ISSN: 1647-032X

www.esec.pt/opdes

Nº7

OPDES

Pedagogia no Ensino Superior

The University's role in developing rights and social equity

Alistair Ross (London Metropolitan University, London)

'In theory, yes; in practice, no': Is this the reality of Education for Citizenship in Higher Education

Henry Maitles, University of Strathclyde, Scotland, United Kingdom;
Irena Zaleskiene, Pedagogical University of Vilnius, Lithuania;
Miquel Essombert, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain
Eleni Karatzia – Stavlioti, University of Patras, Greece;

esec
ESCOLA SUPERIOR DE EDUCAÇÃO
20 ANOS AO SERVIÇO DA EDUCAÇÃO
FCT
Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia
Ciência.Inovação 2010
União Europeia
Fundo Social Europeu

FICHA TÉCNICA

Direcção: Susana Gonçalves
Comissão Editorial: Susana Gonçalves, Dina Soeiro, Sofia Silva

Título da Série de Brochuras: Pedagogia no ensino superior

Publicação: Escola Superior de Educação de Coimbra
Paginação: NDSIM/ José Pacheco
Janeiro de 2010

PUBLICADOS

Brochura nº1
- *Método Expositivo*
Susana Gonçalves (Coordenadora do projecto OPDES, Escola Superior de Educação de Coimbra);
- *Uso de informação e feedback para melhorar as práticas de ensino*
Alan Kalish (Director da FTAD _ Faculty & TA Development, The Ohio State University, Columbus, EUA);

Brochura nº2
- *Princípios fundamentais de um planeamento curricular eficaz*
Donna Ellis (Directora Associada do Centre for Teaching Excellence, University of Waterloo, Canadá);
- *A Construção de Contextos de E-learning (ou B-learning) no Ensino Superior*
Dina Soeiro (Investigadora no projecto OPDES, Escola Superior de Educação de Coimbra);

Brochura nº3
- *Estilos de aprendizagem e ensino*
Susana Gonçalves (Coordenadora do projecto OPDES, Escola Superior de Educação);
- *Aprendizagem Colaborativa: uma proposta ao serviço da aprendizagem profunda*
Sofia Silva (Investigadora no projecto OPDES, Escola Superior de Educação de Coimbra);

Brochura nº4
- *El crédito europeu: Un nuevo modo de concebir la formación en la Universidad*
Miguel Pérez Ferra (Catedrático de Universidad, Área de Didáctica y Organización Escolar) e Juan Antonio Callado (Miembro del Grupo de Investigación: "Investigación Curricular y Didáctica de las Ciencias Experimentales"), Universidad de Jaén;
- *Os Surdos e a Educação no Ensino Superior: Estratégias de Ensino-Aprendizagem*
Isabel Sofia Calvário Correia (Docente da Área de Língua Portuguesa, Escola Superior de Educação de Coimbra);

Brochura nº5
- *Actividades e trajectos exploratórios da Oralidade no Ensino do Português Língua Estrangeira*. Pedro Balaus Custódio (Docente da Área de Língua Portuguesa, Escola Superior de Educação de Coimbra)
- *Colaboração e reflexão*: Mecanismos de uma avaliação transformativa
Dina Soeiro e Sofia Silva (Docentes da Área de Psicologia e Ciências da Educação, Investigadoras no projecto OPDES, Escola Superior de Educação de Coimbra)

Brochura nº6
- *Shaping University Culture: Challenges and Opportunities for Leaders in Higher Education. Christopher P. Adkins, School of Business; Michael F. DiPaola, School of Education; The College of William and Mary Williamsburg, Virginia, USA.*
- *Plagiarism key issues and pedagogical strategies. Digby Warren (London Metropolitan University, London).*

A Colecção de Brochuras sobre Pedagogia no Ensino Superior é editada pela Escola Superior de Educação de Coimbra. Esta colecção integra o projecto OPDES: Orientações pedagógicas para Docentes do Ensino Superior (ver sinopse), financiado pelo Programa Operacional Ciência e Inovação – POCI 2010, acção IV.1.2. "Projectos inovadores no ensino superior".

Sinopse do PROJECTO OPDES

Título:"Orientações Pedagógicas para Docentes do Ensino Superior" (OPDES)
Ref: POCI/C/04.01.02/0247/0002/2006
Responsável Técnico: Susana Gonçalves, Professora adjunta da ESEC
Equipa nuclear: Susana Gonçalves, Dina Soeiro, Sofia Silva
Financiamento: programa Operacional Ciência e Inovação – POCI 2010, acção IV.1.2. "Projectos inovadores no ensino superior"
Temática: qualificação pedagógica de docentes do ensino superior; métodos pedagógicos para aumentar a motivação e aprendizagem dos estudantes; promoção da inovação, qualidade e excelência no ensino superior.
Destinatários: docentes do ensino superior
Objectivos específicos: adaptação, concepção e disseminação de materiais pedagógicos, orientações para o ensino eficaz e boas práticas pedagógicas no ensino superior.
Resultados:
Um site na Internet;
Uma série de brochuras sobre pedagogia no ensino superior;
Folhetos de orientação pedagógica para docentes em início de carreira;
Aquisição de recursos para formação dos docentes (livros, vídeos e jogos pedagógicos);
Organização de cursos e workshops de pedagogia no ensino superior.

Cooperação internacional:
o projecto inclui uma parceira para efeitos de consultadoria, formação e avaliação externa, com centros de desenvolvimento pedagógico no ensino superior:
- Faculty & TA Development (FTAD): The Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio, USA);
- Center for teaching excellence (ex-Teaching Resources and Continuing Education (TRACE): University of Waterloo (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada).

Estes centros são organismos universitários que asseguram o apoio aos departamentos, faculdades e docentes através de orientação pedagógica, conferências, workshops, seminários, consultoria pessoal, apoio a projectos de investigação e programas de planeamento e coordenação de âmbito científico-pedagógico. Esta parceria teve como objectivos assegurar a consultoria pedagógica especializada e a avaliação externa do projecto assim como a aquisição de direitos de uso de uso, tradução e adaptação de alguns dos seus materiais e produtos, tal como recursos pedagógicos (textos e questionários) adequados à formação de docentes do ensino superior.

THE UNIVERSITY'S ROLE IN DEVELOPING RIGHTS AND SOCIAL EQUITY

Alistair Ross

ALISTAIR ROSS

London Metropolitan University, London, United Kingdom

Alistair Ross is now Emeritus Professor of Education at London Metropolitan University and he has been awarded the title Jean Monnet ad personam Professor, 2009-14. He was Professor of Education at the London Metropolitan University (UK), where he is the Director of the Institute of Policy Studies in Education and the International Coordinator for the CiCe (Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe) Thematic Network. He was for many years the director of a Teacher Education course that recruited about 30% of its students from minority ethnic groups. He helped establish the national on-line resource network for teacher education and diversity (Multiverse) 2002-2009. His research interests are in the area of the school curriculum (Curriculum: Construction and Critique, 2000, Falmer), children's social and political learning, the careers of teachers (co-editor, The Crisis in Teacher Education, 2002, Trentham) and the recruitment and careers of minority ethnic teachers, citizenship education, access to higher education (co-author, Higher Education and Social Class, 2003, Falmer/Routledge). He is series editor for European Issues in Children's Identity and Citizenship.

The University's role in developing rights and social equity

Wendell Phillips, the American jurist and abolitionist, once said that 'eternal vigilance is the price of liberty' (Phillips 1853): in the contemporary world this view has been superseded by Vlacev Havel' assertion:

> *Nemylme se: sebelepší vláda, sebelepší parlament i sebelepší prezident toho sami mnoho nezmohou. A bylo by i hluboce nesprávné čekat obecnou nápravu jen od nich. Svoboda a demokracie znamená přece spoluúčast a tudíž spoluodpovědnost všech.*
>
> [Let us not be mistaken: the best government in the world, the best parliament and the best president, cannot achieve much on their own. Freedom and democracy include participation, and therefore responsibility, from us all] (Havel 1990).

Havel's statement requires active citizenship from all to safeguard democratic rights and freedoms. As Biesta (2009) observes, the concept of citizenship is moving from being simply the discourse of rights, as promoted by Marshall (1950) in the 1950s, towards demands for active participation. It will be argued in this paper that active participation in citizenship may present particular challenges to the university.

What activities are appropriate for universities to take in developing understandings of rights and equalities in young people? I will first discuss what the phrase 'active citizenship might entail, and then consider the current position of universities in educating an elite, particularly within the instrumentalist framework that is implicit in the Bologna framework which is reshaping universities within the European Union. There are, I will argue, particular tensions within Europe about the purposes and directions that the universities should take. I then

outline various analyses of the ways in which education, and higher education in particular, can and has acted in ways to reproduce elites and to entrench privilege and inequity. Finally, I consider how universities might develop human rights, respect for diversity and promote social equity.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY ACTIVE PARTICIPATION?

