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CITIZENSHIP AND MULTICULTURALISM: A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE

LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION
Far from being a new concept in Britain, citizenship education has been featured within the curriculum on a number of different occasions throughout history. The actual existence of citizenship education spans over several decades. Through careful examination of the particular times when citizenship education has been reformulated and its promotion intensified, it is clear that its emergences have been carefully orchestrated to correspond with specific social circumstances. Attempts to redefine citizenship education often occur at times of perceived societal crisis (Kerr, 2003). The latest resurgence of citizenship education is no less timed or premeditated.

Current citizenship education has come about as a result of mounting fears for the health and stability of British democracy. At the centre of these concerns is the perceived political apathy of young people in Britain. Within the Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship it is stated that there are “worrying levels of apathy, ignorance and cynicism about public life” (QCA, 1998:7). This problem has come to the fore amidst the rapid changes taking place within the modern world. Changes that have influenced the nature of societal relationships and have ultimately shifted and strained traditional boundaries of citizenship. Citizenship education was designed to address these fears by promoting and encouraging active participation and empowering young people to initiate their own forms of involvement. In doing so it is intended that the political culture of British society will be transformed, ultimately safeguarding the future of British democracy.

“We aim at no less than a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally” (QCA, 1998:7)

“We should not, must not, dare not, be complacent about the health and future of British democracy. Unless we become a nation of engaged citizens our democracy is not secure” (Lord Chancellor cited in QCA, 1998:8).

Both of the above quotes taken from the Crick Report, strongly reflect the concerns and aims that underpin citizenship education and the intended outcomes of its implementation.

Considering the content and orientation of the Crick Report on the Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools, it is clear that current citizenship education has been constructed on a political foundation and has at its core, an overt political agenda. This political focus will be strongly reflected throughout the literature review.

The first chapter constitutes a review of literature related to the main issues
surrounding the project focus. Here, the concept of citizenship will be presented, as it is perceived within the various political, philosophical and social arenas. This chapter will show that citizenship in itself presents a distinct definitional challenge in that it is constructed within so many different capacities that it is becoming increasingly difficult to ascertain what it actually is. Under contemporary social conditions, citizenship is no longer an automatic given but is something that is negotiated, debated and constructed. This chapter will examine the various tenets of a range of conceptualisations, highlighting differences both between and within the main construction arenas. The final part of this chapter will outline the concept of citizenship used within education today.

The second chapter constitutes a detailed examination of the concept of political participation. As indicated earlier, this social factor is central to the aims and purpose of citizenship education and stands at the core of its very existence. This chapter will explore the different types of political participation, participation trends and determinants of participation. In addition the chapter will also look more specifically at the political involvement of black and minority ethnic groups and of young people. Here the notion of political apathy among young people will be critically examined. In doing so it will be suggested that young people and in fact people in general, are more politically engaged than literature would seem to suggest.

The third chapter will examine notions of multiculturalism from both factual and theoretical standpoints and will also highlight at various points, the intersection of multiculturalism and education. Within this chapter the sociological conceptualisations of multiculturalism will also be explored, each pinpointing a particular force, which is seen to contribute to the shaping of multiculturalism as a social reality. The final part of this chapter will feature a critical discussion of multiculturalism and current citizenship education as outlined within the Crick Report.

Chapter four explores the nature and positioning of citizenship within the current education system. This chapter outlines the central aims of compulsory citizenship education and other key elements that support these aims. The chapter then proceeds to explore practical delivery of citizenship within schools, with reference to government guidance. This chapter draws on a number of guidance documents pertaining to the implementation and delivery of citizenship education within schools.

The fifth chapter on black and minority ethnic groups in education, outlines problematic aspects of the educational experience of black and minority ethnic pupils, focusing specifically on compulsory schooling. These issues have raised major concerns for decades and various attempts have been made to tackle the related shortcomings. However despite these efforts, it is still shown to be the case that the British education system fails these students in a number of ways.


CHAPTER 1 - CITIZENSHIP
A BRIEF CONCEPTUAL HISTORY

The Modern conception of citizenship as active membership of a political community is thought to have originated in Greece between 700 and 600 BC (Pattie, Seyd and Whiteley, 2004). Underlying this early conception were notions of equality and freedom (Clarke, 1994), principles that still constitute central concerns within citizenship debates today. At this time citizens were classified with regards to their wealth and status, which determined their influence on government affairs. Under the subsequent Roman Empire citizenship was expanded to also confer legal status instead of just political status. This conceptualisation enabled citizenship to extend beyond the city-state, enhancing integration within the empire (Pattie, Seyd and Whiteley, 2004).

However as the Roman Empire declined so too did its idea of citizenship. The following feudal system, failed to accommodate for such a conception and only fragments of the Roman and Greek conceptions of citizenship survived within particular social groups (Pattie, Seyd and Whiteley, 2004). It was only following the establishment of parliamentary sovereignty that the evolution of citizenship began to move in increasingly expansive and inclusive directions, extending membership to a broader spectrum of groups. This expansion process remains at the heart of Marshall’s highly influential yet highly contested theory of citizenship development throughout history (Pattie, Seyd and Whiteley, 2004). Although it has received much criticism in recent years, Marshall’s theory has at the very least ignited the British citizenship debates arena and has been at the heart of many enlightening and challenging discussions.

The emergence of contemporary perspectives of citizenship, represent yet another stage in its evolution. These theories have been built on varied perceptions of late-modern society. Ingrained within them are deep considerations of the changed and changing nature of this society and the consequent effects on the nature and positioning of citizenship. Within such perspectives, the process of globalisation is carefully considered together with its consequent side effects including: nation-state decline, the emergence of transnational institutions, the disembedding of time and space and the rise of culturally plurality.

The dynamic changed and changing nature of citizenship is reflected in the multiplicity of interpretations of citizenship currently in operation.

“The common good can never be actualised. There will always be a debate over the exact nature of citizenship. No final agreement can ever be reached”
(Mouffe cited in Heater, 2004:287)

“Citizenship as a useful political concept is in danger of being torn
asunder…. By a bitter twist of historical fate, the concept which evolved to provide a sense of identity and community, is on the verge of becoming a source of communal dissenion. As more and more diverse interests identify particular elements for their doctrinal and practical needs, so the component parts of citizenship are being made to do service for the whole. And under the strain of these centrifugal forces, citizenship as a total ideal may be threatened with disintegration”.
(Heater, 2003:287)

The recognition of the decline in nation-state sovereignty, coupled with fears for the stability of the modern democratic society, has placed citizenship high on national and international agendas. This has instigated an upsurge in citizenship debates and related anxieties. In Britain, citizenship education is now compulsory in secondary schools, and is also taught at primary level. Yet as the citizenship agenda is thrust ever forward, the answer to one fundamental question still remains unclear: What is citizenship? The diverse pool of citizenship literature shows that far from being a universal given, citizenship is very much a social construction, pieced together within differing trajectorial contexts. This section will present the notion of citizenship as it is conceptualised within various conceptual contexts within the arenas of political philosophy and sociology. These presentations will clearly demonstrate that far from being a standardised given, citizenship is a complex and pliable notion, the shape and form of which, is dependant on the arena in which construction takes place.

The Political Philosophical Foundations Of Citizenship
Throughout the modern period, the most predominant perspective in Western political thought has been the liberal theory. The advancement of political theory has been achieved through ongoing debates between this and other opposing standpoints. During the twentieth century liberalism has undergone a number of changes due to the emergence of conceptual threats and contemporary overarching institutions. Consequently, most modern political theoretical debates can be situated within a broad liberal tradition. Other traditions, which have emerged, constitute critiques of the liberal tradition. None of these traditions however is a closed, internally consistent cluster of thoughts. Instead, political traditions are pliable conceptual realms that occasionally overlap (Heywood, 1999).

Amongst the range of political philosophical perspectives there are four roughly distinguishable strands. These are liberal theory, the consensual order, participatory republicanism and moderate post-modern pluralism (Isin and Turner, 2002). This section will briefly outline the general ideas contained in each of these strands, highlighting key representative thinkers. The main tenets of these perspectives and the viewpoints contained within them will be further elaborated upon within the following sociology section, which highlights the political orientations of each strand.
Out of the four perspectives named above, liberalism is considered to be the most dominant in the areas of philosophy and political theory. This perspective strongly emphasises the individual and rights are mostly based on liberties that apply to everyone. In this view, legal and political rights are prioritised and are balanced by only a few obligations, particularly the obligation to obey laws. The relationship between these rights and obligations is a contractual and reciprocal one (Isin and Turner, 2002). Political parties grounded within this view tend to aggregate the various issues raised by interest groups and most political activity takes place within representative legislatures.

One philosopher, well renowned for his Liberal theory of citizenship is Rawls. Rawls is widely considered to be one of the most important political philosophers of the late twentieth century. In his theory of justice as fairness, Rawls presents a framework that explains the significance of political and personal liberties, equal opportunity and cooperative arrangements that are beneficial to the less advantaged of the society (Garrett, 2005).

Quite apart from many of his liberal counterparts, Rawls aims to explore the rights of free and equal individuals as part of a social cooperation theory. Rawls seeks to achieve this by associating justice with the idea of fairness. Rawls postulates that when co-operation between individuals is fair, justice can then be insured. And justice in essence, becomes fairness. In this sense Rawls approach represents a shift in the liberal focus from private to public but without forsaking the traditional concern for the rights of the individual (Shafir, 1998).

In his quest for a basic structure for social order, Rawls seeks a social contract type agreement. Rawls suggests that as a prerequisite to the establishment of fairness, those who are in the original position of contracting must operate from behind a ‘veil of ignorance’, pertaining to their social positioning. Rawls argues that such conditions will enable individuals to develop a framework of political justice and consequently construct a society of free and equal individuals (Shafir, 1998).

In recent years a new strand of liberalism has emerged. The neo-liberalist strand is, like traditional liberalism, committed to individualism. The aim of neo-liberals is to address the dangerous imbalance inherent in individual – state relationships. In this view the state has become too involved in the economic and social life of the citizen and therefore stands accused of robbing individuals of self-respect and liberty. The neo-liberalist ideal of citizenship is one that centralises the nineteenth century liberalist notion of ‘self help’ and individual responsibility (Heywood, 1999).

The consensual order perspective incorporates communitarianism and civic republicanism. In contrast to liberalism, communitarianism emphasises community goals achieved through mutual support and group action, participation and integration. Whilst communitarianism places more emphasis on obligations it also seeks to preserve individual rights. However here, the
relationship between obligations and rights in this sense is less immediate than in the liberal tradition. Civic republicanism bears many similarities to communitarianism in its emphasis on the obligations of citizens. However this emphasis is articulated from the standpoint of civic virtue rather state requirement (Isin and Turner, 2002). Within this perspective, the state is seen to be responsible for the enforcement of obligations on the members of society, however civil society also enforces obligations to a certain extent. The work of Rousseau with its emphasis on community, clearly reflects these general sentiments.

Rousseau begins from the standpoint that men are naturally unequal and that as societies evolve from a state of primitiveness into civilisations these inequalities are replaced by politically imposed inequalities, which are totally separate from the former. These inequalities progress in their extremity and if the process remains uninterrupted the final phase is that of the establishment of the master-slave society (Reese, 1980).

Rousseau visualises savagery and civilisation at two opposing ends of the development spectrum, yet postulates that they are not much better than each other. Whilst the state of savagery is unable to accommodate rationality in the absence of language, the onset of civilisation leads to depravity and corruption. Rousseau therefore suggests that between these two states there is “the simple human community where humanity has been achieved and corruption still lies ahead” (Reese, 1980:497) and that this political constitution must be found in order to foster the conditions necessary to establish a simple human community in the modern age (Reese, 1980).

In *Social Contract* (1762), Rousseau outlines what he deems to be the political conditions necessary for the political reformation of society. These involve the defence and protection of each person and their goods and the sustaining of both societal unity and the freedom of each individual. Rousseau suggests that this process begins with each person yielding his or her natural rights to the community. These are then exchanged for civil rights, which enable individuals to become citizens of the state. This transaction impacts upon the citizen's will, who, whilst still willing as an individual also becomes a constituent of the general will (Reese, 1980).

The third group of theories is that of participatory democracy. This perspective is composed of expansive democratic and neo-republic theories. The expansive democratic element emphasises the rights and participation of the lower classes and other marginalized groups to a greater extent than the previous perspectives. The focus here is on the balancing of group rights with individual rights and obligations with a view to establishing a self-identity that unites individual interests through community activities whilst also preserving the individual's civil rights. Central to expansive democracy are the principles of empowerment, participation and deliberation in and through democratic processes. Similar to this view, neo-republicanism advocates that citizens should partake in shared public action with other citizens, adopt an office which
incorporates formal rights and duties and establish a plurality (as opposed to a majority) to guide the community (Isin, 2002). The ideal here is for the state and civil society to create deliberative institutions such as deliberative poling.

Philosophical representation of the ideologies held within this perspective, are embodied in the work of Habermas. Habermas's aim is to piece together a social theory that propels the cause of human emancipation whilst still preserving an inclusive, universalist moral framework. He views the rationalisation, humanisation and democratisation of society as resulting from the institutionalisation of the potential for the rationality ingrained within the communicative modes common to humans (Wikipedia encyclopaedia, 29/11/05). In this sense Habermas advocates a discursive democracy, which suggests a direct correlation between the prevalence of democracy and its ability to generate communication. This democratic form is grounded in a type of argumentative communication, which places greater focus on deliberation than consent (Delanty, 2000).

Moderate postmodernist theories are the most recent addition to the political philosophical debates arena. Theories contained within this group can be arbitrarily divided into two categories, those who propose that citizenship is dead, and those who whilst accepting the notions of citizenship and politics, advocate significant modifications geared towards the establishment of group or particularistic rights. One of the theories contained within the latter category is that of radical pluralism. Within this view it is envisaged that there will be an ongoing contention referred to by Mouffe as agonistic pluralism. A process through which antagonism is transformed into shared consensus on basic democratic issues. According to Mouffe, the antagonistic form of democracy involves confrontations between individuals who agree on basic foundational rules but have differing interpretations of these rules and disagree on key political and moral issues. Central to this model is the notion of the active protesting citizen (Isin and Turner, 2002).

The Sociology of Citizenship
This section will first begin by outlining the classical conceptions of citizenship, which are born within three dominant traditions; liberal theory, communitarian theory and that of radical democracy. The section will then proceed to document some of the recent contemporary theories, which will also assist in highlighting a number of issues that are seen to determine the nature of citizenship in our late modern age. Here the key features of the nature of late modern society will be considered and its effects on the nature and positioning of citizenship explored.

Liberal Theory
In its most general sense, citizenship as membership of a political community and is constructed around a set of interrelations between four key elements, these are rights, duties, participation and identity. The conception of citizenship within the liberal tradition has generally focused on the rights of the citizen (Delanty, 2000). This formalistic conception of citizenship is a market
centred one, which is based on the principle of equality (Delanty, 2000). This conception effectively presents citizenship and civil society as pre-political forms by placing the citizen within the confines of the private domain (Delanty, 2000).

One of the main theories encompassed within modern liberal thought and one in which there has been a recent revival of interest, is that of Marshall (Delanty, 2000). Although Marshall’s theory is widely applicable it is important to note that his analysis was constructed with particular reference to English history. The theoretical standpoint of this theory is often termed as left wing liberalism or the social democratic version of citizenship. Where as liberalism highlights the rights of the citizen and conservatism focuses on the duties of the citizen, Marshall stresses both rights and duties (Delanty, 2000). Marshall saw citizenship as an official legal status associated with full membership of a community. Within this conception, citizens have the right to have rights and all citizens are equal with respect to their rights and duties (Kennedy, 1997). Marshall’s work bears some resemblance to Marxism in the sense that it redirects the focus placed on civil society and places it on the class system (Delanty, 2000). In fact possibly the most important aspect of Marshall’s theory is its explicit proclamation of the relationship between citizenship and social class (Barbalet, 1980). Marshall’s theory presents a State-based model as opposed to a market based one (Delanty, 2000).

According to Marshall it is following the encompassing of both political and social rights that citizenship develops a more overtly contentious relationship with the class system. Marshall does not see this contention in a purely negative light however. On the contrary, Marshall’s theory postulates that through this conflict citizenship or more specifically social citizenship, is able to impact upon the capitalist class system, reducing social inequalities. Marshall did not claim that this interactive relationship marked the end of the class system, but that it enabled citizenship to impose certain modifications upon it (Barbalet, 1988). It is for this reason that Marshall states: “citizenship has itself become in certain respects the architect of legitimate social inequality” (Marshall and Bottomore cited in Heater 2004:114) Marshall sees this interactive relationship between social class and citizenship as an ongoing one in which both structures act upon each other, each initiating and shaping changes in the other (Barbalet, 1988).

Marshall perceives citizenship as an integrated whole comprised of three interrelated elements; the civil, the political and the social (Kennedy, 1997). According to Marshall these three elements have independent histories and institutional bases which could be traced back to the eighteenth Century when civic rights were acquired, through to the nineteenth Century in which Political rights were acquired, through to the twentieth Century which marked the acquisition of social rights. Marshall did however acknowledge a certain amount of elasticity within these stages (Heater, 2004). Marshall postulates that is was through this accumulative chronological pathway of rights acquisition that citizenship as a concept has evolved (Delanty, 2000). Marshall’s account of citizenship is therefore in effect, a theory of social change, which documents
the growth of citizenship throughout time (Barbalet, 1988).

