

### Section III—Present

#### Introduction: Participation and Citizenship

Jeanne Connell

University of Illinois, U.S.A

Alistair Ross

London Metropolitan University, U.K

Diversity of thought, aims, and approaches has characterized progressive education from its beginning. This diversity persists in progressive education efforts today as indicated by the variety of projects in this section. In Section III we continue our examination of current progressive education efforts throughout the world that are guided by the broad progressive ideals of respect for diversity and the development of individuals who are able to participate effectively in the life of the community. The overarching question that contributors in this section address in a number of different ways is: How do learners come to view themselves as active participants, whether as a member of a small group, a local community, or as citizens in the larger society? These chapters explore education efforts for children and adults; programs in school settings as well as in the community; and issues of identity, civic engagement, the use of new digital technology, and citizenship education. The contributors report on programs in the United States, Southeast Asia, Georgia, and Ireland, as well as a large number of countries in Europe. While these progressive educators share optimism about possibilities for changes that move society towards more democratic social and political arrangements, they also recognize that most educational endeavors operate within highly politicized, complex, and bureaucratic environments, which typically make societal change a slow and challenging process.

## **Progressive Insights From the Past**

Progressive visions for social progress today resonate closely with progressive educators from the past, particularly with the ideas of philosopher John Dewey and social reformer Jane Addams. For Dewey (1927), members need to participate in discussion and decision-making that shape the aims and policies of the groups to which one belongs. Each member needs to be actively engaged. Enriched learning opportunities occur as more individuals participate and as the diversity of ideas expands. Dewey noted that, “diversity of stimulation means novelty, and novelty means change” (p. 85). Thus, Dewey captured the progressive belief that active and varied participation holds possibilities for change. The direction of change is not pre-determined, but emergent by the learning process as members participate.

Dewey (1927) addressed the difficult challenge of achieving social change, stating that: “No social modification, slight or revolutionary, can endure except as it enters into the action of people through their desires and purposes” (p. 318). Dewey (1916) noted that members of a group or the larger society share and communicate through ongoing participation, grow in a shared consciousness, and develop a kind of intelligent disposition that increases the learners’ abilities to reorganize and reconstruct experiences through actions guided by purposes shared with the community. For Dewey (1916), growth in shared consciousness and intelligent dispositions are dependent upon “participation in conjoint activities having a common purpose” (p. 323). Over time, as participation increases, there would be a greater diffusion and development of shared interest in the common good among all members as well as an awareness of others. Deeper connections with the community develop as an individual “has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own” (p. 87). As reconstruction of

experience proceeds, participants expand their awareness of issues concerning the common good, as well as how the actions of others continually give new meaning to their own ideas. Dewey connected these dispositions as being “equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory” (p. 87), in other words, the building of an evolving community through participation by its members.

Jane Addams also contributed a unique vision of participation in the community as the foundation of learning, which is a key to fostering her concept of social democracy. For Addams (2002a), Hull-House was “an experiment in social democracy marked by flexibility, tolerance, and readiness to change its methods as the environment may demand” (p. 26). A society needs to be inclusive in social and educational activities so that mutual interests can develop and widespread support for change can be nurtured among all groups in society. The social settlement experience in Chicago provided Addams and her colleagues at Hull-House with a model for direct social engagement based on the concept of *reciprocity*—to form relationships *with* others, not to have some do *for* or *to* others (2002b, p. 70). Addams emphasized that it was not enough to say that the goods of democracy and social progress must be extended to all in society before it can be secure as unless all classes contribute to a good, we cannot be confident of its broad usefulness.

Contributions from everyone meant input from those with diverse perspectives and experiences. Addams (2003) reiterated this position in her reflections about civil government by stating that:

in our overwhelming ambition to remain Anglo-Saxon, we have fallen into the Anglo-Saxon temptation of governing all peoples by one standard. We have failed to work out a democratic government which should include the experiences and hopes of all the varied peoples among us. (p. 28)

Addams (2002b) believed that

We are learning that a standard of social ethics is not attained by traveling a sequestered byway, but by mixing on the thronged and common road where all must turn out for one another, and at least see the size of one another's burden. (p. 7)

For Addams, it is diversified human experience and resultant sympathy for others that are the foundation of a social democracy.

