"City – Diversity – Participation"
by Concepción Maiztegui Oñate
University of Deusto (Spain)

In a global era of increasing migration and social pluralism, it seems particularly pertinent to examine their implications on citizenship education (Kiwan, 2008). This paper reflects on citizenship education in light of some keywords of the education public debate: diversity and participation. In the first part, it describes the theoretical and conceptual goals for citizenship education in a plural society, mainly in formal education. The second part focuses on the main elements at stake in the implementation process.

1. Citizenship and education in a plural society

The history of contemporary citizenship education can be traced back to national and multinational shapes. In the past, in most nations, citizenship education embraced an assimilationist ideology. One of the major scholars in this field, James Banks, comments that the main aim was to create nation-states where all groups shared one dominant mainstream culture (Banks, 2004b). It was assumed that many students lose their first culture, languages and ethnic identities in order to achieve those objectives. Furthermore powerful groups designed citizenship education to promote their social, economic and political interests. As a consequence of this assimilationist conception of education, Banks (1999) remembers that minorities often suffered a double process of marginalization. First they become marginal citizens and second marginal members of their own groups of reference. It is not only a portrait of American society, if we take a look to the European history, most of those features could be close to our historical processes. Indeed, civic education had an assimilationist past in countries like Spain, Portugal or Easter countries. With similarities that overcome ideologies from right to left political spectrum.

In the 60's and 70's, the assimiliationist approach evolved to respond to the concern of the ethnic revitalization movements and Civil Right Movements who wanted to maintain important aspects of their cultures as well as the right to fully participate in society (Banks, 2004b). On the basis of the concept of culture citizenship (Rosaldo, 1997) and multicultural citizenship (Kymlicka, 1995), Banks (1999) stresses the need for a greater commitment to our respective cultural communities without losing local and national projects (p.55).

Today, globalization processes and increased migration engender complexity and diffuse the boundaries between the local and the global. There is a growing consensus that we should prepare young people to live in a global world where they "*will leave, learn, love and work"* (Suarez Orozco, 2005:210). This situation queries a traditional understanding of citizenship education that ought to

incorporate a concern for global perspective of welfare and justice as well as an active commitment to taking action to address and promote solidarity (Osler & Starkey, 2008; Osler & Vincent, 2002). Marcelo Suarez Orozco is quite explicit when he states that "*educating youth people in a global era means preparing them to engage in a global world of ever growing diversity and complexity*" (Suarez Orozco, 2005:209).

Citizenship education became a statutory subject which presented new demands for pupils and teachers worldwide (Palmer & Garret, 2009; Print, 2007). European Union becomes an important agent as a promoter of active citizens committed with democratic values to learn to cooperate with others, living together, and participate in political and social life. Regarding the practice of citizenship curricula, Eurydice report explains that, normally, citizenship education involves political literacy, development of critical thinking, certain attitudes and values, and finally, an active participation (Eurydice, 2002). The new social context could delineate more interactions between intercultural education and citizenship education (Bartolomé, 2002; Georgi, 2008).

2. Citizenship education development: participation and identification in plural societies.

Practical application of citizenship proposals has further implications for schools, in terms of delivering this subject within the existing curriculum framework. Moreover, education reform does not come easily or cheaply, it requires energy, creativity and more flexible and inclusive forms of education (Kiwan, 2008; Print, 2007; Suarez Orozco & Satin, 2007). At this stage, it is necessary to comment that mandatory citizenship education aims to enhance capacities for active participation. This is not only a subject of comment in international literature (Print, 2007) but also a central issue in educative programs. Analyzing the Lisbon objectives in education, a recent supranational report, we can realize that it includes active citizenship as one of the key competencies for promoting equity and social cohesion (European Commission, 2009). The review of previous research, allow them to affirm that "*education is correlated with active citizenship behavior. However, it is difficult to say for sure that this correlation is casual*" (2009: 92). In a similar manner, on the basis of the evidence of research[1] on young people, Print (2007) asserts that through formal and non formal curricula, schools offer an opportunity to become more engaged in democracy. He argues that students are likely to be engaged when they participate in instrumental activities which develop civic engagement (newspapers, debating, clubs, etc.). Those comments reflect the argument that participation mainly occurs when projects go beyond the cognitive engagement theory. This is a point that Print (2007) makes clear when stating that citizenship needs to be addressed to what we can do to bring a change.

In addition, identity and identification become crucial features in understanding citizenship. On the other hand, the necessity to increase social cohesion in post-industrial societies, and to generate a

---

[1] Particularly Youth Electoral Study (YES) and Centre for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)

type of common identification, is one of the objectives of citizenship education. Thus, the ethical dimension of citizenship implies an affective dimension, related to feelings of belonging and a narrow association of citizenship with nationality poses difficulties in multicultural societies (Banks, 2009;

Osler & Starkey, 2008). This is followed by a further quite fundamental point: belonging. As Osler and Starkey (2008) explain, a broad concept of citizenship requires a sense of belonging. However, belonging is a concept wider than citizenship since it is created through experiences of inclusion and exclusion (El Haj, 2007). It would not be an exaggeration to say that student's experiences of exclusion from the imagined community derived in strong outsider-affiliations and they difficult the process of participation. Hence, education should provide a comprehensive context for them to integrate their own experiences and identities.