Two of the main criticisms of liberal theory are; its perceived inadequate response to the challenge of community and to the challenge of democracy. The first of these criticisms is levelled from the theoretical camp of the communitarians. In contrast to liberalism, communitarianism situates civil society in the community. In this viewpoint participation and identity are emphasised as opposed to rights and duties (Delanty, 2000). Communitarianism is unique in its rejection of contractualism and individualism, which separates it both from liberalism and social democracy (Delanty, 2000). Although communitarian theory can be seen to have drawn the citizenship debate into the political domain, the concept of politics utilised by communitarians, does not encompass democracy. Consequently this viewpoint is often associated with liberal theory, which also stands accused of this shortcoming.

Communitarianism
The communitarianism perspective is one which centralises the social sphere and more specifically the community. In fact the formulation of values and order within the community are favoured above the formulation of such aspects on an individual level. Consequently, communitarians have a vested interest in the social units through which values are transmitted and enforced. These include the family, schools and other community based organisations. Whilst all communitarians uphold the general importance of community, they differ in the extent to which they regard individual liberties and rights (Christensen and Levinson, eds, 2003).

Within the communitarian viewpoint there are three main categories, these are liberal communitarianism, conservative communitarianism and civic republicanism. Although uniquely individual in their stance, these three forms are held together by a number of permeating strands. Due to the specific philosophical issues it embodies, the liberal communitarian debate is one that is notably separate from other debates within communitarianism (Delanty, 2000). This particular viewpoint is commended for its highlighting of the identity problem within the citizenship debate. Liberal communitarians seek to affix the political community within the context of the cultural community and believe that these circumstances facilitate the discovery of identity. The focus here is a kind of moral, cultural collectivism in which material values are marginalized (Delanty, 2000). This focal area is reflective of Liberal communitarians quest to highlight the importance of cultural identity as opposed to individual rights (Delanty, 2000). The above sentiments are clearly expressed in the work of one of the best-known communitarian theorists, Charles Taylor who offers the most concrete analysis of citizenship issues within the liberal communitarian debate (Delanty, 2000).

Unlike liberal communitarianism, conservative communitarianism has more of a sociological as opposed to philosophical content base. This particular form of communitarianism tends to emphasise the family, religion, tradition, nation and
the culture of consensus. Conservative communitarianism is distinguished by its strong consensus on identity issues, its perception of participation as a civic responsibility and its emphasis of social reconstruction (Delanty, 2000).

Emphasis within the civic republicanism perspective is placed on civic bonds this is quite apart from the market or state emphasis found in liberal theory or the moral community emphasis found within mainstream communitarianism. Central to this tradition are participation in public life and commitment. In fact civic republicanism postulates that it is within this context that individualism is able to attain its highest level of expression. The model of citizenship constructed within this perspective is one which is anchored in participation and public action, one in which identity occupies a minor position (Delanty, 2000).

The political ideal here is that of the ‘self governing political community’ (Delanty, 2000) which constitutes the very heart of citizenship notions within the civic republicanism perspective. Democracy is regarded within this tradition with considerable ambivalence. Although civic republicanism did in certain respects accommodate the democratic revolution that followed after it, republicanism has maintained a deep-rooted scepticism of the concept of modern democracy (Delanty, 2000).

Though individual in their approach, Liberal communitarianism, conservative communitarianism and civic republicanism are nevertheless united in their efforts to furnish citizenship with the political dimension that is absent from other state-centred conceptions. All three strands also present community as the central constituent of civil society. It is additionally evident that the above traditions seek to give citizenship a public voice centred around identity and participation (Delanty, 2000). Despite their contrasting perspectives of citizenship, viewpoints within the Liberalist and communitarian traditions still share in their disregard of democratic issues. It is for this reason that both traditions are heavily criticised by theorists who perceive democracy to be central to any valid notion of citizenship (Delanty, 2000).

**Radical Democracy**

The aim of radical democracy is to deepen the political significance of citizenship to a level that is impossible to attain within liberal and communitarian traditions. It is important to note however, that radical democracy is not so much a theory of citizenship as it is a theory of democracy which has been highly instrumental in transporting the citizenship debate out of the liberal and communitarian realms and giving it a deeper political grounding. Within the liberal tradition, citizenship is reduced to the various rights of the individual. Communitarianism counters this view by effectively substituting democracy with the concept of a participative, community based citizenship. Within radical democracy, citizenship is repoliticised through democracy. Not surprisingly the desirable model advocated here is one of democratic citizenship (Delanty, 2000). Within radical democracy there are a number of different perspectives that construct images of citizenship from differing standpoints. These are direct democracy, discursive democracy and feminist perspectives.
Direct democracy emerged during the 1970s and 1980s during a time when much debate was centred around the new social movements. Within this viewpoint the aim is to induce social change through the transformation of democracy (Delanty, 2000). Citizenship here is seen to have the potential to eradicate the separation between state and society if its potential for democratic political participation is realised. A citizenship of participation would effectively transport politics out of the hands of the state and into the domain of society thus bridging the gap between the two (Delanty, 2000). It is this line of thought that characterised the new social movements of the 1970s and 80s, which led to the reintroduction of the idea of ‘civil society’. Also underpinning the direct democracy movement was the concept of collective identity, grounded by a common goal. In this sense the direct democracy movement extended the citizenship agenda to the self-creation of society, empowering citizens in a way that could be distinguished from all other previous perspectives.

Following its dominant emergence during the 1960s, 70s and 80s, Direct democracy experienced a steady decline during the 1990s. It was at this time that a number of separate movements arose. One of these successive movements was discursive democracy (Delanty, 2000). Discursive democracy focuses on the deliberative process of democracy and challenges notions of privatism by extending this process into certain ‘depoliticised areas’. This model both acknowledges and respects the distinction between state and society but also distinguishes civil society as a third domain which cuts across both state and society, creating a “social basis for autonomous public spheres” (Habermas, cited in Delanty, 2000:41). Discursive democracy is therefore located both in the public sphere and within civil society, which is characterised by a “partly institutional political culture” (Delanty, 2000:41). Within this model, the public sphere is seen as a space where information, opinions and problems can be articulated and deliberated over. Its capacity to actually solve problems is however limited. It is therefore thought that the process of decision-making lies firmly in the hands of the institutionalised political system (Delanty, 2000).

Within the discursive democracy perspective, contemporary society characterised by its decentred and self-critical nature. This is due to the significant rise in the emergence of competing interest groups and frontline issues of cultural pluralism, which dominate debates surrounding the nature of contemporary society. According to discursive democracy theorists, the only viable response to this social climate is for civil society to become discursive as opposed to self-organising, thus making citizenship the basis of politics instead of segregating the two completely (Delanty, 2000).

Though mindful of the democratic political potential of the autonomous public, discursive theory is nevertheless criticised by feminists who claim that inadequate consideration is given to the pre-discursive domain and that consequently deeper power structures related to identity construction are
neglected (Delanty, 2000). Such feminist perspectives will be discussed below and will constitute somewhat of a critique of the theoretical viewpoints that have been presented thus far.

The central complaint of feminist theorists is that little or no attempt is made to politicise the private sphere, which exists outside of the politicised public domain. Feminists therefore promote a politicised view of the private domain together with a pluralist conception of the public domain. Rejecting both the universality of liberal perspectives and the communitarian notion of the unitary community, feminism constructs its argument from the point of group difference also rejecting notions of the homogeneous society constrained by common concepts or goals (Delanty, 2000). Young (1989, 1990), suggests that the liberal ideal only serves in privileging dominant groups and excluding women and other subordinated groups, despite the fact that they have equal citizenship status (Delanty, 2000). Such viewpoints are also thought to assume that every individual has equal access to avenues of participation in society, whereas for many groups this is far from reality (Delanty, 2000).

The exclusion of women in particular is emphasised by Foster who along with other feminist theorists states that citizenship is a masculine construct which excludes women through its separation of the private and public domains. The claim here is that “the burden of women's responsibility for work associated with the private sphere has implications for their legal status as citizens” (Foster in Kennedy ed, 1997: 55) simply because it places women outside the public domain and therefore outside of the realm of citizenship (Kennedy, 1997).

According to young (1989), what is needed are group rights which will enable marginalized and minority groups to uphold their autonomy in the face of dominant groups. The citizenship ideal here is one which accommodates and respects the diverse private identities of individuals enabling the formation of “a group differentiated citizenship and a heterogeneous public” (Young cited in Delanty, 2000: 44).

Underlying each of the viewpoints housed within the radical democracy model is the premise that citizenship is located in collective action, the nature of which changes from viewpoint to viewpoint. Under radical democracy, the realms of citizenship are also extended to the domain of the self. One of the main contributions of radical democracy to the citizenship debate is its questioning of the notion of assumed consensus, a notion that is integral to both liberal and communitarian perspectives.

There is no doubt that all of the above perspectives have made valuable contributions to the citizenship debates over the years. They have at the very least maintained thought provoking animation within the citizenship dialogue and have been instrumental to succeeding theorists who in criticising the early perspectives in particular, have in effect anchored and amassed their own arguments. In this sense, these theories can be viewed as the foundation blocks of the modern citizenship debate as we know it. The reality is however,
that earlier citizenship debates are often deemed to be inadequately equipped to accommodate issues inherent to the nature of late-modern society (Delanty, 2000). It is on this premise that many of the more contemporary theories have arisen.

Contemporary sociological perspectives
Contemporary perspectives of citizenship have been built upon varied perceptions of late-modern society. Ingrained within them are deep considerations of the changed and changing nature of this society and the consequent effects on the nature and positioning of citizenship. Because of the innately complex and multilayered nature of these theories, there is considerable disagreement about their categorisation. For the purposes of this exploration however, the theories covered will be very loosely separated into nationalist and post-nationalist theories. These categorical boundaries are however permeated by some theories, which can be classed as belonging to both camps.

Multinational Citizenship is one of the few nationalist theories within the contemporary citizenship debate. Here it is believed that an operational and effective post-modern citizenship can maintain harmonious existence within the confines of nation and state structures. This viewpoint is presented within Harty and Murphy's ‘defence of multinational citizenship’ (Harty and Murphy, 2005). Whilst Harty and Murphy agree that regional and global integration are indicative of significant challenges to state sovereignty, they disagree with predictions of the complete dissolution of the state and its replacement with regional and/or global authoritative forms (Harty and Murphy, 2005). Instead it is envisaged that state sovereignty will be redistributed both internally, for the purpose of internal autonomy within nations (within nationally plural states) and externally to cater for the realities of global interdependence. Supporters of this viewpoint believe that the adequate provision of access to autonomy for national groups within multinational states is possible, and also that this can be achieved without the transcendence of nation and state boundaries (Harty and Murphy, 2005).

Here the aim is to highlight the ways in which institution based solutions can satisfy nationalist demands. The claim is that a multinational citizenship will enable the establishment of a sub-state citizen community with the freedom to select political representatives and with the autonomy to make decisions without interference from external authorities. It is thought that this process can be enabled through appropriate institutional designs, which as a basic principle, must incorporate the equal consideration of the range of national identities for which they cater. This would accord greater autonomy to national groups whilst safeguarding the political and territorial elements of citizenship and fulfilling the traditional demands of the state (Harty and Murphy, 2005).

Postnationalists argue that the process of globalisation has depleted state sovereignty and that this has resulted in the erosion of the political salience of
regionally situated national identities and citizenship forms. Theorists within this area envisage the replacement of national identities with identities and citizenship forms that transcend national boundaries (Harty and Murphy, 2005).

One of the more contemporary postnationalist approaches to citizenship is that of cultural citizenship. This theory is based on the premise that we live in an information society in which networks and information are paramount, where time and space are separate and disembedded, where risk and uncertainty have replaced progress and confidence and where consumerism prevails throughout. According to Stevenson (2003), it is in this societal climate that symbolic, mobile cultures have arisen (Stevenson, 2003).

Cultural citizenship promotes the development of a communications-based society, in which democratic communication is an institutionalised norm. In this viewpoint, it is under these conditions that social transformation can take place and not through the collective insurgence of workers. The implementation of this communication mode requires individuals to seek beyond their own culturally relative viewpoints to gage and deliberate the perspectives of others and consequently learn from others.

“A genuinely cosmopolitan dialogue would need to be underpinned by both the acceptance of universal principles and the recognition of difference. This is the very essence of cultural citizenship” (Stevenson, 2003:25). Further to this point, the development of a cultural citizenship also involves the eradication of assumed identity labelling of particular groups. This in turn involves the questioning of dominant codes and cultures, which enable and encourage such labelling processes (Stevenson, 2003).

Whilst cultural citizenship strongly encourages the acceptance and embracing of difference it does not undermine the importance of overarching, inclusive, democratic communities. Indeed the view here is that both ideals can be adequately accommodated in communication-based societies and without the need for the homogenisation of difference (Stevenson, 2003). In sum “cultural citizenship includes rights, obligations, civic spaces of participation, respect, identity and difference and individualisation” (Stevenson, 2003:33) and explores the possibility of maintaining solidarity whilst at the same time promoting the creativity of the self (Stevenson, 2003).

Another contemporary portrayal of citizenship is forwarded by cosmopolitan citizenship. This theoretical standpoint transcends the boundaries of nation and state yet fails to dispense with either. Like the cultural citizenship viewpoint, the cosmopolitan citizenship perspective places general emphasis on inclusion and the accommodation of difference and acknowledges the ‘advanced interconnectivity of cultures’ that characterises late-modern society (Delanty, 2000).

Within the cosmopolitan citizenship viewpoint there are several sub-strands, which whilst reflecting similar central concerns, construct cosmopolitanism from differing points of emphasis. The first of these notions of cosmopolitanism
emphasises both international and legal aspects. This particular strand was initiated and led by Kant. During the late 1700s Kant proceeded to explore the notion of an international civil society. The central theme running through his work was the principle of reason, which led him to believe that it was necessary to restrict the exercise of power to law. Kant campaigned for a system of international law, which he termed cosmopolitan law. This notion encompassed the possibility of citizenship existing beyond the state (Delanty, 2000).

While Kant’s theory of cosmopolitanism is said to have opened the debates arena on the subject of internationalism, many post Kantian theories of cosmopolitanism tended to a certain extent, to be shaped by the concept of nationalism, shifting from the wider focus evident in Kant’s work. However in the relationship between civil society and nation, the concept of nation was later replaced with that of the state. Within this paradigm there emerged two viewpoints, that of realism, which promoted the notion of autonomous states and that of functionalism, in which supporting states were at the centre. Both of these views were counteracted by the emergence of arguments for a post-national order, which would induce the dissolving of the state as a sovereign entity. Bull (1977) for instance, whilst remaining heavily sceptical of the notion of global civil society, argues for an order in which sovereignty is shared on multiple levels (Delanty, 2000).

Within this diversified discourse of internationalism and citizenship, cosmopolitan citizenship is generally confined to a state centred world. Despite Kant’s early efforts, the idea of citizenship beyond the state still remains a subordinated concept within this citizenship model (Delanty, 2000).

The second theory of cosmopolitanism emphasises globalism and holds the concept of a global civil society at its centre. Here, strong emphasis is placed on the cultural and social nature of cosmopolitan citizenship. The emergence of globalisation theory carried with it strong implications of a dissolving significance of nationality and the severing of the link between nationality and identity alongside the rapid growth of cultural pluralism. It was on the general premise of such implications that the theory of global cosmopolitanism arose. The globalisation debate has given voice to a number of different perspectives, all of which conceive the possible existence of a global civil society under pinned by democracy. In contrast to Kant’s notion of internationalism these standpoints are overtly anti-statist. From the points put forward within the globalisation debate it is clear that there are various possible ways that globalisation can accommodate cosmopolitanism yet the eventuality itself is not a certainty (Delanty, 2000).

Another notion of cosmopolitanism is built on the concept of transnational communities. Within this conception, cosmopolitanism is situated within determinitorialized transnational communities formed of highly mobile cosmopolitan citizens. In fact mobility is a key component to this form of cosmopolitanism. Within this view the identity of the cosmopolitan citizen embodies greater flexibility and these citizens are more likely to be
multilingual. Since such citizens are typically those who have left their homeland to settle in another country, they are characterised by the multiple loyalties, which transcend physical location (Delanty, 2000). For instance, a British resident who was born and raised in Estonia may have dual loyalty, to Estonia as their homeland and to Britain as their place of abode. This is seen to result in what is often termed, the ‘creolisation’ of global culture. This is the adaptation of global culture by its recipients. In one sense there is an acknowledgement and assimilation towards the strong currents of the global culture and on the other these currents are rode against and its central force weakened (Delanty, 2000). The flexibility of cosmopolitan citizens which extends to cultural identity also pertains to the citizenship of the individual, which is subject to alteration (Delanty, 2000).

The notion of transnational communities outlined within the cosmopolitan citizenship perspective reflects less of a concern with world governance and more of a concern with the identities of these communities. Within this viewpoint cosmopolitan citizenship is tied to residence and not birth. This theory highlights the impact of cultural issues on citizenship, consequently exposing the inappropriateness of the segregation of public and private spheres in the conceptualisation of citizenship (Delanty, 2000).

A fourth strand of cosmopolitan citizenship is that which places the notion of post nationalism at the centre. Although accorded with a number of different meanings, within the discourse of cosmopolitan citizenship, the term postnationalism refers to the “reflexive transformation of existing national conceptions of group membership” (Delanty, 2000:65). Again, the key factor here is residence. One of the key supporters of the post-national citizenship ideal is Habermas. At the foundation of Habermas's proposals is the notion of the dual existence of a constitutional order and a civil society characterised by a discursive democracy and grounded in public spheres. His theory also reflects a strong commitment for both the constitutional state and cosmopolitanism. Habermas visualises the development of cosmopolitanism taking place within the confines of the constitutional state as opposed to it being imposed through global processes. For Habermas postnationalism is more to do with the embedding of cosmopolitanism in the realm of constitutional state, than it has to with global civil society. It is these premises that separate Habermas’s theory from most other normative cosmopolitan theories, which envision the establishment of global civil society following the dissolving of the nation-state (Delanty, 2000).

