Curriculum and Tasks in Citizenship and Language Education

*Dermot F. Murphy**
King's College, University of London
University of Lancaster
Reino Unido

Resumen

La educación cívica es un elemento ya establecido del programa nacional para colegios, y en ocasiones se propone adoptar una estrategia interdisciplinaria en la enseñanza de esta materia. Rara vez se proponen o se consideran los idiomas modernos extranjeros en las discusiones de tal estrategia. En el presente artículo se revisan argumentos para la exploración de esta estrategia, examinando primero hasta qué punto el contenido y la metodología preferidos de ambas disciplinas pueden integrarse a nivel de los programas. A continuación, se considera lo apropiado de adoptar como metodología de esta estrategia la enseñanza a base de tareas. Se esbozan algunos hallazgos acerca de tareas para el aprendizaje de los idiomas con relevancia pedagógica al caso y se analizan las implicaciones para una enseñanza interdisciplinaria de la educación cívica y los idiomas extranjeros.

Palabras clave: ciudadanía, programa curricular, idiomas modernos, aprendizaje a base de tareas

Abstract

Citizenship education is an established part of the national curriculum for schools, and it is sometimes suggested that it should be taught in a cross-disciplinary approach. Modern foreign languages are rarely proposed or considered in discussions of such an approach. Arguments for exploring this approach are considered here, looking first at how far the favoured content and methods of the two disciplines can be merged at the level of the curriculum. Consideration then turns to the appropriacy of taking task-based learning as the methodology for this approach. Some of the pedagogically relevant findings about language learning tasks are examined and their implications for cross-disciplinary teaching of citizenship and modern languages are discussed.

In many countries, citizenship education has been an established part of the national curriculum for some time now. The reasons adduced for its inclusion as a subject on the curriculum are many, but it is still no easy task to specify what the knowledge, skills and values inherent in the notion are, and to identify how these are to be taught and learned effectively. Taking the English national curriculum as an example, certain content is prescribed, and it is expected, but not specified, that the main approach will be to teach citizenship as a cross-curricular discipline. This suggestion was widely acknowledged when first introduced (2002), and taken up in at least one book-length treatment of the topic. However, while the book included chapters which looked at citizenship in relation to nine other disciplines from mathematics to physical education, there was no mention of modern foreign languages and citizenship (Bailey, 2000), and a decade later the position is not much better (Wright, 2009), with no mention of foreign languages in a survey of the current position on citizenship education (Ofsted, 2013).

For a variety of reasons this is a curious omission. Many view culture

as linked to citizenship (e.g. Cairns, 2000), and the national curriculum at the time encouraged consideration of different cultures as part of the programme of study for modern languages (DfES: Department for Education and Skills, 2003), and to a linguist the key place of language in considerations of notions of culture seems self-evident. Currently the curriculum is disapplied (2013) and a new one is due in a year, but there is no indication that this will take a new line on citizenship. The idea of teaching modern foreign languages in a cross-curricular approach has a history, having been suggested early on in the development of what has come to be known as communicative language teaching (Widdowson, 1978), it was inherent in the development of specific purpose language teaching in the 1970s (e.g. Candlin et al., 1978), and is and has been put into practice in language immersion courses in various countries for some time (Grenfell 2002). However, the potential for a cross-disciplinary approach to citizenship and modern languages has largely gone unrecognised, although among the teaching materials prepared in line with curriculum requirements for citizenship education and offered to the profession by charities and official bodies, there are a few examples intended specifically for use in language teaching (e.g. Brown, 2002a & 2002b). The materials include a range of tasks which are designed to be suitable for the goals of both disciplines.

Task-based learning seems to have become the favoured methodological interpretation of the communicative approach to language teaching, partly, perhaps, under the influence of the research which has been carried out on language learning tasks over the last three decades. As a consequence, a deal of information about tasks is available to language teachers (see below). The information is about language learning tasks, however, and not about cross-curricular tasks, or about tasks for citizenship education, hence the relevance of the discussion here.

