments, claims, and suggestions that they implied as significant for serious consideration into national programmes.

Reintroducing school active involvement
According to officials in the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MEHRD) the values taught in schools were not enough.

Solomon Islanders need to promote and involve children in activities such as flag raising ceremony, sports carnivals, voluntary activities, and cultural events (MEHRD – DS).

It is not good merely to teach for knowledge and not to practise the values from the knowledge. Another MEHRD officer claimed:
Why Solomon Islanders encounter a lot of social problems is because the values are not promoted in the school system … a more effective way would be for schools to organise extra-curricular activities. This suggestion depends on the schools and the activities they promote in schools (MEHRD – SCO2).

It is important for the current school inspectorate division, which is responsible for the practical activities of the school, to find out the areas that need more emphasis. The whole school inspection requires schools to write their own programmes, policies, and constitution but they need to align them constructively with the Education Act. For example:

The curriculum teaches about littering, the schools have to be practical enough to make rules on littering and students must comply and act on the rules. This would then mean practising the knowledge learned at school (MEHRD – SCO1).

The officer claimed that the curriculum is too rigid. This has caused activities based on hands-on experience not to be fully utilised. The officers stated that:

Students never go beyond what they learned in the classroom or what is prescribed in the syllabus (MEHRD – SCO2/MEHRD – SCO1).

**Extra-curricular for continuity**

Government officers claimed that teaching students skills and values did not continue progressively, and they saw that as challenges. They proposed for values to be promoted as extra-curricular. They argued that when students left school they can forget about values learned in class but what they continuously learn from activities set as extra-curricular at school would remain with them and they would practise it after leaving school. As illustrated:

One of the good values is there in school programmes but continuity was the challenge. Teaching values is becoming a classroom challenge. There is no passion from teachers to teach the values and students seem not to acquire good values at the end of their education. Teachers and parents focus on employment as the only way out after school (MEHRD – SCO1).

Government offers in the Ministry of Education also favoured teaching values through extra-curricular activities, stating they were also important for Solomon Islanders.

We need to promote activities like flag raising ceremony, singing the national anthem, and other activities that respect other national events (MEHRD – DS).

Diversity is obvious in the Solomon Islands, so we must teach about unity. In schools, we must translate knowledge into practical activities. Hands-on activities are important for Solomon Islanders. Sports activities, agriculture, home economics, but other subjects like Social Studies, English, and Math is not at all [hands-on] (MEHRD – DS).
Reintroducing national identity activities
According to a senior government official in the Ministry of Home Affairs, promotion of flag raising ceremonies and singing of the national anthem in schools should be made compulsory. Nowadays these activities were missing and were referred to as something of the past. The officer lamented:

National identity is very weak in the Solomon Islands, because it is no longer practised. The Government has a budget for it but it has often not been utilised. Currently, from experience, independence celebration is national identity day (MHA – SO).

When asked about national identity activities, the officers mentioned the following:

Currently, in our curriculum there is none to bring about national pride and national identity. This causes students to fail to develop consciousness about their own country (MEHRD – CEO).

Participation is missing in our current school curriculum that could stimulate students to participate; even sports activities are not organised for students. This is a bad sign for schools as students are trained partially and not holistically (MEHRD – CEO).

Solomon Islands is divided … we are divided by schools, language, ethnicity, island people, and race. We need to start looking at what should bring us together. Some of the values that are needed to be promoted are those that can be emphasised as extra-curricular activities at schools. These include voluntary community works, inter-sports carnivals, music clubs, athletic clubs, senior citizens clubs. Those things were seen during the colonial era. Just after independence those things started to fade away (MHA – SO).

Citizenship education policy
Another important consideration was the avenue to develop a policy for citizenship education. Current reviews of the curriculum, according to MEHRD – DS, are underway. The curriculum development team/unit was working to incorporate the values of citizenship in the curriculum but the concern was whether the values incorporated reflect the country’s needs:

If we have a national policy for it, it will help increase work on the activities that will translate into activities from all sectors of society (MEHRD-DS).

The government officials were asked on what people and the government should do with this fragmented and volatile society. One posite: “the government must create a CE policy. The policy can be translated into activities and can be used in all institutions in the SI” (MEHRD – CEO). Education officers expressed the opinion that some good policies were put in place but are not seriously adopted to benefit the people. They were not properly translated to be reflected into activities that would benefit students and the whole of the country. In the colonial period it was found that civic activities were dominant. When Solomon Islanders determined their own
Values incorporated into the national curriculum reflect the priority of successive Governments (MEHRD – CEO).

Population is another challenge. In the earlier period there were not many schools around. Now we have a lot of schools. Organising of some activities is quite complicated (MEHRD – CCO1).

Respondents here saw that having a policy for civic and citizenship education was very important in order to stimulate or reinforce active participation. Many activities viewed were taken on ad hoc or piecemeal bases. For instance, one government officer suggested “Extra-curricular activity is important but it has to be supported by the Government so that it can become permanent” (MHA-SO). According to respondents from this case study, the good value of participation was missing and currently all, teachers as well as students, were minding their own business, not the business of the school and communities. Therefore, education has become a challenge in terms of students’ participation. To support this claim one education officer pointed out that:”There is no active involvement in school, and teachers are only concentrating on what will come in examinations” (MEHRD – CEO). People’s expectation was for the government to do something about it. Therefore, it is important to develop a policy for citizenship education.

Diversity is obvious in SI, therefore, respondents here saw the significance of teaching about unity. They proposed for schools to translate knowledge on content into practical activities – such as flag raising, singing of the national anthem, inter-school cultural activities. Hands-on activities are seen by CS5 respondents as important for Solomon Islands.

*Teaching on constitution and legal instruments*

The administration of activities should be integrated with people in every area of service to the people. For example, schools should teach about our Constitution, our Acts and our laws that govern people and the environment. Political literacy, which includes the constitution, must be incorporated in the curriculum as compulsory:

Laws about discrimination – people’s freedom and its limitation. Contrary to that is the government decision-making, laws, and how it protects people (MHA – SO).
Respondents mention that they themselves did not know laws of the country prior to being employed by the government as public officers. Therefore, they saw the teaching of modern laws as a very important value to include in school programmes.

The values summarised below are values the government officials considered important for Solomon Islanders. They are inferred by respondents as important and must be considered seriously for inclusion into national programmes.

Figure 5.3 Values recommended for Solomon Islands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Officers</th>
<th>Values considered important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singing of national anthem, voluntarism, inter-sports carnivals, music clubs, athletic clubs, senior citizens clubs, teach about Constitution, Acts and laws, sports activities, respect, inter-school quiz, unity, participation, hospitality, community engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.4 The values reflected in the School Curriculum

The respondents in this case mentioned that values are documented in the curriculum and school syllabus. However, the process to follow in order to teach and learn values and skills was absent. A curriculum officer mentioned that the Social Studies teaches civic concepts such as ethnic groups, diversity, national identity, and family relationships. However, the delivery process was ineffective. CS5 MEHRD officer mentioned:

The values are important for Solomon Islands and if tied with education it will change our stagnant society. In our education system we must include activities or programmes that educate or enlighten students to respect the social environment and the physical environment (MEHRD – DS).

It requires schools and the Government to allocate budgets that will run those programmes. An issue found common in the society is violence in the community. Youth people try to exercise their right through disobeying rules (MEHRD-DS).

The officer stated:

Disrespecting of people of the community through their young people’s aggressiveness response to the social and physical environment is obvious (MEHRD – DS).

According to the CS5 respondents all values may be relevant:

There needs to be proper and wider consultation with people to gather information on values that are needed for Solomon Islands. The government could run workshops to gather information on values of civic and citizenship education that are relevant for Solomon Islands (MEHRD-DS).
5.4.5 **The extent to which values are adequately and effectively covered.**
The values in figure 5.6, according to CS5 respondents, were needed in SI but they were not introduced in schools. In addition, there was support from the CS5 respondents for values from culture and peace education. As one government offer stated:

> We audit the curriculum to ensure that values from the culture and churches are in the curriculum. We ensure that we develop the whole person: spiritually, socially, physically, and individually about something from the heart (MEHRD – SCO 1).

The reason given for not adequately covering the values was the limited resources to deliver lessons on values. According to this respondent:

> If we want the whole curriculum to work perfectly well to achieve the outcomes we have to consider resources including teachers and students (MEHRD – SCO 2).

5.5 **Case study Six (CS6): Rural Village Elders**
This case study is a rural community. Its selection for this study was based on the following criteria: the site is located in the most populous island, respondents were representative of the largest dialect grouping on the island, and the community is the biggest in the area. Six prominent village elders volunteered to participate in the group interview. The responses gathered were assumed to represent the elders of rural communities in SI. The responses in this case were transcribed from Kwara’ae dialect to English. As a native speaker of the language, the researcher had no difficulties in transcribing words and phrases. However, where clarification of some words was needed, the elders who are expert in the language used and who were part of the discussion group were asked to explain further. The approach taken for gathering information was more conversational, using more of an unstructured questioning format to keep the discussion more informal and more informative so that respondents felt able to discuss freely.

5.5.1 **Conceptualisation of good citizenship**
According to rural villagers in this study, a good citizen was someone who can saungailana kwaima’anga (create a space for love and respect for everyone in the community), through creating tuafiku’anga ani kwaima’anga ma aroaro’anga (living together in love, peace, and harmony through mutual relationships). That emerged from fa’a’ino’to’a’lana falafala (understanding and appreciating our way of life) and being manata’ uana (considerate) to tuafiku’a (the whole community and those from other communities). According to one elder:
A good citizen has the ability to look after the community, share with the community food, material things, money, and labour. A person for a person. What I have should be shared with my family members or even neighbours. It is a communal approach in dealing with society involving and sharing what we have with others around us and helping others. (RVE2)

Respondents asserted that *saketo ’anga ma fuliru ’anga* (participation) was the most important thing in the community and if someone did not help with activities in the villages he/she was not a good citizen.

We educate people about working together, helping others, involvement in communal works, sharing in church works, educating on church values, practising cultural values will make a good citizen (RVE3).

Respondents also referred to good citizens as those who demonstrate character of good behaviour, having a respectable lifestyle that was developed from childhood. This includes obedience, respect, and helping others that are vulnerable in society. Those identifiable behaviours represent a good citizen. Another elder saw a good citizen as: “A person that can feed people, is open and welcoming, sees everybody as equal according to culture and church standards” (RVE5).

More of the findings from the rural elders are written in a conversation form and placed in appendix H, to retain the actual words and statements offered by the respondents.

**Figure 5.4 Values rural village elders recommended for Solomon Islands (CS5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Village Elders</th>
<th>Values considered important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RVE, 1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
<td>Love, caring, sharing, helpful, respect, willingness, relationship, fairness, unity, peace, participation, leadership role, equality, hospitality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.6 Survey questionnaire findings (Four Case Study Schools)**

The survey was conducted after the qualitative interview and the tables below provide descriptions of summaries synthesised from data obtained from survey questionnaires. They summarise the cross-tabulation of data that were presented into themes based on “the standard, common sense approach to data summarization” (Singh, 2010, p. 119). Such presentation of findings was assumed to be appropriate as the survey data of this research are only to confirm and affirm the qualitative findings.
5.6.1 Question 1. Citizenship Education is about individual rights and responsibilities of citizens in a community or nation-state.

A. Do you learn about those values from any subject/s at school?

B. Do you prefer the teaching of rights to be included in the school programs or the curriculum?

C. Do you prefer the teaching of responsibility to be included in school programs or the curriculum?

Table 5.11 Responses of Case Study Schools (CSS) participants for question 1, by type of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Provincial Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q 1 A</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>74.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 B</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>70.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 C</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>70.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q 1 A</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 B</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 C</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>93.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Day Community High School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q 1 A</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>71.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 B</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
<td>18.90%</td>
<td>66.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 C</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>75.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q 1 A</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 B</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>35.70%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 C</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>75.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boarding National Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q 1 A</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>69.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 B</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>60.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 C</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>67.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q 1 A</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 B</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 C</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>35.70%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Day Community High School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q 1 A</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>85.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 B</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>81.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 C</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q 1 A</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>84.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 B</td>
<td>42.10%</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
<td>42.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 1 C</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
<td>89.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the first category, the responses to the first question show that some forms of values on rights can be found in the formal curriculum. The majority of students indicated that the concept of rights is there; in contrast the majority of teachers believed that only a small portion of the concept is seen in the curriculum. Obviously, a small number of respondents did not believe that it existed at all.

For the second category the preference for teaching of rights and responsibilities in schools was strongly supported. While the majority of respondents showed support for their inclusion in the school curriculum, a small percentage still had doubts and mixed feelings. The responses to the
last question also showed strong support for the teaching of responsibilities in the school curriculum although some still had reservations. Overall, as shown in table 5.11, the support for the teaching of the values of individual rights and responsibilities at the school level was strongly supported.

5.6.2 Question 2. Citizenship Education values community works, voluntarism, helping others, respect for others and the state, tolerance, unity, love for your country.

A. Do you learn those values at school?

B. Do you prefer the values of active citizenship (participate in community works, voluntarism, helping others) to be included in the school curriculum?

C. Do you prefer the values of good citizenship (respect for others, the state, tolerance, patriotism, unity, and love for your country) to be included in the school curriculum?

Table 5.12 Responses of Case Study Schools (CSS) participants for question 2, by type of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Boarding</strong></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q 2 A</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>77.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 B</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>16.50%</td>
<td>70.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 C</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>73.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q 2 A</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>53.30%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 B</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 C</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Day Community High School</strong></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q 2 A</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>18.90%</td>
<td>71.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 B</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>64.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 C</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>74.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 A</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 B</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>35.70%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 C</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Boarding National Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q 2 A</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>69.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 B</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>26.80%</td>
<td>55.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 C</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>64.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 A</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>71.40%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 B</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 C</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Day Community High School</strong></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q 2 A</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>81.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 B</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>82.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 C</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>89.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 A</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
<td>63.20%</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 B</td>
<td>47.40%</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2 C</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
<td>57.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that a majority of students in all schools alleged that the values mentioned are learned at school from school programmes. However, the majority of teachers who should know what they teach, indicated that only “a bit” has been disseminated to students in school
programmes. Also, the respondents showed strong support for question two, indicating that the values of active citizenship (active participation) and good citizenship (tolerance, respect) were significant values that need to be included in the school curriculum or other school programmes.

5.6.3 Question 3. Do values currently learned at school help you to become a good citizen of Solomon Islands?

This question aimed to find the effectiveness of current values taught and learned at school and the impact it had on students’ behaviours.

Table 5.13 Responses of Case Study Schools (CSS) participants for question 3, by type of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Boarding Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>73.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Day Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>71.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>35.70%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boarding Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>76.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Day Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
<td>67.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>57.90%</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the teachers did not think that values teaching was as effective as students did. Although the majority of students think that the current values learned from school helped them to become good citizens, teachers feel that there should be more emphasis at the school level on the area of values to develop students to become good citizens.

5.6.4 Question 4. Are values for good citizenship represented in formal school subjects?
This question was intended to gain information from findings concerning values that were obviously represented in the current curriculum subjects.

Table 5.14 Responses of Case Study Schools (CSS) participants for question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Boarding Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
<td>30.40%</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>26.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Day Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>39.20%</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
<td>29.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boarding Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>26.80%</td>
<td>30.40%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>35.70%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Day Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>43.80%</td>
<td>39.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>47.40%</td>
<td>47.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses show a mix of opinions. While there was no clear majority that declared “yes” to the question, most appeared to believe that the values required for good citizenship can be found “a bit” in school subjects. A small number of students and teachers felt that values were not represented in the school curriculum at all.

5.6.5 Question 5. Do subjects learned at school change students’ behaviours?
This question focused on the impact of values learned from subjects teach at school. The reason was to find whether students’ learning on current subjects have changed their behaviours to become good citizens as expected by society.

Table 5.15 Responses of Case Study Schools (CSS) participants for question 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Boarding Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>24.10%</td>
<td>70.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Day Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
<td>55.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>35.70%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boarding Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>69.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Day Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>51.60%</td>
<td>43.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>57.90%</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of students affirmed that subjects they learned at school did not change their behaviour, although, some do believe it does. However, the teachers appear to think otherwise. They felt that subjects learned at school do not really change students’ behaviour. This can be found from the low rating of yes in the table; however, the subjects changed students behaviours just a bit.

5.6.6 Question 6. Citizenship Education includes political systems, government structures, voting, history, and you and your society. Do you learn about those values in other school subjects?
The teaching and learning of nation-state political systems, government structures, voting, history, and society is part of citizenship themes. The question aimed to find out whether those values were included in any of the curriculum subjects in schools.
The findings illustrated values focused on in the question are included in the curriculum. However, some teachers and students still believed that only a bit of the values were in the subjects taught at schools. A handful of teachers and students still believed that the values are not learned and taught at school. This kind of mixed feeling has indicated the uncertainty of the themes in the curriculum held by participants of the study.

5.6.7 Question 7. Do values from help you to become a good citizen of Solomon Islands?
This question aimed at getting students to respond on whether the values in current learning themes help them to become good citizens.

Table 5.17 Responses of Case Study Schools (CSS) participants for question 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Provincial Boarding Secondary</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>13.90%</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
<td>67.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>73.30%</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Day Community High School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>27.00%</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td>59.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>35.70%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boarding National Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>30.40%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Day Community High School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>78.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>57.90%</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 5.17, students felt the values taught and learned at school from themes helped them to become good citizens. However, the majority of teachers, who assess students’ academic work and behaviour, thought otherwise. They thought that the values had informed students to become good citizens only “a bit”. A small number of respondents for this question felt that the values learned at school did not help them at all to become good citizens.

5.6.8 Question 8. Do teachers teach you about values for good citizenship?
This question was designed to find out what respondents say about teachers teaching values for good citizenship because, although topics were prescribed in subject syllabus, teachers have the final say to choose what to teach in each lesson for the day.
Table 5.18  Responses of Case Study Schools (CSS) participants for question 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Provincial Boarding Secondary</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>34.20%</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>46.70%</td>
<td>46.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Day Community High School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
<td>29.70%</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>46.70%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boarding National Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Day Community High School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>73.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
<td>42.10%</td>
<td>42.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses from the table indicated that only less than half of the teachers confirmed that they teach on values for good citizenship. However, the majority of students believed that values for good citizenship were taught at the school level. The table also indicated that there was a mixed feeling among student respondents, while teachers are less sure than students that they were really teaching students about good values.

5.6.9 Question 9. Do teachers display values of a good citizen in school?
Teachers as learning models are important subjects for citizenship learning. This question considered finding whether teachers displayed good values that could positively influence students at school or not.

Table 5.19  Responses of Case Study Schools (CSS) participants for 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Provincial Boarding Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
<td>21.50%</td>
<td>59.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Day Community High School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
<td>36.50%</td>
<td>39.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boarding National Secondary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>39.80%</td>
<td>46.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Day Community High School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>28.10%</td>
<td>67.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
<td>57.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the responses students and teachers of CS2 and CS3 felt teachers did not really display good values at school while CS1 and CS4 felt that teachers in some ways had display good values at school.

5.6.10 Question 10. Do activities outside of class influence students’ behaviour to becoming a good citizen?
Influences from outside the school can become dominant to students’ behaviour. This question aimed to find out whether influences from outside the school had an impact on student behaviour toward becoming citizens that the society needs.
According to the summary of responses, the majority of respondents, particularly the teachers, declared that outside activities influenced students’ behaviour, a lot more than what they learned from schools. This was confirmed from the results, which show that more than half of the students in CS1 and CS2 believed they were influenced from outside activities.

5.6.11 Question 11. Do you apply the values learned at school in your daily contact with the social and physical environment?
This question seeks to find whether students applied the values learned at school from their daily contact with the social and physical environment.

According to the table, more than half of respondents declared “yes” while the rest of them responded either “no” or “a bit”. This indicated that there was a mixture of feelings and uncertainty among respondents about whether they applied the values or not.

5.7 Summary
The descriptions and findings recorded in this chapter have provided data that inform this study. The findings show that the CE values that were anticipated for SI are missing from the current themes found in the school curriculum. There were also claims that elements of CE values are there in the national education documents but how they are planned and translated into lessons in class by school curriculum practitioners is the issue of concern. The teachers who are supposed
to teach values fail to do so. The findings also report that much of the values relevant for SI are not reflected in the curriculum, therefore, values that are contextual to Solomon Islands fail to be adequately and successfully covered.

Further, many of the values incorporated in the curriculum are reported to have been adopted from outside of SI and respondents perceive that this has become a challenge to nation building. Values identified by participants as relevant to SI – relationship, unity, peace, respect, ethical leadership, and responsibility – are not found in the curriculum. It was also reported that values of rights, tolerance, identity, and responsibility should not be overlooked if values for citizenship education are to be promoted in the school system. However, those values must be carefully grounded on standards accepted not by modern institutions only but also on culture and Christian principles and standards. The discussion on these findings is taken up in the next chapter.
CHAPTER SIX
DISCUSSION AND THEORISING

6.1 Introduction
The previous chapter presented the description and findings of the fieldwork in Solomon Islands (SI), reporting the data collected from one-on-one and focus group interviews and from questionnaires. This chapter presents discussion and theorizing based on the findings. This includes a detailed examination of the findings on conceptualisation of citizenship, identifying values of citizenship that are important to SI in that, they are relevant and contextual with people’s engagement and their experiences in the social, political, civil, legal, and economic environment. Further, the chapter discusses pedagogies that can effectively translate values into meaningful outcomes for SI. This discussion is expected to highlight gaps that exist and how these can be filled to inform a new Citizenship Education (CE) framework for SI whereby relevant policies and curriculum pedagogies can be developed to influence nation-building.

The chapter is structured as follows: Section 6.2 discusses how people of the SI conceptualise citizenship education and citizenship; section 6.3 examines evidence of the adequate and effective teaching and learning of citizenship values at the current secondary school level; section 6.4 discusses obstacles for teaching citizenship values at formal school level; section 6.5 provide interpretation of good citizenship; section 6.6 discusses values that are considered important to SI, including values relating to culture, modern institutions, and Christian values; section 6.7 discusses the findings in relation to the suitability of various citizenship education approaches to SI context; section 6.8 considers the most effective pedagogical approaches to teaching and learning in SI; section 6.9 examines the policies regarding CE in the SI; and section 6.10 the chapter is summed up with a brief overview of what has been covered.

6.2 Conceptualisation of citizenship education (CE)
The study has found that people’s knowledge of the nature of CE is quite limited. Whereas CE is acknowledged in Western curriculums as a subject that expects to prepare individuals to be good and active citizens in democratic societies and also to integrate diverse populations into a single culture (Hébert & Sears, n.d; Osley, & Stakey, 2001; Wylie, 2004), the study found that people of SI do not experience these benefits in the teaching and learning environment. Further, established democracies claimed, it is an important subject in its own right used as a means to
develop a democratic culture among citizens (Kerr, 2006; Kiwan, 2005; Lawy, & Biesta, 2006); and it is conceptualised as a subject that helps students to understand the society in which they live and to make people aware of their roles as citizens and their rights and duties in their specific nation-state (Piattoeva, 2005). Nevertheless, the current study shows that the term CE itself has not been included in SI curriculum materials. As a consequence, teaching and learning at the formal education level never exposes Solomon Island students to feeling or experiencing the benefits of CE.