It is from the departure point of Habermas’s novel theory that Delanty constructs what he terms, the idea of civic cosmopolitanism. Delanty proceeds a step further than Habermas in that he dares to propose a new concept of cosmopolitanism based on the premise that cosmopolitanism poses a real challenge to the forces of globalisation. However Delanty’s proposals are not without condition. Delanty postulates that in order for this threat to be a significant one, cosmopolitanism must replace the already unstable institution of nationalism. In order for this to be achieved, the relationship between
cosmopolitanism and the community, which still remains monopolised by nationalism, must be re-established.

Delanty’s notion of civic cosmopolitanism reconciles nationalism with post-nationalism, thus forming what he terms a self-limiting kind of cosmopolitanism, which avoids both the extremes of particularism and of universalism. (Delanty, 2000). In contrast to other normative cosmopolitan theories, Delanty presents a form of cosmopolitanism that looks not to transcend the political community through “an international organisation of states” but rather through “a pluralist world of political communities” (Delanty, 2000:145).

One post-nationalist theorist, who questions the appropriateness and stability of the notion of citizenship altogether, is Soysal. Soysal argues that due to the effects of globalisation in late modernity, human rights have adopted an enhanced role and position. In fact, Soysal’s proceeds further in proposing that human rights are presently replacing citizenship as the primary facilitator of individual autonomy (Faulks, 2000). Soysal argues that the post-war era has cultivated a revolutionised notion of citizenship, which is underpinned by principles of universal personhood as opposed to national belonging (Faulks, 2000).

This shift in principles is said to have occurred against a backdrop of globalisation, which has encompassed international law, the United Nations network, the emergence of global civil society, and the establishment of regional governance. As a result, Soysal argues that human rights are increasingly taking centre stage in the global political arena, as the notion of state sovereignty begins to fade. Put another way, “once relegated to the status of pre-political privatism, human rights are now overriding the rights of citizenship and reshaping democratic politics” (Delanty, 2000:68). Using the example of ‘guest workers’ in Europe, Soysal concludes that the fact that these workers had been accorded social and civil rights without being granted official citizenship status, demonstrates the decline in the importance of citizenship benefits caused by the increasing prevalence of human rights. Through this demonstration Soysal also highlighted the frailty of national laws, which can now be overridden by transnational communities via transnational legal institutions such as the European Union (EU). These communities are also able to take advantage of the incorporation of international human rights laws into national law. From Soysal’s viewpoint this evidence shows that social membership is seen to be a post-national phenomenon built on personhood as opposed to citizenship itself (Faulks, 2000).

Taylor, who postulates that in the late modern age, risk has become a global common denominator and thus has created common interests and concerns, further supports this view. According to Taylor, the current social climate has given way to a more overarching and unified agreement on the importance of human rights in the late-modern age (Faulks, 2000).

Another theory which emphasises the nature and form of rights in its portrayal
of citizenship is multicultural citizenship. Multicultural citizenship is one which combines concerns for the universal rights and membership in liberal nation states, with those for the challenge posed by ethnic plurality. While many liberal theorists believe that the universal rights accorded through citizenship safeguard the cultural membership of individuals, theorists within this school of thought envisage the need for additional rights for vulnerable minority groups, in order for such groups to sustain themselves amidst the dominant culture(s) (Kymlicka, 1995).

Within this perspective there are two general versions both of which reflect differing conceptualisations of the relationship between multicultural citizenship and universal citizenship. On the one hand, feminists and (post) marxists perceive a critical and antagonistic relationship where both concepts are seen as opposites. In this view, universal citizenship facilitates the prevalence of oppression whilst multicultural citizenship allows for marginalized voices to be heard. At the centre of the feminist contribution to the multicultural citizenship debate is the theme of ‘oppression’. According to young (1989, 1990), society is formed of different groups which are either dominant or oppressed. This strand of differentiated citizenship therefore concerns the denouncing of universal rights and the provision of special rights for oppressed groups. This suggests a politics for difference and not one geared towards the possibility of integration (Isin and Turner, 2002).

On the other hand, this notion of ‘oppression’ is hardly featured in Kymlicka’s liberal version of multicultural citizenship. Within this viewpoint the notion of universal rights is an acceptable one. However it is the inadequate number of them for certain groups that remains problematic. Kymlicka (1995) campaigns for the establishment of group differentiated rights for particular minority cultures in addition to the universal rights bestowed upon all (Kymlicka, 1995).

The central concept here is ‘societal culture’ which is effectively synonymous with the majority culture. Within a culturally plural society this evokes issues of equality and justice, which can only be confronted through the according of special rights to aid in the recognition and protection of minority cultures (Kymlicka, 1995).

Unlike many other post-war liberals Kymlicka argues that General human rights cannot replace or subsume minority group rights, as these are unable to adequately confront important questions relating to cultural minority groups. This ultimately results in cultural minorities being left vulnerable to injustice at the hands of the dominant group, thus aggravating ethnocultural conflicts. It is for this reason that Kymlicka advocates a supplementing of traditional human rights with special minority rights in order to minimise or avoid altogether such disputes, which too often result in bloodshed and loss of lives (Kymlicka, 1995).

In his presentation of multicultural citizenship Kymlicka aims to show that the emergence of ‘politics of difference’ brought about through the increased mobilizing of national groups need not pose a threat to liberal democracy. In fact kymlicka demonstrates that many of the demands of such groups
correspond with liberal principles of social justice and freedom (Kymlicka, 1995). Whilst the allocation of minority group rights to particular groups may seem discriminatory, Kymlicka argues that it does in fact correspond with the liberal principle of equality. Instead of giving these groups an unfair advantage, these rights are seen to compensate for the inevitable disadvantage they experience, existing within multinational societies (Kymlicka, 1995).

CHAPTER SUMMARY
From the information within this section it is clear that citizenship is indeed a complex and multifaceted notion and one which has been constructed and reconstructed on a number of different levels. As times have changed so has the nature and positioning of citizenship. Within the contemporary advanced industrial society citizenship is a negotiated and constructed form and is in this sense reflective of the continually shifting, diverse and ultimately uncertain social climate. Within this climate, individuals are able to shape their own histories and piece together multilayered identities. It is important that citizenship education accommodates for this pliability and adopts a concept of citizenship that embodies a broad outlook, thus allowing greater scope for inclusion and genuinely engaged involvement.
Apart from the embodiment of particular norms and values, citizenship may also be seen as a matter of civic behaviour, a willingness to support the perpetuation of democratic society through active participation in politics and public affairs (Pattie et al, 2004). This political participation is widely viewed as a positive aspect of democratic society, which cultivates integration, encourages individual identification with the wider community and generally enhances social solidarity (Segal, 2000). According to White (1993), it is a key requirement for a meaningful democratic society (Johnson and Lollar, 2002).

There is much disagreement among political scientists concerning the definitional boundaries of political participation (Schlosser, 2005). One commentator states that Birch (1993), defined political participation as an activity which “is essentially a case for substantial numbers of private citizens [...] to play a part in the process by which political leaders are chosen/or government policies are shaped and implemented.” (Birch cited in Schlosser, 2005). According to Huntington (1991), political participation involves two dimensions. These are participation and contestation. Huntington’s definition also implies the existence of civil and political liberty to speak, assemble and publish in the name of political debate, and also the freedom to conduct electoral campaigns (Johnson and Lollar, 2002).

Political engagement incorporates both conventional and unconventional acts. Conventional or institutional participation refers to involvement in electoral party politics (Barnes, 2004). This form of participation refers to the political venues of participation that are established, monitored and encouraged by the state (Segall, 2005) and includes acts such as voting, standing for office or participating in political party campaigns (Sanghera, no date). Unconventional or non-institutional participation on the other hand refers to acts such as demonstrating, leafleting or petitioning (Segal, 2005) such acts may be legitimate or illegal (Citizenship Foundation, 2004).

Whilst many traditional accounts of political engagement have tended to focus on the conventional political activities, there have been recent calls for the widening of the definition of political participation in light of new forms of activism that have arisen in recent decades (Schlosser, 2005). There are also claims that narrow traditional conceptions of political participation create a deceptive portrayal of political activity levels within contemporary society (Pattie et al, 2004). As stated by Pattie et al, “the citizen audit survey reveals that citizens have not contracted out of politics, but rather are engaged in a multiplicity of political activities beyond the traditional ones” (Pattie et al, 2004:266). It has also observed that unorthodox forms of participation are increasing in popularity and importance (Pattie et al, 2004:266) and therefore need to be adequately considered within participation debates.
Both conventional and unconventional forms of participation can be divided into three main categories. The first of these is that of individualistic participation. Individualistic forms can be undertaken by the individual, without assistance from others. Such forms may involve the donation of money to organisations and voting. One of the more invisible individualistic forms of participation is ‘consumer citizenship’. Many politicians conceive active citizenship to consist of the influencing of public services to respond to customer preferences. However, consumer citizenship implies that citizens are able to influence the political process by using their purchasing power and that in doing so, such citizens are participating politically (Pattie et al, 2004). Contact participation is from the respondent’s viewpoint, also individualistic, however also requires the participation of representatives or officials. This form involves such activities as writing to the media or speaking to a Member of Parliament. Lastly, collective participation involves the joining together of citizens for political purposes. Collective participation activities may involve attending political meetings or participating in demonstrations (Pattie et al, 2004).

Participation Trends
Concerning contemporary liberal democracies, several trends of political participation have been identified. These are:

- An increasingly informed and critical citizenry
- A decline of trust in effectiveness of political elites and institutions
- A decline in loyalty to traditional political parties
- A drop in turnout rates in elections
- An increase in unconventional political participation.

(Sanghera, no date)

Such trends are generally reflected in accounts forwarded by Pattie et al (2004) concerning the current British political climate. Here it has been observed that with the exception of protest forms, collective forms of participation have experienced significant decline, this has been coupled with the weakening of norms central to the perpetuation of collective participation. In turn, writers have also observed a marked increase in individualistic forms of participation, which are thought to have overshadowed collective forms. In light of this evidence, Pattie et al conclude that Britain is largely composed of ‘atomised citizens’. These shifts have resulted in the weakening of institutions that facilitate collective participation such as political parties. This movement is further reinforced by the increase in ‘cheque-book’ participation (Pattie et al, 2004).

With this emergence of atomised citizenship there comes the increased risk of policy fragmentation and failure. If civil institutions become weak then such processes are harder to counteract. A major consequence of this trend is that the state abdication of its responsibility to provide collective goods and services placing it in the hands of the market (Pattie et al, 2004). The problem with this arrangement is that citizens feel less obligated to a market state. Also, markets are unable to enforce the rule of law needed to sustain an inclusive, fair and
cohesive society. State withdrawal will ultimately result in a breakdown in basic security. Another consequence of weakening institutions is the breakdown of communication between ruler and ruled (Pattie et al, 2004).

Despite these risks however, there are certain advantages of atomised citizenship and market intervention. One such advantage is the provision of increased choice in public services; another is increased efficiency due to the market focus on innovation and cost reduction. A third advantage is the direct correlation between the cost of services and the benefits gained by the user (Pattie et al, 2004)

Determinants of Participation
Gaining a full understanding of the relationship between the personal characteristics of citizens and their involvement in political activities has been one of the ongoing goals of political behavioural empirical research (Barnes, 2004). At the most basic level, theories of participation can be divided into two categories: those which focus on individual or personal attributes and those which highlight the effects of wider social networks. Traditional theories of participation determinants tend to focus on personal or individual characteristics (McClurg, 2003). These studies have generally found the main determinant factors of participation to be individual resources such as education, income or socio-economic status and age or experience. It has been found that those with greater resources in these fields tend to have greater political involvement. In the case of age for instance, it has been found that there is what appears to be a universal increase in participation as people grow older, suggesting that experience is in itself, a political resource (Barnes, 2004). In times past, women have been found to participate less than men. These differences have narrowed considerably and have almost disappeared in industrial democratic societies (Barnes, 2004).

Income has also been identified as a key determinant factor with those at the lower end of the income scale displaying lower levels of political engagement. Unemployed individuals are even less likely to be politically active because they do not have access to social networks existent within the workplace through which political participation is facilitated (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade, 2001). In addition such individuals have very low levels of residential stability. This hinders participation because they are less likely to be integrated in their communities and therefore less likely to have a stable network of neighbours and friends (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade, 2001).

Whilst the individuals most likely to be apathetic and non-participatory are those who lack power and resources, these individuals are those most likely to desire state intervention on their behalf. This creates a vicious cycle of frustration, as the lack of political involvement among such individuals constitutes a significant barrier to the implementation of state intervention (Pattie et al, 2004). Another aspect of non-participation is the emergence of ‘cheque-book’ participation. This essentially involves one individual
subcontracting out his or her participatory duties someone else. Maloney suggests that this type of participation is responsible for much of the recent growth of interest groups such as green peace and shelter (Pattie et al, 2004). Skocpol (2002), further suggests that the establishment of such organisations often rests in the hands of political entrepreneurs who generate funds through direct mail which are then used to hire pollsters and media consultants to frame policies and lobbying strategies (Pattie et al, 2004).

More recently, apparent limitations in personal characteristics perspectives, have led to greater emphasis being placed on the environmental determinants of political engagement (McClurg, 2003). A key focal point within this area of research has been the relationship between political participation and individuals' involvement in formal and informal groups. Such groups may include sports clubs, student societies or Book clubs. Although such groups may have few direct links with the political process, they are nonetheless arenas in which individuals can learn skills that can be utilised within political activities of a higher intensity. They can therefore be considered as training grounds for political participation for many of those involved (Pattie et al, 2004). It is suggested that involvement in such groups stimulates collective political interest, makes individuals available for mobilisation by the elites and equips people with skills that make participation easier (McClurg, 2003).

Considerably less research has focused on the role of informal groups in political mobilisation. These groups are nevertheless said to underpin civil society and provide vital services. Activities within this area may include involvement in a pub quiz team or the provision of support for neighbours or friends. These activities are valuable because they help to build civic engagement networks and also provide valuable services (Pattie et al, 2004). One explanation of the relationship between such groups and political participation is that when individuals have friends who participate, they themselves are more likely to do the same (McClurg, 2003). Other research emphasises the size and political orientation of the group as influential factors of political involvement. Another suggestion is that even very basic interactive activities such as playing cards or having lunch with friends may influence participation by enhancing interpersonal trust and compliance to social norms. In addition, there is also evidence to suggest that family interactions can also affect political engagement (McClurg, 2003).

Whilst the above research is highly valuable and enables a clearer understanding of political behaviour, it is nevertheless seen by some to lack detail in certain areas. McClurg (2003) for instance argues that whilst social interaction influences participation the actual affect it has is very much dependant upon the amount of political discussion that occurs within these networks. According to McClurg (2003), social networks can only influence participation through the political substance they encompass (McClurg, 2003) thus to fully understand the relationship between social interaction and participation it is necessary to adequately examine this substance as opposed to solely focusing on the social network form.
A more comprehensive and detailed categorisation of political participation theories is given by Pattie et al (2004). The categories used here are choice-based theories and structural-based theories. In the perspective of the choice based theories, actors are seen to be operating within a world where individuals seek to obtain the highest return at the minimum cost. This perspective views citizenship as something which results from the choices that people make which reflect the costs and benefits of the situation in question. The point here is that individuals choose their levels of participation. Within the structural perspective emphasis is placed on the socialisation of individuals into norms, values and behaviours of social groups and those of the wider society. Here, citizens are viewed as products of social forces and structures, which affect behaviours and attitudes (Pattie et al, 2004)

The first choice theory of participation is the cognitive engagement model. The core idea of this theory is that political engagement is determined by the individual's access to information and their willingness and ability to use it. Education is a central component of this theory because it enables people to acquire and process large amounts of information. Education also enables the acquisition of key skills such as IT and information analysis skills. Increases in education levels coupled with the declining cost of information acquisition, creates a process of cognitive mobilisation which in turn produces politically conscious individuals who have a clear understanding of democratic norms and principles. The cognitively engaged citizen is also a critical citizen who is likely to take action if dissatisfied by state delivery of services. If such citizens feel that they are not receiving adequate benefits, they may be less inclined to acknowledge their obligations as citizens. This is why cognitive engagement is essentially a choice based theory, because it postulates that the political involvement of citizens depends on their perception of the performance of the state system (Pattie et al, 2004).

One of the main criticisms of this theory is that whilst it explains the importance of information gathering of it is not clear why the individual would want to act on this information or what encourages them to do so. Thus, the process of information acquisition and processing is seen by some as an incomplete explanation for participation (Pattie et al, 2004).

The second choice based theory is the general incentives theory. This theory specifically explains involvement in high intensity participation, involving political activists. The core idea that underpins this theory is that in order to participate, actors need incentives. These incentives are divided into five types; collective, selective, group, social and expressive (Pattie et al, 2004).

Collective incentives refer to the benefits of citizenship that are available to all individuals regardless to whether or not they participate. Economists refer to these incentives as public goods. These goods are provided by the state and include, freedom from crime and freedom from invasion. Other goods such as healthcare, education and infrastructure are also public goods. In this view it is
thought that if individuals perceive policy delivery to be effective then they will be motivated to participate but if they perceive failing delivery then this will function as a deterrent to participation. Here the individual’s own belief that they can affect outcomes plays a central role. This is because, even if an individual perceives the system to be an effective one, if they don’t think that they can have any influence within it they still will have no motivation to participate (Pattie et al, 2004).