This paper is a tentative step in looking at what might be involved in taking a cross-curricular approach in which tasks are used for citizenship and language education. The intention is to see how far the interests and concerns of the two disciplines can be merged at the level of the curriculum, and then at the level of task. It is hoped that this

exploratory examination will permit us to conclude how far a cross-curricular approach to citizenship education and language teaching appears feasible and desirable, so that teachers might then be encouraged and supported in adopting such an approach. This investigation will not reveal anything about the effectiveness of such tasks in action, and knowledge of this will be required ultimately to specify effective criteria for task evaluation and design. Those steps are further ahead. For the moment, then, this paper begins by examining the concept of cross-curricular teaching in citizenship and languages. It then considers some of the pedagogically relevant findings about language learning tasks and their implications for citizenship education with language teaching. For the most part this is done within the context of the English national curriculum, with the hope that some of the issues and discussion will find echoes and have relevance elsewhere. The challenge will be to strip away the particularities and find the concepts and practice that are of broader relevance (Pawson & Tilley, 1997).

From an early stage in its identification as an element of the national curriculum, citizenship has been considered a cross-curricular theme, like information and communication technology (Ross, 2000, p. 77). The notion and desirability of inter-disciplinary study and cross-curricular treatment of subjects seem to be well-established, and appear frequently in writing about citizenship education (e.g. Breslin, 2000; Wilkins, 2000). Given this, we might expect that in the literature on citizenship education or curriculum development, we would find explicit consideration of how schools and teachers might implement such an approach and what methodologies would be appropriate. It appears not to be there, and discussion remains at a general, indicative level, not backed up by any detailed discussion or presentation of ideas or research.

Traditionally we have compartmentalised the curriculum into subject disciplines, and have not explored the relationship between, say, history and modern languages, so it is not evident how straightforward the notion of cross-curricular teaching and learning is. When we start to consider the idea of teaching two subjects at the same time, a number of questions arise. First of all, there is an issue of how far two disciplines overlap or complement each other in terms of content, permitting cross-curricular

treatment which will be insightful, revealing and beneficial to the learners. Secondly, it will be necessary to conceive the methodology in a way that will work for both subjects, so that it shares a view of how these are to be learned. This section examines these questions at a general level, and later sections consider the suitability of task-based instruction.

Some writers feel that a specific curriculum subject (theirs) makes an ideal pairing with citizenship – English (Bearne, 2000), History (Coq, 2000; Stow, 2000), Physical Education (Bailey, 2000), Social Sciences (Audigier, 2000). The concerns of the two disciplines are taken to match because the older discipline has, historically, been concerned with values and the kind of knowledge relevant to the newcomer. There is no discussion of why other disciplines are less advantaged, and such a position does seem to miss the point that every subject on the curriculum is founded on social values, and can offer a perspective on citizenship. It is not that some subjects are better suited, but rather that there is an issue of where the line is drawn about what is and is not citizenship. The limitation of what constitutes citizenship as a valid and valuable part of the curriculum is not perceived as a problem, but will have to be addressed.

Where the development of a cross-curricular approach is based on matching areas of the subject curriculum with elements from the citizenship curriculum, there is a danger that the relevant aspects become subsumed, and that the citizenship element is marginalised (Santerini, 2002; Evans, 2000). Such treatment may lead to a "hidden values curriculum" (Walkington, 2000), a notion which points to the need for explicitness about design and implementation, because the outcome and effect on the pupils of citizenship education will be influenced by the way that it is taught, through the relationship between teaching approach and educational ideology the methodology realises (Bailey, 2000).

As this last remark implies, curriculum design is a political, ideological activity: it cannot be neutral. It has to take a view on the nature of knowledge and of learning, of the purpose of education and how learners are to be assessed. If the curriculum designers view knowledge

as something that can be parcelled up in neat gobbets, and work on the principle that to achieve this knowledge they can set out categoric goals for learning which do not admit choice on the part of the learner, then such a curriculum will not represent the lessons of democratic citizenship that many feel this education should impart:

> any political regime which embraces such a view of knowledge, which fails to recognise the problematic nature of human knowledge, even if it does so in ignorance rather than from deliberate intent, must in its policies, particularly those for education, veer towards a totalitarian – and thus away from a democratic – form of governance. (Kelly, 1999, p. 37).

The concern that citizenship education should be democratic is widespread, so the importance of finding appropriate curriculum designs is paramount.