Traditional participation in 'the civic culture' was set out by Almond and Verba (1965), who suggested that a stable civic culture required a combination of citizens who for the most part accepted existing political systems and structures - voting in elections but otherwise generally quiescent - and a few citizens who would be more actively involved in political roles and leadership. This – it might be argued – was a necessary and a sufficient level of political activism in the period of Cold War confrontation, providing the ruling elite with legitimacy through support at the polls.

Norris (2002) has argued that such forms of political and social engagement are being replaced: using Lasswell's (1936) definition of politics as 'who gets what, when and where', he suggests that:

> Political Participation is evolving in terms of the 'who' (the agencies and the collective organisations), 'what' (the repertoires of actions commonly used for political expression) and 'where' (the targets that participants seek to influence). (Norris 2002: 4)

Active participation is, very broadly, about doing things, while passive citizenship is generally seen as related simply to status, to the act of being. Exactly where the delineation between the two can be drawn is debatable (Ireland et al 2006; Nelson and Kerr 2006); but the model suggested by Kennedy (2006) may be helpful.

He distinguishes four forms or levels of active participation in civil affairs, and two forms of passive citizenship. Conventional political activity – the level at which those concerned with the democratic deficit

would have us act – is engaging in voting, in belonging to a political party, and in standing for office. The first of these, though active, is of course a minimalist action, but these kinds of traditional conformity are nevertheless participation, and participation with a view to changing civic society. These forms of activity were those enshrined in the traditional civic culture, and were indeed defined as the only legitimate forms of political activism by analysts such as Almond and Verba.

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. These, and the previous conventional form, constitute what is sometimes disparaged as the 'voting and volunteering' approach to citizenship education.

The third form consists of action for social change, when the individual is involved in activities that aim to change political and social policies. This would range from such activities as letter writing and signing petitions to working with pressure groups and participating in demonstrations, pressure groups 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.

The fourth active form is of enterprise citizenship, an essentially individualist model of citizenship action, in which the individual engages in such self-regulating activities as 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.

These four forms in no sense comprise a hierarchy or sequential form of development – the individual does not need to progress through one form to achieve the next. Kennedy also distinguished two forms of passive citizenship. The first of these is concerned with national identity, where the individual understands and values the nation's history, and the symbolic and iconic forms of the nation – in its institutions, the flag,

the anthem and the political offices. This kind of passive citizenship is commonly taught through transmission models of education, through civic education and the hidden curriculum of unspoken mores, structures and assumptions. A second and variant form of passive citizenship is seen in patriotism, a more extreme national identity that includes military service and unconditional support for one's country against any claims of other countries. This form of passive citizenship would inculcate values of loyalty, and unswerving obedience, and stress the value of social stability and hard work.

Differentiating citizenship education into active and passive is not uncontroversial. The development of citizenship as a simple passive identity has led to some issues as individuals are formally incorporated as citizens in France, for example (Sutherland 2002), while others (Mannitz, 2004) identify parallel issues of identity and civic belonging amongst young people from non-German heritages in Germany. Arguably, these issues are related to a widely accepted concept of 'citizenship' that has traditionally been linked to the ideology of nation-states and legitimised membership to them. Nation-states have often been ideologised as homogeneous entities with shared culture, values and language (Gellner 1983), thus leading to the notion of 'social cohesion' as a necessary feature of a united nation. This concept may be challenged, however, by members of society who 'move' across social or ethnic boundaries as part of a complex process of self-assembly of multiple voices. This concept of 'border-crossing', introduced by Rampton (1995), is emblematic of (usually young) people striving to redefine their identities across different ethnic, cultural or racial boundaries. The consequences of identity negotiation for participating in complex environments of multiple theoretical constructions of identity must be considered in any attempt to identify 'participation'.

UNIVERSITIES: CHAMPIONS OF PRIVILEGE AND INEQUITY?

Universities have had a traditional role in political education. They have educated a political elite, both to act as a ruling class, and to occupy authoritative leadership roles in the professions. Up until less than fifty years ago, in all European countries, only a very small minority

of young people attended university, and they were broadly recruited from a very narrow social range. Over the last half century, higher education has become 'massified' (Arimoto 1997; Teichler 1999), and a higher proportion of the age cohort attend university than before, but those attending are still predominantly drawn from the higher social classes. This appears to be true over most countries in Europe, with the possible exception of some Scandinavian countries (Erikson and Jonnson 1996).

In France, the Director of the elite Institut d'Etudes Politiques (Science Po), Richard Descoings, described the Institut's admission procedures as the "unfair recruitment of France's academic elite almost exclusively from its social elite" (Gentleman 2003).

In the UK, widening participation since 1962 has resulted in it becoming the norm for middle class young people to enter university, while this remains an exception for working class young people (Archer et al 2003). The expansion has allowed women in particular to achieve equality in admissions processes (though with still some subject bias), but confined most students of working class origin, and most minority ethnic students to lower-rated universities. London Metropolitan University, an inner city institution that does not fare well on the comparative league tables in the UK, has more black students than are admitted in total to the 25 of elite 'Russell Group' Universities. Whether one attends university, and which university one attends, has profound significance for political leadership: in the twenty-five UK Cabinets that were formed between 1900 and 2000, 60% of the members attended either Oxford or Cambridge (and 25% attended just one private school, Eton). This was not merely an early 20th century phenomenon – between 1951 and 1997 the proportion of Oxford and Cambridge graduates was never less than 45%, usually over 65%, and on one occasion 83% (Butler and Butler 2000: 71).

The issue is particularly acute in Germany, which has been described as 'der Weltmeister in der sozialen Selektion' (Arnhold 2005). Selection for Gymnasium secondary education occurs after primary school, and the gymnasia are the predominant schools that feed into universities. The selection process favours eleven year olds from middle class backgrounds – over 50% of those selected have parents who have themselves attended university (Ehemke 2004; Schnieider 2008).

Moreover, the selection also discriminates against those who do not have two German-born parents (Auernheimer 2006; Landesinstitut für Schulentwicklung 2007).

The situation is not dissimilar in eastern and central European countries that were under Soviet domination between 1946 and 1989. The abolishment of social class and gender inequalities was one of the explicit goals of socialist governments, and there were affirmative action programmes with admission quotas for the working classes (Simkus and Andorka 1982; Mateju 1993). This led to initial changes, but the new socialist elites, drawn largely from the intelligentsia, used their positions to both reverse some of these policies and to use personal networks and party membership to secure their own children's admittance to universities (Mateju 1993). Simkus and Andorka (1982) report that quotas were abolished and administrative rules eased in the 1960s and 1970s.

This appears to be part of a fairly consistent pattern across Europe. In a wide-ranging and often cited study, Brezis and Crouzet (2004) examined the changes to the admission processes to elite universities after 1945, when meritocratic recruitment replaced simply admitting upper class students. They conclude:

> the idea of meritocracy made inroads …. the first post-change elite was recruited in a diverse way, by successful performance in exams. For the first generation after these changes in recruitment, elite universities were not only enabled to choose the best, but also provided an opportunity for some who did not belong to the elite milieu to enter the best schools. In succeeding generations, however, exams have not permitted opportunity for all: …. the children of the elite enter the elite schools in greater proportions, due to a cultural bias.
>
> … whenever a new system is introduced, the nascent class system is destroyed, yielding a fluid, mobile society. However, from the second post-change generation on, the children of the elite again have an advantage. … meritocratic exams lead to an auto-recruitment of elites, resulting in a stratification effect. Meritocratic choice

> is therefore not equivalent to equal opportunity, since success in exams is correlated with family wealth and education. (p 20)

It is often forgotten that the word 'meritocracy' was originally devised as a satirical concept, to predict how attempts to recruit and admit by ability alone would be subverted by the first wave of meritocrats, who would entrench their own children's position and exclude others (Young 1958). Commenting on the misuse (or misunderstanding) of the term he coined forty year later, Michael Young wrote of

> … If meritocrats believe, as more and more of them are encouraged to, that their advancement comes from their own merits, they can feel they deserve whatever they can get. They can be insufferably smug, much more so than the people who knew they had achieved advancement not on their own merit but because they were, as somebody's son or daughter, the beneficiaries of nepotism. The newcomers can actually believe they have morality on their side. So assured have the elite become that there is almost no block on the rewards they arrogate to themselves. … as the book also predicted, all manner of new ways for people to feather their own nests have been invented and exploited. …. As a result, general inequality has been becoming more grievous with every year that passes (Young 2001).

Those recruited to universities are sometimes unaware of their particular elite status – or are, as Young observed, likely to feel that it is deserved. Isolating an elite, privileging it, and encouraging it to assume that political leadership is theirs as a right might not be considered the best way to encourage a democratic society founded on conceptions of equal rights and inclusion. Student political activity has, down the generations, been regarded as a way of politically socialising the political leaders of the next generation. This is preparation for political participation as leaders, and is as true of 'conventional' political activity as described above as it is of action for social change': the soixant-huitards who took on the establishment politicians of the 1960s with their chants of 'Rome, Paris and Berlin: we shall fight and we shall win' are now themselves the establishment politicians of the twenty first

century.