Addams thought that extending democratic ideals into the social realm had the potential to radically alter social relations. One of the primary objectives was that the social settlement experience would build relations that bring sympathetic understanding through contact and exchange. Addams (2002b) stated:

We are thus brought to a conception of democracy not merely as a sentiment which desires the well-being of all men, nor yet as a creed which believes in the essential dignity and equality of all men, but as that which affords a rule of living as well as a test of faith. (p. 7)

The rule of living meant that experiences, particularly social experiences of daily life, shaped understandings, interests, and common bonds. Addams suggested that isolation between rich and poor in the modern industrial city has diminished the will to share across class and ethnic lines. This condition of isolation is the same problem for societies today.

Both Dewey and Addams suggested that social change is possible. We now turn to a discussion of recent scholarship on various meanings of citizenship. Each of these chapters in Section III explores these meanings, through the analysis of policies and practices. Active citizenship promises much: Does it deliver?

### **Education for Active Citizenship: Practices, Policies, Promises**

In recent years the adjective "active" has frequently been added to the term *Citizenship Education*. Bernard Crick (1999) wrote "an education that creates a disposition to active

citizenship is a necessary condition of free societies” (p. 337). Active citizenship is necessary for what Barber (1984) called strong democracy, echoing Dewey’s call to participate in the process of authority within the community. This suggests that *active citizenship* is seen as more desirable than *passive citizenship*—but what do these terms mean, in terms of either educational policy or educational practice? Is it related by some policy makers to concerns about what is called the democratic deficit? Or is it perceived as a variant of service learning? Are there different kinds of active citizenship, and active citizenship education? Aristotle (1962) wrote:

it is not possible to be a good ruler without first having been ruled. Not that good ruling and good obedience are the same virtue—only that the good citizen must have the knowledge and ability both to rule and be ruled. That is what we mean by the virtue of a citizen—understanding the governing of free men from both points of view. (p. 33)

But the good citizen is not the same as the active citizen. Crick (2007) also pointed out that one can be a “good citizen” in an autocratic state, and one can merely be a good citizen in a democratic state (“that is one can obey the law, pay taxes, drive carefully and behave oneself socially,” p. 243). Active citizens, on the other hand, will be able to discuss whether laws work well, if they are inequitable, and how they can be changed.

Citizenship education deals with the relationship between the individual and political society, between the self and others. The curriculum needs to reflect this: it must help the individual understand both their own identity and the nature of society, and how to actively engage with the complex relationship of rights and responsibilities that exist between the two. Audigier (1998) indicated the magnitude of this:

Since the citizen is an informed and responsible person, capable of taking part in public debate and making choices, nothing of what is human should be unfamiliar to

him [sic], nothing of what is experienced in society should be foreign to democratic citizenship. (p. 13)

Possibilities are opened for a vast range of exhilarating and stimulating work, drawing from the whole canvass on contemporary political and social debate. In one sense, the content of the citizenship curriculum is straightforward, based on the social and political debates of the day. What is critical however, and the major thrust of these chapters, are the conditions and means by which these issues are debated, argued, analysed, and acted upon by learners.

The goal is the development of the active citizen: while many politicians would settle for a passive citizen (the “good citizen,” who votes, subscribes to the state, obeys the law), many others—including most progressive educators—would hope to empower young citizens, to critically engage with, and seek to affect the course of social events. This critical distinction between active citizenship and passive citizenship must be analysed, in both policy and practice.

Politicians and policy-makers in many countries now press for an “active” citizenship that will address what they perceive to be a democratic deficit. A considerable literature has developed on this (see, for example, Avbelj, 2005; Hirschhorn, 2006; Mitchell, 2005; Moravsci, 2004; Verdun, 1998). In many democratic states the level of participation in elections appears to be falling from election to election, and it is claimed that the percentage of young people voting also tends to be less than that of older people. This creates a problem for political leaders, who need a reasonably high percentage of the electorate participating in elections, in order to give them the legitimacy to govern. On the other hand, many in the citizenship education movement, and others, would also aspire to educational processes that empowered citizens—providing the intellectual skills and the practical knowledge to individuals who will critically engage with, and seek to affect the course of, social events. Active citizenship is, very broadly, about doing things, while passive citizenship is generally

seen as related simply to status, to the act of being. The distinction between active and passive citizenship has been particularly debated over the past 5 to 6 years (Ireland, Kerr, Lopes, & Nelson, 2006; Nelson & Kerr, 2006).

There is no consensus on these terms, but the model suggested by Kennedy (2006) may be helpful. He distinguished four forms or levels of activity in 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. This is not necessarily far removed from Almond and Verba's (1963) third type of citizen orientation, the "participant," who possesses a sense of influence and confidence in understanding the domestic political system and who votes regularly in elections. Voting, though an activity, is, of course, a minimalist action, but these kinds of traditional conformity are nevertheless participation, and participation with a view to changing civic society.