There is concern with this aspect of citizenship education even in countries where civic education is general and long-established because education for democratic citizenship is now seen as a way to deal with and provide a unified response to crises in social integration, youth and the role of the education system, making the school the place where this solution can be implemented (Ballion, 2000, p. 177). The role of the school in the modern nation state was to do away with difference (Gellner, 1983), but this has not been achieved, and modern societies are no more homogeneous than their nineteenth century ancestors, having become more complex in their ethnic and cultural mix, while still subject to conflicts and power differentials (Perrenoud, 1997; Evans, 2000). The new expectation is that citizenship education will help us live with the range of differences found in modern nations, meaning that social problems may become performance indicators of success, so that when they rise, or do not fall, citizenship education can be deemed to have failed (Santerini, 2001). Underlying this concept of the school is a presupposition that the institution is integrated into and valued by its community, so that its pupils will be able to take their learning into the community and put the ideas of citizenship education into practice

there: "thus making a contribution to the development of just, peaceful and democratic communities." (Osler & Vincent, 2002, pp. 28-29). The paradox is that schools almost everywhere are institutions apart, "authoritarian and sectarian" by nature, and consequently ill-conceived for preparing pupils to live in democratic, pluralist societies (Perrenoud, 1997).

Nevertheless, the widely held goal is that pupils are to know about, understand and be able to work for social justice and peace in democratic communities, which means they will need to acquire certain knowledge, skills and values, the terms under which the content of citizenship education is frequently summarised. There is not sufficient space here to go into detail of what these might be (cf. Audigier, 2000). The opinion of the major architect of citizenship education in the English national curriculum, Bernard Crick, is that these choices should not be restrained, and could be negotiated by pupils as well as teachers: "Nothing is ruled in, but then nothing is ruled out. Schools and teachers are given freedom (and are advised to let the pupils have some choice too!)" (Crick, 2000, pp. 7-8). Even this brief statement emphasises the point about political and ideological choice.

It is relevant here to pick up again the issue of how the curriculum envisages that pupils are to learn about these things. A constant problem of curriculum design is how to select and present what is to be learned in ways that do not fragment learning. This effect is often produced by the desire to control what is learned, and underlies the objectives-based and outcomes-based curricula, where there tends to be a focus on easily presented basic steps, on student performance, and easily measured outcomes (Harland, 2000). On the other hand, the approach to citizenship which several writers advocate stresses the importance of experience, process and reflection on learning, so that pupils critically evaluate what they do and find, and can seek alternative values, actions and views (e.g. Bailey, 2000; Lawton et al., 2000; Obin, 2000).

If we turn now to language teaching, we need to see how far notions of negotiation, process, experience and evaluation inform the methodology, and in what ways the content of each discipline complements or can be

used with the other. Ways to establish a cross-curricular approach need to be considered, before assessing the possibility of developing a task-based methodology to implement this. As mentioned earlier, modern foreign languages and language-related issues do not figure much in the discussion of cross-curricular approaches to citizenship education, so that language only gets a passing mention in discussion of cultural diversity (e.g. Skinner & McCullum, 2000). It is concerning that language is not seen as a defining element of cultural identity, and that the need to learn other languages as part of global citizenship is not discussed, both issues which are recognised elsewhere in Europe (e.g. Audigier, 2000; Santerini, 2001).

As in the examples cited above, we can begin by considering how far intrinsic values of learning modern languages may match the citizenship curriculum. Of immediate relevance to citizenship is the national curriculum goal for modern foreign languages for the 11 to 16 age group, to increase cultural awareness through contact with speakers of the languages, and use of materials from countries where the languages are spoken, in particular through comparison with the pupils' culture, and consideration of "the experiences and perspectives of people in these countries and communities" (DfES: Department for Education and Skills, 2003), which is a clear echo of the citizenship curriculum:

> Pupils should be taught to:
> a. use their imagination to consider other people's experiences and be able to think about, express, explain and critically evaluate views that are not their own (DfEE, 1999, p. 16).

Such overlap could lead to the problem described earlier of the marginalisation of the citizenship element, but even if it does not, it does not guarantee an approach based on the curriculum values identified above, so a more careful consideration is required.

The starting point for this argument is that for some time now many language teachers have subscribed to the idea of teaching language as communication. In brief, this notion means that language teaching

is concerned with encouraging and helping students to develop communicative competence in another language (Hymes, 1972). The notion of developing competences is also found in citizenship education, with a comparable sense that learners must acquire these if they are to master effectively the appropriate knowledge and skills. At one time Hymes suggested that he would elaborate further on his concept of communicative competence, but he never did, explaining later, that, while the idea has usefulness as a general proposition, attempts to define it in detail are doomed to futility, "to tinker with it seemed awkward and to add to it endless" (Hymes, 1985, p. 14). Interestingly, the influential ideas of Audigier on competences for citizenship are subject to the same problem, and risk becoming an endless list (Audigier, 2000), reminding us that Aristotle warned his students not to look for more precision in a subject than its nature allows. The fact that these notions are not accessible to revealing analysis, but can only be reduced to endless taxonomies, arguably implies that they characterise complex, real-world processes, and indicates the need to find ways to present and develop effective use of the processes.