Student volunteering is another long-standing traditional activity, but again – perhaps inevitably because of the elite backgrounds of many students, and the privileged position of them all – often becomes ameliorative activity for those seen as less fortunate, a form of social obligation to one's inferiors. Such EU activities as the European Year of Volunteering (DG Education and Culture 2009a, 2009b) may have good intentions, but possibly divert students from activism against the causes of inequalities into assumptions about how they (and their class) should treat the symptoms. This perhaps leads us to a consideration of how the European Union are seeking to position universities, which has some important consequences, it will be argued, for their ability to promote social equity and rights.

THE EUROPEAN MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF UNIVERSITIES

Universities are, by their selective nature, by their inculcation of a privileged status, and by the assumption that they are providing future the elites of political and administrative leadership, are likely to be anti-egalitarian, to promote inequity, and to be inimical to democracy. The European Union's encouragement of a unified policy towards higher education seems to accentuate this.

The Bologna Process was founded on the basis that the countries of the Union's higher education systems needed to be transformed to create a European Higher Education Area (EHEA) that would specifically educate a skilled workforce of 'a Europe of Knowledge'. This was to competitively position the European Union as a leading advanced technology skills economy (see, for Example, European Commission 2002). There were other associated aims: these includes making European Higher Education attractive to potential students from non-European countries (perhaps recognising the way in which the US universities were attracting many such students, and perhaps also seeking to encourage the migration of the most highly-skilled people from the developing world to settle in Europe). Other attributes of the EHEA were to promote the values and roles of higher education

and research in a globalised society, to have a common structure with transparency and equivalence of qualifications, that would encourage student mobility. This is very much an instrumentalist approach to higher education, stressing he economic advantages both to the economies of Europe and to the individuals selected to participate in such education. Lorenz (2006) has argued that

> the basic idea behind all educational EU-plans is economic: the basic idea is the enlargement of scale of the European systems of higher education, ... in order to enhance its 'competitiveness' by cutting down costs. Therefore a Europe-wide standardization of the 'values' produced in each of the national higher educational systems is called for … it is obvious that the economic view on higher education recently developed and formulated by the EU Declarations is similar to and compatible with the view developed by the WTO and by GATS.

Others hold that the meeting of the Bologna Process Group that produced the London Communiqué (2007) referred to 'the full range of purposes' of higher education, thus moving well beyond a purely instrumental view, and opening space for the development of a political or civic dimension to education (Zgaga 2009). But against this, Lock and Martis (2009) argue that the Bologna process can better be seen as part of the continuing consumerisation of higher education, which is progressively being turned into a marketised product: they suggest that Bologna should be seen a 'psychotic reaction' of governments, to use universities for world domination (169). The degree of control being used, and its manner, is very similar to that described by Deem (2001) in her analysis of 'the new public management' in higher education. Lock and Martis suggest that citizenship in the European Union has become simply a management system for civil society in Europe. Not being a proper state, with the loyalties that might be entailed, the Union provides and polices a system of justice, satisfies people's economic needs, and does not need 'politics'. Biesta (2009) argues that citizenship in Europe is essentially consensual, and anti-political, in that the political is conflictual and non-consensual.

ENTRENCHING PRIVILEGE

Educational systems have an inherent tendency to reproduce the existing social order. Jencks (1972) argued that education had not been an equalizing influence, and that not only have the better-off appropriated far more than their share of publicly funded educational resources for their children, but that even if all pupils had the same educational resources, there would be no substantial change towards equalities of income as a consequence. Raymond Williams argued that 'the common prescription of education, as the key to change, ignores the fact that the for and content of education are affected, and in some cases determined, by the actual systems of decision and maintenance' (1961, p. 120): political (decision) and economic (maintenance) structures tend to prescribe the composition of the curriculum and the systems by which it is delivered in ways that minimizes the possibility of societal or economic change. Michael Apple develops this further, concluding that education contributes to inequality because it is intentionally organized to unequally distribute particular kinds of knowledge (1990, p. 43).

Apple argues that this reproduction is not a conspiracy to deprive, but a 'logical necessity' to maintain the unequal social order (1990, p. 40). A university system which credentialises a fraction of the population is an almost natural way of maintaining the economic and cultural imbalance on which these societies are built. Universities play a critical role in the economic hierarchy necessary for each generation, using structures to produce and reproduce different forms of official knowledge in different social orders, and to inculcate acceptance of the uneven power structure that lies behind this as normal and common sense.

One of the best known expositions of the nature and workings of the hidden curriculum in the context of the political economy was made by Bowles and Gintis (1972, 1976, 1988, 2002). To them, education is simply a response to the capitalist system, transmitting technical and social skills (through the overt curriculum), and inculcating discipline and respect for authority (through the hidden curriculum). The social relations of the means of production correspond to the social relations of education, and this, they argue, is no coincidence. The expansion of the service and corporate sections of the economy

> has fostered a tremendously increased stratification of the white-collar labour force, and relied upon educational credentials to legitimize this stratification process (Bowles and Gintis 1976, p. 202)
>
> … community colleges allow for more independent activity and less overall supervision. At the top, the elite four-year colleges emphasize social relationships conformable with the higher levels in the production hierarchy. (126)

Pierre Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital includes both cultural production and reproduction in educational institutions. The cultural capital, of the middle class is expressed through its habit of thought, assumptions and complexions, that are particularly cultivated land expressed by the school system: the school inculcates, partly through the formal but particularly through the informal curriculum, 'not so much with particular arid particularised schemes of thought as with that general disposition which engenders particular schemes, which may then be applied in different domains of thought and action' (Bourdieu, 1971, p. 184). This cultural capital is used as a mechanism to filter pupil to particular positions within the hierarchy of capitalist society. Universities re-create the social and economic hierarchies of the society in which they are embedded, by using processes of selection and teaching: but by judging and comparing these; activities against the cultural capital held by the middle class, they effectively discriminate against all these children who have not had access to this. 'By taking all children as equal, while implicitly favouring those who have already acquired the linguistic and cultural competencies to handle a middle class culture, schools take as natural what is essentially social gift, i.e. cultural capital' (Dale et al., 1976, p. 4). As Bourdieu puts it, 'the cultural capital and the ethos, as they take shape, combine to determine behaviour and attitude to school which make up the differential principle of elimination operating for children of different social classes' (Bourdieu, 1974, p. 36). At higher levels, educational systems will remain exclusive and socially reproductive, because the high status elites restrict access to higher education for the offspring of the working class, whereas at lower levels, educational institutions will open up for low status children because of macro-economic requirements as stated by modernisation theory (but see also Zimdars, Sullivan and Heath (2009).

TOWARDS A RIGHTS-PROMOTING UNIVERSITY

What can be done? This final section will argue that universities need not be instruments of social reproduction, but could – and I believe should – play an active role is preparing students to be politically active, not merely active citizens.

This will involve not simply adding to existing provision and processes, but actively considering who is recruited to higher education. If a particular social class can successfully monopolise the markers of success and outcomes for the compulsory phase of education, ensuring that their own offspring are disproportionate in achieving 'success', should universities passively accept this system, and recruit primarily from this narrow segment of society? There are four arguments for why they should not continue to do so. Firstly, this allows for a massive waste of resources and potential. School students from poorer social backgrounds are marked as failures, when with a more equitable and less classed schooling hey would achieve much better. Excluding them in favour of a favoured elite, which id favoured by the school examination system's systematic bias, is denying the potential of these individuals, and (from an instrumentalist perspective) wasting valuable potential. Secondly, such a system is inequitable, because it systematically denies possibilities to particular categories of student, and favours others. Thirdly, such policies promote social segregation, and this is likely to lead to social unrest and disaffection. And finally, such policies mean that a particular social class is disproporiately likely to become the political and administrative leadership of the country, and this is anti-democratic.

Universities therefore need to consider alternative ways of selecting students, that measure genuine potential to benefit from higher education, and not merely accept the current education systems that protect the outcomes for children from one particular class. Perhaps, as Breziz and Crouzet (2004) suggest, any changes will only produce results for a generation, but they will be a step towards equity, and can be revised again later to maintain the momentum.

Students that are selected, under whatever system, need to be educated to understand diversity. In particular, they need to know that they are not representative of the population as a whole – not because they are privileged or have any particular greater entitlements, but because they have been selected through a particular social and educational screening process. When a group of young people perceive that they are privileged, and look and speak the same way, it is all to easy to see how they come to believe that they are in some way superior to those of other ethnicities, classes or accents. Diversity needs to be not merely appreciated, but valued.

The curriculum needs to help create not simply civic competence and quiescence, or service learning – both of which can undermine political agency (Biesta, 2009), but should encourage political activity and learning that leads to a critical awareness and commitment to political citizenship. Citizenship programmes are often turned into sets of competences, as indicators that can be marked off once 'achieved' – voluntary work, participation in debate, membership of specialist interest groups, political participation in student affairs: as Simons and Masschelein (2009) observe, these can translate citizenship education into a set of individual learning problems, and do little to achieve real political and social change. Many curricula in higher education effectively immunise students from matters of concern, from contemporary issues, by miring the syllabus in matters of fact. Students should rather, I suggest, be exposed to issues of concern, and to be encouraged to be concerned by them, to take issue and to take and argue sides. A critical attitude towards knowledge and a real attitude of respect for enquiry and the processes of argument and debate are critical in this respect. We need to make our students into concerned members of the public, rather than consumers of fact, and to recognise that they should only presume to be 'members of the public', not necessarily leaders or managers of the public.