Selective incentives are the benefits gained as a direct result of participation. Such incentives are exclusive to participants and are not accessible to non-participants. There are two types of selective incentives, process and outcome. Process incentives refer to the perceived benefits of involvement in the participation process itself. The joy of meeting new and interesting people for instance, may be enough of an incentive for someone to get involved in a political activity. Outcome incentives refer to the achievement of certain personal (as opposed to collective) goals whilst participating in the political process. Such incentives help to secure individuals’ political commitment for private reasons. For instance a citizen may harbour a private desire to become a local magistrate and this may be their personal incentive for sustained political engagement (Pattie et al, 2004).

Group incentives refer to the willingness of individuals to be involved in political activities because of the group benefits that will be gained. Individuals propelled by these incentives will often think of the welfare of the group instead of their own welfare. This theory implies that a person may engage in political activity because of the available benefits for a group that is important to them (Pattie et al, 2004).

The fourth motive for involvement in the general incentives model is drawn from social norms or from the perception of the individual that those around them are supportive of participation and civic values. This viewpoint postulates that a person’s level of political involvement will either be inhibited or enhanced by the views of those around them, depending on what they perceive these views to be (Pattie et al, 2004).

The final set of motives for political engagement outlined within the general incentives model involves the individual’s emotional or affective attachments to society. Here it is implied that for some people the motive for political engagement is an emotional attachment to their country, a sense of ‘British pride’ for instance (Pattie et al, 2004).

The general incentives model has been criticised for overemphasising the centrality of choice behaviour whilst neglecting the role of socialisation processes in explaining participation trends. Evidence gathered by Barnes and Kaase (1979) for instance, suggests that people become involved in voluntary activities due to their parent’s involvement (Pattie et al, 2004). A person’s involvement may also be dictated by the extent to which they are embedded within their community (Pattie et al, 2004).
Structural theories of participation highlight the influence of macro level forces as opposed to the individual choices made by citizens. The civic volunteerism model is the most prevalent of the structural models. At the centre of this model is the availability of resources, namely; time, money, civic skills, political efficacy and access to political recruitment networks. The central suggestion of this model is that individuals with these resources will participate if the resources have resulted from social structures, education and inherited characteristics from parents. Within this viewpoint, psychological engagement, which is subject to individual choice, is less important than these resources (Pattie et al, 2004).

Though useful, this type of theory does present a number of problems. The first of these is connected to the proposed correlation of socioeconomic status, participation and civic values. The model fails to adequately explain why significant numbers of high status individuals are not politically engaged. There is also the anomaly that despite the fact that advanced industrial societies are becoming better educated and more affluent, political participation levels continue to decrease. Verba et al (1995), also suggest that this model would benefit from a broader examination of resources including spare time and financial resources in order to provide a more comprehensive explanation of the connection between socioeconomic variables and participation (Pattie et al, 2004). Another perceived problem with this model is its tendency to focus on supply of participation whilst failing to adequately consider the incentives that underpin political involvement (Pattie et al, 2004).

The equity-fairness theory, offers an alternative perspective of political participation. Here it is believed that society is composed of various groups who compete for resources. The central notion is that individuals compare themselves with their peers and if these comparisons reveal an unfavourable reflection on the individual, then this can result in frustration or aggression. This aggression may be manifested in the political actions of the individual. In other words, individuals compare their actual life situations with their perceived expectations of that situation, which are constructed through peer comparisons. If there is a significant gap between expectations and actual reality, then relative deprivation results, which has consequences for political action. This type of scenario is more commonly manifested amongst objectively deprived groups such as ethnic minorities and individuals with low income. The larger the gap between expectations and reality, the more substantial the political consequences. This model has been used to explore the occurrence of unconventional political activity (Pattie et al, 2004).

Despite its usefulness in explaining unorthodox political participation, the relevance of the equity-fairness model in the general exploration of political participation is somewhat questionable. It is also possible that relative deprivation hinders more conventional forms of participation. These differing effects of relative deprivation cause theoretical postulations of the theory to be unclear. The relationship between equity-fairness perceptions and attitudes
towards rights and obligations are also said to be inadequately defined (Pattie et al, 2004).

The last structural model of participation is the social capital model. In the literature, there is much debate about the definition of social capital. Putman (1993) defines it as “features of social organisation such as trust, norms and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating co-ordinated actions”. (Putman cited in Pattie et al, 2004:149). Central to this theory is the notion that if individuals trust each other and work cooperatively to solve societal problems then society will be much better off. Generally trust is the key constituent of social capital theory. This trust is strongly embedded in social structures, which transcend time and are concentrated in particular geographical zones (John et al, 2003). According to social capital theorists it is trust that enables individuals to transcend beyond their immediate networks and connect with others in corporate activities. According to Tocqueville (1990), communities with high levels of social capital feature extensive civic engagement networks and appear to have less crime and higher levels of political participation (Pattie et al, 2004).

Despite being one of the more predominant models of participation, social capital theory is seen to have some inadequacies. One problem is that of circularity. When utilised in the explanation of wide forms of participation there is a danger that it could be seen to imply that voluntary activity perpetuates itself in some sort of continuous cycle. This in turn poses the potential problem of broad measures of participation becoming both independent and dependent variables in explanatory models (Pattie et al, 2004). It has also been suggested that current social capital theory does not adequately account for the causal effects of the socialisation processes (John et al, 2003).

**BME Groups and Political Participation**

Over the last two decades, various studies have shed light on the political participation of immigrant groups and the factors which influence participation levels. Drawing from their study of political participation in California, Uhlaner et al for instance, conclude that voting behaviours were influenced by ability to speak English. Cho (1999), also came to similar conclusions and also postulates that immigrants educated outside the United States are less likely to vote than those educated in the United States. In 1999, Junn concluded that immigrants may be less likely to participate in institutional political activities, however are just as likely as natives to be involved in direct unconventional political activities such as protesting (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade, 2001).

Since 1974 several studies have demonstrated that non-registration among ethnic minority groups in Britain is notably higher than it is among the white community. This was highlighted in the 1974 sample survey. Another survey reflected the same results in 1979. Over 10 years later in 1991 another survey showed that although participation levels had improved among BME groups they were still notably lower to those of the white population. Consequently, there has been mounting concern about the non-participation of ethnic minority
groups. A more recent study undertaken in 1998 discovered that non-registration among black respondents was still very high (Anwar, 2001).

Non-registration has been connected to doubts surrounding the residential status of respondents, others experienced language barriers. There was also a fear of attack from extreme right wing groups who were able to use electoral registers to target individuals from ethnic minority groups. High levels of non-participation, particularly among ethnic minority young people, were also found to have resulted from a general alienation from political processes. High levels of non-participation may also be accounted to the policies and practices of registration offices, which at times fail to meet the needs of ethnic minority electorates (Anwar, 2001).

According to Fennema and Tillie (1999, 2001), differences in political participation amongst ethnic minorities are connected to disparities in civic communities, which primarily constitute the amount of ethnic social capital of the group, indicated by involvement in ethnic associational life (Jacobs et al, 2004). Here it is predicted that the denser the political ethnic association networks, the more political trust will be generated among the group and the more political activity will be embarked upon (Jacobs et al, 2004).

This model was however found not to be applicable to Brussels where it was found that although there were notably higher levels of ethnic membership among the Turkish community compared to the Moroccan community, there were no notable differences in political participation between the two groups. From this, Jacobs et al (2004), conclude that the proposals put forward by Fennema and Tillie need to adequately consider the differences between ethnic social capital and cross ethnic social capital and the relationship that exists between the two. Jacobs et al also stress the importance of examining the possible differing effects of ethnic social capital on different ethnic groups (Jacobs et al, 2004).

A similar theoretical viewpoint suggests that political involvement is affected by ethnic residential concentration. The claim here is that those who live in areas which are highly populated with co-ethnics, have greater access to ethnic media and community organisations. This is said to lower the cost of political mobilisation encouraging participation (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade, 2001).

Another factor said to affect political involvement amongst immigrants is their prior political experiences. Those who have escaped from oppressive political regimes may be distrustful of the political system and therefore less likely to participate. On the other hand however, they may cherish the opportunity to choose freely the candidate of their preference, which may increase their tendency to vote. The prior political experiences of first generation immigrants may also influence the political participation levels of their children. Studies of political socialisation demonstrate that the voting behaviour of adults is significantly influenced by political activities and discussions of parents during childhood (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade, 2001).
Anti-immigrant legislation may also influence immigrant political mobilisation. Where the public benefits of immigrants are placed under threat, the first and second generations are more likely to mobilise against the laws in question for their own benefit and that of their relatives. This was shown in the case of the 1996 American elections where it was indicated that immigrant legislation was more prominent for immigrants than it was for other members of the population (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade, 2001).

Many of the traditional theories of immigrant adaptation perceive assimilation to be a unilinear process through which social and economic conditions of immigrants improve over time. Over the past decade however, this view has been strongly challenged in light of the “new” second generation. Many of the revised theories perceive more of a segmented assimilation trend where disparities in group characteristics and incorporation trends lead to unpredictable outcomes (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade, 2001).

One such viewpoint is forwarded by Ramakrishnan and Espenshade (2001), who in their examination of immigrant generational status and voting participation found that immigrant political involvement trends were varied according to the racial or ethnic group. The research also found that linguistic barriers may not necessarily be primary obstacles to voting and that previous political experience does not have an effect on voting participation as suggested within more traditional accounts. The study did reveal however, that the presence of anti-immigrant legislation did increase voting participation among immigrants. Overall the findings highlight a need for further systematic research to be conducted concerning immigrant political participation (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade, 2001).
Young People and Political Participation

Current representations of young people tend to be quite negative. Youth today tend to be portrayed as self-centred, inconsiderate and apathetic or as a source of trouble (Rocker et al., 1999). A central constituent of this negative portrayal is the view that young people remain indifferent to social and political issues and alienate themselves from the political world (Rocker et al., 1999). As concerns for the perceived political apathy of young people have mounted, various approaches and responses to the issue have been forwarded.

In the 1996 MORI Omnibus survey on conventional political participation in Britain it was again confirmed that age is a key determinant of political engagement. In turn, these findings confirmed those of earlier studies, which imply the existence of extensive non-participation and political indifference amongst youth. The study revealed that young people were less likely to vote, join a main stream political party or to engage in political activities that involve any significant costs; either in time, information or finances. The data gathered also revealed clear and systematic variations in levels of political engagement according to employment status, income and class. Unemployed and low-income respondents were much less likely to be politically engaged than those on average or above average incomes. However even when income and social class were accounted for, age was still found to be strongly associated with levels of political engagement (Fahmy, no date).

In light of these findings, Fahmy stresses the importance of examining and confronting the wider social and economic issues when discussing and encouraging the political engagement of young people. According to Fahmy, such an approach has implications for citizenship education, which, apart from its central emphasis on knowledge skills and values, must consider the wider social and economic circumstances of the young people it attempts to reach (Fahmy, no date). This involves a commitment to tackling the processes of economic exclusion that continue to afflict youth transitions. Fahmy additionally comments that young people are unlikely to benefit from the social and professional networks or civil associations that facilitate involvement in conventional politics. This is partly due to their dependant and subordinate positioning within the life cycle and often within society. This is particularly true of disadvantaged young people (Fahmy, no date).

In its conclusion the report recommends that in order to encourage more widespread participation, the political views of young people be seriously considered and that serious consideration be given to the accessibility of political structures to groups marginalised by the political process. It is also seen to be necessary to widen avenues for the involvement of young people in formal politics and to develop ways of articulating formal politics using the unconventional forms that young people prefer. This viewpoint accepts that young people have a very limited involvement in formal politics, it also proceeds further in exploring the aetiology of this disengagement with reference to the social and economic
disadvantages and the perceived shortcomings of political systems and processes.

Another approach which challenges notions of youth apathy perhaps in a more overt sense, is that forwarded by Rocker, Player and Coleman (1999). Here, young people’s involvement in more informal voluntary and campaigning activities is highlighted as an area of political involvement that is often overlooked. Quite apart from the above negative claims, it was found in this study that whilst young people in Britain seem to be somewhat alienated from the world of party politics, they are at the same time very much involved in single-issue campaigning and volunteering activities. This evidence applied to young people from a variety of different backgrounds. It was also found that such activities could help to develop political knowledge awareness, understanding and skills (Rocker et al, 1999). These results are endorsed by John et al (2003) who state that whilst young people do not appear to have an interest in conventional politics, they do tend to engage with broader political issues and with a range of group activities (John et al, 2003).

More recent research funded by the Economic and Social research Council argues that young people are not politically apathetic but simply have a different understanding of what politics entails. The report also states that most young people desire to be socially engaged but not necessarily in the ways that are traditionally advocated by politicians. In addition the project concludes that young people have a strong interest in political issues and are in fact highly articulate about political issues that affect their lives (Citizenship Foundation, 2004).

In light of such findings, it is suggested that claims of rampant youth apathy are founded on an overly narrow definition of ‘the political’, which excludes what may be seen as the more unconventional political activities (Rocker et al, 1999).

CHAPTER SUMMARY
Political participation is widely recognised as a central component of citizenship. This is reflected in the sentiments of the Crick Report and other related texts. Yet political activities seem to be more accessible to some than others. In addition, the political activities of some are more likely to be classified as political than those of others because of the extent to which these activities do or do not correspond with traditional definitions of the political. The groups that are typically experience political marginalization are the economically deprived, black and minority ethnic groups and young people. Indeed there are large segments of the British population that fit all three of these categories. Clearly there is a pressing need to ensure that such groups have adequate access to political involvement especially in the light of emergent inclusive notions of citizenship. This may be enabled through the revision of political participation boundaries and a movement beyond the confines of voting behaviour, allowing the consideration of more unconventional forms. It may
also be necessary for a paradigm shift to occur in relation to the language used to explain and promote political involvement. In general it is vital that a greater effort is made to ensure that all have equal access to political expression. These debates also have obvious implications for citizenship education, which aims to cultivate active and engaged citizens for the future.
CHAPTER 3
MULTICULTURALISM

“If anything is truer of the world post 9/11 than before it is, whether we like it or not, that we live in a multiethnic world” (Olssen, 2004:189)

The issues of immigration and multiculturalism have now become hot topics of debate in many western countries (Verkuyten, 2005). So much so, that Multiculturalism is currently at the forefront of global affairs (Siebers, 2004). The increased focus on this global issue has resulted from notably increasing immigration flows across national borders. This movement began in earnest during the mid 1940s. However it is only since the 1960s that it has emerged as a major global force (Guibernau and Rex eds, 2003). As a result the vast majority of western countries have developed diverse multi-ethnic societies and are having to examine the implications of this type of society for existing political, social and cultural orders (Verkuyten, 2005). The following section will examine the notion of multiculturalism from a factual and theoretical standpoint and will also pay particular attention to the intersection of multiculturalism and education.

Like citizenship, multiculturalism is a difficult term to define. The term has been used and misused to such an extent that any discussion of multiculturalism must first in some way distinguish its intended meaning (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997). For the purposes of this section, multiculturalism will be generally operationalised into two understandings: that of multiculturalism as a social reality or fact and that of multiculturalism as a theory or theoretical field.

Multiculturalism as a social reality or fact simply refers to the demographic condition of contemporary societies which contains two or more ethnic groups whose differing cultural traits are distinctive enough to enable the establishment and maintenance of differing cultural identities and communities (Tiryakian, 2003). The British society with its devolved Scottish and Welsh constituents is an apt example of this multicultural reality.

This social condition is said to have emerged in the midst of the demographic overhaul that is occurring in western societies, incorporating increased immigration and movements of race and gender awareness. Consequently, the ways in which these societies define themselves and other institutions has been brought into question. Moreover the cultural nature, values and mission of the West are no longer presumed givens but have become the objects of investigation, exploration and critical analysis. It is in this social climate that Westerners are having to except the reality of the multicultural society in which they live. In the case of multiculturalism, belief and disbelief are of no consequence; it is simply a fact of late twentieth century Western society (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997).
There are various ways in which this reality has been responded to. These are tailored by contrasting definitions of the social world that correspond with specific interests of a social, political and economic nature. The first of these responses is that of Conservative multiculturalism or monoculturalism. Conservative multiculturalism basically reflects a belief in the superiority of Western patriarchal culture. It tends not to address issues of social injustice and conceptualises multiculturalism as a threat to western identity.

Central to this approach is the idea of a ‘common culture’, which is seen as the only way to secure the effective functioning of society. It is therefore deemed necessary to assimilate all to the white middle class social ideal. The western monoculturalist construction of traditional consensus encompasses the perpetuation of the white fear of non-whites. This position is also characterised by the polarisation of ‘we’ and ‘they’, ‘we’ being the legitimate homogeneous civil assembly and ‘they’ being the heterogeneous burdens to society (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997).

The second response is that of Liberal Multiculturalism at the centre of this viewpoint are the concepts of sameness and universal equality. Here it is believed that everyone is essentially equal and that the existence of intellectual sameness enables diverse individuals to compete equally for capitalist economy resources. Liberal multiculturalists explain positional inequalities between groups as the resulting from the lack of social and educational opportunities that are needed to enable equal competition in the economy. Whilst emphasising on consensus and similarity, the liberalist approach to multiculturalism is often accused of failing to address the pressing issues of oppression and inequality, allowing the assimilationist movement to plough forward unchallenged. The perceived danger here is that an over emphasis on sameness will undermine attempts to understand the mediation of race class and gender in the construction of experiences for both privileged and marginalised groups (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997).

According to Kincheloe and Steinberg (1997), the ethos of this perspective is evident in ‘black’ shows of the 1990s such as *The Cosby Show*, which failed to confront the issue of African American oppression or other issues of particular concern to African Americans. Instead, a more ‘sanitised’ depiction of black culture was presented. What kincheloe and Steinberg refer to as “a warm and fuzzy, feel good lesson on multicultural unity and racial accord” (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997:11).