Language learning theorists have not resisted the temptation to tinker with the detail of communicative competence, but at a general level agree that students have to learn the language code, culturally based sociolinguistic and pragmatic conventions, and strategies for use. In one view at least, this means that part of the content of the teaching, the topics of communication, are not specified. These may be identified through a needs analysis which predicts what will be useful to the learners, may be chosen by the materials writer, or may be selected by negotiation between teacher and learners (Breen & Littlejohn, 2000). When, over thirty years ago, the idea of the negotiated curriculum in language teaching was proposed (Breen & Candlin, 1980), it was dismissed as "a pedagogical mystery tour" which would lead to a decline in standards (White, 1988, p. 102). To begin with, many language teachers felt, and some still feel, threatened by the ideas of the communicative approach and negotiated syllabuses, just as teachers now feel nervous about teaching citizenship because they are uncertain about what it is and how to teach it (Bottery, 2000), although fear of inspection may goad them into doing what the curriculum requires (Wilkins, 2000).

One approach to communicative language teaching, then, the "strong version" (Legutke & Thomas, 1991, p. 13), puts negotiation at the heart of curriculum practice and implementation, just as certain approaches to citizenship education do, and it appears that the idea has finally reached its time. We now have convincing, research-based accounts of how teachers in a variety of contexts negotiate aspects of the modern language curriculum with their learners (Breen & Littlejohn, 2000). The mystery tour can be a routine daily journey. Elsewhere the whole curriculum has been negotiated for decades, in class councils in the *Écoles Freinet* in France, for example (Perrenoud, 1997), although this is not mainstream practice. The commitment to negotiation brings a learner-centred approach and a focus on process, rooting itself in a social-democratic approach which realises rather than pays lip-service to freedom and equality (Kelly, 1999, p. 77). For language teachers who have adopted this approach it has meant basing pedagogy on the development of understanding, rather than the accumulation of fragmented knowledge; they have learned to work with the notion that there may be more than one route to the curriculum aims, and that learners may benefit from understanding the processes through which they learn. Under this approach students learn how to learn and how to understand processes which will help them develop autonomy as learners.

Such learning is founded in experience, and in reflection on experience, so that students become critical learners. Sometimes, in project work, for example, it is possible to base that experience in the world outside the classroom (Legutke & Thomas, 1991), but it means recognising as well that the classroom is part of the real world, with its own specificity. Teachers need to vary what is done there and link these activities to the world outside. Critical reading exemplifies such a concern (Wallace, 1992), and aims to develop an awareness in pupils of the ways that texts, whether from a newspaper, or history book, carry an ideological baggage in the language chosen by the writer. The language teacher working on reading comprehension can help pupils develop a linguistic awareness which will enable them to analyse the information and ideas writers present to them, so that as citizens they can be critical of these and evaluate their content, just as developing a knowledge and understanding of science can develop better informed student citizens

who need to understand issues surrounding genetic modification or pollution (Audigier, 2000; Nicholls, 2000).

In this interpretation, then, we can identify considerable sharing of principles and practice as far as the two disciplines are concerned. Both attend to negotiation, process, experience and critical reflection, making a cross-curricular approach possible. As stated here, however, this has to be acknowledged as an ideal state of affairs. Communicative language teaching is often questioned, because the general theory does not take enough account of the history and local practices of the different contexts in which this approach is to be implemented (e.g. Holliday, 1994; Canagarajah, 1996, 1999). Where there is no perceived need on the part of the learners to acquire the ability to communicate in an additional language, then it becomes difficult to motivate them to experience this in the classroom, and do the hard work which is needed to learn another language. Similarly, the necessity and reality of experience in citizenship classes can easily be called into question by learners; in many contexts precisely the conditions of social disjuncture and marginalisation which make some aware of the need for citizenship education may undermine its value for learners. With this caution in mind, we turn to look at how the curriculum may be implemented in the classroom, through task-based learning.