The university needs to become a rights-respecting institution, in much the same way that some schools are now being encouraged to be rights-respecting schools, in the UNICEF programme for a Rights-Respecting Schools (UNICEF 2008). Adapting these to apply to the university context, these might read: students should

» be aware of the provisions of the Human Rights conventions

(European and UN): they should know that these rights belong to everyone, and are not conditional;

» develop a sense of being connected with all others, in their society and in the world, and see themselves as global citizens;

» understand that they have the responsibility to respect the rights of others;

» understand that they have the responsibility to use their rights;

» have regular opportunities to give feedback on their learning and development;

» have opportunities to make choices in their learning;

» be involved in the assessment of their own learning and the evaluation of their work; and should be supportive evaluation of each other's work; and

» respect and value each other's similarities and differences and support each other and those who do not attend university, and negative behaviour (such as racist or sexist comment) should be absent.

» University staff should

» model rights-respecting behaviour: for example, listening carefully to students' views and respecting their opinions; and lecturers and professors should demonstrate respect for other university staff and all other adults;

» use a wide variety of teaching strategies, recognising the variety of learning processes; and

» emphasise mutual support and collaboration between students, and between staff.

Universities in general should consistently employ the language of human rights, using this is relation to a wide range of moral issues, from all aspects of the curriculum, student behaviour to each other and to other members of society, and in relation to global issues of citizenship, such as fair trade, sustainability and equalities issues.

All courses and programmes, in all subjects, should consistently pose questions about moral issues and issues of justice. This extends students' understanding of human rights and wider moral and political issues. Such questions might include:

» What human rights are involved in this context?

» Who has responsibilities in this situation? What are they?

» Whose rights are/are not being respected here?

» What examples of people enjoying their rights are there in a particular context?

» Are there any examples of rights being denied?

This is not an easy agenda. But it is critical that universities strive to ensure that students do not see themselves as a privileged elite, with superior rights of access to positions of power and influence, and at the same time recognise and understand their obligation to responsibly participate in civic society.

REFERENCES

Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1965) The civic culture: political attitudes and democracy in five nations. Boston MA: Little, Brown and Co.

Apple, M. (1990) Ideology and Curriculum (2nd edn). London: Routledge

Archer, L., Hutchings, M. and Ross, A. (2003) Social Class and Higher Education: issues of exclusion and inclusion. London: Routledge

Arimoto, A. (ed) (1997) Academic Reforms in the World : Situation and Perspective in the Massification Stage of Higher Education: Report of the Hiroshima International Seminar on Higher Education), Hiroshima: RIHE International Seminar Reports, 10

Arnhold, G. (2005) Soziale Selektion im deutschen Schulsytem. http://www.asta.uni-frankfurt.de/aktuell/themen/kultur/289130.html Accessed 12 December 2009

Auernheimer, G. (2006) The German Education System: Dysfunctional for an Immigration Society. European Education. 37, 4, pp 75 - 89

Beista, G. (2009) What kind of Citizenship for European Higher Education; Beyond the competent active citizen. European Educational Research Journal, 8, 2, pp 146 - 158

Bourdieu, P (1971) Intellectual Field and Creative Project. In Young, M. F. D. (ed) Knowledge and Control. London: Collier-Macmillan

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron J-C. (1977) Reproduction in education, society and culture. London: Sage

Bowles, S and Gintis, H. (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. London: Routledge

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life; London: Routledge

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1988) Schooling in Capitalist America: Reply to our critics. In Cole, M. (ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited: Correspondence and Contradiction in Educational Theory. London: Falmer

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (2003) Prosocial emotions Santa Fe Institute Working Papers 02-07-028 http://www.santafe.edu/research/publications/workingpapers/02-07-028.pdf

Brezis, E. and Crouzet, F. (2004) The role of Higher Education Institutions: Recruitment of elites and economic growth Cesifo Working Paper No. 1360 Munich: Center for Economic Studies (CES)/Ifo Institute for

Economic Research
Butler, D. and Butler G. (2000) Twentieth Centuy British Political Facts1900-2000. London: Macmillan
Dale, R., Esland, G., and Macdonald, M. (eds) (1976) Schooling and Capitalism: A sociological reader. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul/Open University Press
Deem, R. (2001) Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities: Is the Local Dimension Still Important? Comparative Education, 37, 1, pp. 7-20
DG Education and Culture (2009a) 2011: The European Year of Volunteering. The Magazine, 42, pp 31
DG Education and Culture (2009b) 2011: Spread those wings and Volunteer! The Magazine, 42, pp 28 – 29
Ehmke et al., (2004) Der Bildungsstand der Jugendlichen in Deutschland – Ergebnisse des 2. internationalen Vergleiches, in: PISA-Konsortium Deutschland PISA 2003 . Münster/NewYork: Waxmann Verlag
Erikson, R. and Jonsson, J (eds) (1996) Can Education be Equalised? The Swedish case in comparative perspective. Boulder CO: Westview Press
European Commission (2002) Education for an entrepreneurial Society and training: Directory of measures in favour of entrepeneurship and competitiveness in candidate countries [http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/enterprise_policy/enlargement/cc-best_directory/education/slovenia.htm]
Gellner, E. 1983. Nations and nationalism. Oxford: Blackwell.
Gentleman, A. (2003) 'France rules on elite education for poorest', London: The Guardian, 6 November 2003
Havel, V. (1990) Speech by the acting President of the Czech Republic in Prague on the implications of the democratisation process, at European Navigator [Novoroční projev prezidenta ČSSR Václava Havla (Praha, Pražský hrad, 1. ledna 1990], http://www.ena.lu/address_given_vaclav_havel_czechoslovak_people_prague_january_1990-03-22055. Accessed 1 December 2009.
Ireland, E., Kerr, F., Lopes, J. and Nelson, J. (2006) Active Citizenship and Young people: Opportunities, Experiences and Challenges in and beyond School. Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Fourth Annual report. London: Department for Education and Skills.
Jenks, C (1972) Inequality: A reassessment of the effects of family and schooling in America. New York: Basic Books
Kennedy, J. K. (2006) Towards a Conceptual Framework for understanding Active and Passive Citizenship. Unpublished, quoted in Nelson, J. and Kerr, D.
Landesinstitut für Schulentwicklung (2007) Untersuchung zum Abschneiden von Schülerinnen und Schülern mit Migrationshintergrund im Rahmen der DVA 2007. http://www.schule-bw.de/entwicklung/bildungsbericht/migration_dva.pdf. Accessed 12 December 2009

Lasswell. H. (1936) Politics: Who gets what, when, how. New York NY: McGraw Hill.

Lock; G. and Martis, H (209) The European Universities, citizenship and its limits: what won't solve the problem of our times. European Educational Research Journal, 8, 2, pp 159 - 174

London Communiqué (2007) The London Communiqué: Towards the European Higher Education Area: responding to challenges in a globalised world (18 May 2007). http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/Bologna/documents/MDC/London_Communique18May2007.pdf. Accessed 12 December 2009

Lorenz, C. (2006) Will the Universities survive the European integration? Higher Education policies in the EU and the Netherlands before and after the Bologna Declaration Sociologia Internationalis. 44. pp 123-151

Majeju, P. 1993. Who Won and Who Lost in a Socialist Redistribution in Czechoslovakia? In Persistent inequality: changing educational attainment in thirteen countries, Shavit, Y. and Blossfeld, H-P. (eds). Boulder, CO; Oxford: Westview (251-271).

Mannitz, S. (2004) Pupils' negotiation of cultural difference: Identity management and discursive assimilation. In Schiffauer, G., Baumann, G., Kastoryano, R. and Vertyovec, D (eds) Civic Enculturation: Nation-State, School and Ethnic Difference in the Netherlands, Britain, Germany and France. New York: Baic Books pp 242 – 303

Marshall, T. H. (1950) Citizenship and Social Class. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Masscheilein, J. and Simons, M. (2009) From Active Citizenship to World |citizenship: a proposal fro a world university European Educational Research Journal, 8, 2, pp 236 - 248

Nelson, J. and Kerr, D. (2006) Active Citizenship in INCA countries: definitions, policies, practices and outcomes: Final Report. London: Qualification and Curriculum Authority.

Norris, P. (2002) Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing political activism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Phillips, W. (1853) speech in Boston, Massachusetts, January 28 1852, Speeches Before the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. Boston MA: Wallcutt, p 13

Rampton, B. (1995) Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents New York: Longman.

Schneider, T. (2008) Social Inequality in Educational Participation in the German School System in a Longitudinal Perspective: Pathways into and out of the most Prestigious School Track European Sociological Review 24, 4, pp 511-526

Simkus A. and Andorka R. 1982. Inequalities in Educational Attainment in Hungary, 1923-1973. American Sociological Review 47: 740-751.