The third approach, pluralist multiculturalism, is the most mainstream version of multiculturalism and has close association with current multicultural education. Whilst pluralist multiculturalism is said to bear many similarities to liberalist multiculturalism, it maintains an opposite focus on difference as opposed to sameness. In this approach, diversity is intrinsically valuable. Here the experiences of different groups are viewed as separate yet essentially equal (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997).
Like liberalist multiculturalism, Pluralist multiculturalism is somewhat reluctant to address issues of socioeconomic status, ethnicity and race. Here, cultural pluralism is viewed from beyond the boundaries of social structure power relations. In this sense pluralist multiculturalism is seen to have a tendency to depoliticise, whilst again allowing the status quo to remain unchallenged (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997).

The fourth approach is that of left-essentialist multiculturalism which is one of a number of existing forms of essentialist cultural politics. Left-essentialist multiculturalists see groups as having certain historically grounded essential characteristics or essences around which identities are formed. In this viewpoint difference is often connected with a historical past of cultural authenticity where the core elements of group identity were established. These elements are thought to transcend historical, social and power dynamics (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997).

Left-essentialist multiculturalists stand accused of failing to acknowledge the dynamic and fluid nature of the identity formation process (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997). In a critical examination of left essentialist multiculturalism critical multiculturalists make the point that identity formation is in itself socially constructed and therefore is subject to the constant shifts inherent in all such discursive and ideological constructions (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997).

Lastly, the approach of critical multiculturalism is effectively a critique of all of the above approaches. In this view it is important that we transcend beyond conservative and liberal assumptions of equal status across all gender, racial and ethnic groups and open access to the social system and take note of the prevalent power dynamics that are instrumental in the construction and perpetuation of social inequalities (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997). Critical multiculturalists are concerned with the interaction of class with other axes of power and with the particular contexts in which class and gender inequalities emerge.

Multiculturalism as a theoretical field is the ‘multicultural movement’ and what it stands for. It can at a very general level be viewed as a normative critique of the institutional functionings within society, which result in depriving cultural minority groups of their rights (Tiryakian, 2003). The concept of multiculturalism emerged at a time when it was recognised and accepted that market economies and democratic polities had failed to dissolve resilient ethnic identities despite the establishment of immigrant policies geared towards assimilation this ignited fresh concerns about the nature of political institutions within ethnically plural societies. The theoretical field of multiculturalism constituted a response to these concerns (Mahajan, 1999).

Contemporary theories of multiculturalism tend to focus on the specific needs of minority groups and indigenous people, they argue for greater sensitivity and respect towards the cultural identity of these groups. Multiculturalist theorists such as Kymlicka (1999), advocate that these minority groups should at least
be provided with a sense of involvement in the wider societies in which they exist and that this can be achieved through a system of group rights (Mahajan, 1999). From the multiculturalist viewpoint the ideal society values diversity and encourages and supports the preservation of a healthy dialogue between cultural groups (Parekh, 1999).

According to Parekh (1999), this perspective or way of viewing human life rests on three central insights. Firstly that humans are culturally embedded in that the worlds in which they exist are culturally structured and that their social relations and general life organisation are shaped by culturally determined meaning systems. This does not mean that humans are incapable of critical evaluation of these systems but that they are inevitably directed by them in some sense. Secondly the multicultural perspective postulates that different cultures are grounded by different meaning systems and ideals of the ‘good life’. In this sense, each is able to capture and embody only a segment of the totality of human existence and consequently needs other cultures to assist in a better understanding of itself and to enable intellectual and moral expansion. Thirdly, within multiculturalism, each culture is seen to be internally plural and encompasses an ongoing dialogue between different traditions and thought strands. Far from implying an absence of coherence, identity and self-determination, this feature suggests that cultural identity is plural and dynamic and able to filter and accommodate external influences. From this point of view all cultures are established through interaction with others and are shaped by the overarching economic and political dynamics amongst other structural influences (Parekh, 1999).

**Sociological Approaches to Multiculturalism**

Within multiculturalism theory, there are a number of perspectives, each of which present and promote multiculturalism in slightly different ways. The sociology of multiculturalism offers four major approaches. These approaches are categorised according to the factors of multiculturalism that they emphasise.

Circumstantialists tend to focus on the effects of social conditions and the positioning of groups in social stratification structures. Circumstantialists stress the influence of stratification factors on collective consciousness within society, consequently, emphasis is placed on the influence of social depravation influences the extent to which cultural groups develop and retain their particularism within the wider society. The perceived causes of this social depravation of racial immigrant or religious groups include: barriers of prejudice and discrimination, power relations structures and exploitation operating through competitive labour markets (Baubock et al, eds, 1996).

Circumstantialists believe that it is when the consistent marginalisation of such groups is attributed to social inferiority that they are able to gain the greatest saliency as contrasting entities. Groups are able to establish a collective consciousness, which facilitates solidarity as a response to discrimination (Baubock et al eds, 1996).
It has been shown by numerous writers (Hechter, 1975, 1978; Lipset/Rokkan, 1967), that cultural particularism is more widely prevalent among minority groups within the lower strata or working class communities as opposed to the middle classes. Milroy 1989 claims that isolated working class communities tend to display certain cultural and linguistic codes that can be seen to constitute a form of ethnicity. These codes are grounded in the close-knit networks which substantiate them. On the other hand it is believed that members of these groups who do manage to progress academically and/or professionally face greater exposure to cultures outside of the group. This suggests that whilst social mobility breeds acculturation to the mainstream social inferiority facilitates the cultural crystallisation and social cohesion, which is related to the concept of ethnicity. In this respect, this perspective generally implies that “the conjunction of culturally contrasting groups may be a major feature of lower strata, while the mainstream culture which refers to that society as a whole is predominant in the higher strata” (Baubock et al eds, 1996:137).

The culturalist position insists on the role of the dominant culture in the establishment of multiculturalism. Here the dominant culture is seen to represent “the systematic relation of social reality to the symbolic order” (Baubock et al eds, 1996:138) and thus is central to the justification and moulding of the dominant social order. This social order encompasses the central tenets and obligations of membership.

Of particular concern to those within this perspective is the inclusion of attitudes towards social disparities and multiculturalism within the content and orientations of the dominant culture, which are legitimated and solidified within the central political domain. These attitudes are known to differ between dominant cultures. Two types of attitude highlighted by the culturalist theorists are the ‘Unifying syndrome’ where integration and conformism are expected of newcomers, and the ‘pluralistic syndrome’ where cultural differences are accommodated and cultural differences are institutionalised within the social order. In addition, within some dominant cultures more tolerance may be accorded to certain pluralisms than others (Baubock et al eds, 1996). In this respect it is argued that the dominant culture plays a vital role in the shaping of multiculturalism (Baubock et al eds, 1996).

The approach of primordialism emphasises the bonds between group members and the way in which they are solidified through social, cultural and historical means. This viewpoint postulates that groups do play a role in their development and therefore implies that culturalist focus on the dominant culture overlooks the fact that different groups have been known to embark upon diverse paths whilst remaining within the context of the same dominant culture. An example of this can be seen in the case of the Italian, Scandinavian and Jewish immigrants within the USA (Baubock et al eds, 1996). Here it is believed that it is on the basis of the complexity of primordial influences that groups construct and reconstruct their relationship with society and to
themselves. It is important to note however that due to the differing social positions of group members this process is not necessarily uniform throughout the group. The process is very much dependant on the extent to which group members are willing to perpetuate the group, at least in a symbolic sense (Baubock et al, eds, 1996).

Having briefly reviewed the sociological approaches above, it is clear that each highlights a major force, which contributes to the shaping of multiculturalism as a social reality. Each aspect indicates something concerning the group's acculturation or assimilation into wider society or the group's orientation towards particularism. Through the consideration of all three of these key aspects we gain a true sense of the multidimensional nature of multiculturalism (Baubock et al, eds, 1996).

The last of the sociological approaches is the cultural capital approach. This approach focuses on the cultural symbols of groups, which function as markers of group identity and constitute cultural resources of the wider society. These resources are accessible or at the very least visible to non-group members. In this sense the group symbols become part of the wider society's cultural resource pool at the very point at which they join the dominant culture (Baubock et al eds, 1996). This pool of cultural resources can be seen to constitute the cultural market of society. In this context, resources become goods that are priced according to the efforts individuals are willing to go to in order to acquire or attain them. Within this viewpoint, cultural resources are seen to be highly influential to the development of multiculturalism. The cultural market is particularly significant because of its relation to the acculturation/assimilation of groups verses the perpetuation of cultural diversity and particularism (Baubock et al, eds, 1996).

Through the social pressures that it represents, the cultural market distributes appreciations of symbols, which in turn influence the willingness of the original carriers to retain them and the non-members to acquire them. The market also dictates the extent to which groups are obligated to share or give up all together their symbols and the extent to which commercialisation of such symbols are economically beneficial to their careers. In other words this cultural market effects the nature of multiculturalism through its influence on the extent to which cultural groups wishing to retain their cultural particularism are able to do so (Baubock et al, eds, 1996).

In terms of social stratification, studies of secondary languages have demonstrated that the stronger the social status of individuals, the greater their ability to control the cultural goods they desire and the weaker the social status of individuals, the more reliant they are on other factors in the pursuit of their goals. It may also be concluded that the higher the price of the cultural resource, the more it is sought after by those of the stronger social layers and the less appeal it has to those within the weaker layers. In addition, the weaker the resource price, the more stigma is attached to their possession.
This is especially the case for high status individuals however this stigma is less of an issue for Lower-status individuals (Baubock et al, eds, 1996).

**Multiculturalism and Education**

The extent and nature of the incorporation of multiculturalism in education is very much dependant on the approach adopted by the educator and/or educating body. Within the conservative approach for instance, the purpose of schooling is to socialise immigrant children into civilised western society. The education advocated here is therefore one aimed at assimilation, an effort that is substantiated with the argument that this type of assimilation aids in the economic progress of such pupils (Kinzeloe and Steinberg, 1997).

Within the Liberal approach to multiculturalism, educators reflect similar sentiments to that of conservative multiculturalism. Within this viewpoint, educators whilst emphasising diversity, still promote the Eurocentric culture as the norm and still assimilate to white male standards. Liberal multiculturalists believe that educators are able to divorce their political orientation from the practice of teaching. In this sense, liberal multiculturalists can be seen to de-politicise the educational process (Kinzeloe and Steinberg, 1997). Such a view is described as “a hyper rationalisation of politics that represents the political as a very narrow terrain which never overlaps the moral and ethical” (Kinzeloe and Steinberg, 1997:13).

With reference to education, pluralist multiculturalists believe that it is of great importance that pupils gather knowledge concerning the values and beliefs of a variety of cultural groups and that they develop an awareness of social unfairness. It is envisaged that this development of cultural literacy will enable pupils to operate effectively in diverse cultural contexts. At the same time it is believed that it is important for pupils from culturally diverse backgrounds to learn to function effectively within the mainstream culture to enable them to gain equal opportunities in the educational and economic spheres. In addition, cultural pluralists also in the building of students pride in their own cultural heritage in order to further chances of gaining equal opportunities (Kinzeloe and Steinberg, 1997).

Educators with a left-essentialist approach to multiculturalism tend to advocate the transferral of unquestioned bodies of data to students in such a way that is thought by some to resemble indoctrination. In this sense it is thought that this educational approach is unsuitable for democratic society (Kinzeloe and Steinberg, 1997).

The critical multiculturalist approach to education aims to move beyond traditional liberal and conservative critiques of schooling. Operating on the premise that education is not a politically neutral process critical multiculturalists seek to uncover hidden educational processes that privelage the affluent whilst disadvantaged the poor. In this viewpoint it is believed that students should be allowed to examine and evaluate a range of perspectives
and critically reflect upon the contradictions encased within them (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997).

**Multiculturalism and Current Citizenship Education**

The Crick Report presents a rather limited view of multiculturalism which sees it as being about visible minorities rather than about all citizens in society, including the majority white population (Osler, 2000:33).

The intersection of current citizenship education and contemporary theories of multiculturalism is an essentially critical and contentious one for a number of different reasons. Since the development of the citizenship education syllabus a number of criticisms have been raised concerning the ‘narrow liberal’ ideologies that have been detected within the report (Olssen, 2004). The following section will outline some of the perceived questionable areas of the citizenship education agenda as it is outlined within the Crick Report.

Firstly, the Marshallian liberal notion of citizenship reflected within the Crick Report is seen to be inadequate for contemporary multicultural society. The Crick Report is seen by many multicultural theorists to encompass the central tenets of liberalism, firstly in its universalistic stance, whereby a uniform standard is applied to everyone regardless of circumstantial disparities and secondly in its reluctance to recognise as legitimate the particular claims of different cultural groups. Major criticisms of the liberalist viewpoint have been strongly maintained by Young (1986, 1990, 1995, 1997). Young argues that the notion of universal citizenship incorporated within the social democratic citizenship ideal incorporates a sense of universality as generality and equal treatment. According to young, this ideal of a citizenship that serves to “express or create a general will that transcends the particular differences of group affiliation, situation and interest” (Young cited in Olssen, 2004:181), has in fact succeeded in excluding groups deemed incapable of adopting that general viewpoint. The assumption that laws and rules can be applied to everyone in the same way is also said to result in exclusion and/or homogeneity (Olssen, 2004).

Young advocates the notion of “differentiated citizenship” which advocates the public recognition and acceptance of irreducible differences and the coexistence of these differences with “common procedural commitments” contained within the communication process that operates across differences (Olsen, 2004:182). This particular structure of political life preserves minority group differences through the institutionalisation of mechanisms and minority group representation (Olssen, 2004).

Other authors such as Osler and Starkey (2001), and Pearce and Spencer (1999), argue that the Crick Report presents an overly consensualist portrayal of society. This can be detected throughout the report in the reoccurring suggestion that “certain uniform conceptions of moral values and social development constitute an essential precondition for citizenship” (Olssen, 2000:33).
2004:183). This in itself implies the promotion of the idea of a single national identity (Olssen, 2004).

The Crick Report is also widely criticised for its inadequate portrayal of ethnic minority groups. Taking careful note of the wording used in the Crick Report Osler and Starky argue that the Crick Report presents certain ethnicities as ‘other’ when exploring the issue of ethnic diversity. Further to this point, the Report is seen to suggest that visible ethnic minorities are not necessarily capable of conforming to the laws, standards and conventions, which characterise democratic society (Olssen, 2004). Put another way, the report suggests that the cultures and values held within these minority groups, conflict with those of mainstream laws and conventions (Osler, 2000), and therefore individuals within these groups must undergo change in order to participate in the common culture (Olssen, 2004). With reference to “our minority communities” (QCA, 1998, cited in Osler, 2000), the report also stands accused of promoting the assumption that members of ethnic minority groups view the country from which they or their families migrated, as their ‘homeland’ as opposed to the country in which they reside (Osler, 2000).

An additional criticism of the Crick Report is that it fails to adequately highlight the threat of racism within the democratic multicultural society, when presenting the case for citizenship education with reference to threats to democracy. In this view, the Crick Report gives no consideration to the ways in which citizenship education can support antiracism in education and thus fails to challenge the force that poses a substantial threat to the very structures which it aims to preserve and strengthen. In fact Osler (2000), proceeds further in stating that the proposals for citizenship education themselves would seem to encompass examples of racism and are also reflective of the institutionalised racism present within society. Osler argues that if an inclusive concept of citizenship is to be developed within a pluralist society and a citizenship education which supports the development of democratic practice, then a different conception of multiculturalism is required. One which is founded on human rights and is inclusive of all citizens. One which requires the recognition of the operation of racism at both the institutional and interpersonal level (Osler, 2000).

Lastly the Crick Report stands accused of failing to adequately incorporate human rights issues. Despite general references made to rights and responsibilities of citizens and various human rights legislation, there are no references to the equal rights of minority groups. The Report also fails to mention how international human rights standards provide general principles which can be utilised as a foundation of shared values in culturally plural societies (Osler, 2000). These two aspects are thought to be particularly significant since human rights are increasingly used in the mobilisation and facilitation of minority groups within contemporary multicultural societies. According to Parekh, (2000), “human rights principles provide a sound framework for handling differences” (Parekh cited in Olssen 2004:185).
The disparities between the above sentiments of the Crick Report and those contained within the multiculturalists ideal are made even more evident when the Crick Report is compared to the Parekh Report on multiethnic Britain. The Parekh Report is the product of the commission on the future of multiethnic Britain, which was set up by the Runnymede trust in 1998. The remit of this commission was to analyse the state of current multicultural Britain and to suggest ways in which disadvantage and racial discrimination could be counteracted to make Britain a more lively multicultural society (Olssen, 2004). The Parekh Report suggests that presently existing concepts of ‘Britishness’ do not accurately encompass or assist ethnic relations and that this had a definite impact on citizenship education (Olssen, 2004). The Parekh Report therefore advocated the use of ‘British’ in a way that reflected a greater awareness of multi-ethnicity and the array of groups that constitute British society (Olssen, 2004).

The Parekh Report is underpinned by several guiding principles. The first is that all people have equal worth and that all are entitled to have equal claims to the opportunities needed for their development and contribution to the collective well-being. The second principle emphasises the twofold nature of British society as a liberal community of citizens on the one hand and a multicultural community of communities on the other. The report also highlights Britain’s need to reconcile the sometimes conflicting requirements of these two sides. The third principle advocates that full recognition be given to the differences of citizens. The Report also goes on to state that negative effects are caused both when equality ignores diversity and when diversity ignores equality. In saying this however the fourth principle strongly emphasises the need for cohesion and additionally advocates the simultaneous nurturing of diversity and common sense of belonging and identity. The fifth principle affirms this principle of common cohesion advocating the importance of common values as well as procedural values. The last principle takes account of the nature of racism and of its deeply damaging effects to the “common sense of belonging lying at the basis of every stable civilisation” (The Runnymede trust cited in Olssen, 2004:185).