The themes of CE found in the literature review are not included in subjects that the formal curriculum prescribes in SI. Teachers’ claims that elements of CE are found only in the Social Studies curriculum confirmed this: there, it is laid down that students will learn about social and political changes, government and leadership, the environment and government structures. This aligns with other studies, which assert that CE was traditionally part of the Social Studies curriculum (Kerr, 2000; Massialas, & Allen, 1996). Also uncovered in the study is the sense that the themes of CE in Social Studies are learned in the classroom only in the interests of acquisition of the knowledge and understanding needed to pass internal and external examinations. This claim, supported by research done by Lingam et. al.,(2013) who found that the curriculum of SI is tailored for examinations only, further corroborates conclusions of (Engle and Ochoa (1988) who claimed that the Social Studies curriculum is more about exposition of facts and generalisations about what social scientists at a given point in time have agreed with.

The study show clearly that respondents view CE as the teaching of values that reflect people’s way of life, which includes values of the past, present, and into the future. This affirms the interpretation from Western democratic countries that CE concerns the teaching of values that the society wants its citizens to uphold in order for them to display the knowledge, values attitudes, and skills that will make their nation-state more democratic (Banks, 2004; Heater, 1999) and for people to demonstrate actions that are consistent with democratic values (Banks, 2004). This includes rights and responsibilities, freedom, tolerance, social cohesion, national identity, and active participation.

However, the study found that conceptualisation of CE in SI was different from the democratic interpretation. Respondents associate CE with the teaching of values emerging from their way of life (culture) and values that unite people of different races and backgrounds, which they claim
are Christian values. The revelation is consistent with views of teachers in New Zealand who referred to CE as an obligation that leaders bear, a charge to educate their communities on how to live and work together in unity (Mutch, 2008). The study shows how people perceive and associated the obligations of leaders with society; indeed, the core of leadership lies in the alignment of traditional SI society with its obligation to care for, serve, and protect the society. This corroborates the claim of Sanga (2014) and Karen-Watson Gegeo and David Gegeo (2014) that a good society is not about equalising or empowering people about their rights so much as it is about moulding people’s ideas and beliefs about values that guide and control behaviour.

In such a situation, a leader is expected to acquire certain knowledge, values, and skills to teach, train, coach, mentor and shape others in the community properly. The study suggests that the responsibility that a person has in the community involves the training of people about cultural, church, and modern institutional values both within school and outside of the classroom. It is expected that teaching children cultural and church values would expand their knowledge and capacity and thus provide unity and security among people. These values appear to be missing from the communities and formal schools today. Such a conception from the study finding is different from conceptualisation of CE that focuses on orienting citizens around the production of competencies for political participation and mobilisation of all people for democracy (Sander & Yulaelawati, 2008).

The study also relate CE to the teaching of modern values. CE includes the teaching of modern democratic systems, structures, and values and, as such, aligns with the contemporary understanding of CE that has emerged through modern rules and governance and are translated into secular institutions. However, the study shows that Solomon Islanders have limited understanding of modern rules and how they are structured because they are not highly prioritised in modern curriculum and education systems. People fail to apprehend the importance of modern rules with behaviours that are commonly found in societies. Unfortunately, people lack the understanding of their rights and responsibilities as citizens of SI. In addition, although some people may have understood their rights and responsibilities, their interpretation is different from the Western conception. They may fail to differentiate between modern and traditional leadership roles, applying leadership only to equal sharing of wealth and resources including land. In this regard, when CE is conceptualised on the basis of the teaching of modern
values, it influences the interpretation of the term. Therefore, the study suggests the promotion of values in the school system to maximise learning on modern, cultural, and Christian values so that people may understand their rights and responsibilities contextually. This calls for the inculcation of values that the society sees as important and valuable, and that bring people together to live together in peace and harmony.

6.2.1 Conceptualisation of citizenship
The main finding of this section is related to Solomon Islanders’ conceptions of citizenship and the ways in which these differ from Western views, confirming that to be effective, any CE programmes must be contextualised. Responses show how the participants conceptualise citizenship in terms of birthright, status, identity, participation, character, values, and disposition. The term citizenship, the study finds, does not have an equivalent word in local dialects in SI particularly Malaita the site of the study. This supports the argument that citizenship is conceptualised in many ways and in varying degrees (Banks, 2008; Kerr, et. al., 2003; Nelson, & Kerr, 2006). It probably accounts for the mismatch and inconsistent views people hold when trying to put the term into context in SI. Multiplex factors influencing the SI conceptualisation of citizenship reflect interpretation of the term within cultural, religious, political, legal, and social contexts as well as the civil situation people experience.

Evan (2006) provides another example of this, arguing that the conception of citizenship is based on individualism and collectivism, political rights and social rights, local and global. This argument also has links to the mainstream conceptualisation of Western democratic countries that citizenship is based on rights and privileges of citizens and their allegiance to the government (Lagasse, 2000), to citizens’ status of being citizens (Simpson, & Weiner, 1999), and to their sets of duties and identities linking them with the nation-state (Coopmans, et al., 2005, cited in Banks, 2008). For this study, individual rights and responsibilities or duties, tolerance, and national identities have no resemblance to any traditionally or culturally used word. People, it was found, do not judge citizens as Westerners do. Instead, they judge people according to cultural and Christian ties based on values that are practised and demonstrated, that are acceptable in the society, as well as judgment based on ownership of land that only has connection from indigenous tribes.
It can be seen, then, that the way people relate to other people in SI society is through genealogical and land attachment. This recognition is broader than the individual identification through certain symbols like passports, election cards, or other national identity cards. It is a communal identification where you have been recognised among people to share in all communal and tribal ownership and obligations, and free, active, and acceptable participation. In Western societies, citizenship is the right of the person under the rule of law (Grossman, et al., 2008), but in SI, citizenship is the right of ownership and participation under cultural guardianship and indigenous ownership. The political demarcation of boundaries to cover people also has little or no meaning to people’s daily lives and wellbeing as well as people’s entitlement as citizens of SI.

This indigenous interpretation of citizenship considers that recognition of people based on the status offered by modern institutions or by modern laws is shallow compared to recognition based on church and cultural affiliations and land ownership. Further, the recognition, identification and judgmental perspective people hold, as highlighted earlier, is based on cultural norms, values, and land and resource ownership, and is, respondents affirm, more accepted than other recognition. Further, the conceptualisation of recognition of citizenship through ownership of land and resources that have been transferred down along the genealogical lines does not occur in a vacuum: rather, the recognition comes with full obligation to adhere to the standards expected from culture and religion. The responsibility also involves protection of tribal land, resources, and genealogy from outside influence or interference, equal sharing of resources, protection of customary land rights, and mandatory participation in communities by way of providing support to people in the community.

The study further relate the conceptualisation of citizenship to the recognition and protection of the rights of the person. In modern democratic states the recognition and protection is granted under the rule of law. In traditional SI, however, the rights of a person are recognised through fulfilling certain indigenous obligatory processes – particularly in rightful ownership and participation under cultural guardianship; the right to claim the land and share with obligation that must go unfulfilled; and the right to lead people according to custom and Christian standards. This is consistent with the finding of earlier studies by Gegeo (2001), Koya (2012)
and Nabobo-Baba (2008) on indigenous rights of ownership of land as the guaranteed license to act without question.

**Citizenship by birthright**
For Solomon Islanders, it is found, citizenship is primarily based on indigenous birthright. Such a conceptualisation of birthright is different from modern democratic states’ birthright, which is assigned solely under the law. The finding in this study is consistent with the interpretation that other indigenous societies have on citizenship through birthright and ownership (Wood, 2012): that is, it is significant to take into consideration how people see themselves as citizens among people and their social space with others in their situated environment.

This study affirms a study on Maori people in New Zealand, which reports that traditional Maori understandings of ownership and land rights cannot be separated from where a person is from (Durie, 1994, cited in Wood, 2012). A person is part of a community and only the community, not the individual, has the right over land (ibid.). In this understanding, the right to access the land was more like a license for an individual. The expectation of such ownership enables individuals to use a particular resource without question from people but with certain obligations of the whole community (Durie, 1994, p. 328, cited in Wood, 2012). This understanding is contradictory to the Western conception of ownership, in which if you purchase or are given something, it is yours to keep and use (Wood, 2012). Therefore, the conceptualisation of citizenship status and entitlements varies from context to context, although it may seem to be similar in some ways.

In this study, citizenship based on birthright refers to those who are born in SI and have indigenous land rights that are traceable through the genealogy of indigenous tribes. In such recognition, affiliation with a tribal or land owning group is paramount. The respondents said that people born in a country are recognised as “persons of the place”. This phrase represents the communal attachment, identification, and recognition previously associated with indigeneity.

The study highlighted that citizenship is also assigned by birth for naturalised citizens and by the modern laws of the country. However, although the rule of law acknowledges citizenship through birth, recognition based on the practices of cultural and Christian values and norms – caring, sharing, respect for one another and the rule of law – is fundamental to citizenship
acceptance. The respondents confirmed that a person who belongs to the place must have the knowledge, skills, and values of the place. The person must ensure that the culture of the place is practised and people must demonstrate respect for everybody in society through kindness and love. The practice of such values is recognised by the people of the society as the mark of citizenship and status.

Citizenship by status
The status for indigenous people in this study is linked to their entitlements in their locality, tribe, clan, kin group, or family. The entitlements are related to land, wealth, resources, relationship, leadership, and security. Entitlements are related to responsibility based on each individual’s ability to contribute to the welfare of everybody in the community, tribe, clan, kin group, or family. This includes the sharing of labour, wealth, food, clothes, even school fees for everyone in the community. Such responsibility is the status that is recognised by people and the kind of entitlement that guarantees the freedom of each individual that is meaningful to them. The person of such entitlement has the freedom to eat from any fruit tree from the community, collect food in the garden without fear, receive money when needs in the family occur, and freely holds leadership responsibilities.

This aligning of status with indigenous birthright is different from the individual rights, responsibility, and freedom that are stipulated under the supreme laws of the land, which holds legal, social, and political status of citizens within a sovereign territorial boundary (Caren, 2000; Kymlichka, & Norman, 2000). It is different from having status manifested through formal identification from national documents such as identity cards or passports that endow certain rights and responsibilities. It is different from interpretation along certain features, implying how people should behave and respond to democratic values that include the rights and responsibility of an individual that were granted by the nation-state to consolidate individual entitlement suggested by Marshall (1964). Rather, recognition of rights, freedom, duties, and responsibilities is ascertained from recognition of indigenous ownership. Each citizen has links with a local tribe, is recognised as part of the owning group of land and resources, can speak the same language or dialect, and has been recognised as a leader or leader-in-waiting for the community. The findings identify citizen status in terms of being a rightful person of a place, village, or community that holds communal identification, free participation, and unrestricted leadership status, and having
an interdependent space to be cared for and protected, and subject to recognition by indigenous birthright.

The study also illustrate that legal and political status of citizens is meaningful only to those who are educated and live in urban centres, having had both the opportunity to exercise their rights, freedoms, and responsibilities, and the experience of how these are protected, under the rule of law. The majority of people who live in rural areas, on the other hand, associate citizenship with birth, land ownership, genealogy, resources, and traditional leadership. In the rural areas status is recognised through birth and membership of a certain indigenous tribe. Such status is important for people because having recognition from such status means acceptance, survival, security, wealth, and sustenance of life.

**Citizenship by identity**

In the study, a true citizen of SI can only be identified from the practice of values of cultures in SI; values practiced by traditional customs and the Christian church. In this finding, citizens are recognised by ethnicity, race, cultural marks on peoples’ bodies, dress codes, demonstrated behaviours, and spoken dialects. This is similar to an explanation by Tonnie (1955) that a person who is born into that kind of society was born into those prescribed norms and values. Therefore, in most cases the people may not be conscious of some of their identities because they are embedded in them (ibid.).

This conceptualisation of citizenship, then, is based on identity that is acquired, and not ascribed to what is promoted by modern nation-states. This is consistent with the notion that identity that is based on social category that individuals are identified with (Okuma-Nystrom, 2009). In contrast, in modern societies, identity is chosen, contracted, and imposed on citizens (Brenner, 1993). It is chosen and constructed to fit the naming of the self with others in order for everybody to confirm into the tenet of uniformity (Okuma-Nystrom, 2009). In SI, to affiliate oneself to another culture to which you do not belong by birth is restricted, particularly, to those who belong to that culture. With such identity, it is believed that when a person is culturally attached to a certain ethnic group or tribe they comfortably accept the marks, language, and values of the setting because it is their pride and identity. Such conceptualisation of identifying a citizen with the place or ethnic group the person is originally from is similar to that of pre-
modern traditional societies (Fromn, 1978, cited in Okuma-Nystrom, 2009) before the notion of individualism emerged. In SI, where people are from is their identity. They can be identified from body marks, the language spoken, the attitudes and behaviours, the colour of the skin, and specific bodily features such as tattoos, scratch on the face and decorations people put on daily.

The study also found that citizenship identity has a kind of merit that is obvious among the society and that is known to be valuable. The recognition of certain merit places people in certain levels of power or authority in society that require some adjustment to the status that is given to them. This is similar to national identity status, which requires people to adjust to national values in order for them to match the naming (Brenner, 1993). According to the study, recognition comes with civic qualities, leadership qualities, and demonstration of cultural and spiritual values. The values are believed to bring, unity and relationship for a common cause that produces respect for other another.

Further, in this study, citizens are identified by how they live their lives and the relationships they have with their neighbours and the state. The identification and recognition demands the appreciation of democratic principles like freedom to exercise rights, and obligations people have towards the state, and the respect people demonstrate towards the laws of the country. The study found that identification along the status of rich and poor, gender and social services in rural and urban society is now a concern. The citizens who are legal members of the state and have certain rights and responsibilities are unequal in a lot of ways. This also includes individuals’ freedom to participate in elections, which includes voting, participating in politics, and joining political movements and parties (Bank 2008). The finding shows that solidarity as a nation and equality are democratic ideals that need to be sustained. The study also suggests that people who do not have respect in the community may not be recognised by others as citizens even if they are Solomon Islanders by law or by birth.

*Citizenship by active participation and public practice*

The notion of who is a citizen according to this study can be measured from the active involvement of citizens. It is suggested that people can claim to be citizens of SI only when they show care for people and the environment. This conceptualisation refers to citizens who demonstrate practical competencies like respect for the laws of the land, keeping communities clean and tidy, participation in public clean up campaigns, and organising activities that target
peace building and unity. The interpretation is consistent with citizenship as a model of active learning that occurs through active engagement in public affairs and obligations in societies (Crick, 2000; Lynch, 1992). This active sense requires people to be prepared to see beyond their own interests and commitments and to take a wider view of the community (Pearce, & Hallgarten, 1988).

The study show that “activeness” is interpreted not only as participation and engagement but also as demonstrated values of hospitality, inviting, sharing, and respect for others through support that shows the qualities of a citizen. The study justifies this claim in terms of citizens who have come to the country and taken the status of citizenship but avoid or restrict themselves from participating in charity works and supporting those in need, and who only socialise with their own ethnic groups or those who have equal social status. In this study, respondents felt that people who do not demonstrate such active participation should not claim to be citizens of SI although they are recognised as such by the law. Active participation in this study refers to the involvement people have with the community they live in and are associated with. This is different from Western countries where, according to Banks (2008), active participation involves voting in elections, joining political parties, and participating in community works: citizens are expected to participate in protests against the government and even demonstrations against the state, making public speeches regarding conventional issues, or challenging reforms that do not consider the welfare of people.

Furthermore, the study illustrates that people’s active participation includes participating in church activities, helping in community activities, supporting the elderly, and helping people in the community who are unable to help themselves due to disability. This is more about consensus than protest. Those who behave in ways contradictory to the interest of others and try to protest against communal support are seen as contravening society’s peaceful co-existence. What is important in this regard is the active involvement in the affairs of the community and responding promptly to needs and taking on strategic actions to improve certain areas in the society. This requires people to have knowledge of how the government functions, skills in organising activities, taking on leadership roles in the community, and also recognising and actively contributing to culture and religion.
In SI, active participation is common amongst people and becomes part of their way of life. Membership of a community is accompanied by certain kin obligations and responsibilities that cannot go unfulfilled, and from which one is freed only after death. Such responsibilities in SI include contributing to bride price or bride wealth payments in marriage (Gegeo, 2001). This corresponds to the communal model where people who do not actively participate in community affairs are subjected to public condemnation and criticism. Members of the family receive the blame for the individual’s actions because it is assumed that cultural norms and values have not been properly taught and nurtured by the family.

In addition, the study found that a person who actively demonstrates values of care for oneself and others has practised the important values of society. The values of care are interrelated and aligned to obligations and responsibilities. However, such obligation and responsibility is different from what is promoted by Western democracies who associate these with political participation in voting, joining political parties, and respecting the state (Abowitz & Harnish, 2006). Taking responsibility for things in society and participation as shown from the study, is an obvious reflection of people’s concern for culture. It also reflects important values that have to be demonstrated openly in order to show clearly the results of the teachings that are received from the family. People showcase their activeness and distinct abilities in arranging ceremonies such as feasting, contributing to bride price, arranging and actively engaging with communal works and rendering support to help people with disabilities; such behaviour is characteristic of good citizenship and such active participation is recognised among people with great respect.

**Character, value, and dispositions**

This study revealed that citizenship for people of SI is associated with the values and behaviours people demonstrate openly. The values and dispositions based on culture and language are a necessary requirement of membership of a nation-state and this has been termed a territorial-based model (Zajda, 2009). The study further revealed that, values are necessary components to people and for that reason, people related citizenship to values demonstrated in public. People rate demonstration of values of local culture, church, and the modern rule of law as important. A person who shows responsibility to the welfare of all people in the society, and demonstrates respect to all people and the state is regarded as a citizen of SI. According to this study, a citizen is a person who has good attitudes, and behaves appropriately according to the rules of the society. The person has to participate fully without complaint in all activities that are important
to society. This is different from individualism, which holds rights and freedom in a secular state that are perpetuated by democratic principles (Daggar, 1997). The conceptualisation of citizenship on a moral dimension is based on what matters to people. Individuals have to recognise and observe the values and norms of society to show the calibre of their membership in the community. In SI, the norms and values referred to are those from cultures and churches. For example, the way people dress and think, and their attitudes and behaviours indicate that they are from the place and the community of people. The government participants referred to citizenship as applying to somebody who has responsibility in the country in regard to public life, private life, having values of the society that embrace cultural, church, and modern laws. The person has to appreciate societal values as well as values from the modern laws, the constitution, and civil laws and the good governance agenda.

In summary, this study show that SI conceptualisation of citizenship relates to birthright; entitlements based on land and resource ownership; identity with indigenous land rights and Christian membership; active participation in family, tribe, or communal obligations; and demonstration of cultural, Christian, and democratic values and disposition.

### 6.3 Adequate and effective covering of values at the school level

The section discusses the extent to which values are adequately and effectively covered at the school level and the factors that hinder the effective covering of values at school. The study shows that SI does not have a specific programme for CE. Some of the themes of citizenship, however, are placed in some formal subjects in the secondary curriculum. This concurs with the assertion that values of CE are part of formal national curriculums in many democratic nation-states (Hébert & Sears, n.d.). In SI, the values that address contentious areas such as diversity, dis/respect, dis/unity, violence, inequality, hatred, division, ethnic conflict, corruption, racial discrimination, and lack of loyalty to the government are there in the curriculum. However, it is how they are translated and disseminated through teaching and learning in the classroom setting that is problematic.

The curriculum of SI has been used in the formal sector as a product institutionalised from the Education Act 1978 (National Curriculum Policy Statement, 2011). This was the year SI gained independence from Great Britain. The study found that the adoption of an Objective Based
Curriculum (OBC) at the time of independence has affected the pedagogies and approaches used in teaching (Dorovolomo, 2005). The teacher centred approach to teaching and learning and the focus on rote learning for internal and external examinations contributed to the achievements of the OBC. This study found, however, that, the transforming of knowledge for demonstrating good behaviour was not given much importance and emphasis.

It also becomes apparent from the study that the current goals of education have affected the delivery of teaching and learning of values important to SI. The participants were very optimistic about modern education as a driver for good living, peaceful co-existence and a stable society as expected outcomes from the content of the current curriculum with reference to knowledge, skills, and values taught and learned at school. However, the perspective for such optimism derives inextricably from the implications of having formal employment, engaging in white collar jobs or being an entrepreneur to produce and accumulate cash in a short time. In the SI case, because gaining access to cash is what people expect at the end of formal education, any teaching outside of areas likely to bear on means of accumulating modern cash is considered unimportant and irrelevant to modern education. Study findings clearly indicate that this popular perspective for the purpose and goals of education has markedly – and negatively – affected the teaching and learning of values in formal classroom settings.

Participants’ feedback on the teaching of values indicates that the content of the current curriculum does include important values that are appropriate for building relationships among diverse groupings; respecting others’ ethnic, religious and racial backgrounds; and on aspects of government and politics that are stereotyped as ‘dirty’ or ‘bad’. However, this study finds it is what people aspire to achieve at the end of education that predetermines the knowledge, values, and skills that teachers prioritise for students’ learning. As a consequence, teachers focus only on the knowledge that is expected to be tested in examinations. This being the case, rote learning is the strategy that is prioritised for teaching and learning, and memorising facts to pass examinations and to gain good marks is the approved learning style. The more students pass examinations with high scores, the more teachers will get credit and be labelled as good teachers enabling credible ‘parrot’ students to enter formal employment.
6.4 Obstacles for teaching citizenship values at formal school level

Despite the effort to teach values that are prescribed in the curriculum text books, the issues that hinder effective progress in teaching and learning of values are obvious in SI. The SI curriculum is overtly academic and employment driven (Dorovolomo, 2005). This has created some of the issues found in this study. A number of obstacles have been identified: examinations, expected outcomes of education, teacher training on teaching values, attitudes of teachers, the formal education and curriculum system adopted for the country, teaching approaches, methods and strategies, overcrowding in classrooms, financial state of schools, and limited time allocated for the lessons all play their pernicious parts.

The first obstacle found is the internal and external examinations. In SI, the value of learning is measured by and equated with high achieving of excellent grades. Unsurprisingly, then, teachers and parents pay more attention to schooling students to pass examinations. This supports the claim that examinations have been the determining factor for students’ progress in the education system of SI (Lingam et al. 2013). Values are taught and learned at school, the study has shown, but they are not covered well because teachers know this material will not feature in an examination paper. The themes on values and teaching methods, approaches and strategies are there but practising teachers are not utilising them fully because of the dominance of the examinations system. On the contrary, participants believe that schools have now become the worst place for students to live and study, and that school authorities have, by their policies and practice, now effectively marginalised the development of good character and behaviour. The academically-driven education system has caused ill-prepared students with unrealistic expectations to migrate to town in search of employment for which they are unqualified (Dorovolomo, 2005). Many, too, believe that the higher crime rates in urban centres have resulted from the influx of those town in-migrants.

Another challenge to teaching and learning of values in the formal school curriculum is education stakeholders’ equally unrealistic expectations of outcomes. Most of them wish – and expect – young people to go to university, leading to a white colour job (Dorovolomo, 2005; Pollard, 2005). It is clear from the study that values are included in the curriculum but are not appropriately and effectively covered, because the purpose and outcomes the curriculum text books prescribe are different from the outcomes the government and people of SI desire and
expect. The focus of education is not very much on the importance of values but more on acquisition of knowledge to pass examinations to go to university and to have a decent job (and almost nobody thinks to add, ‘If you are lucky!’).