Simons, M. and Masschelein, J. (2009): The public and its University: beyond learning for civic employability? European Educational

Research Journal, 8, 2, pp 204 - 217
Sutherland, M. (2002) Educating Citizens in Europe. European Education. 34 (3) 77
Teichler, U. (1999) Massification: A challenge for Institutions of Higher education, Tertiary Education and Management, 4, 1, pp 17 – 27
UNICEF (2008) The case for 'Rights-Respecting Schools', based on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. http://rrsa.unicef.org.uk/?nodeid=rrsa&section=6
Williams, R. (1961) The Long Revolution. London: Chatto and Windus
Young, M. (1958) The Rise of the Meritocracy 1870-2033: An essay on education and equality. London: Thames and Hudson
Young, M. (2001) Down with meritocracy The Guardian, Friday 29 June 2001
Zgaga, P. (2009) Higher Education and Citizenship: 'the full range of purposes'. European Educational Research Journal, 8, 2, pp 175 - 188
Zimdars, A., Sullivan, A., Heath, A. (2009) Elite Higher Education Admissions in the Arts and Sciences: Is Cultural Capital the key? Sociology. 43: 648-666

'IN THEORY, YES; IN PRACTICE, NO': IS THIS THE REALITY OF EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Henry Maitles, University of Strathclyde, Scotland, United Kingdom;

Irena Zaleskiene, Pedagogical University of Vilnius, Lithuania;

Miquel Essombert, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain

Eleni Karatzia – Stavlioti, University of Patras, Greece;

Correspondence:
Henry Maitles
Reader in Education, University of Strathclyde / Faculty of Education, Southbrae Drive, Glasgow G131PP, Scotland, UK
h.maitles@strath.ac.uk

HENRY MAITLES

is Reader in the Department Curricular Studies at University of Strathclyde Faculty of Education in Glasgow, Scotland. He researches and teaches in the area of citizenship and values and in particular the impact of initiatives, such as pupil voice and Holocaust education, in the schools. He was a member of the Scottish Executive Review Group which drew up the proposals for Education for Citizenship which is now a national priority in all Scottish schools. Recent relevant publications include:

* Maitles, H. (2005) Values in Education: We're citizens now (Edinburgh: Dunedin Press), (ISBN 1 903765 24 2).

* Maitles, H (ed.) (2008) Exploring cultural perspectives in education (Alberta: ICRN Press), (ISBN 0 9731036-2-6)

* Maitles, H. (2009) 'They're out to line their own pockets!': can the teaching of political literacy counter the democratic deficit?; the experience of Modern Studies in Scotland. Scottish Educational Review, 41,2, 46-61.

ELENI KARATZIA-STAVLIOTI

is an Assistant Professor in Educational Evaluation in the Department of Elementary Education, University of Patras. She has served as a Primary School Teacher, a Head-teacher, a School Counselor, a Primary Education Counselor at the Hellenic Pedagogical Institute and a Vice President at the Department of Quality in Education at the Hellenic Pedagogical Institute. Her main research interests are on educational evaluation, school effectiveness, educational performance indicators and pupil assessment related to biopedagogy. She is an author of several scientific refereed articles, of many national and international conference presentations as well as a co-author of two scientific-pedagogic books. She is also a member of several local and international professional societies. Recent relevant publications include:

* Alahiotis S.N. & Karatzia- Stavlioti, ?. (2006). «Effective curriculum design and cross curricularity: Analysis of the new curriculum design of the Hellenic Pedagogical Institute",

Pedagogy, Culture & Society Vol. 14, No. 2, 119-148.

* Alahiotis, S. N., and Karatzia-Stavlioti, . (2008). "Biopedagogism: A New Theory for Learning". The International Journal of Learning, Vol. 15, No 3, ?? . 323-330.

* Karatzia -Stavlioti , E. & Alahiotis , S.N. (2009). "Citizenship in teaching /learning and assessment: effectiveness of the flexible zone (FZ) curricular innovation". In L.Neophytou (ed), Proceedings from the international conference Citizenship Multiculturalism Cosmopolitanism, Nicosia. Vol.1 : 101-114.

IRENA ZALESKIENE

is a Professor in Education, Head of the Department of Social Pedagogy at Vilnius Pedagogical University, Lithuania. Her field of research and teaching is Civil Society and Citizenship Education, particularly civic values, identities, civic participation of young people. For many years she has been involved in Lithuanian Rewiew Group for designing National Core-Curriculum and textbooks for Citizenship education. Recent publications include:

* Barkauskaite, Marijona, Zaleskiene, Irena (2009). Values of teenagers living in urban and rural areas. In: The Quality of Education and Culture = Qualität von Bildung und Kultur , Gerd-Bodo von Carlsburg (ed.). Vol. 17. ISBN 9783631595855, 145-153.

* Zaleskiene, Irena (2009). Citizenship education in changing Lithuanian society Social science tribune : quarterly scientific review. Special issue, From a national identity to a European one University of Thessaly. Vol. 14, iss. 55 (2009). ISSN 1105-1167, 211-228.

* Zaleskiene, Irena (2008). Models of social participation and students' civic activeness //Socialiniai tyrimai = Social research : mokslo darbai. 2008, Nr. 1 (11). ISSN 1392-3110 p. 74-84.

DR. MIQUEL ANGEL ESSOMBA

is currently professor of Education at the University Autonomous of Barcelona and director of ERDISC, a research team on education, diversity and inclusion. he is also the director of the educational review Perspectiva Escolar. Recently he has become the director of the UNESCO Centre of Catalonia (Barcelona).His expertise is on diversity management and intercultural education. He has been a visiting research fellow at the London Metropolitan University in 2005 and usually collaborates in several international research teams and projects, for instance with the Hogeschool van Amsterdam (Amsterdam) or the Institut für Technik und Bildung (Bremen). He has given conferences and lessons worldwide, especially in Europe, Latin America, and South-eastern Asia. Recent publications include:

* Essomba, M.A. (2006), "Quand le présent dépasse l'avenir. Dix ans de formation d'enseignants en diversité culturelle en Espagne",/ Revue des Hautes Études Pédagogiques/, vol. 1, pp. 149-169.

*Arnesen, A.-L., Hadzhitheodoulou-Loizidou, P., Bîrzéa, C., Essomba, M.-A., Allan, J. (2009). Policies and practices for teaching sociocultural diversity - Concepts, principles and challenges in teacher education <http://www.theewc.org/library/category/view/policies.and.practices.for.teaching.sociocultural.diversity.concepts.principles.and.challenges.in.teacher.education/>.
Strasburg : Council of Europe Publishing.

* Essomba, M.A. (2010). Teacher education for diversity in Spain: moving from theory to practice. (Within the collective work Educating Teachers for Diversity: Meeting the Challenge) Paris : OECD.

'In theory, yes; in practice, no': Is this the reality of Education for Citizenship in Higher Education

ABSTRACT

Whilst Education for Citizenship has primarily been developed for schools, most countries recognize its significance for post-compulsory education. This raises questions as to the role of Higher Education in the effective development of citizens.

Although Education for Citizenship courses have been prevalent in teacher education institutions, primarily because of the developments in schools, there is a recognition in many faculties and departments that components of Education for Citizenship, such as service learning and activities in the wider community, that relate Higher Education learning to the significant issues of the contemporary world, are important, along with active, problem-based learning in the tutorial rooms.

This paper has stemmed from research being carried out for the EU funded network Childrens Identity and Citizenship in Europe (CiCe) regarding Education for Citizenship practice in higher education. Its purpose is to try to get answers to 2 key questions: firstly, how far and in what ways do university managements support citizenship education; secondly, to ascertain examples of good practice and helpful conditions. Tentative conclusions can then be drawn on the current state of Citizenship Education in European Higher Education Institutions

This paper:

» Highlights the background to the research;

» Outlines results from specifically formulated questionnaires;
» Explains the country case study results comparatively;
» Shows examples of good practice;
» Highlights the barriers across the system, as identified by the research, hindering the development of Education for Citizenship in the universities;
» Draws conclusions and makes tentative recommendations.
»

Keywords: citizenship; higher education; values; active learning; democracy

WHAT TYPE OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION? WHAT TYPE OF CITIZEN?

The key questions surrounding education for citizenship in higher education – what is education for?; what are universities for?; and what values should education systems aim to develop in young people? – raise complex issues. As these are such challenging questions and as there is little agreement about them, this raises for the public, students, academics and educationists, as many issues as definitive answers (Arthur and Bolin, 2005; Englund, 2002; GUNI, 2008); indeed Englund's article is subtitled 'the democratic potential of the university?' Nearly all of us who chose education as a career did so to make a difference; not just to degree results, but to the lives and aspirations of young people and society as a whole. Thus, although we champion the development of critical abilities, the skills of enquiry and questioning, activity based approaches to learning and the notion of rights as something to be cherished, this is not in itself merely a chronicle. It is to suggest that a mixture of creative content, ethos and a participatory, consultative, democratic approach in the framework of macro and micro improvements can lead to better, deeper learning and crucially a fairer and more just society.