The second form of activity lies in social movements, in being involved with voluntary activities—either working as a volunteer with agencies, or collecting money on their behalf. This form of participation in civil society (as opposed to the former civic action) is essentially conformist and ameliorative in nature: it is action to repair rather than to address causes, or even to acknowledge possible causes: as Lister (2003) put it, "an exhortation to discharge the responsibilities of neighbourliness, voluntary action and charity" (p. 31). These, and the previous conventional form, constitute what is sometimes derided 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. Pahl (1991) described this as “local people working together to improve their own quality of life and to provide conditions for others to enjoy the fruits of a more affluent society” (p. 34), or, as Lister (2003) put it, “active citizenship which disadvantaged people, often women, do for themselves, through for example, community groups, rather than have done for them by the more privileged; one which creates them as subjects rather than objects” (p. 32). Chapters by Nam (Ch. 21), Bruce (Ch. 22), Ribeiro, Rodrigues, Caetano, Pais, and Menezes (Ch. 23), and Harnisch and Guetterman (Ch. 24) clearly describe activities in this category of active citizenship.

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: but the third form in particular would appear to be the type most closely aligned to what is meant by “active” by most of the contributors to this section. But any curriculum should see all of these as concurrent activities to be encouraged, at any age or stage of development: the agenda set out by Chow (Ch. 26) on this issue seeks to classify all of these within a framework of civic competency. Nor is active citizenship necessarily always progressive: Lister (2003) distinguished a radical collectivist activism from the narrower voluntary action and charity (p. 31).

Kennedy (2006) 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. Ghosh's chapter (Ch. 25) illustrates the problems and potential challenges that such an approach might give rise to.

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.

But these distinctions are not necessarily clear-cut, and Nelson and Kerr's (2006) analysis demonstrated that there are strong cultural variations in what might be considered appropriate forms of "active" citizenship. In some countries it is clearly considered that many of the attributes characterized above as forms of passive attributes concerned with accepting status are elements of active citizenship that are to be encouraged and developed. This may depend on the particular historical development and configuration of the state: in some countries (perhaps particularly in Europe) there is a greater perception that citizenship and national identity may now be seen as social constructs, and that active citizenship may embrace a diverse range of relevant political scenarios in which to be a "politically active citizen." The idea of multiple citizenships has been possible for the past half century, and ideas about nested citizenship were developed by Heater (1990), the "Treaty on European Union" (1992), Commission of the European Communities (1993), and the Council of Europe (2002).

These variant forms of citizenship all imply a much greater sense of activity than passive citizenship, or even of conventional active political behaviour. Thus Davies and Issitt (2005), for example, suggested that aspects of the global citizenship education program might be usefully incorporated into citizenship education, as separation appears to constrain both movements. Active citizenship, it is now being suggested, moves necessarily beyond the confines of the nation state. 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.

What are the key elements or components of an active citizenship education program? The consensus in many countries seems to be that three major elements can be distinguished in any effective citizenship education program: values and dispositions, skills and competences, and knowledge and understanding (Cleaver & Nelson, 2006; Crick, 1998; Crick & Lister, 1979; Kerr & Ireland, 2004).

The identification and demonstration of certain values and dispositions lacks precise definition of which values are meant, and the extent to which they agreed to be universalistic (or even universalistic in contemporary times) is not unanimous (Joppke, 2010). These key values might, for example, include the upholding of human rights; ideas of social responsibility and obligations towards others, particularly in relation to equity, diversity, and minorities; certain legal values, particularly those concerning the rule of law, democratic processes, and various (contested) notions of freedom; and humanistic values of tolerance and empathy for others. This list may appear at first sight to be relatively uncontentious: a survey by Kidder (2002, cited in Sutherland, 2002) suggested that people from all across the world, when asked to identify their core moral values, would all agree on the same five ideas—

honesty, respect, responsibility, fairness, and compassion—but these concepts will have different meanings and differences in diverse cultural contexts and societies.

Crick and Porter (1978) and Crick and Lister (1979), in their pioneering works on political literacy in the 1970s (described in Clarke, 2007), had a more critical edge on these values: they argued for attitudes of scepticism to be tempered with self-awareness, self-criticism, and an awareness of consequence. They also qualified the conception of tolerance of the substantive values of others (religious, ethical, political doctrines) with the need to maintain particular procedural values necessary to freedom—respect for truth and reasoning, open-mindedness, and willingness to compromise. Toleration, they argued, was not just accepting difference, but welcoming diversity, though not exploitation, racism, or the suppression of opinion. Memorably, having an open mind did not mean having an empty mind.