It was on the basis of these principles that the Parekh Report assessed that current state of multiethnic Britain (Olssen, 2004). Through this assessment the report sought to create a balance between difference and diversity and commonality universalism and consensus. The Parekh report seeks to purport a respect for difference whilst at the same time positioning it within the context of the democratic community. In this sense the report is based on the premise that difference and unity are interdependent entities (Olssen, 2004).

Because of its recognition of commonality, the Parekh Report is said to be superior to other multicultural models which emphasise difference whilst neglecting the need for common provisions. It is due to this unique nature of the Parekh Report that Olssen suggests that a richer text on citizenship education might be gained if it were joined together with the Crick Report (Olssen, 2004).
Olssen states:

“While it is true that the Crick Report tends to ignore racism, multiculturalism and any sophisticated understanding of how the politics of difference might inform citizenship education, I am arguing here that it need not do so, at least on the grounds of theoretical coherence, and that the Parekh report resolves the issues between difference and universality in a way that makes sense” (Olssen, 2004:188).

According to Olssen the conceptual adjoining of these two reports will create a citizenship education that emphasises the equal dignity of citizens, equal rights and entitlements, equality in inclusion and equal rights to participation and an overall principle of equal citizenship which is accepted by all (Olsen, 2004).

CHAPTER SUMMARY
From the evidence presented, within this section, it is clear that multiculturalism both as a social reality and a theoretical concept is highly complex, encompassing a number of perspectives. As shown throughout this section, these various approaches are also representative of possible teaching styles and contents within the educational context. The stance taken within this context is very much dependant on the educator and institutional ethos. Careful consideration of the nature and consequences of the various multicultural perspectives and approaches is particularly poignant within citizenship education in which issues of identity and belonging are central components.
CHAPTER 4
CITIZENSHIP IN EDUCATION

“Citizenship gives pupils the knowledge, skills and understanding to play an effective role in society at local, national and international levels. It helps them to become informed, thoughtful and responsible citizens who are aware of their duties and rights” (QCA, 1999:12)

“Citizenship is more than a statutory subject. If thought well and tailored to local needs, its skills and values will enhance democratic life for us all, both rights and responsibilities, beginning in school and radiating out” (Prof. Bernard Crick, cited in QCA, 1999:13)

The existence of citizenship within the curriculum spans over a number of decades and has adopted a number of forms such as: political studies, Civics, world studies and general studies (Inman and Buck, eds, 1995). During this time there have been various calls for some form of citizenship training (Lawton, Cairns and Gardener, eds, 2000), however citizenship education remained a somewhat subordinated area within the UK national curriculum (Bailey, 2000). The emergence of citizenship within the present school curriculum, came about as a result of the Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship, published in September 1998. It was due to this report and the ensuing consultation process, that the government in 2002, granted citizenship the prevalent position it now occupies within the school curriculum. This section will outline the concept of citizenship held within education through exploring the main tenets of citizenship education and how citizenship is currently taught. Particular focus will be placed on the secondary school context where the teaching of citizenship has now become a compulsory subject area.

The primary aim of citizenship education as outlined within the current national curriculum, is to equip pupils with knowledge, values and skills that will enable them to become informed and effective citizens within local, national and global society (www.dfes.gov.uk, date accessed:14/09/05). The particular nature of this aim is heavily related to the social climate in which citizenship education has emerged. Citizenship education has arisen against a social back drop of considerable social and political upheaval caused by the rise of nationalism and increased disregard for ‘civic virtues’. Within this climate global capitalism rivals national democratic institutions and the nation state can no longer be viewed as the given natural order (Bailey, 2000).

These societal characteristics were reflected in research carried out by Professor Crewe and others during the 1990s in which 80 per cent of British students stated that outside of school, they had very little participation in discussions of public issues. For many of these students religion and politics were considered to be prohibited areas of discussion. When questioned about their perceptions of good citizenship only 10 per cent of students mentioned voting or exercising of political rights (QCA, 1998). The British election study
also reported that 25 per cent of 18 to 24 year olds had planned not to vote in the 1992 elections, a figure which rose to 32 per cent in the 1997 general election (QCA, 1998). Such studies reflect the disengagement and apathy that is seen to be increasingly typical of young people living within contemporary society.

On a broader scale, the cause of citizenship education is further propelled by the “increasingly complex nature of our society, the greater cultural diversity and the apparent loss of value consensus, combined with the collapse of traditional support mechanisms such as extended families” (QCA, 1998:17). The combined effects of such characteristics threaten the stability of traditional citizenship and national identity (QCA, 1998).

Current citizenship education seeks to confront these societal trends by reasserting the traditional liberal democratic conception of citizenship (Bailey, 2000). It is hoped that this conception will enable the establishment of a common citizenship base in which the multiplicity of identities present in British society can find a place. The education system seeks to achieve this through the exploration of three key areas outlines by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES):

Social and moral responsibility – Pupils learning from the very beginning – self-confidence and socially and morally responsible behaviour both in and beyond the classroom.

Community involvement – Pupils learning about becoming helpfully involved in the life and concerns of their neighbourhood and communities, including learning through community involvement and service to the community.

Political literacy – Pupils learning about the institutions problems and practices of our democracy and how to make themselves effective in the life of the nation, locally, regionally and nationally through skills and values as well as knowledge - a concept wider than political knowledge alone.

(www.dfes.gov.uk/citizenship, date accessed: 14/09/05)

Metaphorically depicted as “three heads on one body” (QCA, 1998:13), these three areas whilst being independent, are interrelated segments with mutual dependence on each other (QCA, 1998).

These three key areas are reflected within the programmes of study which outline what pupils should be taught and set out the basis for the planning of schemes of work (QCA, 1999). Programmes of study are based on the work of the Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship, the sentiments of which are encapsulated in the Crick Report. These programmes were completed following a consultation on proposals put forward by the Secretary of State for the revised national curriculum. The programmes of study are complemented by the non-statutory guidelines for personal social and health education for Key stages 3 and 4 (QCA, 2000).
Also interwoven into the programmes of study for citizenship education are three key constituents which function alongside the three key areas of learning to form the complete citizenship learning experience at Key stages 3 and 4. These are divided into three interrelated parts:

- Knowledge and understanding about becoming an informed citizen – this involves: the teaching of legal and human rights and responsibilities; the diversity of identities in the UK; the legal system, the government and democracy; the role of the media; conflict resolution; and the challenges posed by global interdependence and responsibility.
- Developing skills of enquiry and communication – here pupils should be taught to consider issues, events and problems and to express and justify opinions and contribute to discussions and debates.
- Developing skills of participation and responsible action – pupils should learn how to take account of others experiences and to responsibly participate in activities and reflect on this participation.

(QCA, 2000:8-9).

Below is a slightly more elaborated outline of the Knowledge and skills taught at each key stage:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key stage</th>
<th>Knowledge, Skills and Understanding</th>
<th>Skills of Enquiry and Communication</th>
<th>Skills of Participation and Responsible Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Key stage 3** | Pupils should be taught about:  
- Legal human rights and responsibilities underpinning society  
- The diversity of religious and ethnic identities  
- Central and local government  
- Characteristics of parliamentary and other government form.  
- The electoral system  
- The work of voluntary groups.  
- Conflict resolution  
- The Media in society  
- The global community and the role of the EU, Commonwealth and United Nations. | Pupils should be taught to:  
- Consider topical, political, spiritual, social moral and cultural issues, problems and events by analysing information and its sources.  
- Justify a personal opinion about such issues problems or events  
- Contribute to group discussions and debates. | Pupils should be taught to:  
- Consider other peoples experiences and express and explain views that are not their own  
- Negotiate, take part and explain responsibly in school and community based activities  
- Reflect on the participation process. |

| Key stage 4 | - Legal and human rights and responsibilities underpinning society and their relation to citizens.  
- Origins and implications of diverse religious and ethnic identities in the UK.  
- The work of government, parliament and the courts in shaping Law.  
- Playing an active part in democratic processes.  
- The functioning of the economy  
- The opportunities for individuals and voluntary groups to bring about social change.  
- Free press and the role of the media.  
- Rights and responsibilities of consumers, employers and employees.  
- The United Kingdom’s Relations in Europe.  
- Wider issues and challenges of Global interdependence and responsibility. | Research a topical political, spiritual, moral, social, or cultural issue, problem or event by analysing information from different sources  
- Express justify and defend a personal opinion about such issues, problems or Events  
- Contribute to group discussions and formal debates. | - Consider other peoples experiences and express, explain and critically evaluate views that are not their own  
- Negotiate, decide and take part in school and community activities  
- Reflect on the participation process. |

(QCA, 1999)

There are three different ways in which the above citizenship education can be delivered:

- discrete citizenship provision with separate curriculum time  
- teaching citizenship within and through other subjects, curriculum areas and courses  
- citizenship events, activities and tutorial work  
(QCA, 2000:12).
Discrete citizenship provision, is when citizenship is thought within specified citizenship lessons, where citizenship is given separate timetables provision. This type of provision has the advantage of being easily identifiable and is also is easier to plan and monitor and assess. However if this is the only approach adopted by the school, citizenship may be seen to be separate from other curriculum areas, making it more difficult to integrate citizenship as part of the everyday functioning of the school (QCA, 2000).

The teaching of citizenship through other subject areas or courses has the advantage of involving a range of subject areas in the citizenship curriculum (QCA, 2000). It also spreads the responsibility for the teaching of citizenship across the school departments. Some examples of how citizenship can be thought through other subject areas are:

- the teaching of diversity of cultures in RE
- the teaching of environmental issues in science
- the teaching of sustainable development in geography

This approach however requires detailed planning and continuous monitoring to ensure consistency. Also in cases where pupils do not take the subjects where these opportunities for citizenship are provided, discrete provision is required (QCA, 2000).

Citizenship education provision through events, activities and tutorial work, provides pupils with the opportunity to implement and develop the skills and principles of citizenship in a practical way and to reflect on and share their experiences under the guidance of tutors and other appointed adults. This approach may involve:

- special activity days or weeks in school
- volunteering in the local community
- participation in local community initiatives

The QCA initial guidance for schools recommends that schools create links with other organisations within its community such as other educational institutions or voluntary groups so that pupils can learn and develop citizenship skills outside of the school. This document also encourages the use of specialist visitors who can provide current knowledge on certain aspects of the citizenship programme of study such as the criminal justice system (QCA, 2000).

The citizenship education programmes of study are constructed in such a way that schools have flexibility in the way they plan, approach and provide citizenship education. This allows schools to: build on what they may be doing already, vary the coverage of aspects of understanding and be innovative and develop their own approaches to citizenship (QCA, 2000).

Here, it is clear that citizenship learning takes place within three distinct contexts. Firstly, learning takes place in the context of the school curriculum,
which includes elements of citizenship education that are delivered through other subject areas. The cultural context of the school is also integral to citizenship education. That is the ethos and value system, which underpin everyday operations. Thirdly, learning takes place within the wider community, through the involvement of students in community programmes and events (Huddleston and Kerr eds, 2006). Both the elements and contexts of learning serve in reflecting and effectively substantiating the three core areas of learning within citizenship.

In particular, the cultural context of the school is often pinpointed as a highly influential aspect of citizenship education (Arthur, Davison and Stow, 2000). The DfES advises that ‘the ethos, organisation, structures and daily practices of the school have a considerable impact on the effectiveness of citizenship education’ (www.dfes.gov.uk, 26/09/05). This point is further reinforced by a number of perspectives which call for a broader conception of citizenship that involves not only the teaching of the subject, but the practical experiencing of it (Inman and Buck, 1995; Lawton, Cairns and Gardner, 2000; Arthur, Davison and Stow, 2000). This conception of citizenship education corresponds with the maximalist model as described by Mcloughlin (1992), where citizenship education penetrates all areas of school life (Inman and Buck, 1995).

This practical experiencing of citizenship education in action involves a number of key institutional factors such as the interrelations between students and between students and teachers, the nature of democracy within the school and the schools discipline structure (Arthur, Davison and Stow, 2000). In order for citizenship education to be effective it is argued that such aspects of the school culture must be reflective of the values and aims set out within the citizenship agenda. According to Arthur Davidson and Stow (2000), this is necessary because the school is an individual’s first experience of an organised community setting and effectively constitutes a microcosm of the wider society (Arthur, Davidson and Stow, 2000).

It has been suggested that the implementation of such a model involves treating young people with respect and allowing them an appropriate forum in which their views can be heard and considered (Kerr, 2003). This will then give them first hand experience of the procedures and duties involved in a democratic process similar to that which governs the wider society. This advocacy for student involvement corresponds with the sentiments of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), undertaken by the British government in 1991. Within this document, mutual respect for each persons’ equal claim, dignity and worth is endorsed (Lawton, Cairns and Gardner, 2000), Article 12 in particular also emphasises the child’s right to freely express their views concerning matters that affect them.

This view is further supported by Alderson (2000), who looks at the implementation of citizenship values in the context of student rights. According to Alderson, the rights of children or students are often overlooked by professionals and policy makers and while many claim that their school teaches
citizenship, few actually take rights and mutual respect seriously. This is mainly due to current education policies that conceptualise children as future as opposed to present citizens (Lawton, Cairns and Gardner, 2000).

The danger is that if discrepancies between the teaching and practice of citizenship education persist within the school organisation, some pupils are likely to become alienated and disengaged with the whole citizenship agenda. This would ironically result in counteracting the Governments central aim of citizenship education, which is to address increasing political apathy by empowering children and young people with the knowledge and tools to actively engage in democratic society (Lawton, Cairns and Gardener, 2000). In order to avoid this, Alderson suggests that changes be made in the routine and relationship structures within the school and that significant changes also be made to popular perspectives concerning the nature of rights and of childhood (Lawton, Cairns and Gardener, 2000).

There are various learning approaches that can be used in the teaching of citizenship. These include: research, group work and discussion, simulation activities, and action activities, which are pupil responses to issues they have learnt about (QCA, 2000). Three key approaches that are strongly connected to the three strands of the citizenship programme of study are:

- A concepts approach
- A skills approach
- An enquiry approach

The concepts approach uses the key concepts as specified by the Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship, to provide a clear framework for citizenship. These key concepts are:

- democracy and autocracy
- co-operation and conflict
- equality and diversity
- fairness, justice, the rule of law
- rules, the law and human rights
- freedom and order
- individual and community
- power and authority
- rights and responsibilities

The above concepts can be used to organise aspects of knowledge and understanding within the citizenship programme of study. They also constitute the basis for required skills development. These concepts also help to identify both context and content for the issues, problems and events incorporated within citizenship education. In doing so, they help to identify specific headings that connect aspects of knowledge and understanding, the discussion of current issues and participation skills and the required actions in relation to the programme of study (QCA, 2000). The use of this approach can ensure that
the programme of study is manageable for educators and coherent and relevant for pupils across key stages. This approach does however require careful planning to ensure that meaningful links are established between, concepts, aspects of knowledge and skills (QCA, 2000).

The skills approach utilises the development of required skills as a means of promoting knowledge and understanding. These skills include; skills of enquiry and communication which encompasses the exploration of contemporary issues, problems or events on a local, national or international scale. Pupils also learn skills of participation and responsible action. Pupils develop such skills through active involvement in local, national or international activities. The main difficulty with this approach is that the emergence of local, national and international issues and events is unpredictable; making detailed planning complicated (QCA, 2000).

An enquiry approach accesses the interests and curiosity of pupils to investigate elements of the programme of study. Here, the central concepts, knowledge, skills and understanding contained within the foundation of the programme of study are promoted through certain lines of enquiry. This approach provides structured opportunities for active exploration of key problems issues and events through discussion and debate. It also highlights connections between local and global activities (QCA, 2000).

Although individually distinct, the above approaches can be used in combination, over the course of the academic year. Citizenship educators may preference one approach over another, depending on the topic of study and the issues involved. Choice of delivery may also be influenced by the characteristics of pupils being taught.

**Assessment**

From August 2003, teachers are required to assess pupils attainment in citizenship at the end of key stage 3. However, there is no statutory assessment requirement for the end of key stage 4. Instead, schools are advised to decide on the most appropriate methods for monitoring progress and recognising achievement. The QCA Initial Guidance for Citizenship at Key Stage 3 and 4 (2000), advises that assessment in citizenship should be based on the attainment target for citizenship at the end key stage descriptions. These include:

- Pupils’ knowledge and understanding of elements of the programme of study
- Pupils’ skills development, enquiry, communication, development and action.

According to the end of key stage description, at the end of key stage 3 pupils should be judged on:
• Their ability to demonstrate a broad knowledge and understanding of the
topical events they study
• Their understanding of how the public gets information
• Their ability to participate in school and community activities.
(QCA, 2002).

Although there is no statutory requirement for assessment at key stage 4,
schools are advised that teachers and pupils should collaborate to identify
pupils’ strengths and development needs in line with the end of key stage
description in which it is stated that pupils should be able to:

• Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the events studied; the
rights, responsibilities and duties of citizens. The role of the voluntary
sector; forms of government and the criminal justice, legal and economic
systems.
• Access and utilise different kinds of information to form and express an
opinion; evaluate the effectiveness of different ways of bringing about
change in society.
(QCA, 2002)

It is advised by the QCA that pupils’ progress is recorded in pupil profiles,
record sheets or portfolios and that pupils review and record their own
progress. Annual reports on citizenship are also required from August 2002
(QCA, 2000).

Inclusion
“The teaching of citizenship should be relevant to the individual needs
and concerns of pupils, connect with their interests and experiences and
relate to their abilities and backgrounds” (QCA, 2000:5)

“Pupils need to be provided with structured opportunities to explore
issues actively, problems and events through school and community
involvement, and to take part in critical discussions that are challenging
and relevant to their lives” (QCA, 2000:19).