A "task" is a complex activity, so it is not surprising to find that there is a wealth of discussion about how this notion is to be defined relative to learning, and in particular language learning. Here the term is often contrasted with "exercise" and "activity", which are generally considered to lack certain key properties of "task", and be more mechanical and controlled in their nature and use. One definition, based on a survey of other people's conceptualisation of this activity-type, and which has won a certain consensus, suggests that language learning tasks are characterised by these facts:

a) meaning is primary,
b) learners are not given other people's meanings to regurgitate,
c) there is some sort of relationship to comparable real-world activities,

d) task completion has some priority,
e) the assessment of the task is in terms of outcome (Skehan, 1998).

This definition is valid for most research interest in tasks, which covers second language acquisition in classrooms, task-based pedagogy, and the role of tasks in assessment and testing. The question now arises how far this definition appears, *a priori*, to be suited to tasks for citizenship.

Considered from the perspective of citizenship education, the last two terms in this definition (d and e) seem uncontroversial, and will not be discussed further. However, the first characteristic, "meaning", initially appears redundant, and emphatic of how far language teaching is still reacting to a period when meaning was not a requirement. It relates to issues around the learning of language form, which suggest why it may be erroneous to take meaning as a given in citizenship tasks: it is as easy to reduce citizenship as language to a collection of facts, about civic duties or verb tenses, disjuncted from the use where they acquire meaning. The second parameter (b) can be taken more or less as it is, if we accept the idea of negotiation and process in citizenship education, rather than the ingestion of facts alone; any implicit notion of democracy would suggest that this should be the approach.

The third point (c), like the first, seems initially to be a preoccupation of language teaching; however, tasks for citizenship may equally come up against this problem of remoteness from the real world. Certainly, pupils react well to tasks and activities which represent, for them, real language use, and there is likely to be a similar challenge over tasks for citizenship (cf. Alderson, 2000). We have to face the quandary that what we do for language education and citizenship education is, to some extent, posited on future need, on what the learners do after they complete their schooling, so the challenge is to make these subjects relevant both now and here, as well as adequate preparation for the future and wherever. Otherwise, as Ken Livingstone, then Mayor of London, once suggested, citizenship risks being "the most-bunked off subject on the timetable" (cf. Santerini, 2001), a status that modern languages has in some contexts, or has held in the past.

It seems possible that effective tasks for citizenship may share these characteristics, so in order to identify conditions for effective use of such tasks, we turn now to pedagogically relevant findings from research into task-based instruction, and look first at a general methodological issue and the role of the teacher. From studies of task use in the classroom, it is argued that task-based methodology should be learner-centred; such instruction does not work effectively where the class of pupils is expected to learn in lock-step, under the control of the teacher at all times (Skehan, 2002, pp. 294-295), the kind of step-by-step progression through material associated with structuralism, a methodology which experience suggests many teachers in schools throughout the world still adopt, while claiming that they teach communicatively. The metaphors which are used to conceive the teacher's role in a task-based approach need to change from terms such as "controller", "assessor", "organiser", to others such as "facilitator", "adviser", and "monitor", and understanding of the implications of the change is essential if teachers are to learn how to implement task-based instruction effectively (Samuda, 2001, p. 120). Similar proposals are made for the teacher of citizenship (Kerr, 2000). Rethinking these roles also means reconsidering how we motivate pupils, a point implicit in the comments above about the attractiveness of these subjects. However, there is also a particular issue around the need to learn about and understand pupils' motivation to do tasks, where findings so far emphasise the value of meaningful, real world-like tasks (Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000, pp. 293-294).

Learners' performance on task is complex. There is a certain consensus that performance can be analysed under the headings of fluency, accuracy and complexity, where fluency is measured by phenomena such as pauses, revealing how the learner copes with communicating in real time, accuracy is measured by "error-free clauses" and reflects the learner's attempts to avoid error, and complexity, assessed through "the amount of subordination per communication unit" reveals the learner's endeavour to express more complex meanings (Skehan & Foster, 1997, pp. 190-191). Different task-types, defined, for example, by contrasting goals such as relating a narrative versus making decisions, affect performance on these variables, suggesting that attention to these varies with the processing requirements of the task (Skehan & Foster, 1997). Knowing about these effects and their relationship with the task-type

allows us to make limited predictions about task utility, but there is much more to understanding how tasks work.