The second group of key elements comprise the skills and competences necessary to be a citizen (Ross, 2007). These include the skills of enquiry, of rationally seeking to establish processes, causes, and the bases for action; sophisticated skills of communication, which include being able to consider and respond to the views of others, being able to persuade, and being capable of being persuaded; skills of participation, which include an understanding of group dynamics and how to contribute to the social development of civic action; and skills of social action.

Knowledge and understanding is necessary for passive citizenship, but also underpins active engagement. These include both a conceptual understanding of key concepts of politics and society, but also knowledge of particular institutions and their procedures, local, national, and international. It can be argued that an understanding of the underlying principles of the role of the law; of the nature of representative democracy; the powers of and restraints on

government; and some awareness of the premises of the economy, society, and the environment are necessary for the educated citizen.

Values, skills, and knowledge are necessary factors for active citizenship (ineluctable, difficult to measure, and imprecise though this may be); knowledge alone is sufficient for passive citizenship (though it may be efficiently and accurately assessed).

The chapters in Section III all contribute to our understanding of what it means to become an active participant in the life of the community. The first chapter (Ch. 20) looks at how adult learners expand their engagement in the larger community by becoming part of the digital world. The next two chapters (Ch. 21, 22) broaden our understanding of community by exploring how the social philosophy of Jane Addams provides a useful lens to view individual development and societal improvement through a wide range of social and educational activities for young children and adults. The final four chapters (Ch. 23, 24, 25, 26) examine and critique how formal education in different parts of the world is utilized to shape future citizens either as passive or active participants.

Chapter 20 explores the need to expand engagement in social activities by investigating the connections between participation and learning in a basic digital literacy class for older adults in Ireland. In “Participation as Telos for Learning,” Leo Casey investigates the nature of learning and identity formation by examining the relationship between the need to learn and the desire to become a participant in the activities of society. The increasing use of digital technology in all aspects of life presents significant challenges for older adults. The older adults in this study were not seeking credentials, but rather sought to identify themselves as part of the digital community and to be engaged with others in useful activities in their daily lives. Qualitative interviews were conducted with 10 participants over a period of 7 months, and grounded theory practice was used to construct their conceptions of learning influences, motives, and actions. Casey suggests that the ideals

of progressive education point to learning as participation, and supports a pedagogy that shifts the focus of the learning process from the individual to the participant and from competence to participation as the fulfillment of learning. Casey also raises larger concerns expressed by other progressive educators today about how the competence approach (the development of individual skills and abilities) drives most teaching today without regard to “learning as a social practice directed at enhancing activity itself.”

Chapter 21 examines participation and civic engagement by youth of color in a community-based program that emphasizes transformative education and creative and critical media production. In “Technology as Connected and Critical Learning Practice,” Chaebong Nam reports on a case study of an anti-underage drinking campaign conducted by urban youth of color in an afterschool program in Chicago that provided civic engagement training, classes in the use of new digital media tools, and the opportunity to mount a community-wide public service campaign. Nam shows how Jane Addams’ concept of socialized education, with its emphasis on connected learning in ordinary lives and transformative action for social transformation, offers a useful lens to view the educational approach of this program. The blended use of new digital technology and traditional media enriched the way the youth made sense of experiences and increased their opportunities to communicate, not only within the community but also beyond their local community. Campaigners created contextualized, culturally relevant, youth-friendly messages based on their ordinary experiences. The campaign had numerous positive spill-over effects. Nam finds socialized education and the ideals of progressive education for building more integrated and socially just communities even more promising in the digital age.

The themes of participation and civic engagement continue in Chapter 22, as Bertram Bruce explores the educational implications for social philosophy of Jane Addams and her colleagues at Hull-House. In “What Jane Addams Tells Us About Early Childhood

Education,” Bruce examines how early childhood education programs at Hull-House evolved “in response to changing circumstances and the capacity for all involved to grow.” Addams understood democracy as a “form of socially engaged living,” and programs at Hull-House emphasized the need to foster more democratic relationships among all social groups, value diversity, improve social conditions, promote collaboration and activism within the community, provide opportunities for education and recreation, and learn from lived experiences of all members of the community. Addams believed that as individuals improved their lives, society also moved closer towards becoming more of a social democracy. These ideas shaped all of the educational programs at Hull-House for children and adults, including its innovative early childhood education programs, which gave attention to art, play, and involvement of parents.