Another barrier to the effective teaching of values is in the area of teacher training. Teachers have not been trained appropriately in how to teach a curriculum based on citizenship and values; they point out, not unreasonably, that they are ill-equipped for teaching values that would bring about a positive effect on students’ behaviour or character building. Their training focused on teaching subject content, not on the values that are embedded within the content and objectives of the lessons. Teachers believe that values can be transmitted effectively to the students – if teacher trainees are first given appropriate training on values.

Teachers’ attitudes present another challenge to the teaching of values. Teachers admit that they see themselves as good citizens only because they carry out their duties as teachers. It was reiterated in the discussion with students that teachers expect students to do what they say but not do what they do. The findings show that the behaviour teachers display in schools often contradicts the standards expected of them as teachers and does not reflect the expectations of society for good citizenship. Teacher behaviour identified as evidence of bad practice includes such things as dress codes, drinking alcohol, and smoking tobacco in front of students. A further obstacle is the formal education and curriculum system adopted for the country. The study found that values are there but the OBC, which focuses on content, is the challenge. It requires written examinations as the assessment tool to evaluate students’ learning. Because the curriculum is rigid and teachers have to complete themes within the time allocated – especially before internal and external examinations – whatever values are prescribed in the syllabus are not important compared to content that will be evaluated in examinations. Therefore, regardless of its importance, it is difficult to add extra activities to what have already been prescribed in the syllabus for the day, week, month, or year.

Pedagogical matters like Teaching approaches, methods, and strategies constitute another obstacle to teaching values. In PIC, the entrenchment of colonial styles of teaching is seen as leaving teachers little opportunity to teach outside of what is prescribed (Glasgow, 2014). The dominant teacher-centred approach of teacher talk and write while students listen and take notes
is not an effective teaching strategy for teaching values – and not necessarily good for teaching subject content either. Responses showed that teachers feel they cannot do much about the situation because it is governed under the Education Ministry and the National Education Act 1978.

Research has highlighted that classroom overcrowding is an obstacle to the SI education system (Ministry of Education Report, 2012). The minimum official teacher:student ratio is 25, while the maximum is 35 students per teacher. However, classes now have 60 to 70 students squeezing into classrooms built to accommodate 35 students. Realistically, teachers go into class and throw information to students like people throwing food to pigs or chickens. Those who are stronger will take more food and the weaker will catch nothing. Being preoccupied with the supervision of very large classes makes it extremely difficult for teachers to teach specific themes on values.

Teachers also identify the financial state of schools as an obstacle to improving their teaching methods to cater for values learning. Resources available for use in teaching values are few. For example, the curriculum recommends effective methods to use in lessons that would actively engage children, including excursions and participating in sport activities, cultural activities and voluntary schemes. Such activities may demand some kind of financial outlay to get started; so lack of financial resources nips most of them in the bud. In addition, important values that schools are supposed to promote are not effectively covered in the programmes because funds to pay for teaching resources that facilitate learning are lacking. The final obstacle is the limited time allocated for the lessons. Teachers claim that they could teach values by aligning them with the knowledge content, but the challenge they face is lack of time to do this. As emphasised elsewhere, teachers are under pressure to give priority in lessons to knowledge required for examinations; teaching values as well would require more time.

### 6.5 Good citizenship values
The study refers to good citizenship as the quality displayed by people who respect and abide by the rules of society. However, good citizenship is interpreted differently according to context and, thus, there are differing perspectives about what it entails. For this study, good citizenship is conceptualised according to the standards of the culture of the SI context. The values and dispositions of this context are from culture and Christianity. Those who have the capacity to
lead in communities, provinces, and the national government, and who demonstrate honesty, respect, and care are regarded as good citizens. Those values may not be considered important from a Westerner point of view, which re-enforces patriotic virtues that bring individuals, groups, and communities to see the benefit of allegiance (Kerr, cited in Mutch, 2005). ‘Holding values that focus on people’s allegiance to authority’ is considered as a minimal description of a good citizen, however, for this study, the virtue of patriotism and respect provides a mark of a good citizen.

6.5.1 Respect for the rule of law, political, and civil domains
This study applies the term good citizenship to people who respect the rule of law. Good citizens are people who respectfully follow the law of the land and believe in its legality. They respect rules instituted by modern institutions. This is consistent with the categorization suggested by Heater (1999) or Lynch (1992) who see good citizens as those who show respect for the law by keeping the law and who know their rights and duties under the rule of law. They are people who know their protection under the rule of law. In the civil domain, a good citizen is someone who actively participates in social groupings, is a member of civil society movements, who continually fights to uphold his/her rights and who has the responsibility to ensure that people’s wishes are met. In the political domain, for Western societies, good citizens are those who vote in elections, join political parties and other political groupings, and share in public discussion on political issues (Clark, 1997; Kelly, 1989).

The study also found that good citizens are perceived to be those who are empowered to be engaged and seek to affect society positively. They are citizens who have the right knowledge, proper behaviour, and respect for authority (Wesley, 1978). This study also equated good citizenship with those who carry out all of the duties and responsibilities of the nation-state; those who obey the law, pay taxes and attend school; and good citizens are willing to defend their country. The study does not refer to the good and active separately; rather, those actions are all reflected as good citizenship.

6.5.2 Active Citizenship (AC)
The study showed that Solomon Islanders regard active citizenship as the crucial component of good citizenship. It is the essence of knowing what is expected of oneself, and fulfilling these expectations. According to the findings, a good citizen is someone who is helpful and
participates actively in communal affairs and national obligations. The person must be visionary, with foresight, and have moral and ethical standing in society. The person has to be a respectable person at community, provincial and national levels and work hard to ensure that the community and country are safe for everybody to live and work happily.

Active participation in communal affairs, then, is a responsibility and obligation that is expected of people in the community. The SI communities comprised family, kin group, tribe, and ethnic group. Therefore, the work done for each other in that community is an obligation, not voluntarism. The term communitarian domain, initiated by Marshall (1964), referred to a good citizen as someone who worked to ensure the community of people is being treated fairly. Therefore a good citizen is someone in the community who works to ensure the social connectedness is there for civil and social order among people. According Wood, (2012) the community should not be positioned merely as an area of territory; rather, it ought to provide social stability and moral socialisation for the people who live within it, and a person who is termed a good citizen must ensure that that prevails. The findings of this study illustrate that an active citizen must be helpful and supportive in doing work for the community. The traditional interpretation of the word helpful in the rural site of this study is *kwaiafi’anga*. This term refers to the obligation that is expected in order to fulfil one’s role in the community. It does not occur when people are in need only, but has to be done purposefully. It is an obligation that is measured by the standard expected of the society in order to maintain unity and stability, equality and prosperity for all in the community.

This study illustrates that AC (*fuliru’anga*) is a very significant aspect in the livelihood of the SI community. As the core of values expected from individuals and the community, a person’s active participation is highly valued. Being active in the community is a mark of a good citizen. People who fail to demonstrate such actions in society are expected to be labelled as *ngwaebu kwaiafi* in Kwara’ae language (literally, not a helpful person). An active participant in society is a person who carries out his/her duty to offer help to people and ensure that communal obligations are taken care of. The literature emphasises AC as a necessary condition for a free society (Wood, 2012). However, the literature also shows that the AC is not yet clearly understood or sufficiently defined to gain an agreement on its conceptualisation (Wood 2012). Thus, each country has its own way of determining the use of AC.
In Western developed societies, AC is interpreted differently to SI. In Western democratic countries active citizens are more than merely helpful in society; they are people who are critical in their view on issues affecting society, and who stand up against authorities who fail to provide equality and service to all citizens. This interpretation of activeness includes engaging in social movements such as voluntary activities, collecting money, or fundraising for charity work (Ross, 2012). Engaging in social activity is dominant in SI society. The study showed that people are expected to offer their labour, finance, food, and other material things free of charge, as part of their contribution to society. Those participating in such activities are labelled good citizens. However, action for social change involving activities that aim to change political and social policies – for example, letter writing, signing petitions to work with pressure groups, participation in demonstrations, and trying to influence decision making (Ross, 2012) – does not align with Solomon Islanders’ conceptualisation and practice of being an active member in society. According to the study findings, anyone who behaves in a way that challenges authority and threatens social stability is regarded as a bad citizen. Indigenous SI ways of settling disputes and disagreements are through consensus and not political antagonism (Kabutaulaka, 2008).

Active participation in the Western context is an essentially individualist model of citizenship action, which involves engaging in self-regulating activities such as achieving financial independence (Ross, 2012). The results of the study illustrate individual active engagement as an essential part of what rural SI participants term as ngwae tala uu ana (a self-established person who can support himself/herself). Such a person is referred to as a good and active citizen since he/she has the power and will to influence society. This influence takes on differing forms. For example, younger people with such enterprise have the upper hand the decision to get married as parents of the intended spouse will allow their children to marry such a person as they have the skills and resources to help others. They have skills to make canoes, gardens that can produce big yields, and even possess certain skills to catch fish even when it is not the season for certain fish. This is somewhat different from the entrepreneurism mentioned in the literature, which is more about individual accumulation of wealth that is not to be shared with others (Dagger, 1997; Hébert & Sears, n.d.). In SI, those who are individualist in their approach to life and who accumulate wealth for themselves are seen as bad people with a selfish attitude. They may be very educated and accumulate wealth in their own right, but if that wealth is not shared they would be referred to as ngwae fangata’a (selfish person) which is literally bad for them. In
addition, people who are helpful and work hard to ensure that society is safe and respectful are referred to as minimal to what is a good citizen for Westerners.

6.5.3 Responsible citizenship
Responsibility is an important value in SI and a responsible person is regarded as a good citizen. Such a person displays attitudes and behaviour that demonstrate care for all in the community, especially the elderly, disabled, children, and women. For instance, if a person in the community shares what he earns from the garden, fishing, or hunting he would be labelled a good and respectful community member. This also applies to youths who behave courteously, responsibly, and honestly among people of the community. The responsible person described in this study as a good citizen of SI, however, is different from how good citizenship is interpreted by Western democratic countries, who connect it with the allegiance that citizens offer to the state being referred to as minimal citizenship (Sears & Hughes, 2006). Included in the concept of a good person in SI, according to this finding, is a person who actively leads the training of younger people towards good action and practice; has concern about young people’s knowledge, skills, and values; and takes responsibility for teaching new knowledge and skills for modern society as well as training of young people about traditional craft making, gardening, fishing, and hunting skills. The SI conceptualization also covers knowledge of land ownership, genealogy, and cultural aesthetics. In addition, responsibility includes demonstration of values reflective of cultural and church standards.

The study found that responsibility involves observing and respecting the standards expected of a community. This includes observing the custom of the place that covers land rights and ownership, and the environment. It also includes rules covering women and children and elders in the community. This is different from gender equality and human rights agenda promoted by international organisations, who base their interpretation on equalising individuals (Tupper, 1997). The study shows that people are equally respected on the basis of the culture and religion. However, women, children, and the elders are more respected than any person in the community. Women, for instance, hold kini abu ana tuaa (literally, female of sacredness or holiness of the place) so that it would be ill advised to do anything that interfered with their dignity. Their dignity holds the status of power, prosperity, security, and friendship in the community. A person who displays respect for the dignity of the weak is seen as responsible and holding good citizenship status.
Another cluster of qualities the study illuminated includes integrity and honesty, and building cooperation and mutual relationships with people as responsible action and a mark of good citizenship. To build cooperation and mutual relationships, a person has to be a law abiding citizen who is reliable and useful among members of the community. The integrity of a person is seen in his/her ability to demonstrate the norms and values of society. Those values are from the culture of people and the church they are members of. Good citizens demonstrate honesty in dealing with society, and build good relationships with everybody in the community and families, demonstrate a caring attitude to every person and the surrounding environment, and show marks of active participation. According to the findings, a responsible person has a caring attitude like a parent for the child, taking care of everything concerning the child, (food, clothing, school fees, and security).

Further, responsible citizenship refers to ownership and sharing. Since the majority of land and resources in SI are owned by people and not the state, society expects allowance of resources to be used by others who are in need. For example, people who own land are expected to allow the land to be used by others for gardening, and the forest to be used by people to build homes for their families. It is a communal approach involving and sharing what we have with those around us and helping others. A person who shows such responsibility is a good citizen who says it and lives it, works hard to improve society, and participates in activities that affect others in the community positively.

Ethical leadership is another factor that reflects responsible citizenship. Leadership is an important value in SI society. In Melanesian indigenous societies, leadership is seen as abu (holy or secret), therefore, only those who meet certain cultural criteria are given the task to lead. The current modern leadership approach to choosing leadership is different from how people chose or choose leaders in indigenous SI societies. For modern democratic society, leadership is assumed through secret ballot papers, but for traditional societies, leadership is assumed through standards of culture. Ethical leadership in this explanation is mainly based on the ethics of Christian religion and the indigenous cultures of people. The study found that a responsible citizen is someone who is ethical in his approach to work and relates ethically to others. A person that is
ethical has to demonstrate moral values, practise respect to others, and be committed and faithful to what they are responsible for.

The study relates responsible citizenship with peaceful co-existence promoted by Christianity – to live in peace and harmony with everybody in the local community, including teachers and students in school communities. In such peaceful co-existence, each person is expected to demonstrate kindness, which includes sharing in material things such as labour, money, food, and clothes. Peaceful co-existence is demonstrated by responsibility and a responsible citizen has the ability to organise young people in things that will involve them in their community, such as sports, religious meetings, cultural gatherings, and other social group meetings. The kind of person is respected in the community because of the values that build relationship with everybody in the community. In short, a good citizen is someone who takes responsibility for things that create peaceful co-existence and love.

In what has been highlighted earlier in this study, people that demonstrate values that reflect people’s way of life are regarded as responsible, active, good citizens. Such people are conscious about demonstrated behaviour, attitudes, and values that unite people in society. A good citizen practises values that provide stability in society and it is clear from what has been reported from the findings that the values of culture and the church are considered to be essential for stability and nation-building. According to rural village elders, a good citizen is someone who respects everyone and who is respected by everyone in the community, who *fulia kwaima’anga* (builds relationships), understands and appreciates *falafala* (indigenous ways of life), and *manata ‘uana* (is considerate) to the *tuafiku’a* (whole community) and those from other communities.

### 6.6 Values considered important to Solomon Islands

The section discusses the values that are considered significant and relevant for SI society. On the basis of the findings, these include respect, relationship, unity, love, care, sharing, hospitality and acceptance. The section discusses the cultural, modern institutional and Christian values that are predominantly practised by people and have become part of their lives.

A major function of education is the transmission of values, knowledge and skills that the society desires to transfer to its population to address the needs of the society and to achieve the broad
goals of education to have a good life. A good life for SI, according to the findings, is to have values people desire that focus on mutual relationships among different ethnic groupings and the state. In this finding, people claimed to be different in many ways therefore, take for granted the showing respect to those who are different. That difference is still not yet addressed in formal systems of the SI. The literature on citizenship values considers such difference as important and therefore, has focused mainly on national identity in most CE programmes (Ellies, 2002). The values are embedded in the subjects instituted in national curriculums of nation-states and based on specific values that are relevant to each country’s need (ibid.). In this study, many of the values that were claimed to be appropriate and relevant to people are consistent with the values highlighted by Osman and Liebowits (2003). They are: loyalty, sincerity, openness, civic-mindedness, valuing freedom, valuing equality, respect for self and others, solidarity, self-reliance, valuing the earth, sense of belonging, and human dignity. Commonly, countries that are divided by ethnic or racial conflicts and violence are most likely to focus on values that develop unity, peace building, national identity, and respect (Ellies, 2002).

The finding also noted that countries like SI that have experienced democratic deficits and lack active participation in political activities can be hard hit. This was evident from the open ethnic conflict between 1998 and 2003, when people were divided along racial and ethnic lines. In such a situation, CE is expected to come to the forefront of national endeavours for ensuring good governance and democracy. The inclusion of values in the education system is of critical importance to develop a common values system that can promote moral regeneration and pride to the country (Osman & Liebowits, 2003). This study points to the need to embrace values that help to bring people together in unity in order for them to have a common purpose and goal as citizens who strive to achieve a common good in SI. The purpose of common citizenship to help create a sense of right to identity and make a person a citizen, not a subject (Osman & Liebowits, 2003). The interpretation of a good life, as noted from the literature, includes but is not limited to economic development, political and social stability, respect for environment, and living together harmoniously as members of a multicultural and democratic society (ibid). Each country has diverse and specific needs and challenges, that they want to address. Therefore, they may need different approaches and values to address their situation. However, it depends on how their social environment functions and the way they prefer to approach their own nation building. The approaches each country employs to develop values depend entirely on the manner they see as
significant. In SI, from their experience with ethnic violence, social and political instability, and lack of respect for authority (Sanga, 2005), the values that people desire most are from the indigenous culture and Christianity as well as modern institutions.

### 6.6.1 Values under cultural domains

The cultural values and dispositions are integral and fundamental to any given society. According to the literature, culture is a characteristic of a person that is developed from the background and experience, disposition, skills, and ways of understanding that are informed by race, ethnicity, identity, class, and gender (Milner, 2006). The study suggests that the much needed cultural values are missing from SI societies. This is unfortunate because the cultural values and disposition are expected to guide people’s behaviour and actions in a society so that it can be stable and safe for all to live and enjoy their lives. In societies like SI, the study found that people have come to have high regard for values and norms that are from culture and Christianity because it has been part of them. People practise the values, accept them and believe that they will work for them; therefore, these values have become the source of stability and peaceful coexistence among the diverse population.

At the same time, the study cast doubts on the integrity of modern rule, claiming that it has failed to achieve its purpose. The country’s failure to produce sound national structures and systems and ethical behaviour reflects the failure to recognise cultural and Christian values in the modern democratic system. Respondents claimed that modern institutions create instability in society today because of the nature of individualism and development, which have, in fact, created gaps between rich and poor, rural and urban, educated and uneducated.

The study strongly argues against measuring oneself according to Western development indicators; only a small proportion of the population meet the measurement standard. Only those who live under corrugated iron in urban centres and have access to clean water, good roads, health facilities, good schools, and comfortable vehicles to carry them around meet the standard. This is a very small percentage compared to the eighty per cent living in rural areas. This argument is consistent with the views expressed in a study in 2013 by the Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands (RAMSI) Report (2013) who found that most Solomon Islanders do not have access to some important services. This study’s findings also note that values the colonial government promoted are not compatible with what people are intrinsically passionate
and motivated about, because the nature of individualism and development pushed by the
coloisers and the neocolonials have, in fact, created and widened the yawning gaps between rich
and poor, rural and urban, educated and uneducated.

Respondents in questionnaires and discussions claim that important cultural values that should
stabilise society are now missing. These include helping and caring for others, sharing,
hospitality, respect, building relationships, and active participation. The study indicates that in
part, the retrieval of those values will necessitate their promotion in the formal school
programmes. Not only that, parents community, and church elders must be motivated and
involved as part of the overall process that the school system is also promoting. Thus, people
desire the values from cultures to be integrated with modern values, and church values to
improve society; the achievement of this end will be a demonstration of those values in action.

Values, Character, and Virtues
The values, character, and virtues identified in the study are important features of the cultural
and Christian domains. The study pointed out that values and character building are significant
features that should be included in CE programmes of SI, a country that is, socially,
geographically, culturally, politically and religiously diverse. Importantly, values, character
building, and virtues are part of CE in many developed and developing countries. This supports
the call for intervention of nation-states to address the effects of individual attitudes and
behaviour through the CE programmes as suggested by Ellie (2002) who found that the erosion
of core universal values should be the concern of nation-states. The study, in finding this to be
critical for SI, corroborates the suggestion by Gegeo (2014) and Sanga (2014) that SI needs
ethical development more than economic development. Gegeo (2014) claims that values such as
respect, unity, acceptance, love, sharing, care for people and the environment, and helping each
other are significant to SI development if it desires a stable and progressive society.

The study also notes the absence of any unifying mechanisms prepared by any of the successive
governments to address the diversity found in SI. When handing over the power to SI, the
Colonial Government emphasised goals and expectations in the education system that meets its
version of nation building. Much of what was in the curriculum was intended to develop people
to be more knowledgeable and educated and included values that were expected to produce
peaceful co-existence and mutual relationships among people. However, things happened otherwise. Hatred and suspicion persisted among individuals and groups and the trust that should bind people was missing, causing many problems. A phrase Solomon Islanders often use when they try to show dislike of others’ opinions is *Who save lo iu*: this phrase in English means “who knows you?” This does not mean knowing their name, their family, or having some kind of meeting with the person and having some recognition of their background. It means: who cares about what you think; I am different; you are not my *wantok* (speaking the same language); you are not from my tribe’s men/women; you are not related to me in ownership of land and resources; and you are not my leader for you to decide for me.” Such connotation is different from the phrase Westerners use to say “mind your own business”, which means do not interfere with what I am doing. Mind you own affairs, not mine. “Mind your own business” aligns to the promoted value of tolerance which Westerners embrace and which is linked to acceptance of people’s right to do whatever is sensible in their (individual) interpretation and judgment.

Other vital values are those like caring for one another, sharing, hospitality, and communal support. SI is framed by communalism, thus the unquestioning expectation that people will care, share, and be hospitable. According to the findings, people feel they cannot survive without the help of everybody in the community. They share with labour, money, and food and help to build homes, gardens, and canoes for each other, contribute money and food to weddings and other cultural church feastings, and they provide security for the weak, the harmless, and the disabled. Respect for cultural values and the environment and observation of custom rules are fundamental to people of SI. The study elicited people’s feelings that the reason the country has experienced so many social challenges is the failure to promote and give prominence to the teaching and promotion of cultural and custom rules in the formal curriculum and school systems. The formal school system, in fact, provides virtually no education on cultural values. Students are ignorant about their own culture and custom, let alone other people’s, so they fail to relate well with people in society. The government cannot expect a stable and respectful society when cultural concepts and values are not included in the school curriculum and lived elsewhere in the system.

**Fa’a’into’anga (respect) and Kwaima’anga (relationship)**

*Fa’a’into’anga* (respect) in this study is extremely important, a value that is universally embraced and subsequently used to sustain democratic communities. This study found that
maintaining *kwaima’anga* (relationship) is also fundamental to SI societies and in doing so, it is important to maintain respect through mutual intimacy and commitment towards one another. Waghid, (2008) considered this an important feature that breeds friendship. The constitutive features of such a friendship or relationship – mutual values of trust, confidence, care, openness, sharing, loyalty, and support towards one another – cultivate a democratic community (ibid.).

The study found that for SI to be stable and respectful requires the teaching, learning, and practice of *kwaima’anga* (mutual friendship and relationship) among different ethnicities. The values are part of the SI culture and a way in which people harmonise society. It is only through *fa’a’inito’anga* (mutual respect) that people came to live together in large community settings (urban centres). The importance of promoting respect is critical for maintaining healthy relationships at the individual, family, community, and national levels. Respect is fundamental to culture and it plays a great role in sustaining and stabilising society. According to this study, *fa’a’inito’anga* (respect) elevates the status, wellbeing, or dignity of people to a level that shows goodness and importance in people. This *fa’a’ino’to’a’anga* (respect) is associated with the term *abua* in Kwara’ae dialect (as in English “make holy”); another interpretation of *abua* is sacredness (Buth 1988; Gegeo, 2001; Keesing 1990). *Fa’a’ino’to’a’anga* is literally a cultural significance of relationship between people. It is also associated with positive social values that are respected in traditional societies.