Performance is further affected by the conditions under which the task is carried out. Where learners are enabled to carry out pre-task planning, this almost always leads to improvements in fluency and complexity, though it does not have such a clear effect on accuracy (Skehan, 2003, p. 6). Task repetition is also beneficial, leading in one study to improved accuracy and fluency, and to a range of improvements with different learners (Lynch & Maclean, 2000, 2001). The methodology of this task, where dyads prepared a poster display on a real world topic, and then, individually, discussed the content with a series of "visitors" to the display, seems particularly relevant to citizenship education. Another study, which focused on tasks requiring skills in argumentation typical of decision-making, also found benefits in task repetition as measured by variables derived from an analysis of argumentation (Németh & Kormos, 2001). Again, this is especially relevant for a subject where tasks are expected to require argumentation.

Although these findings indicate ways to manage task-based instruction effectively, it is as well to remember that while we may have some idea of task utility, this cannot be predicted with certainty, only probability (Ellis, 2000, p. 214). The nature of tasks, and of the approach to task-based learning suggested here, mean that teachers must anticipate that their "task-as-workplan", what is written down in preparation, will have differing outcomes when it is realised by learners in "task-as-process", what goes on as the task is carried out in a classroom (Breen, 1987). The interpretation made by learners of the utility of a task may be unexpected in its difference from the teacher's goal (Murphy, 1993). Learners construct the discourse of the task, they and the task decide what the interaction will be in real time, and they are more likely to participate actively when they are members of a socially cohesive group (Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000, p. 280), so teachers need also to attend to the factor of social relationships in the groupings in their classes, a clear link to citizenship.

There are several indications of the pedagogic value of tasks, though

it is not clear from the literature what the relationship of tasks is to other language learning activities (Samuda, 2001, p. 119), something which has yet to be studied. However, one suggestion is that many of the currently used practice exercises in language teaching do not have the value that mechanical practice may have in learning to play a sport or musical instrument, for example (Skehan, 2002, p. 294). General psychology of learning puts great insistence on the value of practice, and the automatisation of actions (Robertson, 1999); such practice may well be what learners get from much task use, because performance on a task is not necessarily evidence of learning the language, and may only be evidence of practice in language use, however effective the latter may be (Ellis, 2000, p. 213). This suggests that practice and learning should start from wanting to mean, and turn to a focus on form and cognitive competence, whether in citizenship or language, in order to refine and specify meaning.

The account of pedagogic tasks just given is unbalanced since it is not possible to report research into learning of citizenship through tasks. Where, then, do we go from here? The next step must be to apply concepts derived from the practice reported here, but we will do well to "apply with caution" (Skehan, 2002, p. 289). Task design for citizenship and language will need investigation and development in order to achieve validity for the kind of dual-purpose tasks envisaged. Cross-curricular tasks have always posed a problem in specific purpose language teaching, for example, where there is a probability that the language teacher will make errors of fact, interpretation and performance in what is done relative to the other discipline. Teachers in initial education in England are being prepared to teach citizenship, but the preparation is very limited, and it is easy to see why, as a consequence, citizenship could be marginalised and misrepresented. However, from the discussion above it appears there are grounds to consider a cross-curricular task-based approach is feasible and desirable, given the areas of complementarity and of overlap in what each takes to be the underlying principles of its discipline.

Nevertheless, we must be conscious of the gaps in our knowledge and information which need to be filled. In putting such an approach into practice in a school, it will be necessary to coordinate activity to avoid

finding later that pupils are encountering the same citizenship topic in two or three different disciplines; this practical point is not considered in the literature, but the implementation will require considerable planning, and there are no guidelines or experiences to follow – or avoid. There is still little development of the place of tasks in curricula (Candlin, 2001, p. 230), even though this has been on the agenda for some time (e.g. Candlin & Murphy, 1987a). Various questions arise about how tasks are to be integrated with other elements of the methodology, about the utility of preparing learners to work with tasks, and about assessment. There are more, such as how far task-types can be varied since this is an expectation learners have (Murphy, 1993), and because the research on tasks demonstrates its importance (see above). Further questions include how we can move to consider tasks other than oral tasks and examine, say, tasks based in the written mode (Littlejohn & Hicks, 1987), and how teachers can monitor acquisition of language and of citizenship together. Many teachers will need training to work with and understand the curriculum notions and methodology outlined here, if this route is to be taken.

Task-based instruction is effective, and does enable teachers to help learners do things they might not otherwise do. The methodology is suited to the curriculum elements of negotiation, experience, process, and critical awareness valued in both citizenship and language education. Citizenship complements an area which is not necessarily specified in language teaching, so does not present problems of integration into what is already done, though it should not, either, become the sole content of such tasks. The research base for task use and design exists, is being extended, and provides models for initial investigation of cross-curricular, language and citizenship tasks. In conclusion, then, what has been sketched out here represents a particular opportunity at a time when, in many parts of the world, we are looking afresh at both disciplines, and seek to improve the effectiveness of what is offered to learners in language teaching and citizenship education.