Chapter 23 focuses our attention on becoming a participant in the larger society by examining the priorities of citizenship education programs in 20 countries in Europe. Citizen education in Europe is not the exclusive function of formal education and also involves outside agencies such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that are actively involved in citizen education as a core service. Citizenship education has emerged as a priority in the last few decades in light of such dramatic events as the fall of the Berlin Wall, the increase in the number of nations going through transitions toward democracy, and an increased level of intolerance and xenophobia. In “Citizenship Education in European Schools: The Critical Vision of NGOs” Ana Bela Ribeiro and her colleagues provide a comparative study policy analysis of citizenship education in national policy documents and then survey non-governmental organizations (NGO) that play an important role as citizenship education providers. They present the sharply critical view of school-based programs of citizenship education that many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have. They suggest that in most

cases the priorities of formal citizenship education passively focus on rules, responsibilities, duties, and democratic processes, rather than developing critical engagement and activity.

Chapter 24 also examines a recently implemented, large-scale effort to improve civic engagement in the republic of Georgia through a comprehensive civic education program in a large number of the nation's schools. In "Progressive Education in Georgia: Advances in Professional Development Learning Communities" Delwyn Harnisch and Timothy Guetterman investigate the implementation of a variety of civic education programs associated with the Applied Civic Education Teacher Training Program (ACETT). The primary goal is to positively influence the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours of youth towards more active civic engagement. This comprehensive approach includes the development of teaching resources, the training of civic teachers and school leaders, a national teachers' forum, the funding of grants and professional internships, and numerous web-based resources. A recent evaluation shows an increase in civic initiatives and the level of student motivation.

Chapter 25 seeks to understand the complex relationship between identity, citizenship, nationalism, and education in south Asian countries. In "Activating Citizenship: The Use of Education to Create Notions of Identity and Citizenship in South Asia," Shreya Ghosh writes from a critical perspective, analysing the development of citizenship education policies in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. Ghosh explores how education has been used to replace community identity with national identity in these post-colonial settings. Drawing on textbook narratives in these countries, she suggests that educational practices build a militarist idea of citizenship and, in so doing, show the nation as vindication of community aspirations. In the process, notions of a south Asian space are erased from the cognitive maps of these countries' citizens. In such a context, education in south Asia is used to "activate" a citizenship that is

relational in content—based on ideas of “us” versus “them”—instead of allowing critical understanding of rights and identities.

Finally, Chapter 26 outlines a project in progress that will include active citizenship within a general framework of civic competency. In “Towards a Framework for Understanding Adolescents’ Civic Competency,” Joseph Chow proposes to construct a general framework of civic competency that is a blended measure of civic knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, beliefs, behavioral intentions and behaviors. The framework distinguishes between civic potential, civic behavior, and civic outcomes, with the use of empirical datasets of 14-year-old European students from the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS).

#### References

Addams, J. (2002a). The subjective necessity for social settlements. In J. B. Elshtein (Ed.), *The Jane Addams reader* (pp. 14–29). New York, NY: Basic Books (Original work published 1893)

Addams, J. (2002b). *Democracy and social ethics*. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press (Original work published 1902)

Addams, J. (2003). *Newer ideals of peace*. Bristol, England: Thoemmes Press (Original work published 1907)

Almond, G., & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Aristotle. (1962). *The politics* (T.A. Sinclair, Trans.). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Audigier, F. (1998). *Project “Education for Democratic Citizenship.” Basic concepts and core competencies for education for democratic citizenship*. Strasbourg, France: Council for

- Cultural Co-operation. Retrieved from [http://www.see-educoop.net/education\\_in/pdf/basic\\_conc\\_edc-oth-enl-t07.pdf](http://www.see-educoop.net/education_in/pdf/basic_conc_edc-oth-enl-t07.pdf)
- Avbelj, M. (2005). Can the new European constitution remedy the EU “Democratic deficit”? *EUMAP On-line Journal*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1814/4166>
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley, CA: UCPress.
- Clarke, S. (2007). The trajectory of “political education” in English schools: The rise and fall of two initiatives. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 3–16.
- Cleaver, E., & Nelson, J. (2006). Active citizenship: From policy to practice. *Education Journal*, 98, 34–37.
- Commission of the European Communities, Green Paper on the European Dimension of Education, COM (93) 457 Final (29 September 1993). Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/green-papers/pdf/education\\_gp\\_com\\_93\\_457.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/green-papers/pdf/education_gp_com_93_457.pdf)
- Council of Europe. (2002). *What is education for democratic citizenship—concepts and practice*. Retrieved from <http://www.coe.int>
- Crick, B. (1998, September 22). *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools*. London, England: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Retrieved from <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/1998-crick-report-citizenship.pdf>
- Crick, B. (1999). The presuppositions of citizenship education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 33(3), 337–352.
- Crick, B. (2007). Citizenship: The political and the democratic. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55, 235–248.
- Crick, B., & Lister, I. (1979). Political literacy: The centrality of the concept. *International Journal of Political Education*, 1(1).
- Crick, B., & Porter, A. (1978). *Political education and political literacy*. London, England: Longman.