*Fa’a’ abu’a ngwae/kini* (respect for human dignity) denotes respect for other people’s rights but those rights and the corresponding responsibilities or obligations on the parts of others vary according to the status of both parties and the relationship between them. This is what defines whether an act is regarded as offensive and whether this fact actually constrains the offender. This is why *abu’a* is a relative value dependent on the context. Since rights and relationship are determined by social structure, so is the role of respect or *abu’a*. *Abu’a* is a way of defining social roles in a particular relationship of authority and power (Burt, 1988). The point here in this explanation of respect is that it has to be protected under the standard of culture, implying the values to be observed by people. Such observation literally is what is worthy of respect. It was pointed out in this study that respect in SI society is not about equality and tolerance. It is about observing cultural standards of society. It can only emerge when values and norms of society are practised and observed.
Raofiku’anga (participation and working together)

Raofiku’anga (participation) is another important value in SI society. It refers to active involvement in obligations that one is expected to fulfil in society. Such involvement obliges people to see beyond their own interest and commitments and take a wider, more impartial view (Pearce & Hallgarten, 1988). It is a value and practice that not only motivates members of society to act cooperatively, but it also unites people of different backgrounds. In addition, meaningful participation can lead a person towards recognition for status of community leadership among people in the community. While the notion of participation holds similar value globally, Western countries tend to relate it subjectively with political and legal engagement (Tully, 2008). For instance, in Western societies, participation can be referred to as active engagement even when it involves participation in controversial debates, challenging of people in authority, and engaging in political and legal activities tending to the subversive (Ross, 2012).

In this study, the findings indicate that SI people’s anticipation and expectation for the social community is for all people to be actively involved in communal obligations and family chores. It is about engaging people in obligations that motivate the community to be involved together. Respondents associated obligation with participating in tribal meetings, community work, and working hard every day to ensure that food is plentiful for everybody in the family or community and surplus is there to be shared. Participation includes initiating programmes that bring unity among people. This involves exchange of wealth with other families, participating in marriage ceremonies, leading people in cultural dances, covering knowledge on land issues in tribal meetings. Such perception of active participation is different from the modern conceptualisation that seeks to address democratic deficits such as failure by citizens to be involved in voting in national elections, joining political parties and participating in political debate (Ross, 2012).

It was found also that active participation is now disappearing from rural society. The study suggest that students were forced to concentrate on education in the classroom so that they pass examinations and later have jobs. That is, people are coached to focus on formal jobs to get wages as the only end for which education is the means. The intention is to accumulate wealth as a means to justify being a good and active citizen. Active participation, though, has not been timetabled into school programmes. This has affected SI societies in many ways. For example, SI participation in political elections as voters, candidates, or party members is not done in the
way intended, along the lines practised by Westerners; rather, it is merely activity that is to be
done so that leaders (politicians) can reciprocate in cash as a gesture of reciprocity. It is not about
an obligation or duty that is expected of citizens of the country. When people participate in
government and political activities, it can be seen as a bond between the voter and the candidate.
This now is normal practice in SI and currently has taken over from the traditional practice of
choosing leaders. Equally alarmingly, participants also note that people are depending on the
government to provide everything for them, including children’s school fees, hospital fees, food,
community funds, transport money, and other things. All of this seems to suggest that the point
of values for good citizenship has been very wide of the mark.

The elders who participated in the study claimed that the *raofoiku’anga* (working together) that
once held society together has now changed to *raofangata’a’anga* (selfish work). In the modern
context, this can be interpreted as individualism (Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 2009) as is promoted
by liberal democratic principles and ideals. In the rural Malaita context in SI where part of this
study was conducted, when the label *fa’ngata’a* (selfish) is applied to someone, it carries
negative connotations. A person who cares only for himself and forgets about others falls into
that category. These are the people who do not offer support to their extended family,
community, or church by carrying out obligations such as sharing of food and wealth, responding
to marriage ceremonies, contributing to church fundraising, and offering labour for free. As
people are being exposed to the Western culture of democracy and individualism and adopting
some of its values, it is more difficult to avoid such labelling.

**Kwai’afi’anga (voluntarism or helpfulness)**

CE promotes *kwai’afi’anga* (voluntarism or helpfulness). Active participation in CE includes
social movements that are involved with voluntary activities (Ross, 2012) such as working as a
volunteer with agencies, or collecting money on their behalf. It is an exhortation to discharge the
responsibilities of neighbourliness, voluntary action, and charity (Lister, 2003). These forms of
voluntarism constitute what is sometimes derided as the voting and volunteering approach to CE
(Wood, 2012).

The study found that *kwai’afi’anga* is perceived differently from Western interpretations of
voluntarism. *Kwai’afi’anga* is an obligation to help others that is expected from individuals in
society. Such action implies reciprocity at a later date just as it was done to others. In modern
societies, voluntarism refers to helping others who are in need and can be done only once through availability of fundings from Government or non-government organisations (NGO). Further, *kwai'afi'anga* is an obligation that cannot go unfulfilled by younger people as their recognition for status is dependent on such action. They will be given leadership positions in the community. Furthermore, in SI during marriage ceremonies, people will come from near and far to donate gifts to the bride or groom. They will also offer help in the form of money and food. In the SI society, such help is offered to newly married people who are hardworking and respectable in society.

The study found that *kwaiafi'anga* (voluntarism) is a very important value that has stabilised the society. It is one of the values that sustain rural communities although they fail to match the criteria of democracy and development promoted by modern Western institutions. Someone who freely participate in affairs concerning the home, village, community, and nation have demonstrated the values of a good citizen. It is not the same as responding to a call for volunteers that has been advertised by an institution or organization. It is not about critical thinking and challenging authority. Rather, it is the standard that is required and expected for all people to observe and practice in SI.

**Tua aroaro‘anga ma kwaima‘anga (peaceful co-existence and unity).**

Peace is fundament to human existence. In SI, the values that people desire for promotion in the school system include those that focus on peace building or values that produce peaceful co-existence and unity among people. It is significant for peaceful co-existence as the destiny and future of humanity depend on it. The study finds that only peace can shape our world to give life a peaceful purpose through human relationships. UNESCO (2000) promotes peaceful co-existence among people thus: “Respect for all life, ending of violence and promotion and practice of nonviolence through education, dialogue, and cooperation”. This indicates the significance of the promotion of values for peace in school systems globally.

Such values are so important that they require promotion at the school level in order to address the social instability, and hatred and violence found commonly among people. Sanga (2012) argues that the real challenge for SI is how to achieve unity. This study also finds that unity is lacking, therefore, requiring the school system operating in SI to emphasise and promote it.
There is promotion of knowledge for formal employment and monetary accumulation or economic gain, and less or none of essential and basic values that establish peace and unity. It is felt that any development or advancement of the basic services of countries requires social stability and cooperation among the citizenry; that a country that is divided will never progress in its nation-building endeavours (Ross, 2012). That is the case with SI, a nation of peoples who are defined in terms of culture, ethnicity, and geographical space. SI as a national community of culture has no emotional bonds that share a common ideology.

According to the findings, SI does not enjoy nationhood that is based on unity through emotional bonds. The country, although defined as a community of culture, has no emotional bonds that unite people across the bonds of their more immediate groups, nor do people share any common ideology. It was found that people see themselves as different, because they do not have any attachment with people from different ethnic groups. Participants claimed that it is because they are different that they are not recognised in other provinces even though they are Solomon Islanders. The differences that participants highlighted include languages they speak, land and resource ownership, cultural lifestyle, and leadership structures. It is also particularly clear that because of the way it is practised, people do not have any regard for leadership structures with which they feel no attachment. This was found to be a cause of instability among people. When citizens do not appreciate and acknowledge how people lead, they fail to submit to authority. Many people see this as the root cause of major conflicts in SI, because there is no unifying symbol to merge people together. The only bond found from the study is the pijin language, which generates the word *wantok* that people identify with. They use the word wantok to refer to them as people from Solomon Islands or Melanesian pijin speakers.

### 6.6.2 Modern institutional values

The values of modern institutions include those from the national Constitution, Acts of law, policies, and rules of modern national institutions. This relates to values that strengthen the democratic principles of nation-states (Green et al., 2006). The values have emerged with the formation of nation-states and how people can live together as one people guided by the modern laws and rules. The values pertaining to democratic rights (freedom) and responsibilities (duties), social cohesion (equality), national identity (sense of belonging), and tolerance
(acceptance) are important features in modern institutions (ibid.) and these are discussed below in relation to the findings of this study.

**Democratic Rights**

This study shows that the concept of rights is interpreted communally. The literature of this study found that the value of rights is central to citizenship education and has been the core value in civic or citizenship education programmes of Western democratic countries’ curricula (Bank, 2004). CE concerns the teaching of rights of citizens with respect to the knowledge, values, and skills pertaining to political, social, and legal agendas of a person in a nation state (ibid.). In non-Western developing countries such as small island states, on the other hand, the implementing of rights-based education in citizenship education programmes is seen to be a complex process (Lee, 2008). It is complex because countries are multi-lingual, multi-cultural, multi-racial, multi-ethnic and most are former colonises with a very small economic base (Ellies, 2002). The SI situation conforms with this pattern.

In SI the term rights is interpreted and conceptualised differently from how it is defined and conceptualised in the literature. In the Western-derived literature, the political, social, and legal rights of a person, which concern individualistic features, hold fast to the concept of liberty (Lee, 2008). The West focuses on individual rights of participation under the rule of law, while the non-Western countries and indigenous societies allude to collective and communal rights (ibid.). In SI, however, rights are collective and hold features that substantiate communal ownership. This, then, presents challenges when individual rights are emphasised in the SI context. Additionally, the term rights, according to people of SI, does not have an equivalent in vocabularies or words commonly used in SI societies. From what was found, people’s demonstration of individual right is reflected only through the realisation that they are free to participate among their own people because of communal membership of a tribe or certain grouping. The people exert their freedom only within a jurisdiction of which they are members, of group of people who are recognised as a discrete group by people outside of the group, and by the group itself and its individual members. This includes their own community, the tribe they share and traditionally own land with and the nuclear and extended family they get their support from.
In SI, more than eighty per cent of people are still living in rural areas and continue to live a communal lifestyle (Solomon Islands National Population Census, 2009). In the rural areas, people’s rights are only recognised by their own community and tribe, therefore, their power to exert their rights freely is limited only to their own setting and not outside of their community. The reason is that to extend outside of the immediate setting means stepping on other people’s land, resources and properties. These factors have contributed to the failure of recognition of others’ rights despite the national Constitution’s effort to acquaint people with them through formal education. The questionnaire survey conducted with teachers and students in this study on rights, found that most favoured the teaching of democratic rights at the secondary school level. However, it also revealed how they interpreted these rights more as social rights such as education, health, and other social services. Because there are no road systems in rural areas, no clean piped water, no power supply, no arranged social activities and people have to walk long distances to clinics and schools, people continue to use land for survival and immediate family members as a source of support.

Further, people cannot exert their rights in an environment where only limited recognition of those rights prevails, particularly, under the modern rule of law. According to the study, people blame the government for failing to provide important services that people feel they may rightfully claim. This is affirmed by another survey in which ninety-four per cent of respondents complained that the government did little or nothing at all in the delivery of important services for people (Regional Assistant Mission Solomon Islands, Report, 2013). People do not experience positive effects from government services; rather, they view government as only for the elites and urban dwellers. No surprise, then, that people feel no emotional bond with government. Modern institutions like schools, government civic programmes, and non-government organisations that provide training relating to rights and freedom under the laws of the land are ineffective because people do not have a relationship with them. People are supported by their immediate and extended families, not by the government. As respondents commented, the lack of government support in terms of shelter, food, clothing, and finance – which appear to be provided only by family, kin-group, or relatives – is sufficient explanation for people’s lack of commitment to rights as stipulated in the Constitution and by the NGOs.
The study also highlighted the gaps in levels of understanding about individual rights and the varying degrees of rights that are ratified by international organisations. The qualitative feedback from respondents, supported by the quantitative data, has shown that people are still ignorant of their own status as national citizens who have the right to be treated with care and respect. The study indicates that people feel strongly that values associated with democratic rights and responsibility need to be included at school regardless of how society perceives rights. However, this is not something to be undertaken lightly: it must be done with care and it has to be incorporated hand in hand with the values from culture and church.

**Democratic Responsibility**
CE is commonly based on teaching about responsibilities. Responsibility was the dominant feature in the CE philosophies grounded on the republican model, which is based on relationship and intimacy between citizens to create a common bond in order for people to share in the ruling and being able to be ruled (Heater, 1999). Responsibility in modern democratic states refers to duties that citizens are expected to carry out to fulfil their political obligations. This includes individuals’ participation in political parties, national elections, contributing to charities such as food banks, and volunteering in community work as well as being law abiding, working hard, and possessing good character (Deuchar, 2007).

In this study, what is found illustrate peoples’ interpretation that responsibility also applies to the duties they are expected to perform as members of the society they belong to. Respondents have high regard for values relating to responsibility. However, the study’s interpretation of responsibility is different from that of the literature because for most respondents, it relates to taking care of people and the environment, and not just to participating in political processes. When people talk about responsibility, they are referring to what they are obliged to do for others. However, this expectation relates only to the attachment of a person with the tribe or community to which they belong and is linked to expectations for survival, relationship, and security. Furthermore, people in this study specifically say that they are not responsible for others from different communities because they are not responsible for them.

The respondents favour responsibility because it covers values like stewardship, an ability to take care of the social and physical environment, the values of sharing and giving, which hold society together, and being helpful and hardworking to help in supplying food and labour for everybody.
in the community. People assert that they can live without the government, but they cannot survive without their immediate and extended family. The study, then, indicate how the Western conceptualisation of responsibility – participating in elections, joining in political parties, involvement in volunteer schemes, and respecting the rule of law – are meaningless compared to responsibilities of caring close to home, as perceived by participants in this study.

The study also show that values pertaining to responsibility are greatly supported for the reason that they are perceived to be currently missing or declining in the societies. The decline in the practices of caring for one another was perceived to be causing current trends of unacceptable behaviour such as vandalising private and state properties, stealing from neighbours (a common practice), youth violence, violence against women and children, and discrimination. The analysis of the quantitative data shows that more than eighty per cent of respondents favour teaching of democratic responsibility at the formal secondary school level. People believe that if it is promoted at both the school and the community levels, it will re-instate the values of mutual respect and relationship, safety and security, truthfulness and sincerity, honesty and truthfulness, and fairness and generosity. Ultimately, the teaching of responsibility is expected to re-establish trust so that people can co-exist peacefully alongside each other.

**Social cohesion**

Social cohesion or equality seems to be very weak in SI. This has occurred because education does not do its part. Education was believed to be a powerful generator of social capital; therefore, nations that are rich in social capital are expected to be more cohesive (Green, et al., 2006). Education is expected to be a force for social order and a way of providing collective class and gender consciousness in order to have social and political solidarity (ibid.). However, this was not happening in SI after colonisation and especially over the last two decades, as people were marginalised in a lot of ways: division, hatred, inequality, differences in terms of wealth, education, power, culture, religion, and so forth. Such differences affected social integration, which resulted in instability and disintegration among people in SI.

The study confirm that social cohesion is very weak in SI as people have been struggling to come to terms with the issues of solidarity and social interrogation since gaining political independence from the colonial power. The fact is traditional perspectives of solidarity, acceptance, and equality were different from how they are interpreted in modern times. Solomon
Islanders traditionally considered solidarity only on the basis of reciprocity, the act of the giving, receiving and sharing together, living together and identifying with a certain ethnic group. Such ethnic and community integration created bonds among people that produced mutual respect without feelings of suspicion. Equality in SI, based on this study, is referred to in terms of respect. This is the only equality spoken of in SI. “Iu tufala sem sem tru” in SI’ pijn is not about equality, it is about similarity. That similarity denotes relationship and indicates the following: We have the same culture; we are from the same tribe or community; we are related, and share similar values; we eat the same food and live in similar houses; we enjoy the same social activities and observe similar values and norms. Anything that is not accepted by society is not accepted by all people. This indicates that what makes people equal is the sharing of wealth, labour, material goods, home, and food. Such views on equality and social cohesion are different from Western perspectives, which view social cohesion along the domains of economic, political, and socio-cultural activities (Bernard, 1999). Westerners interpret equality/inequality to mean social justice and equity in the economic domain (mainly related to equality of conditions, i.e. poverty and well-being) (Jenson, 1998).

The study found the terms poor and poverty to be introduced terms associated with modern democracy and neoliberalism that promotes the market economy. The liberal notion of freedom and rights, which causes an imbalance to society, and inequality is detrimental to social cohesion, an issue that Tupper (2008) terms as careless citizenship education. In SI, according to the study finding, there is no such thing as rich or poor. People are equal because they all help with gardening, wealth, and food, and own the land and resources, and the home belongs to all immediate and extended family. The people claim that society cannot and never will be equal if the practice of freedom and rights promoting individualism at the expense of Christianity and culture influences the national direction.

**Tolerance**
In SI tolerance is interpreted differently from how it is conceptualised in modern democratic states. No words with equivalent meaning are used in SI society. The reason is that actions and practice that can be tolerated are measured with cultural and Christian norms and values. For modern democracies, tolerance is about accepting the values, views, opinions, or difference of others and that actions are translated as marks of good citizens (Davis et al., 1999). It is part of school programmes to teach for acceptance among the diverse nations in Western democratic
states. According to this study, rural village elders interpret the term tolerance as *ru’anata’anga*. In Kwarae dialect *ru’anata’anga* means “it’s okay, I accept it for now but do not repeat such an act again as I may not accept it when it is repeated”. Applied to an outsider, *ru’anata’anga* can mean “it’s okay but you have to do that in your own community and not in ours”.

This study shows tolerance is seen as something to joke about, particularly things that are done publicly and do not have any restriction. Something can be tolerated if it does not violate the culture and Christian values or does not contradict the way of life and belief system. Conversely, actions and behaviour that contradict people’s culture and religion (Christianity) are unacceptable in SI societies. A good example is the recent violence that SI experienced, which cost the government and people dearly. The cultures and customs of certain ethnic groups were violated, so they showed their displeasure by resorting to conflict.

In this study, the responses of the rural elders show that people have very little regard for modern rules and systems, because they are alien and make little sense to them. How people see themselves and perceive their social and physical surroundings affects their world view on modern rules and governing systems. People consider modern rules and values as detrimental to their cultures and divisive of their unity. Therefore, they are careless about who leads them in politics, who decides for them in parliament, the rule of law, government, infrastructure, and even what is prescribed in the curriculum as knowledge, values, and skills for them. The indication here is that what can be tolerated by people is that which is accepted by culture and religion. Therefore, tolerance follows the standards of culture and Christianity. What is outside of Christianity and cultural values will not be tolerated. The study also noted that tolerance and acceptance from the standpoint of modern law is still not accepted. For instance, according to the study findings, gay or lesbian practices may not be accepted in SI society although such rights may be included in the Constitution. Other practices such as coming to villages and kissing and hugging and marrying more than one woman as accepted by other cultures may also not be accepted or tolerated. Much instability and chaos in the social environment is due to ignorance of outsiders about the cultures of people in SI. Therefore, tolerance has to be interpreted and adopted in SI society with care.
National Identity
Identity has become a concern to modern societies as people of different race, ethnicity, religion, and culture come together to form a single society. Such modern societies, or nation-states, are comprised of diverse people who may have attached to some communal bond and live together in a demarcated political and territorial boundary (Zajda et al., 2009). SI is such a nation-state, formed by a colonial government (Britain) as a single unit. The unit comprises people of different races, ethnicities, cultures, and languages living and occupying hundreds of islands separated by ocean that are very difficult to be connected. In such a social and geographical diversity, the ability to form people according to a single political tenet is quite challenging. According to findings of the study, people remain fragmented in their small settings with only very few family members and tribal people living together in a small village, separated from others by bush or water. This separation has caused or maintained divisions and sometimes tensions between villages.

In SI, people identify only with their ethnic group, tribe, or extended family. This attachment is linked to their shared past that transcends their present. The sense of solidarity according to Zajda (2009) is based on descent/ancestry or distinct sets of cultural and linguistic characteristics. Such characteristics generally link to people’s moral attachment to their land (Ooman, 1997). The study show that people did not see themselves as one people of SI; rather, they only relate well with those who speak the same language as they do. National identity is weak among Solomon Islanders as they do not feel the effects of nationhood. However, people are proud of their own national heritage although they did not feel a united SI. Since, according to the study, people consider national identity as important, more attention needs to focus on activities that bring people together, to counterbalance the tendency of the weakness in national consciousness to limit progressive development in the country.

When people were asked whether they respect their identity as Solomon Islanders, they said yes but only because they are labelled as Solomon Islanders. However, they claim that they have felt few of the positive effects of the national government. Participants agree they have schools and clinics to support them, but that is all that they have. Therefore, they have a weak sense of association with the government or the national state because there is no true service from the government to the people. They claim that they cannot identify with an institution that does not
take into account their concerns or what has been affecting them. The study also found that people have weak association with government because only a few people, urban dwellers, enjoy government services. The majority of people still use bush roads, survive on gardening, and use streams from the ground for drinking. Only those who work for government as politicians and public officers, and people from the private sector, enjoy the benefits of the government. The study also shows that people identify only with their ethnic group, family or community because they are the only units that provide support when they are in need. Any support that they have experienced came from their family and community members. In other words, people’s nation-state is their own communal setting.

The study suggests that the weak sense of national identity in SI may benefit if activities such as flag raising and singing the national anthem were made mandatory. Such activities were common features in school previously, but there has now been a shift in education towards a more academic oriented system within which academic outcomes have become dominant while policy makers have dismissed “outdoor” activities as a waste of time. Yet the suggestion that activities such as flag raising, singing the national anthem, inter-sports activities, interschool quizzes, and cultural activities in school programmes be reinstated in the formal school programmes to strengthen a sense of national identity was supported by more than fifty per cent of survey responses.

6.6.3 Christian values
The study indicated that Christianity is believed to have provided teaching on the kinds of values-based good manners, politeness, and courtesy for people in SI. This corroborates the claim that religion is part of CE in most Asian and PIC because it relates to developing good character (Mamat, 2008). The finding also confirms the profound interpretation of education is to care for and to nurture in a positive way (ibid.). Documents and literature from the SI have shown that Christian religion has dominated the lives of Solomon Islanders for the last century and it has become part of them. It strongly influenced people’s day-to-day living even before the introduction of colonial rule by Britain in 1893 (Fugui, 1978). People of the SI easily adopted Christian values because these were similar to rules and values of people’s culture. The traditional religion was for manifestation of good health, security, prosperity, and strength (ibid.). That eventually has correlated to the values and belief of Christianity which are also assumed to contribute to a good life, including good health, and prosperity. This also was
confirmed by the Solomon Islands Peace and Reconciliation report (2012) which claimed that “the Western separation of religion and daily life, and subsequently the separation of Church and State, are not features of Melanesian culture” (p. 32). Therefore, moving from traditional religion to Christianity was made easier through that understanding.

The data in the study reveals that Christian values were highly regarded by people, so much so that they considered Christianity to be the only true belief system. Nothing has dominated the lives of people in SI like the practice of Christianity. People read the Bible and pray in the morning before going to work and every night before going to bed. Therefore, they learn about the values every morning and evening. Engaging in such practice is perceived as a means for ensuring good living, stability, peaceful co-existence, and protection. Believing in the doctrine of Christianity which focuses on love is assumed to be the divine action for having a good relationship with God and with man and a hope for eternal life after death. Based on the evidence gathered for this study, including those from post conflict reports, it was found that only Church organisations – not the government and the laws of land or regional interventions or other modern institution – were able to calm the ethnic violence that erupted among people in the SI from 1998 – 2002 (Sanga, 2005). This indicates the respect people have for Christian values and beliefs as an integral part of people’s lives.