In the teaching of citizenship, teachers are required to adequately consider the
following three principles for inclusion.

• Setting suitable learning challenges - Every pupil should have the
opportunity to experience success and achieve as highly as possible.
This requires teachers to teach the knowledge, skills and understanding
to pupils in a way that corresponds with their individual abilities.

• Responding to pupils diverse learning needs - this requires teachers to
set high expectations and provide adequate opportunities for all students
to achieve including pupils with special educational needs, pupils with
disabilities and pupils from a range of diverse cultural and linguistic
backgrounds. All students should be able to fully participate. In order
for this to be achieved teachers are required to fully implement the requirements laid out in equal opportunities legislation relating to schools.

- Overcoming potential barriers to learning and assessment for individuals and groups of pupils - this requires teachers to adequately consider the particular learning and assessment needs of pupils in order to enable all pupils to participate effectively. This includes taking account of the type and extent of any difficulty experienced by the pupil.

It is intended that through adherence to these guiding principles, the specific needs of individual and groups of pupils will be met (QCA, 1999).

**Post-16 Citizenship Education**

In addition to its implementation in schools, citizenship education is also being developed in some 6th forms, colleges and in other informal settings. This citizenship education is being delivered through a Post-16 Citizenship Development Programme which began in September 2001 and is managed by the Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA) (DFES, 2004). The programme was originally set up as a pilot initiative to explore different ways of offering citizenship to young people aged 16 and above. During the pilot phase 79 citizenship projects were being run. In September 2004 however, the programme was expanded to include 120 organisations from all over England (http://www.lsneduction.org.uk, 2004).

Post-16 citizenship was established in response to recommendations from the Citizenship Advisory Group, who advised that:

- The entitlement to the development of citizenship should be established which applied to all students in the first phase of post-16 compulsory education and training.

- All such young adults should be granted the opportunity to participate in activities that correspond with the development of their citizenship skills and receive recognition for their achievements. (QCA, 2004).

Post-16 citizenship education aims to substantiate and reinforce the citizenship skills developed throughout secondary education. The emphasis at this level is placed on exploring new areas of citizenship and providing opportunities for young people to lead out in activities (www.citizenshippost-16.lsda.org.uk, date accessed: 03/04/2006).

The key concepts of post-16 citizenship education include:

- Rights and responsibilities
- Governments and democracies
- Identities and communities
The guidance issued by the QCA on post-16 citizenship education recommends that learners should have the opportunity to:

- Identify, investigate and think critically about citizenship issues problems or events
- Decide on and participate in follow-up action
- Reflect on recognise and review their citizenship learning


It is intended that through these opportunities, young people will work towards broad learning objectives. Students can then proceed to develop and practice acquired skills through a range of actions and activities (QCA, 2004).

**CHAPTER SUMMARY**

This chapter has documented some of the key challenges with which the health and stability of British democracy is currently faced. Citizenship education has been accorded with the rather ambitious task of addressing these challenges through the promotion of a particular conception of citizenship which underpins and directs its processes and content. This conception is one of the ‘active citizen’ in which an individual is required not only to merely function within a society but to play an active role within it - to possess adequate knowledge and act upon it. Active citizens are empowered citizens who are able to “question, critique and debate the workings and processes of society” (Arthur, Davison and Stow, 2000:27) and in doing so, contribute to the communitarian ethos that underpins the democratic society (Arthur, Davison and Stow, 2000).
Within the post-industrial societies of the 20th Century, the national education systems are looked upon as avenues for the economic and civil incorporation of ethnic minority groups into the host societies. As a result, they are also areas of continued tension. Tensions here are mostly centred around the question of the type and level of education needed for minority groups to function effectively in society, whilst still retaining an appropriate level of cultural autonomy (Tomlinson, 1998). In the 1985 Swann Report in Britain, the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Children of Ethnic Minority Groups, recommended that British education should enable all children to understand the multicultural nature of British society with schools taking a direct approach to tackling racism and stereotyping. The report encouraged Local Education Authorities (LEAs), to commit to the ethos of ‘education for all’ and to adopt a pluralist curriculum (Blair, 2001). Since this time there has been extensive interest in the educational achievements of ethnic minorities and various theoretical and empirical explanations have been forwarded concerning the diverse educational experiences of ethnic minority pupils (Abbas, 2002).

One of the key pieces of legislation, affecting the education of black and minority ethnic children is the Race Relations Act (1976) as amended by the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000). This Act gives public authorities a statutory general duty to promote racial equality (Commission for Racial Equality, 2002). The aim of this act is to centralise racial equality in the everyday functioning’s of public authorities including schools (www.standards.dfes.gov.uk, date accessed: 12/05/06). According to the general duty, schools must give adequate attention to: the eradication of unlawful racial discrimination and; the promotion of equal opportunities; and effective relations between individuals of different ethnic groups. Under the Act, schools have been given specific duties, which includes: the preparation of a written statement of the schools policy for promoting race equality; and the practical implementation of this policy (www.standards.dfes.gov.uk, date accessed: 12/05/06). According to Commission for Racial Equality guidelines, this race equality policy should deal with areas such as: the attainment and progress of pupils, the involvement of parents and community in the school and curriculum teaching and learning including language and cultural needs (http://www.cre.gov.uk, date accessed: 12/05/06).

Following their election to office in 1997 New Labour were eager to demonstrate their valuing of cultural diversity and their appreciation of the inequalities faced by ethnic minority communities. Consequently, within a year the government addressed a number of long running grievances, which resulted in the establishment of the Social Exclusion Unit, with the remit of enquiring into exclusion and truancy in schools, particularly in relation to black pupils. The government also replaced the section 11 grant with the Ethnic Minorities Achievement Grant (EMAG), and made the decision to offer Muslim schools state funding as with schools of other denominations (Tomlinson, 2005). In
1993, the government also announced the commencement of an extensive enquiry into the murder of Stephen Lawrence, this resulted in the Macpherson Report (1999), which led to the strengthening of race relations legislation (Tomlinson, 2005).

Despite these positive efforts of the government, it soon became apparent that implemented measures were limited and were unable to sufficiently alleviate inequalities in education. As schools have increasingly exercised segregation of groups the gap between policy and practice has become more apparent (Tomlinson, 2005). The limited success of these efforts is largely due to the creation of the education market, which has further conflated problems of inequality in education. The choice policies of education for instance have continued to intensify the hierarchy of schools, ranging from least to most desirable, with the most desirable schools containing the lowest numbers of ethnic minority pupils (Tomlinson, 2005). This is largely because the more privileged social groups who are essentially white middle class parents, have easier access to the desired schools that are often situated in prestigious areas where residents can obtain privileged access. It is also the case that due to social class differences, privileged choosers are able to discriminate between schools and evaluate teachers. The less privileged on the other hand, often lack the skills and knowledge needed to effectively engage with the market system and maximise their children’s advantages (Tomlinson, 1998). In turn, schools have also become more selective of ‘desirable customers’ with some students being valued above others.

Schools can select overtly through ability testing or religious criteria. They can also select covertly through parent interviews and by discouraging parents and students or excluding students on the basis of perceived special educational needs (SEN) or behavioural problems of the student (Tomlinson, 1998). This has led to the development of racially segregated schools (Tomlinson, 2005). Under market conditions selection of pupils has continued to increase despite Labour government promises in 1996, that it would be abolished (Tomlinson, 2005). Within the ‘choice’ system, it is usually the ethnic minority groups who predominantly occupy the lower socio-economic classifications that are seriously disadvantaged, despite the high aspirations of parents for their children (Tomlinson, 1998). Tomlinson states that despite the strong rhetoric of partnership purported by the labour government, there seems to have been a general delay in the transferral of good practice between local education authorities concerning the issues of race and ethnicity (Tomlinson, 2005).

Overall, few studies have examined the schooling experiences of ethnic minorities in Britain. However, those that have, have generally reported that whilst considered valuable, these experiences have been tainted in some way by discrimination, stereotyping or racism. Smith (2004), reports that even when minority students attend schools within predominantly white suburban areas, and attain highly, their school experience is still very often plagued by low teacher expectations and negative stereotyping (Tomlinson, 2005). Blair (2001), additionally found that many of the young people she spoke to were
angry about the negative racial stereotypes that they felt had been attached to them by school teachers (Tomlinson, 2005). Tomlinson also reports that studies of refugee children indicate that the majority suffer racial harassment in school and in the community (Tomlinson, 2005).

The vast majority of literature within the area of Black and minority ethnic communities and schooling, is focused on the achievement levels. The relatively low achievement levels of ethnic minorities has been a major concern from the 1960s onwards. A large amount of the corresponding literature focuses on the lower attainments of Afro-Caribbean, Pakistani and Bangladeshi pupils in particular (Tomlinson, 2005). Academic achievements of gypsy traveller pupils are also of considerable concern, such pupils are reported to be most at risk of educational failure (www.cre.gov.uk, date accessed: 09/10/06). Later research carried out on these groups in the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s, has found that these pupils are still making less progress than their peers (Tomlinson, 2005). In the 1999 Ofsted report Raising the Attainment of Minority Ethnic Pupils, it was found that although Bangladeshi pupils made steady progress from key stage 1, their overall performance remained below national averages particularly in relation to the higher grades at GCSE level. Black Caribbean pupils were found to start well in primary school yet underachieve at secondary school level and in some cases they were found to be the lowest performing group at GCSE level. Pakistani pupils were found to achieve well below national average levels at primary school but tended to catch up in secondary school. The attainment of higher grades at GCSE level however, was still a cause of concern with this group. In addition, the attainment levels of gypsy traveller pupils was found to be well below average, with most being placed on the SEN register and few achieving GCSEs (Ofsted, 1999).

Since 1997, various policies and initiatives have been implemented which are specifically geared towards the raising of minority achievement. In 1997 the government established what is now known as the Ethnic Minorities Achievement Division. The Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG), which cost £155 million annually, was also provided for local education authorities with considerable numbers of minority pupils. In addition, every white paper and legislative document that has been produced since 1997 has included a section on raising the achievements of minority pupils. Policies implemented in 2001 included strategies to improve learning, the reinstating Excellence in Cities (EiC) strategies with the addition of the Excellence Challenge Programme, closer collaborations with the inspectorate and teacher training agencies, supporting teachers in the teaching of students who speak English as an additional language and the increased recruitment of teachers from ethnic minority backgrounds (Tomlinson, 2005).

Despite encouraging reports of marked improvements in the achievement levels of some ethnic minority groups, it is still the case that many ethnic minority pupils are not achieving as well as they could. Furthermore, the fact that children from Caribbean, Pakistani or Bangladeshi backgrounds have been half
as likely to attain five good grades at GCSE level when compared to their peers from other ethnic groups is according to the DfES 2001 report, unacceptable (Tomlinson, 2005).

The notion of underachievement was brought to the fore in Britain due to the investigations of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups - chaired by Lord Swann. This committee was constructed in (1979) in response to widespread concerns about the academic performance of West Indian pupils. The committee concluded that West Indian children were under-achieving within the British education system (Gillborn and Gipps, 1996). This issue of ‘under-achievement’ dominated debates surrounding the education of ethnic minority pupils up until the early 1990s, however the concept is still widely misunderstood and highly problematic (Amin et al, 1997). Underachievement fundamentally implies that there exists a standard level of acceptable achievement which has not been reached, a notion that is highly contestable. The term underachievement has also been known to encourage detrimental generalisations about entire ethnic groups (Haque, 2000). If the teacher projects these generalisations, this can also lead to ‘self-fulfilling prophesies of failure’ (Amin et al, 1997:33) among certain groups (Amin et al, 1997). It is for these reasons that writers such as Haque (2000) prefer to utilise the notions of average or relative low attainment or performance which indicates that it may be particular pupils within the group that account for the average low attainment detected in the statistics (Haque, 2000).

Pinpointing the causes of poor educational attainment in relation to particular groups is a challenging and intricate task, because the reasons behind it are very often complex and interlinked (Haque, 2000). Over the years however, a number of different explanations have been formulated, pertaining to the below average achievement levels of black and ethnic minority pupils. Some of the most common of these relate to the socio-economic status of ethnic minority groups. Traditionally, the social class factor has proved to be very powerful in explaining the differences in educational attainments of groups with manual and non-manual backgrounds. It is perhaps not surprising then, that many now propose that educational differences may have more to do with social class groupings than differences in ethnic origin (Hague, 2000).

Within the Swann Report (1985) it was argued that the relationship between poverty and poor educational performance that was seen to be the case for white children could also be applied to children from ethnic minority backgrounds (Haque, 2000). In 1997, Amin et al commented that social background is a key influencer of academic achievement and that “ethnic minorities are more likely to belong to socio-economic groups which will increase their academic disadvantage” (Amin et al, 1997:33). Tomlinson (1998) also reports that whilst there is evidence of a small emerging middle class among ethnic minority groups, ethnic minorities are still most predominant within the lower socio-economic groups (Tomlinson, 1998).
Although a seemingly straightforward concept however, there is a need to be cautious of how social class is operationalised when applied to ethnic minority communities. Whilst the income of certain ethnic minority groups may be reflective of a particular social class status the historically and culturally informed values, interests, aspirations and identity traits of that group may mean that traditional social class categories can not be applied in the same ways as they are for white groups (Haque, 2000). The very term ‘social class’ is in itself increasingly complex (Haque, 2000) and its categories contestable. But when related to ethnic minority groups, it becomes even more so, because advantages and disadvantages are unevenly dispersed across all the variables. An example of this complexity can be seen in the Pakistani community in Britain. Despite being one of the most economically disadvantaged groups, with high unemployment rates, Pakistanis have high rates of self-employment and have high representation as owner-occupiers of homes. Other ethnic minority groups have shown more sustained patterns of advantage or disadvantage. It is for these reasons, that Haque (2000), advocates the careful consideration of the social class composition of each ethnic minority group before comparisons are made between groups (Haque, 2000).

Other influencing factors related to the background and home life of the pupil are thought to be their fluency in English and the length of time they have spent in the British education system. Such factors are seen by multicultural educationalists to be key determinants of educational achievement (Abbas, 2002). In the case of fluency in English, it has been found that this factor disproportionately effects certain ethnic minority groups compared to others. It was found in 1995 for instance, that in both London boroughs of Camden and Newham, a greater number of students who spoke Bengali were at the initial stages of English language learning, had fewer years in education and had been entered for fewer exams than other students who spoke Gujerati, Punjabi or Urdu. It was also found however that these differences became less marked at the later stages of education (Haque, 2000).

It has long been claimed that length of schooling in Britain is a strong determinant of educational achievement. Within a study carried out by the Department of Education and Science between 1966 and 1973, it was found that although pupils of Asian origin generally performed less well than their white peers in the first instance, performance of the Asian pupils improved as did their length of stay in the United Kingdom. More recent studies carried out by Millios (1995) and Sammons (1995), within inner London areas, have also endorsed these findings (Haque, 2000). Despite these claims however it appears that this issue is more complex than the vast majority of literature may suggest. It has been found that African-Asian and Chinese groups, despite arriving post 1970, have been found to perform significantly better than earlier arrivals (Haque, 2000). This inconsistency in findings suggests the need for further research in this area into the more intricate complexities of the relationship between the length of settlement and schooling in Britain and academic achievement levels.
It is widely suggested that disparities in educational achievement and experiences can also be caused by educational structural factors. The curriculum, for instance, is identified as a factor that can possibly hinder educational equality. The curriculum along with the organisation of teaching and learning transmits powerful messages to students, concerning what is valued and what isn’t (Gardner, 2002). Within the curriculum, what is taught often contrasts with the actual learning needs of the students and the reality of student’s everyday lives. At worst, the curriculum may also reinforce limited perspectives, discriminatory practices and stereotyping through: textbooks, the organisation of the school year and schedule, curriculum policies and practices and the artificial division of the curriculum into subject areas. This refers to the division of knowledge into discrete areas and the designated order in which knowledge is delivered (Cordeiro et al, 1994:48).

Academic grouping practices are also pinpointed as being in direct conflict with the inclusive ethos. Besides homogenous class grouping, ability grouping can also take the form of: Special education classes, gifted and talented programmes and Bilingual programmes. Although this practice has become widely prevalent, schools have recently began to reassess grouping practices in light of extensive evidence that suggests that these practices can have long-term, negative effects on children. It is also said by Ireson and Hallam (1999), for instance, that the practice of academic grouping can lead to the development of anti-academic attitudes and feelings of alienation from school (Ireson and Hallam, 1999).

Under the structuralist perspective, the practice of setting by ability is put forward as one of the causes of disparities in the academic attainment of different ethnic groups (Runnymede Trust, no date). In investigations carried out by Wright (1992), it was found that teachers’ perceptions of pupil behaviour were more influential than actual academic ability. As a result, African-Caribbean pupils were more likely to be placed in ability bands that were lower than their academic ability (Dwivedi, 2002). In their study of classrooms in America, Meier and Stewart (1991) discovered that Hispanics and African-American students were less able to access gifted classes and that ethnic inequalities in gifted classes were growing (Cordeiro et al, 1994).

The very measures used to identify and label levels of academic achievement are said to disadvantage ethnic minority pupils. According to Amin et al (1997), these measures can in fact influence achievement levels and can often engender significant achievement differences within student groups (Amin et al, 1997). One of the main problems identified within this area is the over reliance on examination results as an indicator of achievement levels. The problem with this method is that entrance for exams can be heavily influenced by the schools perception of certain pupils as opposed to a genuine measurement of achievement. Researchers such as Wright (1992) and Troyna and Siraj-Blatchford (1993), discovered that certain school processes led to the allocation of students to examinations and courses that were clearly below their academic abilities, an issue which some teachers were unwilling to address (Haque,
Therefore it may be that examination results are not necessarily the most effective performance indicators. It has also been suggested that the use of initial/entry attainment levels in progress measurement/tracking, can lead to misleading portrayals. This is because ethnic minority students are at times, wrongly allocated to lower bands at the end of primary school or at the start of secondary school (Haque, 2000).