This trend towards a larger role for education for citizenship has been global, shown by, for example, calls from the European Ministers of Education every year at their standing conference that there is a need for a more coherent and sustained approach to education for democratic citizenship and the emphasis on it in the Action Plan adopted by the heads of state and Government of the Council of Europe at their 3rd summit

in Warsaw in May 2005. And this itself was reaffirming the Council's decision that 2005 was the Year of Citizenship Through Education (Council of Europe 2006). Further, in central and eastern Europe, the ending of communist one-party rule and uncertain movements towards democracy has put the issue of education for democracy to the fore. The content analyses of different research literature and educational policy documents (regulations, standards, programs) in Eastern Europe suggests that in most cases the curriculum for citizenship education is didactic based (Zaleskiene, 2004) attempting to allow the citizen to be seen as a person (with values, needs, rights and duties), as a creator (making decisions and feeling responsible for those decisions) and as a participant (having certain abilities, skills and knowledge) but not with great success.

Researchers (Fulan 1998; Jarvis 2001; Ozmon and Craver 2007) analysing a changing global world point out features of postmodernity such as social, cultural, economic and political relationships, which have a major impact on how we both view and shape our world. A person living in such a complex society has to be enabled to manage his or her life. And education for citizenship can play an important role in such circumstances especially when democracy is seen as a form of government and as a practice, in which participation and involvement are key points. Role, status and content of citizenship education is influenced not only by socio-educational changes, but it becomes one of the most important factors in enabling young people to face the challenges of globalisation.

Although, democracy is a concept in continuous development and a topic for discussion without definitive answers, there is a broad recognition of the centrality of democracy to contribute to the learning to live together. In the project "Education for Democratic Citizenship" the Council of Europe describes democracy as an'ability of solving conflicts and differences of opinion in a non-violent manner'. Nonetheless, practice at local level can turn out in ways that resemble more those of old socio-cultural traditions than the modern - western oriented - conception of democracy. Active citizenship is more a democratic practice, to a large extent culturally and politically based. The Dakar Framework for Action maintains that '…education must lead to the acquisition of…the knowledge, values and abilities that are needed for individual development, and for the exercise of participatory and

responsible citizenship in a democracy'. Much contemporary thinking suggests that an active citizen should have certain type of competencies which help to manage social life such as the ability to vote and assume one's responsibilities in a democratic political system and in community life, the ability to start family life, to manage resources in a free and transparent market, to find one's way about in the educational system, to defend one's rights and interests and make use of legal procedures.

Thus, almost all sections of society internationally now accept citizenship as a legitimate goal. That is not to suggest that there is much agreement about what it means, other than that it is a 'good thing'. The debate tends to be around maximal and minimal interpretations of citizenship. Evans (1995) summarises this as:

> Minimal interpretations emphasise civil and legal status, rights and responsibilities…The good citizen is law-abiding, public-spirited, exercises political involvement through voting for representatives…Maximal interpretations, by contrast, entail consciousness of self as a member of a shared democratic culture, emphasise participatory approaches to political involvement and consider ways in which social disadvantage undermine citizenship by denying people full participation in society in any significant sense.

Faulks (1998, 2000) identifies three main types of definition of citizenship. Firstly, legal definitions of citizenship (Oliver and Heater, 1994) stress nationality, rights of residence and duties; secondly, philosophical definitions are determined as being the relationship between the role of the state in providing for needs and the duties of the individual to the state. It has been argued (Deuchar 2007; Faulks 1998, 2000; Gardner 1994; Maitles 2005; Turner 1993) that this definition misses out the central issue of the modern world, that of inequalities in society. The third interpretation, socio-political, is defined by Turner (1993, 2) as 'that set of practices (juridical, political, economic and cultural) which define a person as a competent member of society, and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups'.

All definitions tend to stress the nature of the relationship between

the individual and the state. Yet, it would be fair to say that although discussed by policy makers, these debates rarely impinge on the way the discussions are framed in educational establishments.

While citizenship education has primarily been developed for schools, most countries officially recognise its importance post-16 (Arthur and Bohlin 2004; Janoski 1998; Lister and Pia 2008; McDonough and Feinberg 2005). Clearly higher education has an important role to part to play in the development of citizenship education and this relates to its longstanding role as a civilising force within complex industrial societies. The expansion of higher education raises questions about how this role is to be carried forward in the twenty first century. The incorporation of a business and consumerist model into higher education has reinforced the notion that civil relationships are primarily contractual. In such an environment, how can graduates be prepared for citizenship and, potentially, a leadership role in civil society? One way this can be achieved is through the establishment of academic programmes that also incorporate forms of community based learning, an international trend that highlighted the importance of work in community and voluntary organisations for undergraduate students (Annette 2000 and 2005; Chen 2007; NCIHE 1997; Long et al 2001; Mattson et al 1997;). Many higher education institutions around the world now offer their students opportunities to become involved in various kinds of community, service learning and voluntary work. However, if such initiatives are to become part of a broad based citizenship education within higher education, they must help to cultivate skills of critical thinking and social and political analysis. In this sense, citizenship education is a combination of academic skills combined with the actual experience of active citizenship. Reflecting these developments in citizenship education, a key objective should be for students to explore the contested meaning of citizenship and citizenship education. In developing this critical approach to citizenship education, students should be able to evaluate and assess the application of different concepts of citizenship and some teaching programmes are encouraging this CSSGJ, 2007; Higher Education Academy, 2007; Wyman, 2005). Nonetheless, as Annette (2005) points out, there is a lack even of rhetoric about the values of civic republicanism and the promotion of citizenship from most of the statements of many of the higher education institutions throughout Europe.

WHAT IS CITIZENSHIP?

Citizenship education and competencies

But can any of this be measured? And, if it can, would we want to? Whilst there can be some justification in developing a competency model, there are problematic areas related to the overly prescriptive form it can take. Indeed, since the building of an efficient economic and political system ought never to be an end in itself, but only the means to such goals as building a fair, democratic and culturally enriching society, an equally important premise has to be that programmes of education for citizenship are central in preparing people for life as fair minded and competent citizens. Citizenship is thus not something to be segregated into discrete programmes, but should permeate many types of study – literature, history, geography, politics, science, religion. The student who learns how to debate the meaning of a poem or a novel or a film or to weigh the evidence for and against wind farms or genetic modification, or to understand the reasons why Islam and Christianity have sometimes been in conflict is in fact well prepared for life as a citizen.

At the moment, it is hard to know whether and to what extent existing programmes of higher education are any kind of common basis for citizenship at all (Arthur and Bolin, 2005; Englund, 2002). Indeed, there seems to be a tendency within the universities to the opposite, with an increasingly narrow vocational focus (Callinicos, 2006; Grubb and Lazerson, 2005; Symes and McIntyre, 2000). The need for students to get a job on leaving has always been there. The lack of grants and the tuition fees paid by most of our students add to the pressures. Nonetheless, the idea that our university experience should be solely about finding a job should rightly be regarded as inappropriate.

Democracy and rights

Inside the educational establishment, there is the thorny issue of whether one only learns about democracy or also lives it. If we take the 'living' model, then there are implications for our universities and indeed for society as a whole. For universities, it means there should be proper forums for discussion, consultation and decision-making involving students and it should be noted that articles of the United Nations Convention on Human Rights insists that young people should

be consulted on issues that affect them and does insist on functioning democratic processes. Finally, in terms of rights, the whole issue of inequalities in society and their impact on the educational attainment and aspiration of students must be taken into account.

> *However, there is a worry, indeed a panic, in most representative democracies around the world that young people are apathetic, alienated and uninterested in politics. Yet, there is also evidence that although young people are alienated from formal politics, they are active and interested in single issue, environmental, political and animal welfare issues.*

Research into the attitudes of student teachers in the UK suggests that education for citizenship needs to permeate the curriculum in faculties of education. We should note that if, as the evidence suggests (Wilkins 1999 and 2001; Robbins 2003), there is limited citizenship understanding amongst student teachers, it is fair to extrapolate that outside faculties of education these citizenship values will be at least as weak.

This research has implications for our tertiary education institutions and indeed for competences that we should be developing. Whilst education for citizenship is now a part of this, there is no evidence that it plays more than just a relatively cursory part, with many students able to avoid deep discussion or thought on the subject. Similar to the school audits, it is possible for the university faculties to develop policies which look good on paper but do not make a significant impact in practice. It needs to permeate the curriculum of university education and be developed enthusiastically by tutors.

There is much to be positive about. We need to do more research into the effectiveness of learning in the three areas of citizenship: political literacy, involvement in one's community and values. However, it is also clear that we have to keep some kind of realistic perspective on the influence of education for citizenship or any kind of other civic or political education. There was widespread political education at the content level in the communist bloc and that did not prevent a large number of citizens opposing the dictatorships. Equally, there has been a return, albeit limited, in terms of influence of the old communist parties,

sometimes under a new name, in parts of central and eastern Europe. As Colin Power, Assistant Director-General for Education UNESCO, (Power 1995, 7-8) noted: 'as history has often shown, knowledge about human rights is insufficient to guarantee their observance in practice'. Teaching democratic values will not be a panacea where governments 'let down' the aspirations of their populations. However, even within this perspective there is clearly value in the population being politically literate. Indeed the experiences of the lessons of the 20th Century, in particular that of genocide, suggests that this headteacher in the United States, who is a Holocaust survivor, sums up a strand of the case for education for citizenship (Ginott 1972, 317):

> 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 college graduates. So, I am suspicious of education. My request is: help your students become more human. Your efforts must never produce learned monsters, skilled psychopaths, educated Eichmanns. Reading, writing, arithmetic are important only if they serve to make our children more humane.