The values of Christianity are founded on love: mutual love, caring, generosity, respect (reciprocity, cooperation, consensus, maintenance of good relationship,) loyalty, commitment, humility, generosity, sharing cooperation, fulfillment of mutual obligations, honesty, and integrity. Responses in this study affirm that Christian values are perceived to be fundamentally important for social stability, unity, and identity, and therefore, need to be promoted at all levels in the country. As Taufe’ulungaki (2009) mentions in relation to Tongan society, if love is practiced by leaders then relationship to authority and neighbours will fall more easily into place. The values were supported by questionnaire finding which shows that more than eighty per cent of participants favour the teaching of Christian values in SI formal education. It is also suggested from this study that rights-based values should not be applied at the expense of Christians and cultural values.
6.7 Citizenship Education approaches
The literature on citizenship education highlights several approaches that are commonly used globally in the formal teaching and learning of values for good and active citizenship: segregated curriculum approach, cross-curricular approach, extra-curricular approach, and Social Studies curriculum approach (Kerr & Cleaver, 2002). However, another approach that is favoured by participants in this study is the whole school approach. Each of these approaches is discussed in turn below.

6.7.1 Segregated curriculum approach
The study favour placing CE as a separate subject in the curriculum because of its importance to SI social and political contexts. This is consistent with the literature that favours CE as a segregated subject (Turnbull, cited in Kerr & Cleaver, 2002). Developing CE as a segregated subject is perceived as a prerequisite for the effective implementation of the subject in school (Kerr & Cleaver 2006). The SI participants indicate that they favour segregation of the subject rather than the cross-curricular approach to teaching for two reasons. First, it would allow emphasis to be specifically on social and political issues found in SI. Second, because other thematic possibilities are screened out in this way, it is easier to handle the desired emphasis. The argument is that timetabling CE as a discrete subject taught by specifically trained teachers will ease the burden for teachers in other subject areas. Furthermore, it is believed that having proper training to disseminate the concepts will be effective and convincing, as those who teach the subject can concentrate on delivering the knowledge and values without confusing themselves with other themes or subjects. On the down side, the claim supports the argument that teaching and timetabling citizenship discretely can lead to its becoming, for most teachers, “someone else’s problem” within the school, which not everyone regards as a desirable outcome (Wilkinson, 2003).

6.7.2 Cross-curricular approach
The cross-curricular approach in teaching citizenship values concerns factoring CE themes in all subjects in the school curriculum. The argument for this approach is that many of the values in prescribed subjects have elements of CE in their teaching themes. However, in SI the challenges may outweigh the benefits. Challenges include teachers’ knowledge on content and pedagogies of the curriculum under all disciplines, as they are trained to teach only their own specialist subject(s). Further, the challenge of stakeholder reluctance to accept must be foreseen:
implementation of the cross-curricular approach would require major changes in the education system, including teacher training programmes, teacher training curriculum, and establishment of a monitoring, evaluation, and examination system, all of which are expensive exercises likely to put pressure on the government’s financial capacity. As Pollard (2005) points out, when many schools in the country are in a poor state, an overhaul of the curriculum simply may not be feasible, given that the government budget is for recurrent uses only.

Argument in support of the cross-curricular approach claims that success of CE rests on its very flexibility, therefore citizenship education will be most successful where it becomes a unifying element within the curriculum and where schools use it to further their existing aims, as well as appreciating how it can empower impressionable young people (Kerr & Cleaver, 2006). This is consistent with the suggestion that CE should be approached and included according to different levels in the school system. This argument holds that because primary-level teachers are trained to teach all given subjects in a particular class, CE can more easily be taught across the curriculum in primary schools; at secondary level it should be placed in the Social Studies curriculum or as a whole school approach where all teachers have to teach it. The study confirm that participants believe the cross-curricular approach is a difficult process because knowledge of CE can only be delivered through certain subjects in the formal secondary school curriculum. The teachers in this study expressed a view that teaching children CE at an early age (primary level) would be more effective than teaching students when they are mature.

6.7.3 Extra-curricular approach
On balance, this study advocates an extra-curricular approach for CE delivery. In this approach, CE is promoted outside of the formal school curriculum. In most countries, the general curriculum context sets out how civics and citizenship should be taught in the curriculum as well as how it can permeate through school assemblies, special events, and extra-curricular activities (Kerr, 2009). The participants of this study felt that approaching CE as extra-curricular would fit in well with school activities because only examination subjects can be factored into the formal timetable. As an extra-curricular subject the knowledge, values and concepts of citizenship would be delivered outside of formal timetabled subjects. CE would be promoted through activities such as flag raising, singing of the national anthem, arranged inter-school sport activities, and other activities like volunteerism, and active involvement in community work. Such activities are assumed to build character, promote national consciousness, and unify people
of different backgrounds. Study participants view this approach as an appealing and effective means of promoting CE.

A Community High School Survey Report (2002) about the need to promote national identity in Solomon Islands recommended that activities such as flag raising, singing of the national anthem, and interschool or national sports activities should be promoted by schools, facilitated by the government by making them compulsory. However, over a decade later, this current study finds that such extra-curricular activities still do not appear on the school programmes. Further, the indications are that SI children do not recognise the value of flag-raising and the singing of the national anthem, because these have not been part of the school routine: most students do not even know the meanings of symbols on the flag and/or the meaning of the words in the national anthem. The reflection of this in a weak sense of belonging and lack of national pride as people of SI handicaps the diverse country in its endeavours to unite, which will persist as long as the government and people fail to consider unity and national identity as important. Participants suggest that the government should facilitate activities designed to transform the national society into a united one in which all citizens feel a proud sense of belonging. Engaging in such activities may instil into students a sense of pride in their own country and develop a sense of national consciousness. Overall, for these reasons, the extra-curricular approach to CE may best suit Solomon Islands.

6.7.4 Social Studies curriculum approach
A Social Studies curriculum is taught in many if not all formal education systems globally. In SI, themes concerning citizenship values are included in the Social Studies curriculum, consistently with the widely-held belief that Social Studies is an essential and appropriate approach to the delivery and promotion of the concept and values of CE (Allen & Stevens, 1998; Engle & Ochoa 1988; Hill, 1994; Kerr, 2000; Marsh 1991; Massialas & Allen, 1996; Zarrillo, 2004).

Further, teachers and curriculum officers participating in this study find that Citizenship, at least for now, should be included in the Social Studies curriculum, as many of the CE concepts are already included there. This is appropriate for SI because Social Studies investigates knowledge and understanding about people, environment, moral values, political structures, government, and how to deal with issues and conflicts of the contemporary period (Heater, 1999). It is a
subject that teaches about people to help them acquire knowledge and master the process of learning to become active citizens (Ross, 2006). Social Studies also teaches about “how and why in diverse cultures, and in different times and places they think, feel, and act, and organize their way of life” (p.192). Consequently, Social Studies can meet the political, social, economic, legal, and spiritual needs of people (Mutch, 2005).

The teachers from urban centres relate values of citizenship to Social Studies and view citizenship values as part of Social Studies education; however, they suggest that Social Studies be reviewed to cater for values that address the needs of SI society, particularly values that unify the nation and instil values of respect for all citizens through cultural, church, and modern institutions. However, Social Studies is already overloaded with themes from history, geography, sociology, politics, and citizenship and those current themes are hardly completed by the end of the each academic year. To include citizenship concepts as well would be inappropriate, especially when the current topics already look at family, community, the environment, government and change.

6.7.5 Whole school approach
The study has shown that while the teaching of citizenship values via cross-curricular, extra-curricular, segregated, and Social Studies approaches all have value, none may be best suited to solving the demand for developing good SI citizens. The respondents thought that documented values and pedagogies are good on paper but have never been utilised to meet the needs of the country. Most teachers stick to the traditional teacher-centred approach because it is easy, less time-consuming, and complements the examination-oriented education system. The respondents favour regarding the teaching of citizenship values as every stakeholder’s business. Instituting it in school with the curriculum should not be the end of the story; rather, it has to be approached holistically.

Since formal pedagogies are perceived to have failed SI, it is necessary to resort to new approaches in teaching values. The study corroborates claims of Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (2014) and Sanga (2014) that values for good citizenship can only be effective when they are disseminated through family unit, clan, tribe and the village elders. Such an approach makes provision for including teaching, mentoring, and secret advice from elders as means for developing values as discussed in Chapter 3.6.2. CE should not be a situated learning as modern
education does it (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 2014) nor the responsibility of the formal curriculum only. Everybody has to assume the responsibility to teach CE values at home – parents and older siblings, elders of the clan and tribe – to children even before it can be taught at the formal level using the curriculum. The study support calls to approach citizenship holistically. It has to be all school stakeholders’ responsibility; the concern of every person and institution in SI. Teaching of values for good citizenship in Solomon Islands must start in the families, kin-groups, clans, and tribes before it extends to the national institutions.

6.8 Effective Strategies in Teaching and Learning CE

The study found that teachers of citizenship, like any other teachers, have to use proven and appropriate techniques that help students to acquire the knowledge, skills, and values effectively. Participants support mediums of disseminating knowledge, values, and skills that involve concrete applications or hands-on activities. This affirms the call for citizenship education pedagogies to focus more on student-centred and active inquiry-oriented learning, shifting away from transmission modes, rote learning, and drill commonly adopted in formal classrooms (Kennedy, 2008). The study favours teaching strategies such as student projects, demonstrations, dramatising, guest speakers, and teachers as models for learning. Teaching on “real situations” is vital for active and effective learning, the study teachers confirmed: methods that are concrete, as opposed to abstract teaching, can influence students’ learning as they develop into good and active citizens. Discussed below are six strategies respondents particularly recommended: teachers as role models, demonstration, dramatisation, class projects, guest speakers, and excursions.

Role models. The most influential people in school communities in SI are teachers and school leaders. Their demonstrated actions and behaviour in front of students speak louder than what they teach in the classroom together with policies that regulate the school. Teachers have first of all to demonstrate character and behaviour that is accepted by society before their teaching can be effective. The study reveals that the unethical and unprofessional attitudes and behaviour of some teachers have affected the way students act in schools, creating a negative image of the teaching profession and undermining the trust that parents, guardians, and the general public have towards teachers. The study advises teachers to display or model good character before they teach on Citizenship Education values.
Demonstration. The arts of teaching and learning in SI have revolved around teacher demonstration and student hands-on imitation for learning. Demonstration of important values for the purposes of learning is the most effective way to teach and also relevant for students. For instance, children learn well when they are given an opportunity to act out what their parents or elders advise them of, or what is demonstrated freely and carefully. Further, traditionally, this style of learning is part of Solomon Islanders’ cultures. Learning happens through listening, watching, imitating, and doing things. Learning without imitating and practice is not learning at all; the abstract teaching going on in SI classrooms is unlikely to be producing effective learning.

Dramatisation. Teachers point out ention that some of the lesson topics almost beg for dramatisation, which is also prescribed in the curriculum, although teachers fail to utilise this teaching strategy. They claim that planning and preparation for lessons of this type are time-consuming and tiring. All the same, they admit that dramatisation is part of SI tradition and culture as knowledge is acquired through observation and actually acting it out. Some respondents noted that people dance the incident or important value of certain things in society so that it is embedded and becomes part of them from generation to generation. For the transmission of important messages, it is advisable for the knowledge, skills, and values to be formed into a dance or drama. In this strategy, the teachers are expected to plan and organise students to be involved in some role play through which students can acquire and appreciate the values of unity, care, and respect for each other irrespective of differences in race and ethnicity, because it is acted out.

Classroom projects. In the traditional context of SI, personal discovery is a significant value of maturity. If someone wants to be recognised for their leadership in the community, they have to seek advice from the elderly people. The research of Gegeo (2001) refers to this search for discovery as secret knowledge. In the contemporary classroom, important knowledge is acquired from class projects as students are required to follow the same process as well. In such a teaching strategy the students are given a topic to research and are expected to find answers themselves. This is active learning and is also regarded as effective learning. In CE, learning from active methods is the appropriate technique to develop active good citizens.
Guest speakers. In traditional settings knowledge is built and acquired around the family, tribe, and whole community. Teaching and learning is not a single person’s responsibility. It is the obligation of the whole community. It is expected that people of specialised skills, knowledge, and values, aside from their immediate family, will pass these on to younger people. This research found that students view Social Studies as one of the most boring subjects in school because teachers do all the talking while students listen and take notes. Student respondents prefer teaching and learning strategies that are more interactive, like asking question and receiving answers from expert guest speakers.

Excursions. In the SI traditional setting, skills, knowledge, and values considered worthwhile for developing younger people for good and active citizenship are transferred through excursions, which may involve hunting trips, fishing trips, and for mothers to take their daughters to the garden or to collect shells from the beach or take them to where they can find plants to make baskets or mats. Younger people, the findings show, learn effectively through observation and actual practice. This is said to be an effective teaching and learning strategy for developing a person for leadership and self-sufficiency. In modern learning, the absence of active teaching and learning has had negative implications. Students leave school as passive students and consequently have failed to apply what they have learnt in schools.

6.9 Citizenship Education Policy
CE is a crucial subject for a newly formed nation-state because it addresses common priorities in nation-building. For instance, Western countries purposely established policies for CE to influence how countries approach citizenship in practice (Kerr et al., 2009). The study found that SI people desire the adoption of such a policy to promote CE programmes. It is felt that without this, the goals of good citizenship cannot be achieved. One former SI politician suggested that SI focus more on awareness programmes for civil society, particularly on citizenship values that focus on nation-building.

A disturbing feature of this study has been the confirmation that Solomon Islands does not appear to have any substantive policy for education in citizenship. Here, certainly, must be seen the reason for people’s perception that CE is not important. From his research on political stability in SI, Alasia (2013) found that the country cannot move forward unless it puts in place
compulsory civic/citizenship programmes. That can only happen if the government either establishes a division in the Ministry of Home Affairs that specifically deals with citizenship activities or puts it in the formal school curriculum. Those suggestions cannot occur in a vacuum; rather, Alasia (2013) suggests that a policy has to be regulated to guide the development of activities for all people in SI. Again, in this study, a senior government officer felt that already activities exist that can be utilised to provide active participation among citizens, but they are not regulated into something like a policy. Therefore, this indicates that citizenship education is unlikely to serve its purpose unless it is specifically regulated into a policy document.

6.10 Summary
In summary, the analysis and discussion presented in this chapter show that CE translates into a variety of perspectives. This is due to the fact that issues affecting specific nation-states vary across the globe. Citizenship can only be conceptualised meaningfully within the context of each specific nation-state. This also indicates that values, pedagogies, and needs in terms of policy formulation are likely to be different from country to country. Importantly, the study has thrown light on what it means to be a good citizen in Solomon Islands. The overarching generalisation can be stated as the demonstration of and respect for values from modern law and rules, culture and custom, and Christian values and virtues. These can be summarised as rights and freedom, responsibility and duties, national identity, respect, equality, participation, voluntarism, relationship, caring and sharing, love, kindness, generosity, loyalty, commitment, humility, sharing, cooperation, fulfilment of mutual obligation, honesty, integrity, trustworthiness, truthfulness, hospitality, peace, and adaptability.

A second, potentially more indicative (certainly more barbed) finding is that Solomon Islanders, almost four decades after independence, still align the term citizenship with indigenous birthright, in turn based on ownership of land and resources, and with cultural and Christian values. This differs from conceptualisations elsewhere, grounded on democratic status, identity, and social cohesion. CE therefore, according to SI people’s view, is the training of young people in the values of culture, Christianity, and modern laws. Likewise, consideration is given to the appropriateness of a number of approaches to teaching CE in SI; effective pedagogical approaches and strategies in teaching and learning CE; and the significance of policy formulation on the part of the government to make provision for a stakeholder-wide approach to CE in SI.
The final chapter, chapter seven, concludes the study with implications, recommendations and a proposal for a new CE framework for SI.
CHAPTER SEVEN
IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction
This thesis has explored citizenship education (CE) values in the context of Solomon Islands (SI). The specific purpose of the study is to identify values that are contextually relevant to SI, particularly, values that stakeholders or respondents envisage as contributing to the effective transformation of people’s behaviour, attitudes, and characters. To do this, the study examines the current values, knowledge, skills, teaching approaches, and strategies that are used in teaching for good citizenship in formal school programmes. The values and pedagogies that are identified have the potential to add value to any CE programmes initiated for SI.

The previous chapter discussed the findings that emerge from the analysis of the data gathered from interviews, group discussions and survey questionnaires. This final chapter includes the following: section 7.2 provides an overview of the key findings based on the study; section 7.3 summarises the implications of values that are relevant and contextual to SI to enhance good citizenship; section 7.4 sketches implications for further research; section 7.5 makes recommendations on the basis of the study; section 7.6 describes a new Citizenship Education framework initiative for Solomon Islands and other Melanesian countries (Wantok-Centric Citizenship Education Framework); and 7.7 summarises the chapter and the thesis with a final remark.

7.1.1 Study research question
The research questions that the study was designed to address are re-presented thus:

1. What do Solomon Islanders conceptualise as good citizenship?
   i. What, according to Solomon Islanders, are the knowledge and values of a good citizen?
   ii. How do Solomon Islanders acquire those values of good citizenship?

2. To what extent is the current Junior Secondary School curriculum on CE culturally and religiously inclusive of the SI context in terms of good citizenship?
   i. How does the national Junior Secondary School curriculum teach the knowledge and values of good citizenship?
ii. To what extent does the curriculum help to develop students’ behaviour to be more responsible for each other among the general diversity?

iii. What curricular activities are there that develop the knowledge, values, skills, and actions for good citizenship?

The purpose and objectives of this study were to gain insight into the understanding of values and teaching approaches that are relevant to and reflective of SI society; particularly, to elicit values that are perceived to promote good citizenship among the general population of Solomon Islanders. Secondly, the study examines the indigenous knowledge, values, and other traditional forms of good citizenship that may contribute towards building a better SI. Thirdly, the study looks to uncover ways in which the secondary curriculum of SI promotes values at the formal secondary school level. It provides, fourthly, information on the extent to which values for good citizenship are demonstrated and practised in SI societies. In the fifth place, it provides evidence on how CE in SI is improved. The accumulated evidence, sixthly, is expected to inform new perspectives and direction for SI, particularly future policy direction and education for good citizenship policy frameworks and curriculum development.

7.2 Key findings
The study findings derive from perceptions across the gamut of education stakeholders – students, teachers, government officers, and rural villagers – on values considered significant to SI and the pedagogies that could stimulate effective learning on the part of the students.

7.2.1 Conceptualisations of citizenship and citizenship education (CE)
The study findings have provided varying conceptualisations of citizenship and CE from the respondents. Most of them appear to have little understanding of the terms citizenship and CE, presumably because the terms have not been introduced to them in the formal school programmes, and do not appear in the prescribed text books and curriculum materials used at secondary school.

Citizenship
The study findings illustrate that there is no equivalent term in the languages of people of SI to describe citizenship. The term can only be related to individual membership of the family, tribe, and community. Membership that is authenticated is premised on birth and indigenous tribal
associations. The recognition through birth bestows the sense of belonging and identity, and emanates from the status of ownership of indigenous land, custom, membership of an indigenous tribe, and understanding of individuals’ tribal genealogy. Such recognition also holds entitlement in individual affiliation with the country by birth and is expressed through ownership of traditional and cultural properties, including land, historical sites and natural resources.

Further, citizenship seems to be interpreted according to demonstration of values. A person can only be a citizen if he/she demonstrates values that reflect people’s culture and Christian beliefs. The values of culture include indigenous language, virtues such as respect, care, hospitality, hard work, sharing of food, labour, resources, and security. The Christian values that are associated with citizenship include observing church rules, and virtues such as love, kindness, humility, gentleness, goodness, peace, and humbleness. Any values outside of these categories are unacceptable to the people of SI.

Citizenship is also understood as having recognition through the rule of law. Individuals have the rights, freedoms, and responsibilities to be citizens of SI based on meeting the criteria set under the Acts governing eligibility to obtain citizenship and, in turn, become full members of the society. However, the study also finds that people who have similar rights as other citizens are denied free movement in society because more than 80 per cent of the land is held by indigenous people who strictly restrict entry into indigenous land. The notions of equal rights and freedom as practised in democratic societies, and promoted in CE programmes, still have little impact on people in SI. The study suggest that violence in SI is perceived to be caused by inequalities as resulting from modern rules and lifestyle. Therefore, freedom and rights do not make any sense to indigenous people of the Solomon Islands unless interpreted with cultural and Christian values.

**Citizenship Education**

The study relate CE to the teaching of values for molding good citizens. CE teaches about modern democratic ideals, governing systems, structures, and values from modern institutions like the constitution. The study show that CE is equated with the teaching of modern rules, government, and governance that is translated practice by modern democratic institutions. The participants view CE on modern values and rules as important for SI because it appears that people of SI have the habit of manipulating the system and laws at the expense of the silent
majority. It appears that over 80 per cent of the people who live in the rural areas fail to recognise and appreciate modern laws because they are not promoted and translated meaningfully to them. Therefore, the majority of the population do not accept modern laws not because they do not like them but because they are ignorant about them. This indicates that people who gain access to information on democratic values do not have the opportunity to practise them because they have no knowledge about it.

The study show that people favour a CE programme that promotes values from people’s culture and religion (Christianity). Some of these important values appear to be eroding from society. This includes active participation in the affairs of the community (supporting in community works, church works, school, contributing to marriage ceremonies and funerals, supporting elders with food and clothes and money). It appears that most of the values practised nowadays reflect individualism, a concept that is transcended from the values of democracy. The findings indicate the need to go back to communalism as the basis for a good and sustainable society. As mentioned by study participants, there was no hungry person in SI twenty years ago because people looked after each other. Now, some people are begging for food and money in the streets of urban centres. This clearly illustrates people’s failure to care for one another because of the change to a focus on individualism as well as the pressures of the case economy impinging on subsistence lifestyle. Unfortunately, the desired values from the cultures that promote sharing, caring, hospitality, relational bonds with people and the government – values that held society together – are fast eroding.

The study also point to the need to promote Christian values in CE. The Christian religious study currently adopted in the school system appears to be ineffective in adequately transforming children into good citizens. The current Christian religious teaching is theoretical in nature and only learned for examination purposes. Participants of the study confirmed that any teaching of values of good citizenship for SI has to be practical and experiential in nature. It has to include values and skills that people appreciate and hold dear to them, which can bring forth unity among the diverse populace.

7.2.2 Conceptualisations of good citizenship
The study acknowledges good behaviour more than modern knowledge, academic qualifications, wealth, or social status. In SI, people who uphold the values of culture, custom, and Christianity
are regarded as good citizens. Such people are conscious about their values of culture and church and people who follow the custom. Based on the study’s findings, it can be said that good citizenship also means obeying the modern rules, following codes of conduct from modern institutions that govern society, and observing national policy guidelines. It is those who apply the value of good governance, avoid corruption, recognise the needs of society, and contribute to the common good. Good citizens are regarded as those who actively contribute to various activities of society such as organised sports activities, cultural activities, and church ceremonies, and fulfil the obligations that one is expected to accomplish culturally.