- Davies, I., & Issitt, J. (2005). Reflections on citizenship education in Australia, Canada and England. *Comparative Education, 41*(4), 389–410.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
- Heater, D. (1990). *Citizenship*. London, England: Longmans.
- Hirschhorn, J. (2006). *Delusional democracy: Fixing the Republic without overthrowing the government*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Ireland, E., Kerr, F., Lopes, J., & Nelson, J. (2006). *Active citizenship and young people: Opportunities, experiences and challenges in and beyond school. Citizenship education longitudinal study: Fourth annual report*. London, England: Department for Education and Skills.
- Joppke, C. (2010). *Citizenship and immigration*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Kennedy, J. K. (2006). Towards a conceptual framework for understanding active and passive citizenship (Unpublished). In J. Nelson & D. Kerr, *Active citizenship in INCA countries: Definitions, policies, practices and outcomes: Final Report*. London, England: Qualification and Curriculum Authority. Retrieved from [http://nfernew.dudobi.com/research/centre-for-information-and-reviews/inca/TS\\_Active\\_Citizenship\\_Report.pdf](http://nfernew.dudobi.com/research/centre-for-information-and-reviews/inca/TS_Active_Citizenship_Report.pdf)
- Kerr, D., & Ireland, E. (2004). Making citizenship education real. *Education Journal, 78*, 25–27.
- Kidder, R. (2002, April 12). The strength to care. *Times Educational Supplement, Scotland*, 21.
- Lister, R. (1997). Citizenship: Towards a feminist synthesis. *Feminist Review, 57*, 28–48.
- Mannitz, S. (2004). Pupils' negotiations of cultural difference: Identity management and discursive assimilation. In W. Schiffauer, G. Baumann, R. Kastoryano, & D. Vertyovec (Eds.), *Civic enculturation: Nation-state, school and ethnic difference in The Netherlands, Britain, Germany and France*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.

- Mitchell, J. (2005). The European Union's "democratic deficit": Bridging the gap between citizens and EU institutions. *EUMAP On-line journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/eu-democratic-deficit-20050310.pdf>
- Moravsci, K. A. (2004). Is there a democratic deficit in world politics? A framework for analysis. *Government and Opposition*, 39(2), 336–363.
- Nelson, J., & Kerr, D. (2006). *Active citizenship in INCA countries: Definitions, policies, practices and outcomes: Final Report*. London, England: Qualification and Curriculum Authority. Retrieved from [http://nfernew.dudobi.com/research/centre-for-information-and-reviews/inca/TS\\_Active\\_Citizenship\\_Report.pdf](http://nfernew.dudobi.com/research/centre-for-information-and-reviews/inca/TS_Active_Citizenship_Report.pdf)
- Pahl, R. E. (1991) The search for social cohesion: From Durkheim to the European Commission. *European Journal of Sociology*, 32(2), 345–360.
- Parekh, B. (2000). *The future of multiethnic Britain*. London, England: Runnymede Trust.
- Ross, A. (2007). Multiple identities and education for active citizenship. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(3), 286–303.
- Sutherland, M. (2002). Educating citizens in Europe. *European Education*, 34(3), 77.
- Treaty on European Union (Maastricht text), July 29, 1992, 1992 O. J. C 191/1. [http://www.cvce.eu/obj/treaty\\_on\\_european\\_union\\_maastricht\\_7\\_february\\_1992-en-2c2f2b85-14bb-4488-9ded-13f3cd04de05.html](http://www.cvce.eu/obj/treaty_on_european_union_maastricht_7_february_1992-en-2c2f2b85-14bb-4488-9ded-13f3cd04de05.html)
- Verdun, A. (1998). The institutional design of EMU: A democratic deficit? *Journal of Public Policy*, 18, 107–132.