References

Alderson, P. (2000). Citizenship in theory and practice: being or becoming citizens with rights. In D. Lawton, J. Cairns & R. Gardner (Eds.). (2000). Education for Citizenship (pp. 114-135). London: Continuum.

Audigier, F. (2000). Basic concepts and core competencies for education for democratic citizenship. Retrieved on 23 March 2003 from http://culture.coe.fr/postsummit/citizenship

Bailey, R. (2000). The value and values of Physical Education and sport. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *Teaching Values and Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 105-115). London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Ballion, R. (2000). Comment l'école peut-elle former à la citoyenneté? In J.-P. Obin (Ed.). *Questions pour l'éducation civique : former des citoyens* (pp. 175-185). Paris: Hachette Éducation.

Bearne, E. (2000). Values, citizenship and English. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *Teaching Values and Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 42-52). London: Kogan Page Ltd. Bottery, M. (2000). Values education, in Bailey (Ed.).

Bottery, M. (2000). Values education. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *Teaching Values and Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 105-115). London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Breen, M. P. (1987). Learner contributions to task design. In C. N. Candlin & D. F. Murphy (Eds.), *Language Learning Tasks* (pp. 23-46). Hemel Hempstead: Prentice-Hall International.

Breen, M. P. & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum for language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 89-112.

Breen, M. P. & Littlejohn, A. (Eds.). (2000). *Classroom Decision-making – negotiation and process syllabuses in practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Breslin, T. (2000). The emerging 14-19 curriculum and the qualification structure as a context for the development of citizenship education and the role of the social sciences. In D. Lawton, J. Cairns & R. Gardner (Eds.). (2000). *Education for Citizenship* (pp. 64-76). London: Continuum.

Brown, M. (Ed.). (2002a). *Human Rights in the Curriculum – French.* London: Amnesty International.

Brown, M. (Ed.). (2002b). *Human Rights in the Curriculum – ¡Spanish!* London: Amnesty International.

Bygate, M., Skehan, P. & Swain, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Researching Pedagogic Tasks – Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing.* Harlow: Longman.

Cairns, J. (2000). Personal development and citizenship education: setting the agenda for lifelong learning. In D. Lawton, J. Cairns & R. Gardner (Eds.). (2000). *Education for Citizenship* (pp. 38-53). London: Continuum.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1996). Review of *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context.* In *ELT Journal, 50*(1), 80-82.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Candlin, C. N. (2001). Afterword: taking the curriculum to task. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M. Swain (Eds.). (2001). *Researching Pedagogic Tasks – Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing* (pp. 229-243). Harlow: Longman.

Candlin, C. N., Kirkwood, J. M. & Moore, H. M. (1978). Study skills in English: theoretical issues and practical problems. In R. Mackay & A. J. Mountford (Eds.). *English for Specific Purposes – a case study approach.* Harlow: Longman.

Candlin, C. N. & D. F. Murphy (1987). Introduction. In C. N. Candlin & D. F. Murphy (Eds.). (1987). *Language Learning Tasks* (pp. 1-22). Hemel Hempstead: Prentice-Hall International.

Candlin, C. N. & Murphy, D. F. (Eds.). (1987). *Language Learning Tasks.* Hemel Hempstead: Prentice-Hall International.

Coq, G. (2000). Peut-on éduquer le citoyen sans former la conscience du politique? Obin, J.-P. (Ed.). (2000). *Questions pour l'éducation civique : former des citoyens* (pp. 47-61). Paris: Hachette Éducation.

Crick, B. (2000). Introduction to the new curriculum. In D. Lawton, J. Cairns & R. Gardner (Eds.). (2000). *Education for Citizenship* (pp. 3-8). London: Continuum.

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE). (1999). *Citizenship.* London: Department for Education & Employment/Qualifications & Curriculum Authority.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). (2003). Programme of Study. Retrieved on 24 April 2003 from www.nc.uk.net/servlets/ Subjects?Subject=MFL

Dörnyei, Z. & J. Kormos (2000). The role of individual and social variables in

oral task performance. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 275-300.

Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy, *Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 275-300.