In terms of indigenous conceptualisation, good citizens are those who relate well with their ethnic group, or tribe, show respect to people in the community, and share food with everyone in the community. They are people who continuously exert personal and community rights and freedoms through sharing of resources, help in times of need, participate in activities that are organised by churches and communities without fear because of their relationship with people in the community. They are people that take responsibility for their immediate family, extended family, and others in the community. They are people who practise the value of sharing and offering support to people who are in need in the society and offer advice on cultural and church norms and values of society. They are people of integrity and honesty, who observe and practise shared cultural and Christian values and relationships among people of a community as the concrete translations of values of good citizenship. According to indigenous conceptualisations, observance of the practices pertaining to obligatory support for people in the community through providing help for others without expecting to be compensated in return is the nature of a good citizen.

The study referred to a good person as someone who lives up to rules of society, custom of the place and the values that are important to people’s culture. He/she says and lives what he/she believes, works hard to improve society, and participates in activities that positively affect others in the community. A good citizen is a Christian who lives a lifestyle that is based on Christian values and principles. He/she is a person who serves people and the state with integrity based on Christian values. A good citizen is someone who respects the modern rule of law and practises democratic ideals through observing and upholding service to the government. He is also someone who respects and appreciates values of indigenous culture through creating, facilitating
and predestining peace with everyone in the community. Therefore, good citizenship values are generally derived from cultural values, Christian values and modern law and institutions in SI.

7.2.3 Values for good citizenship
The study provide strong evidence of what is viewed as values for good citizens. Much of what has been highlighted by participants includes values from the culture, Christianity, and modern institutions. People have been equally influenced from the three domains and, therefore, have similar respect for all of the three domains. The study point to the need to promote values that build strong relationships among the diverse groups of people in SI, as well as the need to build relationships with the government. This is believed to be very important for SI because it is a fractured society. It is felt that when the goal of building relationships is prioritised, it is likely to bring to the fore values like unity, love, hard work, responsibility, sharing, and care as well as active participation and involvement.

The study also bring to the forefront the need to integrate the values from the culture, the church, and modern institutions, because they are inter-related and affect people in different ways. For example, the value of respect is a global value that is expected to be practised in all institutions. When respect is promoted and practised, it is likely to create unity and stability in society. Further, it was argued from the finding that any value to be promoted in society cannot be observed at the expense of unity and stability of people in society that was transcended from the practice of culture and Christianity. Therefore, the ability to care for others and the environment, sharing of wealth and resources to limit hunger and food insecurity, and the ability to help those who are disabled in society are important values across all domains. The study findings also highlight the need to promote cultural and Christian values because government services in developing countries like SI do not cater for disabled people, the weak, and the elderly. It is the family unit and communities that retain this responsibility, as part of their tribal membership and also kinship obligation.

The study also point out that active participation of citizens has to be promoted. This activeness not only relates to participation in national elections and other political activities, but it has to include community works that focus on sharing of labour, food, wealth, and other resources to help those who cannot help themselves. These are important values that are expected to eliminate what modern institutions label as poverty, food insecurity, instability, and democratic deficits.
This study found the fundamental values in SI need to include peace building, mutual relationship and friendship, respect for other people’s cultures and religions, and mutual respect between the people and the government and public institutions.

The values that connect people for a common purpose should be promoted. This includes building communities with Christian values in order for people to have common purposes, goals, and aims to achieve together. The values that are highlighted in the study findings include love, humility, patience, respect, gentleness, goodness, quietness and hospitality as crucial to SI nation-building. The study also notes working hard to earn a living as an important value, earning money or assisting the immediate family and other extended family members to have an increase in food supply, surplus of clothing to give away for the needy, in particular, the elderly and disabled. The respondents claimed that a nation that has citizens who do not value others through respect for human dignity will always experience instability and chaos. Instability and chaos in the past decade has been attributed to the lack of practising of these values in SI society.

Further, the study highlight the need to promote values that culminate in a sense of belonging, national identity, and social cohesion. People who live together in urban societies have limited relational consciousness or bonds to unite them as a group. They see themselves as different from each other and do not feel the same obligations as in a rural, tribal context, therefore, it becomes very difficult to control their behaviour. In this regard, it is very important to promote values like respect, tolerance, equality, rights and freedoms, responsibility, and active participation. Importantly, those values have to be explained in connection with culture, Christianity and modern institutions which have influences on people’s lives on a daily basis.

Lastly, the study show the need to work with people at all levels and in all situations just as the churches do. It must be a daily practice to change lives, therefore, it has to be promoted at all levels of society. Promoting programmes about peace, respect, unity and pride in the country in the media may only be accessed by a few. The teacher participants claim that people attend training programmes only to eat food that is provided and collect allowances for attendance. Furthermore, according to the study, some of the peace programmes initiated for SI are ineffective and contextually irrelevant to people’s ways of resolving conflicts. People consider cultural and church approaches as more effective for Solomon Islanders, and note that during the
civil conflict when the law and other modern institutions were unable to control the social environment to bring about peace, it was only cultural and Christian institutions that provided peace among people.

7.2.4 Citizenship values in the formal curriculum
The study highlight that citizenship values are included in the school curriculum: themes and topics are provided in the Science syllabus on how to look after the environment, types of food for a healthy diet in the Home Economics syllabus, relationship between family and community, the importance of leadership, and the role of government and the political system are covered in the Social Studies curriculum. However, this study indicates that this has little impact on people’s behaviour, because of how these subjects are delivered by teachers. Little attention is given in class to values for good citizenship. A number of reasons are given for this. Teachers feel that the values and behaviour are important, but should be taught by parents, church leaders, and community elders. Furthermore, teachers do not want to be involved in the teaching of such values, but have high expectations of students to demonstrate good behaviour at school.

The teachers also blame timing constraints as an obstacle to teaching values. Values are not properly covered and practised at all in schools because they are not prioritised in government policies. Teachers claim that students are not assessed on values so values are not important: the goals and objectives of lessons are for passing exams only and not about values learning and teaching. In some instances, values do not exist at all in the curriculum; however, the teachers claim that they are taught indirectly, when it is required or when the need arises for advice.

7.2.5 Effective pedagogies for teaching in SI
The study highlight that the curriculum does contain content, methods and strategies that stimulate effective teaching and learning of important values, knowledge, skills and other useful information, but these have not been fully utilised by teachers, who for their part, largely place the blame on pressure from stakeholders’ expectations of high examination pass rates. Furthermore, teachers feel that values teaching is skimped because their not being specifically prescribed in the curriculum is taken to mean they are fairly insignificant. Small wonder, then, that teachers focus more on examination subjects, and have little regard to the building of students’ character because its absence from their job descriptions clearly signals the perceived unimportance of that responsibility. Students, on the other hand, feel that they do learn good
values and must take the blame themselves for not behaving as expected. They also feel, though, that the values that are important for society are learned from New Testament Studies (Christian religion): the knowledge and values taught and learned in school are restricted to those needed for examination purposes.

The study also suggest the teaching based on active involvement and hands-on activities as important. Such teaching requires teacher demonstration, planning for excursions, and dramatisation. However, this would require more time and effort on the part of teachers, who already feel that the time allocation for lessons, far from allowing for more hands-on activities, pushes teachers to resort to whole class teaching and student note taking as the only approach. Teachers also point to the need for more teacher training on approaches and strategies to use for learning and teaching of values. They claim that because they have no training in teaching values for good citizenship, they just forget about it. Teachers also acknowledge that some of the good behaviour students demonstrate at school is the product of their upbringing from the home environment. This indicates that the approaches and strategies used at home to teach important values are at least as effective as those used in modern classroom teaching.

Further, citizenship values are claimed to be very important and hence, need to be slotted somewhere in the school programme; for instance, as extra-curricular activities so that students have the opportunity to learn about the values at school. In this way, students can involve themselves in activities that help them to improve their behaviour and social relationships. In addition, there is evidence that teacher behaviour and practices do not always measure up to the standard of a good citizenship, although they see themselves as good citizens. The findings here show that in terms of CE teachers do not necessarily do what they say but do only what is prescribed in the syllabus. Equally, they have been known – Watch my lips, please! – to say one thing and do another.

7.3 Limitations
The study, like any other studies in indigenous Pacific Island societies, and perhaps like any other studies, has limitations. This study was limited in the following ways. First, citizenship values is a new area of explicit teaching and learning to the SI education system, so the responses from education stakeholders, particularly younger children and rural elders, can be superficial
because they are new to the term citizenship and its values. The study should have included as respondents senior secondary students who might have some familiarity with the terminology. In such circumstances, the researcher had to spend a lot of time explaining and relating the term to Form One students’ existing knowledge to enable recognition of commonalities and differences on the part of respondent students and rural elders.

The second limitation concerns the representation of the entire nation in the study. In that this study involved only two schools in one rural setting, it might not be truly representative of all rural schools, which comprise more than 80 per cent of the total secondary schools in the SI; and two schools in one urban centre. A selection of two different rural settings and two different urban settings would have been preferable but unfortunately, it was beyond the scope of the project to include such variety because of distances and the ocean separating the sites. The costs and time were other major constraining factors in this limitation as sites are accessible only by boat and plane, and it is anyway part of the PhD project exercise to match topic and scope to limitation of time and cost available.

The third limitation includes the threat of tropical sicknesses such as malaria, which did in fact inconvenience the researcher during the fieldwork. Malaria attacks disrupted and distorted the systematic flow of the research process for some time during the fieldwork period. Further, research was also distorted by family and community obligation such as deaths and weddings, which negated the participation of respondents, thereby distracting students and teachers from participating. Lastly, in societies like SI where people’s perspective on education is primarily on its means value for academic achievement and formal employment, the responses of participants to what is not for academic gain can often be superficial. This is particularly true in a study like this which focuses on community values in a community that people refer to as backward, uncivilized, or something trapped in the village and not relevant to schooling. However, the research has transcended these limitations and successfully acquired data that inform the study.

7.4 Implications for relevant, contextual CE programmes for SI
Despite these acknowledged limitations, the findings of the study are replete with implications that policy makers, community leaders, principals, and teachers in the SI secondary school system need to keep in mind and do something about. These are discussed below.
7.4.1 The implications of citizenship and citizenship education

The term citizenship is not well understood by people of SI because local languages and dialects have no equivalent words. The term emerged to prominence during the ethnic tensions and their aftermath, when rights of people were undermined, particularly from usage by external persons who came into the country to settle the ethnic tension. Indigenous people of SI interpret citizenship as “people of place”, which refers only to those who are indigenous to the place and recognised by those around as rightful owners of land and who have connections to indigenous tribes. This narrower-than-national interpretation has caused people not to recognise and accept other values, particularly the democratic values promoted by modern institutions. Citizenship based on rights and responsibilities of individuals under the rule of law is not particularly understood. Therefore, avenues that recognise values that focus not only on culture and Christian values, but include modern democratic values as well, are needed for SI. People do not accept each other because they are ignorant about the rule of law. They only relate to and appreciate people with the values of culture and religion (Christianity). People fail to understand what it means to be a citizen under democratic rules and have failed to understand the value of the Constitution that provides and protects the right for all citizens by birth to be called citizens of SI. Further, there is a misunderstanding of the values of modern institutions in relation to culture and Christianity. People think that their culture and Christian values override the Constitution, hence their readiness to take the law into their own hands. The need is great for information about the values of a wider reading of citizenship to take centre stage in the lives of all citizens in SI.

In terms of CE, the teaching of democratic values on rights and responsibilities, freedom and equality, tolerance, national identity and sense of belonging is not featured in formal programmes in the SI education system. CE does not exist in the formal curriculum and has not been promoted in formal institutions to educate people about the Constitution, their rights as citizens, and their responsibilities to the state and to one another. Because of this, people fail to relate well with others and the state; which has caused disagreements that later turn into violence. It is important, then, for SI to develop programmes that teach people the values in the Constitution of SI.
Further, related to this lack of understanding about their rights as citizens under the Constitution, a sense of belonging to a nation-state is weak in SI. People do not identify themselves with the nation, but in terms of their indigenous birthright. They only identify with their own family, kin group, clan, tribe, and at the widest, their ethnic group. Their understanding of equality is subject to the measurement of rights through indigenous ownership and the equality promoted by Christian doctrines. This reveals how much the teaching of citizenship values is needed in SI societies, the need for the formal curriculum of SI to include the values, and at the same time a stand-alone programme that focuses specifically on nation-wide citizenship values.

7.4.2 Implications of good citizenship
The goals of education in all countries are to develop people to become good citizens. In SI, however, there is no programme to cater for values of culture and Christianity that focus on building relationship through caring for one another based on the fundamentals of sharing of food, clothing, material goods, wealth, labour, and security. Thus, the values that are perceived to develop good citizens for SI are not included in the formal school curriculum or extra-curriculum programmes. Such programmes are seen to be particularly necessary in an environment where such practices as family and communal support for marriages, death in the family, participation in community work, and offering labour for free to help others who cannot help themselves, are now fast eroding.

In addition, people’s perceptions of what makes a person a good citizen do not align with or recognise and value qualities that are promoted by other modern dominant cultures. For this reason, people do not favour government activities and programmes promoting values of rights, freedom, tolerance, national identity, and sense of belonging. Given this, it is important for the Government of SI to promote understanding of rights and freedoms based on the rule of law (for example; the right and freedom to vote, to participate in political activities, to challenge authorities), equality and tolerance (equality under the law, acceptance of differences) and national identity (recognise all according to the law) in order for people to understand their privileges under the Constitution.

7.4.3 Implication of citizenship values in the formal secondary school curriculum
As mentioned earlier, elements of citizenship are found in all subjects in the national Junior Secondary School curriculum of SI. Social Studies has themes relating to relationships with
people in the country and outside of the country, the study of environment, good governance, leadership and political systems and structures; Home Economics has themes on food and nutrition, home management, clothing and textiles, and family studies; Science has themes of life and living, natural process materials, energy, and change and the earth and beyond (Solomon Islands Secondary curriculum, 1989). However, teachers do not actually focus on teaching of values that target the development of children’s behaviour and character. The teaching of those themes and the values embedded in them is not to transform students’ behaviour, but for examination purposes only.

There is a challenge in stakeholders’ perceptions of the outcome of education. Most people in SI measure effectiveness of teaching and learning with a high student pass rate. Teachers, though, need to change their approach to teaching to cater for values and not just for students to pass external examinations. Such a mindset is causing teachers to spend all of their time coaching students for examinations. It is now becoming very challenging to add values in classroom learning and teaching because people have been indoctrinated with the significance of going to study at universities and then having a white collar job. Clearly, the now is for SI to rethink the content and pedagogies in the school curriculum to cater for character building in the formal education system.

7.4.4 Implication of values significant to SI
The values that are important to people of SI are not prioritised in students’ learning in the modern education system; they have, therefore, very little impact on students. The way teaching is done is generally influenced by teachers’ perspectives on the priority outcome of education, particularly, the pressure from the government and the parents for students to achieve higher education and move into white collar jobs. This priority is reflected in policies pertaining to internal and external examinations, which place examinations as an important component for children’s learning while teaching of values takes second place. This supports the claim that mainstream education is only for acquiring higher qualification and attaining formal employment (Kennelly, 2006). It may be argued that such a perspective is discriminatory because only a few manage to get formal employment in the SI. The few then become the only ones who are clearly distinguished as good citizens of the country because they are regarded as desirable by the government. The rest who fail to meet the expectations of the standardised system go back to the rural villages and continue with a traditional and religious (Christian) lifestyle, which people in
SI stereotype as backward and primitive. Unfortunately, the values that people anticipated for a good life from the modern education they acquire has turned out otherwise, so that the need is for the government to focus on an education that prepares people for a more satisfying life, with values that make young Solomon Islanders more human, informed and well adjusted, and that will require the inclusion of citizenship values.

In SI, school children are marginalised through the assessment system based on examinations and having higher education qualifications. Such measurements of success in education have created rivalries between the government and among members of the elite who are recognised in the mainstream, particularly the urban centres, as good and active citizens. Such entrenchment of the few elite in the urban centres has caused young people to be confrontational and violent against public properties and the elite. In this regard, when the school system fails to acknowledge the cultural and Christian values that have provided stability, peaceful co-existence, and security of people from generation to generation, the stability and co-existence of society is affected. People do not respect modern institutional values because they are viewed as discriminatory and divisive of society.

The values that are desirable for SI society but are missing from the education system include: teaching for good citizenship to acquire love, peace, stability, calmness, patience, humility, gentleness, sharing, faith, and comfort, qualities that are promoted by culture and Christianity. The other values that are important in modern institutions, culture, and Christianity but have not been promoted in the school system are: respect, help, support, truth and care. Further, activities like singing the national anthem, flag raising, voluntary service, and interschool tournaments, which are now excluded from the school programmes, need to be included again. These activities focus on the values of sense of belonging or national identity and social cohesion. The education system has left out those very important values that hold modern society together, and thus, has created a gap of inequality, hatred, disrespect, weakness, suspicion, doubt, unemployment, greed and even belittlement. In an environment where these negative things have occurred, schools need to implement such programmes. Additionally, for a modern society to be stable, it needs to promote those values; and for SI it is essential for them to be integrated with cultural and Christian values.
7.4.5 Implications for pedagogies required for Solomon Island CE programmes

The pedagogies that are normally used for teaching citizenship values now have little impact in teaching of values, because of the exam-oriented system. The Social Studies subject, which traditionally contained much material on citizenship values, is the only subject that is supposed to deliver values but has not done so because values are taught for examination purposes only. Additionally, the cross-curricular approach is seen as expensive, and teaching CE as a segregated subject may not work because of the overloaded curriculum. Furthermore, the teaching approaches and strategies have distorted the teaching of values for good citizenship. The most commonly used approach is still the ‘traditional’ “teacher talk and students listen and take notes” approach. This approach limits the use of practical teaching strategies such as field trips or excursions, research projects and presentation and demonstrations, therefore, cannot contribute to achieving the high examination pass rate that appears to be rated more important to people and the government.

However, for a number of reasons, this approach is likely to continue to dominate classroom teaching. One main reason is undoubtedly that passing examinations, going to university, and securing a white collar job is still the priority for the people of SI. In addition, teachers are very mindful of time allocations for each lesson and the amount of work needed to transfer important knowledge, values and skills. Further, teachers claim that they teach over-large classes in space too limited to deliver lessons using other approaches apart from teacher-centred approaches. Lastly, according to the study findings, teachers fail to teach values effectively because there is no financial support to purchase resources that would assist them with this. In short, values are not adequately and effectively covered in the school programmes. Given all of this, it appears that the best possible avenues for CE are the extra-curricular and whole school approaches. These may be possible because they are hands-on approaches that do not require examinations, extra resources, and timetabling in the academic subjects.

7.4.6 Implications for citizenship education policy

The CE values, skills, and pedagogies are not really important to classroom teaching and learning and outside of classroom activities because they are not prioritised for students learning in the formal education system. The challenge is that CE does not have any policy to legitimate and consolidate its features within the education institutions and formal environments of SI. Realistically, although activities pertaining to citizenship may be timetabled in school
programmes, the activities are never planned and set on the ground as class lessons for students learning at school. The reason for the lack of planning for the teaching of values is teachers’ assessment of them as a waste of time and effort since they only rob the time for and interrupt their preparation of students for examinations. Hence, the education system of SI has failed to focus on activities that generate unity, peaceful coexistence, respect, active participation in sport, culture and church programmes, communal sharing, and demonstrated love.

This has been found as the source of challenges in SI. Students who leave formal education fail to show respect to others because they are not included in the learning and teaching in the formal system. Further, important laws that govern society are meaningless to people because they are not teaching themes in the formal education system and they are not going to learn this at home because these laws are not well understood in the communities. Unfortunately, when people are uneducated about the laws or Constitution of the country, then they violate them unwittingly. When they break the law, which they are unfamiliar with, they are then charged, punished, and labelled as criminals.

The evidence is that, at home and in the communities, students learn certain values and behaviour based on indigenous cultures and Christianity that are relevant to their home environments, so they know how to behave at home – and (maybe) they also demonstrate some of these behaviours at school. However, in other contexts (at school perhaps, and after leaving school) they also need to be familiar with other modern democratic values, and in fact, some of the values learned at home may conflict with what is required away from the home environment (recognizing and looking after only kin etc). Therefore these values (cultural, religious, and ‘modern’) need to be taught and reinforced at school in order to prepare students as good citizens of SI (beyond being good citizens of their home communities).

The lack of knowledge on important values in schools appears to have caused the people to be ignorant of their roles and responsibilities to others and the state. Such ignorance has led to continued violence, discrimination, disunity, low levels of participation in government or public activities, and disregard for public property. Therefore, CE programmes need to be delivered at the formal school level to address such ignorance. In addition, values that should be emphasised at school are not covered at the school level because they are not introduced by teachers. The
matters need to be addressed at the government level as well because that is where it will be
legislated. Students and teachers are more comfortable with passive and rote learning than active
participation because these are not time consuming and are more easily accomplished; that does
not mean they are better.

Lastly, much of what has been stated needs further policy formulation and endorsement to
strengthen CE functions. CE policy should cover teachers’ roles, student activities, parents’
roles, and responsibilities of the school community as a whole. In addition, institution of policies
on teachers’ conduct to guide their behaviour and attitudes is needed. Much of the failure in
terms of behaviour on the part of students may be traced to their copying the behaviour of
teachers. Teachers are regarded as role models, therefore, teachers must provide a conducive
environment and an image that positively supports and influences students’ learning. While
teachers role modelling is significant, it is also significant to consider teachers’ welfare,
especially the conditions of service and how well they are looked after.

7.4.7 Implications for further research
This study focuses only on values and pedagogies that are contextually relevant for SI. Much
research is needed to cover other aspects that are important in CE for SI. The following gaps in
our thinking and rationales for CE have been identified from the study:

i. The first gap is in the area of the assessment of citizenship values. The findings show an
emphatic perception that the Q and A written examination of values has weakened the
way values are learned and taught at the formal school level. It is important that future
research in SI on citizenship focuses on how values of citizenship can be assessed
effectively. A focus on effects on behaviour may be more necessary than a test of
‘knowledge about’; citizenship is ‘being’, not ‘knowing about’.

ii. Second, it is necessary for future research to focus in the pedagogical part of teaching
citizenship values. This study touches briefly on the basics of approaches and strategies,
but the substances of that whole area needs exploration. For example, the cross-
curricular, segregated, whole school and Social Studies approaches are useful in
citizenship education programmes in developed and developing countries that have the
capacity to use them. However, for countries like SI, which is more exam-oriented and
labelled as underdeveloped, with the highest birth rate in the region, what would be the most effective approach? In terms of teaching strategies (demonstration, excursion, research surveys, teacher talk–students listen and take notes), should teachers use all of those as required in the curriculum, or continue to resort to the easier and cheapest, but not necessarily the most effective, teaching strategy, which is the teacher-centred approach? Such questions beg for further research.

iii. The third area that needs exploration is the Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) that is currently being introduced in the SI education and curriculum system. It is important to find the teaching methods, approaches, and strategies that are effective in teaching citizenship values and that also align with the methods and approaches recommended for OBE in SI. The study findings suggest that the OBE curriculum requires approaches that are both knowledge-based and values-based. Rather than assuming that what works in another country with teaching and learning in OBE fits with the SI context, systematic research to inform practice is necessary.

7.5 Recommendations
The study’s key findings have identified CE values and pedagogies that are contextually relevant to the SI. Based on the findings of the study, the following are the recommendations.