It is also argued that the form and content of assessment instruments can often be strongly influenced by a particular worldview held amongst white people. This was found to be the case by Dreyton (1989). The danger here is that the abilities of individuals who are unable to influence this particular worldview may be under-measured in such means of assessment. Dreyton suggests that this problem can be counteracted by the combining of the curriculum content, with the “histories and cultures of under-represented groups” (Dreyton cited in Dwivedi, ed, 2002:212). Dreyton also advises that assessment results be looked upon with some scepticism and with the realisation that they have only limited ability to present ‘real world success’ (Dwivedi, ed, 2002).

In addition, the learning style embedded in the teaching practices of the school can also engender educational inequalities. Learning styles refer to different ways of selecting and classifying information. It is believed that when the learning styles of students are acknowledged and incorporated into learning processes, this gives them more opportunity to become involved in their learning, increasing chances of academic success and enhancing productivity and confidence (Esquivel and Houtz, eds, 2000). Many scholars including Hale-Benson (1986) and Barrera, (1993), have concluded that these learning styles of pupils are culturally and historically based (Esquivel and Houtz, eds, 2000). Cohen (1969), identifies two different learning styles: these are the analytical style and the relational style. Cohen believes that it is the analytical style of learning that is most predominant in schools and that is rewarded and encouraged. However, Cohen also believes that it is the relational style of learning that is most dominant within the black community (Esquivel and Houtz, eds, 2000) The suggestion here is that some students will be disadvantaged because their style of learning does not correspond with the style that is reflected within mainstream education.

Despite the seeming logic of such theories, other writers warn that learning style theory can be precarious territory (Hall, 2004). Many authors claim that the field of learning styles in itself is a considerably unstable one which is underpinned by a series of conflicting terms, concepts and assumptions (Coffield et al, 2004). For example, research into learning styles has been described as largely ‘small scale, non-cumulative, uncritical and inward-looking’ consequently this research seems not to have benefited much from interdisciplinary collaborations. The result is that although there are occasional overlaps in the concepts of different approaches each one has its own separate core characteristics. This causes difficulties for practitioners and academics wanting to engage with this field (Coffield et al, 2004).
According to Hall (2004), the division of pupils into categories and groups according to learning style, can lead to ‘dangerous simplifications in practice’ (Hall, 2004). This misuse of learning styles theory can result in an overemphasis on learner characteristics instead of learning itself. According to Coffield et al (2004), many practitioners implement learning styles instruments in such a way that leads to stereotypical generalisations of student groups. For instance, vocational students may be viewed as non-reflective activists (Coffield et al, 2004). Students may also be stereotyped on the basis of their ethnic or cultural background. This simplistic implementation of learning styles instruments can also undermine the importance of gathering subject specific knowledge and skills and could obscure differences between the learning cultures inherent within different academic subjects. There is also the additional danger that labels will be adopted by learners who will begin to see themselves as being limited within certain boundaries because of their particular learning style (Hall, 2004).

There is a growing body of research that suggests that the teacher-pupil relationship can also affect pupil achievement levels and overall academic success (Sanders ed, 2000). This is thought to be especially true in cases where the pupil has had a history of negative schooling experiences or if the pupil comes from a family whose background characteristics place them at risk of academic failure (Sanders ed, 2000). Research within this area has pinpointed certain hidden processes that serve in denying students the equal opportunities to which they are entitled (Amin, 1997). It was found for instance that relationships held between African Caribbean pupils and white teachers are often characterised by high levels of criticism and control (Amin et al, 1997). Several writers have also implied that black students in both primary and secondary schools criticised and apprehended by teachers to a disproportionate degree (Blair, 2001).

The debate concerning teacher racism or discrimination is a long-running, sensitive and multifaceted. The low expectations that teachers have of black and ethnic minority pupils has been found to be highly problematic, having the effect of de-motivating students. Anti-racist educationalists claim that the negative and discriminatory perceptions of white teachers towards ethnic minority pupils and towards African Caribbean pupils in particular, is the central cause of underachievement within these groups (Abbas, 2002). The persistence of this problem was reflected in the report by the London Development Agency’s Education Commission (2004), which again pinpointed lower teacher expectations as a hindrance to black and ethnic minority pupils (Tomlinson, 2005). In particular it has been shown that some teachers associate academic problems to the home or to the student's innate attributes. A number of studies have reported teachers’ complaints concerning the unrealistic expectations that Asian parents have of their children (Kallie 1986, Mirza 1992, Shaw 1992), complaints that have proved to be unfounded. It was additionally reported that teachers’ perceptions of South Asian pupils are often shaped by negative stereotypes particularly with regards to their home, communities and linguistic abilities (Amin et al, 1997).
The issue of racism or discrimination is also seen to bear strong links with the disproportionate representation of African Caribbean pupils in exclusion statistics. Far from being a recent phenomenon, this overrepresentation is a social reality that can be traced back to the depths of British education history, even before the 1988 education reform Act (Blair, 2001). The DFEE 1998/99 statistics showed that the exclusion rates for black Caribbean, Black African and Black other students were 0.59%, 20% and 49% respectively. Although these rates show an improvement from previous years, they are still significantly higher than those of other groups (Rhamie and Hallam, 2002). While exclusions usually result from violence, threatening behaviour or other such serious offences, additional evidence suggests that the disproportionate exclusion rates of Black pupils may be due to less obvious conflict with teachers (Amin et al, 1997). According to Gillborn (1995), school exclusions operate in a racist manner, denying black students access to mainstream education. Gillborne also comments that the marketisation of education has further conflated this problem (Tomlinson, 1998).

From a somewhat wider perspective, it has been said that pupil-teacher interactions have also been negatively influenced by the establishment of the education market. It is thought that the increased pressure placed on teachers by the teacher appraisal system and the increased workload of teachers has placed them in “a contradictory relationship to their responsibilities to students” (Blair, 2001:23). Hargreaves (1994) further argues that teachers’ preoccupation with administration and assessment tasks means that they have very limited time and opportunity to display care and connectedness towards their students. Aspects, which Wexler (1992) argues, are central to the effective working of the teacher-student relationship. According to Blair, the rationalisation of the curriculum in Britain through the introduction of school league tables, prevents a holistic approach to the lives of students, an aspect which has in times past, been central to schooling in Britain (Blair, 2001).

 Teachers are also thought to be generally disadvantaged by the lack of training they receive to teach within Britain’s multiethnic society. Despite ongoing calls for training in multiethnic teaching, many of the university and local authority courses within this field have now been abandoned, leaving a knowledge deficit amongst teachers (Tomlinson, 2005). Although the teacher training agency did in 2000 produce guidelines which advocated that trainee teachers should understand how to prepare pupils for their role in the culturally diverse democratic society, there is little advice on the practical implementation of this ideal (Tomlinson, 2005).

Black and minority ethnic pupils are also disadvantaged by the racist or discriminatory attitudes of other pupils. Some studies have identified racism to be one of the key factors affecting the achievement levels of ethnic minority groups (Haque, 2000). Despite the multicultural agenda adopted by the British education system in the late 1960s, its achievements within this area have been somewhat limited. Despite a pupil’s level of motivation, racism is often able to
deny them the right to an adequate education (Rhamie and Hallam, 2002). Racial harassment has a significant negative impact on students' performance and confidence. Asian students in particular tend to suffer a high level of racial harassment in schools, the extent of which teachers are often unaware (Amin et al, 1997).

Although racism is largely colour based, it is important that both researchers and practitioners avoid the oversimplification of racism. Notions of racism or discrimination based on colour, tend to disregard differences in religion, culture and language, viewing all ethnic minority groups as one homogeneous group. There is now evidence to suggest that not all ethnic groups are discriminated against by white groups in the same way (Haque, 2000). It has been suggested for instance that the distinctive Muslim identity can increase disadvantage, particularly in schools where pupils are discriminated on religious or cultural grounds (Haque, 2000).

An additional aspect thought to impact upon the achievement levels of black and minority ethnic pupils is the distinct lack of role models. According to Rassool (1999) it is important that ethnic minority pupils are able to see and identify with positive role models in public life so that they can realise what can be achieved and what is within their reach (Rassool, 1999). It is said that such positively impacting figures are not readily available within the immediate educational environment and that this is likely to have a major impact on the educational achievements of African Caribbean pupils (Rhamie and Hallam, 2002).

These shortcomings in the education system have caused widespread dissatisfaction amongst parents, which has instigated a distinct rise in supplementary schooling, particularly within the black immigrant community (Rassool, 1999). These are places where blackness is the norm and African Caribbean pupils can develop a sense of self-confidence and belonging. Such supplementary provision has proved to be a key factor in educational success (Rhamie and Hallam, 2002).

From this review of issues surrounding the education of BME groups it is clear that the process that determines educational achievements is made up of a complex and multilayered set of factors (Abbas, 2002). It is argued that the “the actions of teachers and the policies of schools impact on the performance of pupils on one level; at another it is the adverse cultural practices within the home coupled with disengagement with the school that lead to educational underachievement” (Abbas, 2002, :310). According to Vincent (1995), in order to raise the achievement levels of ethnic minorities a combined effort needs to be instituted that engages both teachers and parents/carers in home - school partnerships (Abbas, 2002).

**Implementing Inclusive Practice**
From a theoretical viewpoint, the constructivist approach to learning is thought to effectively facilitate inclusive teaching practice because of its emphasis on
students playing an active role in the construction and development of their own learning. This perspective stands in stark contrast to traditionalist views of students as passive empty vessels in need of the infilling of knowledge by teachers. In the constructivist viewpoint, the student endeavours to make sense of the curriculum presented whilst the teacher facilitates this sense making process. Constructivists also believe that the curriculum is socially negotiated. This suggests that knowledge is both subjective and evolving as opposed to being fixed (Cordeiro et al, 1994). Within constructivism, teachers are required to assist students in the critical analysis of the views contained with textbooks instead of presenting them as absolute truth. This perspective allows for the integration of student experiences from beyond the confines of the school (Cordeiro et al, 1994).

During research on learning experiences within the multicultural setting, Moll (1988) discovered that the most effective classes for Latino students were those in which they were encouraged to use their personal experience to make sense of school experiences. Moll's research highlighted the fact that in most classrooms, home and community experiences are avoided. However when this area of knowledge is valued, positive effects often result. The integration of personal and cultural knowledge within the classroom can increase the cultural relevance of learning (Cordeiro et al, 1994), thus engaging Black and minority ethnic students more effectively. These suggestions are further substantiated by Gay (2004) who stresses the importance of intercultural, multicultural education, which encompasses the exploration of information concerning a range of diverse ethnic groups (Codjoe, 2006). According to Codjoe, this will allow schools to become more effective and relevant learning environments for minority students (Codjoe, 2006).

The constructivist approach to learning is particularly relevant within inclusive education because it allows the effects of diversity on learning to feature predominantly in dialogues concerning professional development and teacher training. It also requires schools to focus on the improvement of the sensitivity to, and recognition of, diversity within the school organisation (Cordeiro et al, 1994).

One of the keys of effective inclusive education, Identified by Gardner (2002), is collaborative learning. An important aspect of collaborative learning is group work. Whilst some educationalists argue that group work results in low-level thinking, a growing number of teachers appreciate the value of group work as an effective teaching and learning method. This is particularly the case among teachers funded through the Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Grant (EMAG) who tend to place great emphasis on bilingual pupils talking with their monolingual peers within small groups (Gardner, 2002). Corden (2000), has identified a number of benefits associated with this mode of learning which include:

• Greater scaffolding of comprehension skills
Improvements in pupils ability to make connections between the reading and writing process
- Increased corporative behaviour amongst pupils
- Improved interpersonal and social skills
- Improved educational achievement levels
(Corden cited in Gardner, 2002:18)

This type of learning is seen as important within inclusive education because it increases pupils’ opportunities to share their knowledge, including cultural knowledge. Through collaborative learning, students are also able to develop vital communication and social skills. If the material used reflects aspects of diversity appropriately, then important messages can be conveyed concerning the school’s valuing of cultural and social diversity. In addition, an environment where pupils are encouraged to share their thoughts and opinions and where these thoughts and opinions are genuinely valued is likely to lead to psychological security in learning (Gardner, 2002).

Collaboration between colleagues is also seen to be effective within inclusive education. Gardner (2002) emphasises the importance of the effective use of additional staff members in the enhancement of learning and achievement of black and minority ethnic pupils. Here Gardener refers to the corporation of class and support teachers in the planning, delivery and assessment of lessons with the central aim of meeting the diverse needs of pupils (Gardner, 2002). This requires teachers to have mutual respect for each other and to be granted equal status within the classroom, and advocates the sharing of good practice amongst colleagues (Gardner, 2002).

This collaborative ethos can also be adopted as a whole-school approach to inclusive learning. This firstly begins with the ethnic monitoring of pupils to assess the extent to which equal opportunities are being achieved. Without this data, schools can very easily ignore underachievement and the uneven distribution of scarce resources. It is for these reasons that the Parekh Report recommends that educational institutions should be able to demonstrate with the use of statistical data, that disparities in the achievement levels of different ethnic communities are closing (Runnymede Trust, 2002). The second phase involves the identification of underachieving groups and the reasons for this underachievement. Thirdly, important decisions will have to be made concerning the allocation of resources for identified pupil groups. The next stage consists of a comprehensive review of pupil needs, in light of curriculum demands, including the cultural implications encompassed within it. It is suggested that working with cultural frames of reference familiar to the target pupils, results in increased access to learning. Collaborative planning, teaching and assessment amongst teaching staff is also likely to engender a more comprehensive approach to teaching and learning. The reporting and dissemination of achievements resulting form collaborative partnerships will also allow for the collation of wider reflections and learning among staff (Gardner, 2002).
In the case of students who speak English as an additional language, it is important that they too feel valued and included within the classroom. According to Gardner (2002), such students can be made to feel valued and included through the use of different languages within the classroom. If the teacher incorporates even just a few phrases of the pupil’s first language this conveys a message of acceptance to the pupil which is likely to lead to the psychological security of the pupil within the school (Gardner, 2002). Some studies have further demonstrated that that teaching the pupil using their first language, has enabled easier access to the curriculum and can actually enable an improved acquisition of the English language compared to students who are taught in English (Gardner, 2002).

Gurnah (1989), proposes that multilingual studies be adopted as a necessary measure of support for black pupils for whom English is an additional language. Gurnah envisages that this area of learning will constitute a holistic and dynamic approach that would present the issues, concerns and aspirations expressed in particular languages, as well as the linguistic rules and conventions. Gurnah postulates that this type of provision will promote the multifaceted nature of British culture and ultimately eradicate the marginalisation of working class ethnic minority children (Dwivedi, 2002).

According to Gardner, factors that create an inclusive learning environment for EAL students are:

- A stress free learning environment
- Tasks that focus on curriculum access
- Scaffolding learning strategies
- Comprehensible language input
- Collaborative group work
- Supportive pupil networks
- Rich and varied contexts for talking and listening to English
- An inclusive classroom ethos which incorporates Linguistic and cultural diversity
- Opportunities to encounter new concepts through the medium of a first language
- Visual aids
- Explicit modelling of the structures of English

(Gardner, 2002:10)

CHAPTER SUMMARY

At present there exist multiple challenges in the education of Black and ethnic minority pupils, which have remained consistent for decades. Although there is evidence of progress in some areas, there still remains a significant amount of work to be done. According to Haque (2000), what’s needed is a more thorough understanding of what life is like for ethnic minorities living in Britain and what kind of relationship they have with the school. In this view the
effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of the school in bridging the cultural gap between the home and the school warrants further scrutiny. Haque also states that further clarification is needed on the issue of whether differences in the attainments of ethnic groups are related to national origin as opposed to socio-economic, historical or cultural factors which are integral to the ethnic backgrounds of these groups (Haque, 2000).

Recent literature has additionally highlighted the importance of identity and education, and the need for more careful examination of this interrelation in the light of contemporary multiethnic society (Rassool, 1999). Within the last two decades, the concept of cultural identity within the pluralist nation-state, has become increasingly complex. According to Bhabha (1994), within this context there is a need for a reconceptualised framework which transcends the concept of ‘linear ethnic identities’ and contemplates the complex and multilayered nature of identities which are emerging within contemporary society. It is necessary for these issues of cultural hybridisation, adaptation and identity to impact upon the education process, in turn, helping to maximise the potential of black and minority ethnic pupils (Rassool, 1999).
OVERALL SUMMARY
The above chapters have presented a comprehensive account of a number of key factors, which in some way impact upon the conception of citizenship and consequently have implications for citizenship education. Each of these areas contain a multiplicity of different perspectives which contribute to the vastness and complexity of the arena in which this topic area resides. It is important that citizenship education is considered within the wider context of these factors, to enable the construction of an accurate and comprehensive portrayal that is suitable for contemporary post-modern society. In light of these factors, there is clearly a need to address citizenship in a more inclusive way and with a broader outlook of what citizenship means and entails. The diversity of these factors also show that a multidisciplinary approach is warranted for any extensive examination of citizenship or citizenship education.

Each of the wider factors explored, pose a challenge to the citizenship education agenda and should affect the form it takes and the nature in which it is delivered. Whilst these social realities can’t be eradicated, they can be responded to. It is therefore important that citizenship educators are aware of these overarching issues and to respond to them appropriately within the citizenship education that they deliver.
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