Education for citizenship throws up the central questions as to what sort of education we want. That is why the continuing high profile of debate around the subject is so important and valuable. We could come out of it with not just a better understanding of citizenship but a better feel for education as a whole.

Methodology and sample

The research involved two main questions: firstly, how far and in what ways do university managements support citizenship education; secondly, to ascertain examples of good practice and helpful conditions. To get a clearer picture of what was happening in the universities we developed a twin methodological strategy. Firstly, we devised and issued a questionnaire to all Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe (CiCe) members – this is an EU funded network researching and teaching in the area of education for citizenship -- in order to get a feel for both content and democratic practice within their institutions; we received a

30% return and this highlighted for us the barriers and good practice evident across Europe in universities where there was at least some commitment to citizenship through their membership and involvement in CiCe. Secondly, we devised and implemented 3 case studies – Greece, Lithuania and Scotland – through our knowledge augmented with some structured interviews with key university personnel. These case studies are examined comparatively to determine differences and similarities across the countries.

Our intention with this methodology is to establish evidence of good practice and barriers to implementation of education for citizenship in Higher Education.

Citizenship education in higher education – the case of three European countries; Greece, Scotland and Lithuania

We examined Citizenship Education in three diverse Higher Education systems in Europe. We looked at central policies and administrative issues as well as governance. A closer description is made of the status of Citizenship Education at the institutional level with special reference to specific cases of HE institutions and in the context of the existing culture and climate. The investigation was carried out using various techniques and sources in an effort to get a deeper understanding of the various aspects of the investigated theme, including the history of citizenship education through published texts as well as through the relevant information gathered from our empirical work, the study of the curricula in the Universities. The data was collected through interviews with academics and members of the administration in a sample of universities and questionnaires distributed to academics in various HE Institutions.

Whilst there were clear differences evident in appendix 1 in terms of history, culture and practice across the 3 countries examined, there were some clear similarities or at least tendencies in practice. Firstly, a lack of resources meaning large class sizes, favouring a didactic approach which mitigated against active learning experiences. Secondly, we found a stubborn traditional view of academic teaching involving an authoritarian approach to learning. Thirdly, there was a lack of an understanding, particularly in Lithuania and Greece, of the pedagogy of student-centred learning. Fourthly, the Higher Education systems

tend to be assessment orientated, mitigating against Citizenship initiatives and sometimes active learning. Finally, all three countries had introduced formal procedures for some student involvement, but on occasion they appeared to be tokenistic – the students had a voice but lacked agency.

Questionnaire to CiCe members

Specially formatted and piloted questionnaires were also distributed (via e-mail, through post or in person) to 200 members of the Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe (Cice) European Union network. The response rate was approximately 30% (n=64) and, although a small numbers, given the wide range of countries involved from Greece to Iceland and from Ireland to Lithuania, it could be claimed that the information provided was representative in terms of offering the opportunity to make sense of the situation that exists in HE institutions in relation to citizenship education. We could expect that these responses reflect a wide range of initiatives going on in the field of citizenship education in HE.

The majority of our respondents (62%) were in Teacher Education departments, a further 23% in Social and Human Sciences and the remainder in administration or natural science departments. We specifically investigated two broad areas: firstly, the supportiveness of higher education institutions to citizenship education, and secondly, good practices and conditions for developing citizenship education within higher education institutions. It is necessary to state that we must be wary of over-generalising from our 20% return, both as evidence of CiCe members or HE as a whole across Europe, but we did find some trends which are of interest regarding citizenship education in HE.

As regards institutional support for citizenship education, we identified a relationship between the support to a citizenship education policy and the current political framework within the countries. Essentially, those political parties close to a conservative ideology tend not to develop an explicit support and initiatives towards the implementation of citizenship education. There was also a perceived contradiction from our respondents between managerial level support for citizenship education in theory and barriers for practical implementation. Further, according to our respondents, the larger the higher education

institution is, the more the institutional managers pay only lip service to citizenship education. We also found regional variations: respondents from Scandinavia and the UK suggested that the environment here is supportive; those from central Europe, less so.

In terms of identifying examples of good practice and helpful conditions, most of the answers showed that respondents consider that good practices are related to methodology as well as content; that "how" the students learn is more important than "what" teachers teach. We did find a surprising regional variation to this though; most of respondents coming from Mediterranean countries consider that best practices are more closely related to content as opposed to methodology. Further, our data shows that the respondents think that a new profile of university teacher – one who is wedded to active learning in the broadest sense -- is needed. A number commented on this in terms of university recruitment requirements, initial commitments and basic competences in the field of tuition in general, and in citizenship education as a specific topic. It was seen to be of little use to develop programmes of implementation when the academic culture only promotes rigid lectures and written examinations as the major elements of university activity; further, democratisation of academic culture is a requirement to fulfil faculties of good practices in citizenship education. Respondents consider that good practices are based in a cross-curricular approach instead of segregated courses. This point is extremely relevant as it puts the stress in the need of cross-curricular strategies and the need of networking within the higher education institutions.

Our data shows that wherever citizenship education is introduced, it is mainly optional and not compulsory. This suggests something about the status and the role of citizenship education in the framework of university curricula: low, emerging, new.

Clearly in accordance to the statement that pointed out the need of a new teacher profile, respondents who focused their answers on methodology consider that good practice about citizenship education within higher education institutions should be based on such methodologies as

» Experiential, learning by doing
» Student-centred learning as opposed to the teacher-centred didactic approach –
» Participatory environment, co-operative learning

CONCLUSIONS

It is important not to take too much from this small-scale study of Education for Citizenship in Higher Education. Further, there are specific socio-historic conditions which have impacted on these developments. Nonetheless, there are some positives and some barriers which bear examination.

In general we found a commitment by governments, university bodies such as courts and Senates and in most cases members of staff to an education for citizenship agenda in Higher Education. Linked to this, there is an understanding from many of the students of education for citizenship, which comes both from their current experience in Higher Education and their prior learning and experiences in school education. Our respondents in some cases reported on student experiences of being involved and consulted in the running of universities and, in many cases, of genuine consultation within departments and courses, with students having a say in how their learning occurs, involving student centred, problem based learning at its core. There were programmes in the universities in some departments and by some members of staff which stress democracy and rights and values at their core

Nonetheless, we also found some significant barriers to meaningful education for citizenship in the universities. Firstly, an increasingly market orientated neo-liberal agenda which, at its worst, has universities as competing entities based on league tables. Secondly, a 'downgrading' of teaching, often related to a management led research enhancement agenda, resulting in larger sections mitigating against student- centred learning. Further, there can be a lack of expertise by some university staff in relation to problem-based learning. Thirdly, in some cases, the involvement of students was in a formalistic and tokenistic manner, the university, departments and courses having structures in place but in reality give no real say to the student body as a whole. Finally, there is also an increasing vocational orientation by the universities and often by the student body encouraging a narrower agenda.

In reality the emphasis on positives and barriers depends on whether one sees the glass as half full or half empty. Our investigation has suggested that there is excellent work going on to develop young people's interest, knowledge, skills and dispositions in areas of citizenship and democracy; yet it is very limited, indeed rare, to find examples of genuine democracy based on human rights. It is a matter of hearts

and minds. No amount of hectoring and/or government instructions can counter this; academics need to have a sense of mission and to grasp the fullness of moral and social aims. Field research now needs to concentrate on the impact of education for citizenship initiatives and look towards highlighting instances of good and effective practice.

REFERENCES

Andrews, E. (2008) 'Drunk, violent, promiscuous…US views of British youth', Daily Mail, March 29, 2008, p.4

Annette, J. (2000) 'Citizenship studies, community service learning and higher education', in Gardner, Cairns and Lawton (eds.) Education for Values, Morals, Ethics and Citizenship in Contemporary Teaching, pp.109-123 (London, Kogan Page).

Annette, J. (2005) 'Character, civic renewal and service learning for democratic citizenship in higher education', British Journal of Educational Studies, 53 (3), pp.326-340.

Arthur, J. and Bohlin, K. (2004) Citizenship in Higher Education: the role of universities in communities and society (New York, RoutledgeFalmer).

Chapman, J. (2008) 'Why binge drink mobs will scar our streets for years', Daily Mail, February 11, 2008, p.3

Chen, S. (2007) 'Community Service Learning: an approach to facilitate citizenshp education in higher ducation' (www.citized.info/commarticle/sicong_chen.doc) accessed 5 April 2008.

Council of Europe (2006) Higher Education and Democratic Culture (Strasbourg, Council of Europe).