7.5.1 Citizenship Education for good citizenship
In light of this study’s findings about conceptualisations of CE for good citizenship, the following recommendations are made:

i. First, the sense in which the term citizenship is being used has to be indicated explicitly in the documents adopted at the school level such as the subject syllabuses, education strategic plans, curriculum statements, and the national curriculum statements. The failure to specify the definition of the term as it is currently being used in these documents has created confusion, for the prevailing narrow conceptualisation of the term refers only to the legal status of being a citizen of the nation. The values, skills, and knowledge required for the civic quality labelled good citizenship are not used and promoted in the school systems. Failure to conceptualise the term broadly to encompass values and skills, has caused confusion and misinterpretation.
ii. For good citizenship, the findings highlight that it is essential to integrate values of culture (kinship and communalism), Christianity (love and respect) and the formal institutions (rights and responsibilities) as themes of CE in SI. The values recommended include cultural values that establish peaceful co-existence among people, which encompass sharing, caring, helping or supporting each other, and respecting authority. The Christian values include love, holiness, patience, kindness, faithfulness, and honesty. Values from formal institutions comprise democratic rights and responsibilities, human rights, respect, equality, national identity, and social cohesion.

iii. Education for good citizenship will require the re-orientation of educational goals towards holistic development of individuals. In other words, the goals of education must include the teaching of values, character building, and ethics, as well as knowledge and skills. The goals have to reflect what indigenous people and the rest of the country perceive as a good citizen and their reflection of a good society.

7.5.2 Active and participatory citizenship education

In light of the study findings, active participation can be seen as a significant mode for SI. The following recommendations reflect this observation.

i. Active citizenship is a prime necessity and the promotion of active involvement must be made apparent in all sectors of the education system and the whole of society in general in SI. It is important to ensure that all institutions in SI promote active participation and organisation of activities in all institutions, to counter the challenges of stagnancy and the feelings of isolation commonly found among people. As the traumas of the past decade subside, people’s mindset has to be changed towards a more active engagement, rather than waiting in the expectation that others will fix things for them.

ii. The study highlights the need to involve all people in the participatory processes of activities organised by local, provincial, and national institutions. National and local institutions must be encouraged to ensure that students, teachers, parents, education authorities, villagers, and churches involve people in the activities important to communities, so that they feel part of the process and take ownership of the effort and the
outcomes. Too often, people – ordinary people whose lives are affected – are left out of what is to be done because of the play of conflicts of interest among those in authority.

7.5.3 Values for CE in the SI
The study findings elicit many values that are relevant and contextual to people, the most important of which are recommended as follows.

i. This study recommends that the teaching and learning of modern institutional values be included in all levels of institutions in SI. The recommended values – drawn from democratic rights, human rights and responsibilities, values for national identity (such as are generated by activities like flag raising and singing the national anthem), and values of equality that reflect social cohesion – should be promoted in all institutions. This attention to the modern institutional values has to be the core of CE programmes in SI schools, because they have been promoted so little elsewhere in formal institutions, despite being central to the contemporary society emerging from the multiple kin and tribal identities in SI.

ii. As expected, the study highlight the importance of cultural values in people’s daily lives in SI. This makes unsurprising the strong recommendation that aspects of cultural values be strongly promoted in any citizenship education programme of SI. The values must comprise the local language used by indigenous people, traditional dances and stories, and the indigenous values of what are traditionally seen as important virtues. That includes babato’o’anga (stability), aroaro’anga (peace), and tuafiku’anga (living in unity).

iii. In terms of Christian values it was highlighted that values of Christianity that unite people of different races and ethnicity have to be promoted. People’s identification with church values has created peaceful coexistence among people of the Solomons for many decades and the unifying discourse that is mostly based on principles and values of love and relationship. Therefore, the continued inclusion of and strong emphasis on Christian values in the CE programmes of SI is a major recommendation. The recommended values include, love and relationship, peace and friendship, giving and sharing, service, care, respect, humility, honour, and hospitality.
7.5.4 Citizenship education pedagogies

In light of the study findings on CE pedagogies, this study recommends that SI adhere to the following.

i. It is recommended that the teaching of values for good citizenship must be included in all levels of formal secondary education in SI. Further, these values have to be promoted in the formal, informal, and non-formal education sectors of society. The idea is to capture the important values that are recommended for CE so that teaching them becomes available throughout all levels of society in all educational mediums. CE programmes have to be approached in a new and different way. The recommended approach is inclusive of the formal teacher-centred or student-centred approach with the non-formal family and kinship-centred approach in which education in citizenship values begins at home with parents, then extends to the family kinship group, clan and tribe, and finally to the wider society through formal education.

ii. The extra-curricular approach is recommended as the most suitable teaching and learning approach for CE in SI. Because much of what is prescribed in the formal curriculum is for examinations, to ensure that important values are promoted at the school level, it is vital that activities such as flag raising, singing of the national anthem, volunteerism, and education in cultural values and church values are carried out outside of the formal (examinable) school curriculum so that different assessment means can be used for it.

iii. The other approach that is favoured in the findings is the whole school approach. This study recommends that values for CE in SI should be emphasised and be taken care of by everybody in the community and society (parents, elders, schools, government). Confining the concepts and values of CE in the formal curriculum only may not actually work for SI because of people’s perceptions about the country’s examinations and the education system. In addition, because children perceive values for changing behaviours as something to be promoted at home and not only at school, involving all stakeholders in the CE programmes has a better chance of combining into an effective learning approach.

iv. In the teaching and learning of CE values, the teacher modelling strategy, the active teaching and learning strategies, and hands-on activity strategy are recommended for SI. Standards of behaviour must be instituted to evaluate the behaviour and performance of
teachers, who are major role models in the child’s school experience. The standards should be based on a behaviour policy framework that, if formulated, would govern teachers’ approach to their work. Next, the strategies in teaching have to be active and practical in nature. They include demonstration, dramatisation, excursions, research projects, guest teachers or speakers, family and community-oriented interactions for learning, and church-oriented activities.

7.5.5 Assessment approaches
For the assessments of CE values, knowledge, and skills, the following considerations are recommended.

i. At the school level, measurement and assessment of values taught and learned outside the classroom must be done against the standards required by society. It must focus on social indicators such as relationship with the government and neighbours, respect, national identity, individual rights and responsibilities, and social cohesion. The measurement of these values requires affective and psychomotor rather than cognitive indicators.

ii. Assessment of knowledge of CE may still require cognitive examinations. Therefore, it is recommended that the written examination is retained, but only for the assessment of the cognitive domain, which is based on knowledge acquisition.

iii. For adequate preparation of teachers, teacher training institutions must provide courses that focus on skills for teaching values of citizenship education, skills and competencies for assessments of values, and methods that provide effective translation of values for good citizenship.

7.5.6 Policy framework for citizenship education
In light of the findings, the following recommendation considers formulation at the national level of a policy for CE programmes.

i. A national policy is strongly recommended for civic/CE programmes in Solomon Islands. The policy will cater for the following:

(a) National Civic and/or CE programmes, including political and education awareness programmes
The policy is to ensure that CE is promoted at all levels and sectors of society. Furthermore, people of the country would be privileged to learn about democratic rights and responsibilities, national consciousness, and social cohesion, to help overcome the current challenging problem of people’s unawareness or ignorance.

(b) CE Curriculum Development

In the formal curriculum, national policy for citizenship would direct the curriculum development centre on values and pedagogies required for students’ learning. That would be mandatory for teachers, students, parents and the government to take on seriously.

(c) Teacher Education and Training programmes

Teacher education and training courses in teacher education programmes in colleges and universities. It will guide the design and development part of course materials as well as CE programmes.

(d) Legitimated Informal and Non-formal Institutions with Civic and/or CE programmes

The policy framework of CE covers training programmes for non-formal institutions like churches, communities, and families. The policy will be designed to strengthen the teaching of cultural, Christian, and modern institutional values in non-formal institutions like the family, clan, tribe, religious communities, and the wider society.

This study has provided relevant insights into citizenship education for the government, people, churches, teachers, and students to consider seriously in order for SI to move forward in its nation-building efforts. First, because of the nature of CE and the benefits that could accrue for nation-building, all relevant stakeholders must clearly and strongly support citizenship education. Next, the study acknowledges the importance of values of culture, Christianity, and modern rules, laws, and institutions as fundamental to SI identity and nationhood in the 21st century. Significantly, the model of CE that people in the study favour is an integrated or blended model of cultural values, Christian values, and modern values. This approach received overwhelming favour because it is relevant and contextually reflective of people’s ways of life. People’s perception that a good society is one composed of active, responsible people living by the values
of good citizenship has to be considered in the development of citizenship programmes for SI. In addition, the pedagogies recommended for CE in SI must be articulated in the policy documents for citizenship education, to create effective learning by strengthening the teaching and learning approaches. A citizenship education policy framework adopted for SI needs to have the recommended values and the pedagogies that will make the model work for SI society. The Wantok-Centric Citizenship framework presented below has been developed on the basis of the findings of this study as a proposal for such a model.

7.6 Wantok-centric citizenship education framework

From the findings, grounded on the data (ground theory), the study offers a new CE framework for SI, proposed as the Wantok-Centric Citizenship Education Framework. Further, a foundational base for a new Citizenship Education Model, the “Trinity Model”, is also offered for SI and other Melanesian countries. The framework and the model are integrative and are inclusive of the values of culture, Christianity, and contemporary democratic values.

Wantok is the word used in Melanesian countries to signify people who use variants the same language, Pijin in Solomon Islands, Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea, and Bislama in Vanuatu, as a lingua franca. The term derives from two English words: wan (one), and tok (talk). The label Melanesian was applied by interlopers (Europeans in the main), meaning black islands, some Melanesian people being the darkest skinned in the Pacific. Melanesian countries are very diverse and fragmented nation-states that are only unified through the symbolic representation of Pijin/Bislama language which was often used by Christian missionaries and European and Southeast Asian traders as a means of communication with the indigenous peoples. The pijin language, then, has become a representation of a new political community (Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu) who were brought together by colonialism. This is reflected in the use of postcolonial theory that underpins this study.

Wantokism is defined as the set of obligations between people who are related to each other by a common language, ethnicity, and/or district or provincial boundaries in SI and other Melanesian countries (Briggs, 2009). Melanesians believed this to be an important feature of Melanesian society, although outsiders of a different cultural persuasion usually perceive wantokism as a form of nepotism that endorses corruption and undermines political stability (Solomon Islands Peace and Reconciliation Report, 2013). However, “the wantok system plays an important social
support function in the absence of functioning state welfare systems. For example, when thousands of immigrant settlers were evicted from the island of Guadalcanal during the “ethnic tension”, the *wantok* system alleviated much of the hardship for the displaced families” (Solomon Islands Peace and Reconciliation Report, 2013, pp. 35–36).

The Wantok-Centric Citizenship Education Framework recognises the culture, religion, and modern institutions as complementary, none of which should be promoted at the expense of the others. All have to be simultaneously promoted, developed, institutionalised, taught, and learned. Further, because the only unifying symbol is the Pijin/Bislama language, this study considers using Pijin/Bislama as a frame to unify people, reflecting a common identity, Christian religion, and democratic institutions as unifying symbols. A language policy framework and curriculum development framework for CE in SI would further strengthen Pijin in schools.

### 7.6.1 Wantok-Centric Citizenship Education “Trinity Model”

The model that is developed on the basis of this study is labelled the “Trinity Model”. The term reflects the integrative merging of culture, Christianity, and democratic values; the equal influence of these three domains on people of SI; and their inseparability from each other, or the impossibility of using or adopting them at the expense of one another. Furthermore, the inclusive Trinity Model is like the Godhead in the Christian religion, whose three entities cannot be separated from each other, and it also reflects the spirit, soul, and body that cannot be separated from a human being as well. The model reflects the importance of teaching that targets, the spirit, soul and body of human beings, which is holistic in nature. The intersections and overlapping spaces of the three domains accommodate the values that can be used in any of the three domains. The overlapping spaces also represent values that are perceived to be important from the perspective of indigenous people in SI. These values, then, need to be promoted in the formal education systems of SI.
The exemplification of the Wantok-centric Frame Work and the Trinity Model holds that the Citizenship Education of SI has to incorporate all the domains that influence people’s daily decision making. The figure that follows shows how the values are organised under each of the three domains and how these may be translated into activities for learning and teaching in SI schools and family settings.
Table 7.1 Wantok-Centric Citizenship Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Democratic Domain description</th>
<th>Cultural Domain description</th>
<th>Christian Domain description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>Individual rights protected by law: right to talk, own, move, education.</td>
<td>Protected by indigenous culture: right to own land, be cared for by family, security, fill a leadership role, membership of clan, tribe.</td>
<td>Protection by common faith: right to membership of a Christian family denomination, love, food, care from members of church family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Of membership to political parties, vote</td>
<td>To till the land, plant fruit trees, to pick food from the garden, speak on important occasions.</td>
<td>To worship, give support to others, to share, give openly and freely chose ones own believes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>Participate in elections, vote, respect the government.</td>
<td>Care for elders, children, men &amp; women; share food, money, &amp; resources; help in community work</td>
<td>Show care, love, respect compassion for everyone; give freely; help those in need; help those in church communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wantok-Centric Framework sees mainstream pedagogies of formal class teacher–student teaching and learning approaches as ineffective for values learning in SI. Instead, the framework proposes a whole-school approach to teaching and learning of citizenship values in Melanesian societies, in particular SI. The whole-school approach comprises formal, informal, and non-formal education approaches and methods, as exemplified below (Tables 7.2 and 7.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal education</th>
<th>Non-formal education</th>
<th>In-formal education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher–students</td>
<td>Parents–child</td>
<td>Pastor or priest–congregation, children, youths, women groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elders, kin-group, clan–child(ren)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two fundamental elements that effectively drive CE are respect for and consciousness of people’s ways of acquiring important knowledge, values, and skills. If that is utilised, worthwhile learning can take place. This indicates that teaching and learning of citizenship values should not only occur within formal school compounds, but be delivered in non-formal settings such as homes, families, clans, tribes. CE must also use pedagogies that are respectfully aligned with delivery methods used in culture and church settings, as below.
Table 7.3 Wantok-Centric citizenship settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Formal Curriculum (modern education)</th>
<th>Non-formal (home education)</th>
<th>Non-formal (church education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Classroom setting - Standard size 25 – 35 students</td>
<td>Home setting Enclosed, secret, small &amp; intimate (1–5 people)</td>
<td>Church setting age unrestricted, unlimited number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.7 Conclusion

This study of citizenship education is the first of its kind in SI and sought to determine the following: (1) What do Solomon Islanders conceptualise as good citizenship, and (2) To what extent does the current Secondary School curriculum promote values for good citizenship in SI.

The findings indicate that the education system of SI has largely overlooked the importance of teaching democratic values at the formal school level, a necessary precondition for a modern democratic state. SI requires home-grown CE programmes – grounded in the context of SI – in the formal, informal, and non-formal institutions in the country. This study found it imperative to provide a new citizenship framework that is contextual and relevant to people. Over the last 30 years, SI has been changing rapidly, with increased migration to urban areas. The study confirms that a combination of lack of presence of cultural boundaries (kin, clan etc.) and lack of understanding of modern democratic values contributed to the unrest that was experienced from 1998 to 2003 and continuous violence SI has been experiencing ever since. For stability in a modern SI, traditional and religious values must be formally supplemented with those of a modern democracy.

The study highlights the need to include values of culture, Christianity, and modern institutions in the formal curriculum and all sectors of society. Importantly, the values have to be specifically linked with citizenship so that students know what citizenship is and why CE is important for them in the long term. All informal institutions like training or vocational centres, and non-formal institutions like churches, local communities, and family and kinship units and tribes should also promote citizenship values.

This study indicates the desperate need to prioritise research into CE values, pedagogies, and approaches that should sustain effective teaching and learning of CE at the formal school level. As part of this push, teacher training will have to include courses that focus on effective teaching approaches, strategies, and assessments of citizenship values. It is important for people in
authority to understand that skills and competencies for teaching values are different from those required for teaching skills and knowledge in other subjects. CE requires a stand-alone/separate policy to cater for formal national curriculum development and the national civic/citizenship development programmes that will resolve issues in the social and physical environments, and address economic, legal, civil, and political challenges that have affected SI societies for many years.
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Appendix A.
Information Sheet

Information Sheet and Request for Permission Letter.
(For the Ministry of Education and four case study schools)

Citizenship Education in a Small Island State: Exploring values for good citizenship in the Solomon Islands

My name is Billy Fitoo and I am a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Candidate of the School of Education, Faculty of Arts, Law and Education at USP, Suva, Fiji. I will be conducting research with some school stakeholders in the Solomon Islands. For this project, it is a student research study which tries to explore the perspective of education stakeholders (MOE staffs, students, teachers, Principals of case study schools) on the values of citizenship education in the junior secondary school curriculum of Solomon Islands.

Citizenship Education is new to Solomon Islands, despite the fact that, it is a widely explored global educational phenomenon. The knowledge and values of citizenship are widely practiced and highly acknowledged by recipient countries. Particularly, countries that have included and trialed the concept in their formal education system.

In the case of Solomon Islands, much is yet to be explored about the value and significance of citizenship education. Importantly, the relevant values and knowledge that might empower and transform the social environment through the formal education system. In essence, to gain understanding about the values, knowledge and skills of citizenship education, it is important to undertake research as such, to bring out varieties of perspectives that will help to construct citizenship education that is relevant and contextual for Solomon Islands.
This project is informed by the interpretative/constructivist paradigm and use qualitative procedures in research, whereby, focus group and one-on-one interviews are the methods for gathering data. The study will involve four case study schools and the Ministry of Education and resorts to purposeful sampling methods for participant sampling. Students and teacher participants will partake in the group discussions. The one-on-one interview will be used for the Principals and the Ministry of Education officers. The researcher will chair the proceedings in the discussions and interviews through systematically posing semi structured questions and respondents will be encouraged to response accordingly based on their personal conceptualization and interpretation. An MP3 recorder and laptop will be use to record the discussions and the interviews. The discussion and interview processes will last between 45 - 90 minutes, depending on the nature of the interview and discussion. The information collected from the discussions and interviews will be collated and arranged according to themes, which will then be verified and analyzed to generate data for the study.

This research project is done under the auspicious of the University of the South Pacific (USP), Suva, Fiji and an ethical approval has been obtained from the Human Ethics Committee, USP to collect data. For this study, in order to meet ethical standards, first, transcribed materials will be destroyed in due course, but properly stored until completed. Second, data gathered will be kept locked and electronic copies wiped out as soon as analysis is completed. Third, the final report when appeared as thesis, the names of participants and the organizations will not be identified. This is to meet the required understanding of ethical issues that need to be properly and carefully handled.

Participants will not be forced to participate in the study. Therefore, those who are selected are free to withdraw from the study without question should he/she feel to do so. However, participants are encouraged to participate as all information collected and transcribed will be kept confidential. It can only be access by the researcher and the supervisor, Dr. Govinda Lingam as, it is an academic paper whereby, the supervisor under his role has the prerogative to check the documents.

This study is deemed worthwhile for a number of reasons. First, the documentation of its findings will be pivotal for further policy, curriculum, teaching and research development for
Solomon Islands. Second, the thesis when completed will be shelved on the USP Library and a copy will shelved at the USP, Solomon Islands Centre for students and for future references.
I will come in person to the Ministry of Education/schools before the commencement of the interviews and if you have any question regarding the project, please feel free to ask me.
My supervisor, Associate Professor Govinda Lingam, can be contacted for further information, if necessary via email: govinda_i@usp.ac.fj

Thank you

Billy Fitoo
Student Researcher
Appendix B.
Request for permission

To Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Education Human Resource Development
P.O Box G 28
Honiara,
Solomon Islands

Dear Sir

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION

I am a Solomon Islander, studying at the University of the South Pacific, under the Solomon Islands Government Scholarship. I am conducting a research project on citizenship education in the Solomon Islands as the requirement for fulfilling the Doctor of Philosophy in Education Studies Programme.

This research project is done under the auspicious of the University of the South Pacific, Fiji and an ethical approval has been obtained from the Human Ethics Committee, USP to collect data. The project procedure involves group discussions and one-on-one interviews. Some of your senior staffs will assist in this study through one-on-one interview with the researcher.

The attached Information sheet provides further details of the project. However, if for some reasons that this research should not proceed, do let me know or else, I will give you a call as a follow up to this request and if permission is granted, I will proceed in making arrangements to meet with the respondents so that other formalities (signing of consent forms) can be arranged before the start of the field work proceedings.

My supervisor, Associate Professor Govinda Lingam, can be contacted for further information, if necessary. govinda_i@usp.ac.fj

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Billy Fitoo
Appendix, C.
Joint Agreements (CSS).

JOINT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CASE STUDY SCHOOL AND BILLY FITO'O

Citizenship Education in the Solomon Islands: Exploring values for good citizenship in the secondary school Curriculum of the Solomon Islands

I ________________________ Principal of _______________________ do make the following statements

I have approved on behalf of the School Board for Billy Fitoo to conduct research in _________________school from _______ to _________ February, 2014

That permission is given to Mr. Billy Fitoo to conduct research in the school through interviews with the principal and focus group discussion with students and teachers.

That I the Principal, teachers and students selected to participate in the study will fully cooperate with Mr. Fitoo

That having fully cooperated, I expect respondents to provide ranging views and opinions to the satisfaction of the research. As an academic work the data may be viewed by Mr. Fitoo's Supervisor.

I Billy Fitoo, researcher and student of USP make the following statements:

1. I agree to conduct research at _________________ Secondary School, Solomon Islands
2. These at all times, I will maintain a high standard of ethical behaviour during the course of my research.
3. That I will respect the right and privacy of all respondents.
4. That the Principal is my point of contact before contacting other respondents
5. That all soft and hard copies of the documents will be returned to the schools or electronically destroyed.
6. That copy of the thesis will be provided to interested parties

We hereby agree

Mr/Ms Mr.

Date ______________________

Billy Fitoo
Principal Researcher

Date ________________
Appendix D.
Parents/Guardians Information Sheet.

Citizenship Education in a small island state: Exploring values for good Citizenship in the Solomon Islands.

My name is Billy Fitoo, and I am conducting a research study on Citizenship Education in the Solomon Islands Curriculum to fulfill the requirements for Doctor of Philosophy in Education study Programme. This process of data collection has been approved by the University of the South Pacific Human Ethics Committee. The study wishes to explore Education stake holder’s perception on values of citizenship Education that is relevant and contextual to the Solomon Islands and how it can be effectively promoted in the formal secondary school curriculum and use for school policies on good citizenship. In order to do so, this study wishes to involve students who apparently, are stake holders and are direct recipients of the knowledge and values of the curriculum. This research will involve students, through focus group discussions. In other words, a cohort group consisting of form one (1) students will be selected in consultation with the principal. The researcher’s role is to facilitate the proceedings of the discussions, through systematically posing semi-structured questions and respondents will respond based on their own understanding and interpretation. A tape or MP3 recorder will be used to record the discussion of which the recorded information will be transcribed for analysis to informed the research. How will your child be affected? The researcher will chair all the proceedings of the focus group discussions. His role is to pose semi-structured questions and the students will respond to the questions.

All responses will be regard as essential for the study. The researcher role is not to hinder the discussion but guide the progressive flow of the process. Your child’s name will not be used in
the write up, and confidentiality is assured. All the students’ participants will be asked to sign an agreement form before the commencement of the discussion. At any one point if your child disagrees with how the research is chaired he/she can leave the venue without question.

The researcher is a student of the University of the South Pacific and this research is a student academic research.
Appendix E.
Consent forms (parent)

CONSENT TO PARENTS/GUARDIANS FOR STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

Citizenship Education in a small island state: Exploring the values for good citizenship in the Solomon Islands.