Evans, K. (2000). Beyond the work-related curriculum: citizenship and learning after sixteen. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *Teaching Values and Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 157-170). London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Grenfell, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Modern Languages Across the Curriculum.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Harland, J. (2000). A curriculum model for citizenship education. In D. Lawton, J. Cairns & R. Gardner (Eds.). (2000). *Education for Citizenship* (pp. 54-63). London: Continuum.

Holliday, A. R. (1994). *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence, in J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hymes, D. (1985). Towards linguistic competence. *Revue de l'AILA/AILA Review II,* 9-23.

Kelly, A. V. (1999). *The Curriculum – theory and practice* (4th ed). London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Kerr, D. (2000). Citizenship education: an international comparison. In D. Lawton, J. Cairns & R. Gardner (Eds.). (2000). *Education for Citizenship* (pp. 200-227). London: Continuum.

Lawton, D., Cains, J. & Gardner, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Education for Citizenship.* London: Continuum.

Legutke, M. & H. Thomas (1991). *Process and Experience in the Language Classroom.* Harlow: Longman.

Littlejohn, A. & Hicks, D. (1987). Task-centred writing activities. In C. N. Candlin & D. F. Murphy (Eds.). (1987). L*anguage Learning Tasks* (pp. 69-91). Hemel Hempstead: Prentice-Hall International.

Lynch, T. & Maclean. J, (2000). Exploring the benefits of task repetition and recycling for classroom language learning. *Language Teaching Research VI (3),*221-250.

Lynch, T. & Maclean, J. (2001). 'A case of exercising': effects of immediate task repetition on learners' performance. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M. Swain (Eds.). (2001). *Researching Pedagogic Tasks – Second*

Language Learning, Teaching and Testing (pp. 141-162). Harlow: Longman.

Murphy, D. F. (1993). Evaluating language learning tasks in the classroom. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.). *Tasks in a Pedagogical Context* (139-161). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Németh, N., & Kormos, J. (2001). Pragmatic aspects of task performance: the case of argumentation, *Language Teaching Research, 5*(3), 213-240.

Nicholls, G. (2000). Citizenship: the case of Science. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *Teaching Values and Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 126-136). London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Obin, J.-P. (Ed.). (2000). *Questions pour l'éducation civique : former des citoyens.* Paris: Hachette Éducation.

Ofsted. (2013). *Citizenship consolidated? A survey of citizenship in schools between 2009 and 2012.* Manchester: Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills.

Osler, A. & Vincent, K. (2002). *Citizenship and the Challenge of Global Education.* Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Pawson, R. & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic Evaluation.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Perrenoud, P. (1997). Apprentissage de la citoyenneté... des bonnes intentions au curriculum caché. Former les professeurs, oui, mais à quoi? In J.-C. Gracia (Dir.), *Éducation, citoyenneté et territoire.* Colloquium held at École Nationale de Formation Agronomique, Toulouse, on 28-30 April 1997.

Robertson, I. H. (1999). *Mind Sculpture.* London: Bantam Press.

Ross, A. (2000). *Curriculum – construction and critique.* London: Falmer Press.

Samuda, V. (2001). Guiding relationships between form and meaning during task performance: the role of teacher. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M. Swain (Eds.). (2001). *Researching Pedagogic Tasks – Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing* (pp. 119-140). Harlow: Longman.

Santerini, M. (2001). *Educare alla cittadinanza: la pedagogia e le sfide della globalizzazione.* Roma: Carocci.

Santerini, M. (2002). La formation des enseignants à l'interculturel: modèles et pratiques. *Carrefours de l'éducation, 14*, 97-104.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. (2002). A non-marginal role for tasks. *ELT Journal, 56*(3), 289-295.

Skehan, P. (2003). Task-based instruction, *Language Teaching XXXVI,* 1-14.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance, *Language Teaching Research, 1*(3), 185-211.

Skinner, G. & McCullum, A. (2000). Values education, citizenship, and the challenge of cultural diversity. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *Teaching Values and Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 146-156). London: Kogan Page Ltd. .

Stow, W. (2000). History: values in the diversity of human experience. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *Teaching Values and Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 67-79). London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Walkington, H. (2000). Geography, values education and citizenship. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *Teaching Values and Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 53-66). London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

White, R. (1988). *The ELT Curriculum.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, C. (2000). Citizenship education.. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *Teaching Values and Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 229-243). London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Wright, M. (2009). How does learning a modern language help promote citizenship education? Retrieved on 25 January 2014 from http://www.theewc.org/library/category/view/how.does. learning.a.modern.language. help.promote.citizenship.education/