Deuchar, R. (2007) Citizenship, Enterprise and Learning (Stoke on Trent, Trentham).

Evans, K. (1995) 'Competence and Citizenship: Towards a Complementary Model', Journal of Education and Work, Vol. 11, (2), pp.1-11.

Faulks, K. (1998) Citizenship in Modern Britain (Edinburgh, EUP).

Faulks, K. (2000) Citizenship (London, Routledge).

Fullan, M. (1998) Change forces : the sequel (Philadelphia, Falmer Press).

Gardner, J.P. (1994) Hallmarks of Citizenship. (London, The British Institute of International and Comparative Law).

Ginott, H. (1972) Teacher and Child: a book for parents and teachers (New York: Macmillan).

Hall, T., Williamson, H. and Coffey, A (1998) 'Conceptualizing citizenship: young people and the transition to adulthood', Journal of Education Policy, Vol. 13 (3), pp.301-315.

Janoski, T. (1998) Citizenship and civil society (Cambridge, Cambridge

University Press).
Jarvis, P. (2001) The age of learning: education and the knowledge society (London, Kogan Page).
Jones, G. (1995) Leaving Home (Buckingham, OUP).
Lister, A. and Pia, A. (2008), Citizenship in contemporary Europe (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press).
Long, S. (2001) The new student politics: Wingspread statement on student civic engagement (USA, Campus Compact).
Lyall, S. (2007) 'Poor British youth face drinks, drugs and alienation' International Herald Tribune, March 9, 2007, p.18
Macdonald, R. (ed.) (1997) Youth, the "underclass" and social exclusion (London, Routledge).
Maitles, H. (2005) Values in Education (Edinburgh, Dunedin).
Mattson, K. and Shea, M. (1997) The selling of service learning to the modern university: how much will it cost? (http://www.cpn.org/topics/youth/highered/selling_service.html) accessed 10 June, 2008.
McDonough, K. and Feinberg, W. (2005) Citizenship Education in Liberal-Democratic Societies (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
McGory, T. (2008) 'Why the children of Ireland are turning into drunks', Sunday Business Post, January 13, 2008, p.23
NCIHE (1997) Higher Education in a Learning Society (Dearing Report) (London, HMSO).
Oliver, D. and Heater, D. (1994) The Foundations Of Citizenship (New York, Harvester Wheatsheaf).
Ozmon, H. and Craver, S. (2007) Philosophical foundations of education (Upper Saddle River, N.J., Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall).
Power, C. (1995) 'Forty Years of the UNESCO Associated Schools Project', in Meyer-Bisch, P. (ed.) Culture of Democracy, pp.7- 8 (Paris, UNESCO).
Rees, G., Williamson, H. and Istance, I. (1996) 'Status Zero: a study of jobless school leavers in South Wales', Research Papers in Education, Vol. 11 (2), pp. 219-235.
Robbins, M., Francis, L. and Elliott, E. (2003) 'Attitudes towards education for global citizenship among trainee teachers', Research in Education, Vol. 69, pp.93-98.
Turner, B. (1993) 'Contemporary Problems in the Theory of Citizenship' in Turner, B. (ed.) Citizenship and Social Theory (London, Sage).
Wilkins, C. (1999) 'Making "Good Citizens": the social and political attitudes of PGCE students', Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 25 (1/2), pp.217-230.
Wilkins, C. (2001) 'Student Teachers and Attitudes towards "Race": the role of citizenship education in addressing racism through the curriculum', Westminster Studies in Education, Vol. 24 (1), pp.7-21.
Zaleskiene, I. (2004) Social Dimension of Citizenship Education (Vilnius, Center for Citizenship Education).

APPENDIX 1
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION – CASE STUDIES IN THREE SELECTED COUNTRIES

Categorie	Greece	UK/ Scotland	Lithuania
Socio-political/ historical characteristics of HE	The developments in the European space and, mainly after 1992 influenced the system of HE in Greece that consists of two differentiated sectors (university and technological) and three cycles of study according to the requirements of the Bologna process as refined in Prague. By constitution, universities are public institutions and the establishment of private HE institutions is not allowed. Universities are fully self-governed legal entities of public law, under the supervision of the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs (MoE). The Technological Education Institutions (TEI) function by their own status which is similar but not the same with that of universities. As a result of the Bologna and through the Directive 89/48 TEI were granted university status (HETEI). A transitional period (until 2008) is set to allow TEI to reorganize and submit new status. The binary system still stands as TEI hold their technological character. They are, currently, granted the right to conduct research, to establish joint master's programmes in cooperation with universities and to confer the corresponding degrees. They do not all offer third cycle degrees Centralized system with academic freedom on issues teaching/learning and research. Limited resources on teaching/research (in the context of increased student numbers and below EU average funding on research). Traditional didactic approaches. EU funding through Community Support Framework influenced the HE Curricula towards "modernization).	Since 1999, a devolved political system has HE in the remit of the Scottish Government; this has led to some tensions as the Scottish and English HE systems diverge. For example, in English HE there are top-up fees, but not in Scotland. Traditional 4 year undergrad degree; Rise over the last 30 years from approx 10% in HE to nearly 50% now. Worries as to impact of rising class sizes and academic rigour.	Restoration of statehood of Lithuania in 1990 did change the whole socio-political context of Education in general as well as characteristics of HE. The reform of HE (up till 2001) was carried out (Teresevičiene, 2004); the following reforms should be mentioned: The legal base of the system of HE was changed: in 1991 the new Law of Higher Education was adopted; main tendencies and priorities of change towards contemporary higher education were outlined. Non-state establishments of HE emerged in 1999; a dual study system of HE was established in 2000; universities and colleges in Lithuania provide higher education. A three-stage study system of HE education was established in Lithuania. HE consists of: I stage: basic studies. Upon completion of basic studies (lasting four to five years), a bachelor's degree or a professional qualification is awarded. II stage: specialized professional or master's degree studies. III stage: A doctorate takes no more than / three/four years. A proportion of resources for the studies, research and other services provided by institutions of HE increased in budget of institutions. The model of governance was changed from a centralised to a more decentralised one, bodies of self-governance function. Studies are being internationalised: included into study programmes of EC; A credit system was introduced; A system of evaluation and accreditation institutions and programmes is being established.

Socio-political/ historical characteristics of CE in schools	Traditional view on CE (mostly as civics) until recently. Traditional methodologies used in schools (teacher-cantered). Teachers are not specifically trained to teach CE.	CE an explicit central aim of every Scottish school. Citizenship a core plank of 'Curriculum for Excellence', a major initiative 3-18. CE permeates the curriculum – no separate subject. Rights based approach, entailing content and ethos. Discomfort in some schools as to pupil voice. Conflict in some schools between CE and assessment agenda.	National core-curriculum for citizenship education which is obligatory for all secondary schools. Teachers are not sufficienly prepared for teaching Citizenship subject, mostly they are History teachers (but some language, geography, ethics teachers; The assessment of citizenship achievements are still the problem in the sense of measurement instruments; Culture of democracy at schools are being to be established.
Socio-political/ historical characteristics of CE in HE	Discipline based academic culture. Not necessarily value CE related subjects. The "teaching methodologies" are mainly "didactic-traditional". Individual initiatives. Initiatives through the EU funding.	Discipline based, furthered by a market and vocational orientation. Formal procedures for some student involvement.	Some special courses on CE is implemented in universities: for example: "Basics of Citizenship Education", "Civic Participation" at first level of studies; "Community based practises", "Theories and models for citizenship education" at MA level. Integrated topics into Politilology courses, into Ethics courses, into Social study courses, ect.
Examples of good practice in CE in HE	Cross Curricular themes and extensions in any discipline – based course. Introduction of interdisciplinary optional subjects related to CE (e.g. Bioethics, Human rights etc). Attempts to introduce student-centred participatory approaches (debates, visits, events…) in courses wherever appropriate.	There are varied approaches to student voice in the running of the universities. Moves in some disciplines (eg. Law, Medicine, Social Work) to problem based (PBL), student centred (SC) approaches. Initiatives such as personal developing planning for students. Attempts to develop sustainability and global citizenship issues into undergraduate core.	Students self - governing approach; Students voiced at the university management; Students participatory approach in public discussions, deliberations,

Barriers to the implementation of CE in He	The bureaucracy in HE centralized management makes any organizational change very difficult. Lack of resources means large class sizes, favouring a didactic approach. The traditional view of academic teaching involving an authoritarian approach to learning. Lack of an understanding of the pedagogy of student-centered learning towards LLL.	Ever larger tutorial groups favour didactic approach. Labour intensive nature of PBL discourages its spread. System is assessment orientated.	Professors are not qualified enough for teaching CE issues; ilt is still difficult to assess students (it could give more strong wish for students to attend courses on citizenship; Very big groups of students at one time could be serious barrier to teach Citizenship which requires smaller groups in order to exercise the forms of participation, group discussions, etc. Shortage of students motivation; Lack of teaching and learning materials on CE

www.esec.pt/opdes

OPDES

Orientações Pedagógicas
para Docentes do
Ensino Superior

União Europeia
Fundo Social Europeu