I have been given and do understand the explanation of this research project. I also understand from the explanation and to my satisfaction that any information provided by my child will be kept confidential by the researcher and the supervisor. I understood that, I may withdraw my child from this project without having to give reasons and without being penalized of any sort. I also understand that the information provided by my child during the research will be destroyed or if electronically stored will be wiped out after the scripts have been documented for its intended purpose. I also understand that the information my child may provide will only be used for the project only.

I________________________________ parent/guardian gives permission for my child to participate in the research.

Sign __________________________ (parent/guardian) Date:_______________

Sign __________________________ (Researcher) Date _______________
Citizenship Education in a small island state: Exploring the values for good citizenship in the Solomon Islands.

Consent to participate in the research
I have been given adequate information and have understood the nature and objectives of the research project and been given the opportunity to seek further clarifications and explanations. I understand that I choose not to participate individually or as a group from this project before the 20th of September, 2013. I understand that I may do so without providing reasons, and that any data already collected will be destroyed by the researcher.

I understand that any information or opinions I provide will be confidential. Only the researcher and the supervisor/s will have access to the information provided. I give my permission for our discussion to be tape or Electronically recorded. I understand that the tape or MP3 recording of discussions will be electronically wiped one (1) year after the research project completions. All data obtained will be destroyed by the researcher.

I agree to participate in this research project.
I agree and promise to keep the proceedings of the group discussion confidential
I would like to receive a copy of the findings
In duly agreeing to the terms above, I individually herewith place my signatures

Name__________________
Appendix G.
Joint Agreement (MEHRD)

JOINT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND BILLY FITO'O

Citizenship Education in a small island state. Exploring values for good citizenship in the Solomon Islands.

I ________________________ the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Education do make the following statements.

1. I have approved on behalf of the Ministry of Education for Billy Fitoo to conduct research with some staff Mid September 2013 to February, 2014
2. That permission is given to Mr. Billy Fitoo to conduct research in the Ministry of Education through a one-on-one interview
3. That the selected Ministry of Education Officers to participate in the study will fully cooperate with Mr. Fitoo
4. That having fully cooperated, I expect respondents to provide ranging views and opinions to the satisfaction of the research.
5. As an academic work, the data may be viewed by Mr. Fitoo's Supervisor

I Billy Fitoo, researcher and student of USP make the following statements:

1. I agree to conduct research at the Ministry of Education, Solomon Islands
2. That at all time, I will maintain a high standard of ethical behaviour during the course of my research.
3. That I will respect the right and privacy of all respondents.
4. That the Permanent Secretary will be my point of contact before contacting other respondents,
5. That all soft and hard copies of the documents will be returned to the Ministry of Education or electronically destroyed,

6. That copy of the thesis will be provided to the Government.

We hereby agreed

Permanent Secretary Researcher,

Date ____________

Billy Fitoo
Student Researcher

Date ____________
Sign ____________
Date ____________
Appendix H.
Conversation between the Rural Elders and the Researcher

Researcher: Do current societies have the values that bring peace and people together nowadays?

RVE 1: No and yes. Why I say “no” is because if we had those values practiced in society today we would have organised and stable societies. Currently our societies are unorganised and unstable. People do whatever they like without considering others. They think they have the right to work of their own. They only seek help when they are in trouble. It was also “yes” because we cannot assume that everybody is bad. A lot of people live lives that positively affect others. This good person that the society wants to have is starting to fade away. Sports fields, which were once clean and alive, are now bushes and dead with no more sports activities.

Researcher: Did we have those values in the past?

RVE 2: Yes. Relationship and sharing held society together. People worked together to see that everyone had a share in life. We worked in everybody’s garden, we built everybody’s house, we fed everybody whether young or old. We now try to follow outsiders’ culture of individualism and now we have a problem. Young people now neglect the elders, who are unable to help themselves.

Researcher: What can we do and who should be involved?

RVE 4: Community work is the answer because it is lively and it involves everybody. Labour is shared. To work together with willing hearts and being passionate about what they do is what should be done.

Researcher: Do we need to bring back those values?

RVE 2: Yes. We need those values as they were the lifeblood for stability in society. If those values are not promoted society will be in chaos. Young and old people will not survive, there will be discrimination, self-centredness and no care for people. It is happening today in our society. People think that they can do things of their own but at the end fail because that was Whiteman’s culture.

RVE 5: We need to retrieve the following practices: Active engagement through helping vulnerable people, the elderly and those unable to help themselves. The challenges today is: People focus more on themselves and forget others. Young people today even forget their parents and extended families. They try to adopt Western culture in an environment where survival depends on each other. The Government does not support the elderly to provide elderly homes, to pay for their food, water, sanitation. No. It is the people who support their relatives and provide for them. When we emphasise individualism it destroys the survival of society.

Researcher: How can we bring back the missing values?

RVE 3: To bring back the missing values, we have to start organising activities that will bring people together. Start with one, then go for another, then another until people become active and realise their role in society. We should not depend more on the Government as is the practice today. People today depend very much on the Government to do everything for them. Start with smaller units like the village and we work from there creating a small Government in the village in terms of social services. We need to establish schools, clinics, microfinance schemes, and saving funds, micro projects, agriculture, tourism, planning, and land use etc. This is important for Solomon Island
societies. Who will start the process and what to start with to stimulate participation is the difficult part. Once it is started, it will continue and people will take ownership of it.

Researcher: Do we have the teaching of those values in our education system?

RVE1: No. it is found only at home from parents to their small children. When children are young and have education from schools, it becomes difficult for them to follow what was learned from home. This is because they tend to favour modern knowledge more than values learned from home.

Researcher: Do schools teach what parents and society want?

RVE5: No. values are not promoted or even taught at school. This is obvious from how young people display their behaviours among society.

RVE3: Subjects taught at school if strengthened with values learn from home would be effective. Teachers today do not favor or even know of values that are important for society. It is important for teachers to teach cultural values, church values, and modern rules to children today.

RVE4: This must be established in all training institutions of the country. Knowledge on Math, English, and Science only will not provide the values people need for the stability of society.

Researcher: Do we need to teach about rights in schools?

RVE1: Yes but we have to be very careful with it as [the notion of] individual rights is another factor that destabilizes unity and brings marginalisation in communities.

RVE2: You know, rights came into the country when we were not prepared for it. If people exercise their rights who will take care of vulnerable ones in society? Our Government who should provide services to people does not care about the social environment, the physical environment, and peoples resources. How can the Government help people in need?

RVE3: Rights have to be controlled. It cannot be practiced in societies that are communally driven. This means that rights that are individualistic must not be tolerated in societies in the Solomon Islands. How can I tolerate an action or behaviour that violates cultural and church values and norms? How can I tolerate a man marrying a man or a woman marrying a woman? That’s against my cultural belief and my church belief.

RVE5: Rights must not be promoted in societies where responsibility is dominant. In Solomon Islands society responsibility is for survival and sustenance of life. Children have to be familiar with their responsibility to one another before they can be introduced to individual rights. We have to teach responsibility as the main emphasis before rights. Rights that are introduced have to be communally driven, not individualistic. People must realise their responsibility to their community before any other rights-based teaching.

Researcher: Do we need to promote values in all societies and institutions?

RVE2: Yes, it is very important; we have to engage in training people about good values in our institutions. Participation is missing in our society so we need to reinforce our education with policies that involve participation. The Government should spearhead this through Government policies. In the past active participation is dominant in schools. Now, there is no activity to involve students. They remain stagnant and cause the society to be stagnant without active participation. In the Solomon Islands it is different. People wait for the Government to do everything for them.
RVE4: As a Solomon islander, it seems that there is no hope for Solomon Islanders. The only hope is to review our systems and try to develop a system that promotes responsibility and caring for others and the environment. The Government must provide a citizenship education policy to cater for activities required in societies. A society that is active does not exist in the Solomon Islands.

RVE6: Yes. All places are now dirty. The places and rivers that were once clean and tidy are now unusable. The respect that was once dominant among people is now gone; people are now self-centered and now adopt an individualistic attitude and do not care for anybody but themselves.

The values summarised below are values considered important for Solomon Islanders by the government officials. They are inferred by respondents as important and must be considered seriously for inclusion into national programmes.
Appendix, I.
Interview Guide for students (Focus Group Interview)
Warm up questions; 5 – 10 minutes

Prompts
- What do you like about your school?
- What subject is your favourite?
- What values do you receive from the subject learn at school?

1. One of the goals of education is to help you to become good citizen in the country, what is your interpretation of a good citizen?

Prompts
- What is a good citizen to you?
- How do you relate it to the Solomon Islands context?
- What comes to mind when you hear the word citizenship education?

2. What are the values of a good citizen and where do the values come from?

Prompts
- Have you seen yourselves as a good citizen
- What values makes you a good citizen?
- Do values identified acquired from school or at home?
- If at school which subject does it comes from? Or if at home, where does it come from?
- How was it taught at home? Who taught them?

3. What kinds of knowledge and skills do good citizens possess?

Prompts
- What kinds of knowledge do good citizens have and where do those knowledge come from?
- Do knowledge you learn at school makes you a good citizen?
- What kinds of skills do goods citizens have and where do those skills come from?
- How do you differentiate the knowledge and skills of good citizens?

4. What kinds of kinds of knowledge, values, attitude, behaviors and action are expected from a good citizen?

Prompts
- What kinds of knowledge and skills do goods citizens have and where do those skills come from?
- How do you differentiate the knowledge and skills of a good citizen?
- Is the attitude and behaviors positively affect those around them. In what way? What are the benefits of a good action displayed?
- How do good citizen acquire the behaviors and attitudes?
- In what way do they practice those attitudes and behaviors?

5. Is the values of citizenship reflected in the Junior Secondary School curriculum?

Prompts
- In what ways are values of a good citizen reflected in the junior Secondary curriculum?
- Which subject teaches the values?
• How do you identify the values?
• If none is reflected in the curriculum, why?
• Can we add values of citizenship in the curriculum? How?

6. How well does the curriculum teach the values for good citizenship or didn’t your teachers teach you to become a good citizen?

Prompts
• What are the values taught in the curriculum from your teachers?
• How do you acquire the values?
• How do you apply the values?
• How do you know that these values affect others around you?

7. What kinds of things go on in school, both in and out of class that promote the knowledge, skills, attitude and action of good citizenship?

Prompts
• Can you identify some of the things out of class that promote good citizenship?
• What are some of the things in class that promote good citizenship?
• How do you acquire and apply those things?

8. What kinds of things should be add in school programs to promote good citizenship?

Prompts
• If school curriculum or programs needs more of values for good citizenship, what kinds of values should be add?
• How can it be add?
• What kinds of values for good citizenship can we include in curriculum to make it more meaningful to Solomon Islanders?
Appendix J.
Interview Guide for Secondary form one Teachers (Focus Group Interview)

Warmup questions; 5 - 10 minutes

Prompts
- What do you like about teaching in your school?
- Do you enjoy teaching your subjects?
- What are the things that make you enjoy teaching your subjects?

1. As a Solomon Islander, how do you conceptualize a good citizen? (In the Solomon Islands context)

Prompts
- What comes to mind when hearing the word citizenship? What characteristics (words to descriptor) do you think of?
- What is good citizenship to you?
- How do you relate it to the Solomon Islands context?
- Can a person be a good citizen if they merely think and do not act?
- What do you think citizenship education is about?

2. What values are considered important for your conceptualization? Why?

Prompts
- What values do you think are relevant to the Solomon Islands context?
- Do you think you are a good citizen?
- What are some of the values that make you a good citizen?
- Are these values necessary for Solomon island society?
- How effective will the values influence the social environment?
- Whose values are these? How are they sustained?
- Did you see those values applied in people’s daily contact with the social and physical environment, example your school, in public places or at home?

3. To what extent are these values covered in the Solomon Islands Junior Secondary School Curriculum?

Prompts
- How do you know that they are covered in the curriculum?
- Can you give some examples?
- If not covered, why?
- What values do your expect your students to have?
- Did you teach them in your teaching subject?
- Are the teaching of citizenship knowledge and values useful for Solomon Islands context? Why? Why not?

4. What method and strategies does the curriculum advise you to use to teach the values for citizenship?

Prompts
- How did you teach the values?
- Are you satisfied with the methods and strategies used?
• If not, what method and strategies of teaching have you recommended?
• Why do you recommend that method and strategy?
• How effective will they help to teaching the values for good citizenship?

5. How adequate are the values covered in the Junior High School curriculum?

Prompts
• Do you believe, the values of citizenship education are adequately covered?
• How can you tell that the values are adequately covered?
• What can you do to ensure that the values are adequately covered?

6. For the values covered, how successful is the teaching of these values in the curriculum?

Prompts
• How successful are the values taught in the Junior Secondary School curriculum? Why?
• What other values do you believe can be successfully taught in your lessons?
• How do you measure success?
• How do students apply the values?

7. What could we do to expand upon and improve the way we educate for good citizenship?

• Are the approach used in teaching of values effective? If not why?
• Is it possible to integrate knowledge, skills and values of citizenship education in our current Junior Secondary school curriculum?
• In what way can we improve the teaching for good citizenship?

8. What improvement might you suggest?

a. as values for inclusion in the junior curriculum?
b. for teaching of citizenship education in the Solomon Islands schools?
c. for policy, curriculum, pedagogy relating citizenship education?
d. for teacher and teaching?
e. for student learning?
Appendix K.
Interview Guide for Principals (one-on-one interview)

Warm up questions; 5 – 10 minutes

Prompts
- What is your role as the principal of the school?
- What do you like about your role as a Principal of this school?
- What challenges do you encounter daily in your work as a manager of the school? Is student and staff behavior a challenge to your administration and management?

1. As a School manager, how do you conceptualize good citizenship?
(In the Solomon Islands context)

Prompts
- What is your understanding of the word citizenship?
- What does it mean to be a good citizen to you?
- How do you relate it to the Solomon Islands context?
- What do you think citizenship education is about?
- Can values of good citizenship be promoted effectively in your school?

2. What values, knowledge and skills are considered important for good citizenship?
Why?

Prompts
- What are some of the values that you consider important for good citizenship?
- Why are they important?
- What values do you think should be included and which should not be included?
- Were these important values shared by your elder’s generation? Why? Why not?

3. To what extent are the values of citizenship covered in the Solomon Islands Curriculum?

Prompts
- What are the values that are covered in curriculum?
- What subjects teaches the values?
- Whose values do the curriculum incorporate?
- How well are the values covered, particularly, values you considered important? How well can we promote those values that you considered important?

4. How adequately are the values covered in the curriculum?

Prompts
- Do you believe the knowledge, values and skills of citizenship education are adequately covered?
- How can you tell that they are adequately covered?
- What approach does the curriculum adopted to transfer the values?
- What measure can be taken to ensure that the values are adequately covered?

5. What is your role as a school principal on the development of values, knowledge and skills for good citizenship?
Prompts
- Do you play a part in the development of the curriculum for good citizenship?
- Who initiated the values that goes in the curriculum?
- Is the values reflected the needs of the social and physical environment?
- Does the values consider needs of schools

6. For the values covered, how successful is the teaching of these values in the Junior Secondary School curriculum?
Prompts
- How well are the values taught?
- How well are students apply the values?
- What are some of the values you witness from you students?
- Do you believe values are achieved from the classroom teaching?
- How do you monitor the teaching of values?

7. What improvement might you suggest?
a. as values for inclusion in the Junior secondary curriculum?
b. for teaching of citizenship education in the Solomon Islands schools?
c. for policy, curriculum, pedagogy relating to citizenship education?
d. for learning of values by students?
Appendix L.
Interview Guide for Education officers/Public Officers (one-on-one interview)

Warmup questions; 5 - 10 minutes
Prompts

- What do you like about your work as an Education Administrator/curriculum developer?
- Do you enjoy your work?
- What are the things that make you enjoy your work?

1. As a public officer, what is good citizenship? (In the Solomon Islands context)
Prompts
- What comes through you mind when hearing the word citizenship?
- How do you relate it to the Solomon Islands context?
- What do you think citizenship education is about?
- Are the goals state from the curriculum statement reflect in the national curriculum?

2. What values, knowledge and skills are considered important for your conceptualization of citizenship? Why?
Prompts
- What values do you think are relevant to the Solomon Islands context?
- Can you give some of the most important ones? Why?
- How effective will the values influence the social environment?
- Whose values are these? How are they sustained?

3. Are goals provided in the curriculum statement featured in the contents of Junior Secondary School curriculum?
Prompts
- How do you know that they are included in the curriculum?
- Can you give some examples?
- If not include, why?
- Are the teaching of citizenship Knowledge and values useful for Solomon Islands context? Why? Why not?

4. Since the curriculum goals of the country is for good citizenship, do we have a policy for citizenship education?
- If it does, how does it translated in the education system. If not, is it possible to have a policy guideline?
- Who initiated the knowledge, values, skills and attitudes for good citizenship?
- Is citizenship education considered important among curriculum reviewers?

5. What method and strategy does the curriculum provide for teaching the values for good citizenship?
Prompts
- Are you satisfied with the methods and strategies outline in the curriculum?
6. For the values covered, how successful is the implementation of this curriculum for good citizenship?

_prompts_
- How successful are the values taught in the Junior Secondary School curriculum? Why?
- What other values do you believe can be included in the curriculum?
- How do you measure success?
- Is there a change from the student’s behavior attitudes and actions from the teaching and learning received?

7. What could we do to expand upon and improve the way we educate for good citizenship?

- Is the approach use in teaching of values effective? If not why?
- Is it possible to intergrade knowledge, skills and values of citizenship education in our current Junior Secondary School curriculum?
- In what way can we improve the teaching for good citizenship

8. What improvement might you suggest?
   a. as values for inclusion in the junior curriculum?
   b. for teaching of citizenship education in the Solomon Islands schools?
   c. for policy, curriculum, pedagogy relating citizenship education?
   d. for teacher and teaching?
   e. for student learning?
Appendix M.
Interview Guide for Rural community leaders (one-on-one interview).

Warm up questions; 5 – 10 minutes

Prompts
- What do you like about your community?
- What role do you play in the community for its stability?
- What is expected of you as a community member?

1. One of the goals of education is to help students to become good citizen in the country, what is good citizenship?

Prompts
- What is your understanding of the word citizenship?
- How do you relate it to the Solomon Islands context?
- What do you think citizenship education is about?

2. What are the values of a good citizen and where do the values come from?

Prompts
- Do values identified acquired from school or at home?
- If at school which subject does it comes from? Or if at home, where does it comes from?
- How was it taught at home? Who teach it?
- Do yourselves as a good citizen

3. What kinds of knowledge and skills do good citizens possess?

Prompts
- What kinds of knowledge do good citizens have and where do those knowledge come from?
- What kinds of skills do goods citizens have and where do those skills come from?
- How do you differentiate the knowledge and skills of good citizens?
- Where do you learn the skills that make you a good citizen.

4. What kinds of attitude, behaviors and action are expected from a good citizen?

Prompts
- Is the attitude and behaviors positively affects those around them. In what way? What are the benefits of a good action displayed?
- How do good citizen acquire the behaviors and attitudes?
- In what way do they practice those attitudes and behaviors?
- Do you help in shaping students behaviors when they are at home?

5. In your assessment on students behaviors, do you think schools mold students to become good citizens?

Prompts
- In what ways are values of good citizenship practiced by students in your community?
- How do you identify the values?
- What are some of the actions displayed by students that are believed to be from the school?
6. How well does the curriculum teach the values for good citizenship in your experience as someone who also go through the system?

Prompts
- What are the values taught in the curriculum?
- How do students apply the values?
- How do you know that these values affect others around them?

7. What kinds of things go on in school, both in and out of class that promote the knowledge, skills attitude and action of good citizenship?

Prompts
- Can you identify some of the things out from the class that promote good citizenship?
- What are some of the things goes in class that promote good citizenship?
- How students acquire and apply those things?

8. What kinds of things should be added in school programs to promote good citizenship?

Prompts
- if school curriculum or programs needs more of values for good citizenship, what kinds of values should be add?
- How Can it be add?
- What kinds of values for good citizenship can we include in curriculum to make it more meaningful to Solomon Islanders?
Appendix N.
Survey Questionnaire (Students)

Attempt the questions by circling the answer of your choice. The answers are rated according to three levels only as follows:

1. No  2. Abit  3. yes

Q.1. Citizenship Education is the learning about your rights and your responsibility as a citizen in a community or nation-state. Do you learn about those values from any subject/s you learn at school?
   a. Do you prefer the teaching of rights to be included in the school curriculum? (  )
   b. Do you prefer the teaching of responsibility to be included in the curriculum? (  )
   c. Do you prefer both to be included in the curriculum? (  )

Q 2. The values in citizenship education also include learning to actively participate in community works, voluntarism, helping others, respect for others and the state, tolerance, unity, love for your country.
   a. Do you learn those values at school? (  )
   b. Do you prefer the values active citizenship (participate in community works, voluntarism, helping others) to be included in the school curriculum? (  )
   c. Do you prefer the values of good citizenship (respect for others, the state, tolerance, patriotism, unity and love for your country) to be included in the school curriculum? (  )

Q. 3. How do the values currently teach at school help you to become a good citizen of Solomon Islands? (  )

Q 4. How does the values for good citizenship represented in subjects you learn at school?

Q, 5. Do subjects learn at school change your behaviors? (  )

Q 6. Some of the knowledge in citizenship Education curriculum concerns learning about political system, government structure, voting, history and you and your society. Do you learn about those themes in your subjects? (  )

Q 7. How does the knowledge about the themes help you to become a good citizen of Solomon Islands? (  )

Q 8. To what extent do teachers teaches you about values for good citizenship? (  )

Q 9. To what extent do teachers display being a good citizen to you and how to you learn from them? (  )

Q 10. To what extend do activities outside of class impact you to become a good citizen? (  )

Q 11. To what extend do you apply the values learn at school in your daily conduct with the social and physical environment? (  )
Appendix O.
Survey Questionnaire (Teachers)

Attempt the questions by circling the answer of your choice. The answers are rated only on three levels as follows:

1. No  2. Abit  3. Yes

Q.1. Traditionally, citizenship education is about the teaching of right and responsibilities.

a. Does the curriculum of Solomon Islands include those values? (    )

b. Do you prefer the values of rights to be included in the school curriculum? (    )

c. Do you prefer the values of responsibility to be included in the curriculum? (    )

d. Do you prefer both to be included in the curriculum? (    )

Q 2. Citizenship education is also about teaching values like active participation in community works, voluntarism, respect for others and the state, tolerance, unity, love for your country. Do you teach those values from the curriculum?

a. Do you teach those values from the curriculum at school? (    )

b. Do you prefer the values active citizenship (participate in community works, voluntarism, helping others) to be included in the school curriculum? (    )

c. Do you prefer the values of good citizenship (respect for others, the state, tolerance, patriotism, unity and love for your country) to be included in the school curriculum? (    )

Q. 3. How do the values currently taught at school help students to become good citizens of Solomon Islands? (    )

Q 4. How does the values for good citizenship represented in subjects you teach at school? (    )

Q, 5. Do subjects you teach at school change students behaviors? (    )

Q 6. To what extent does the knowledge learn from subjects taught at school help students to become good citizens? (    )

Q 7. To what extent do approaches of teaching values for good citizenship effectively used? (    )

Q 8. To what extent do you teach values for good citizenship in your lessons? (    )

Q 9. To what extent do you display values of a good citizen to your students and the community? (    )

Q 10. To what extent do activities in school but outside of class impact students to become a good citizen? (    )
Q 11. To what extent do you apply the values taught at school in your daily conduct with the social and physical environment? ( )