From this point of view, it seems evident that citizenship education could not be a simple subject. It requires the development of an ethos, a way of thinking and doing that allows students to critically reflect on values and experiences (Palmer & Garret, 2004; Kiwan, 2007; Pike, 2007b). This issue deals with another important topic in citizenship education: **hope.** Hope comes from the quality of relationships (Pike, 2007b:219). Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco (2001) explain that the ethos of reception or the social climate is an essential factor in everyday experience and it affects the perceptions, identities and behaviors of children. If there is a climate of obstacles and hostilities, most children do not continue to invest in schools but in their sense of self. How can we develop hope?

The current position requires a response not only to provide and ensure the same basic educational rights to all the population but to bridge cultural gaps, particularly in times of tensions and attitudes against migrants (Rudiger & Spencer, 2003). Osler and Starkey (2005) argue that citizenship education needs to be based on the understanding of equity and diversity in local communities and in the development of personal and collective identities that will enable students to live together in diversity. Dina Kiwan goes on by proposing that *"citizenship as feeling and citizenship as practice are inextricably linked and mutually enhancing"* (2008:52). Hence, Dina Kiwan (2008) has plausibly asserted that a legalistic approach based on the human right could be ineffective to enhance active participation of citizens unless it should be coupled with an identity-based model. She proposes a "pedagogy of process" which recognizes asymmetric power relations.

In summary, the goal of citizenship education that promotes social cohesion as well as reflects on the diverse cultures within the society seems a difficult but essential task. For many schools, citizenship is not a new subject. Otherwise, it has been part of schools' curriculum for many years and some schools have developed interesting initiatives through which citizenship has been successfully implemented (Kerr, 2009; Maiztegui & Eizaguirre, 2006; Print, 2007). One of the main features of those processes, we could call it a good practice, is the ability to foster real empowerment and autonomy in the practice of citizenship and community education. What should be established is their improvement of dialogue and interaction between school and families which leads towards the

formation of sustained cross-cultural relations. As Banks (2007a) proposes, we could teach student to take care of other people and to create a human society.

References:

Banks, J. (Ed) (2009). *Rout ledge International companion to multicultural education*. New York: Rout ledge.

Banks, J. (2008). *Educating citizenship in a multicultural society.* New York: Teachers Colleague.

Banks, J. (ed) (2004a). *Diversity and citizenship education. Global perspectives.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. (2004b). Teaching for social justice, diversity and citizenship in a global world. *The Educational Forum, 68*. 289-298.

Banks, J. (1999). Multicultural citizenship education. In B. Day (ed). *Teaching and learning in a new millennium* (pp.54-61). West Lafayette (IN): Kappa Delta Pi.

Bartolomé, M. (ed.) (2002). *Identidad y ciudadanía. Un reto a la educación intercultural*. Barcelona: Narcea.

Commission of the European Communities (2009) *Progress towards the Lisbon objectives in education and training. Indicators and benchmarks 2009.* Document Sec(2009)1616.

El-Haj. T.R. (2007). I was born here but my home it's no here: educating for democratic citizenship in an era of transnational migration and global conflict. *Harvard Educational Review, 77.* (3) Pp-285-314.

Georgi, V.G. (ed). (2008). *The making of citizens in Europe: new perspectives on citizenship education.* Bonn: BBP.

Kiwan, D. (2008). Citizenship education in England at the cross-road? Four models of citizenship and their implications for ethnic and religious diversity. *Oxford Review of Education*, *34* (1). 39-58.

Maiztegui, C. & Izaguirre, M. (2008). *Ciudadanía y educación: de la teoría a la práctica.* Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto.

Osler & Starkey, H. (2008). Education for cosmopolitan citizenship. In V.G. Georgi (ed). *The making of citizens in Europe: new perspectives on citizenship education*. (pp. 204-212). Bonn:BBP.

Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship. Democracy and inclusion in education*. Maidenhead (UK): Open University Press

Osler, A. & Vincent, K. (2002). *Citizenship and the challenge of global education*. Stoke on Trent (UK): Trentham Books.

Palmer, J. & Garrett, D. (2009). *Active citizenship reconsidered. The challenge for initial teacher training.* Citized Org. (Available: http://citized.info/pdf/commarticles/Dean_Garrett_Janet_Palmer.pdf)

Pike, M.A. (2007a).The state and citizenship education in England: a curriculum for subjects or citizens?. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 39* (4).471-489.

Pike, M.A. (2007b). Values and visibility: the implementation and assessment of citizenship education in schools. *Educational Review*, *59* (2).215-229.

Print, M. (2007). Citizenship education and youth participation in democracy. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 55* (3).325-345.

Suarez Orozco, M. (2005). Rethinking Education in the Global Era. *Early Childhood*, 209-212.

Suárez Orozco, C. & Suárez Orozco, M. (2003). *La infancia de la Inmigración*. Madrid: Morata.

Suarez Orozco, M. & Satin, C. (2007). Wanted global. *Educational Leadership*, 58-62.