Citizenship, the Self and the Other

Citizenship, the Self and the Other

Critical Discussions on Citizenship and How to Approach Religious and Cultural Difference

Malik Ajani

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Citizenship, the Self and the Other: Critical Discussions on Citizenship and How to Approach Religious and Cultural Difference

By Malik Ajani

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-7049-8
ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-7049-8

I dedicate this book to my mother, who despite not having the good fortune of a high school education, was able to inculcate two thirsts in me: the thirst for *ilm* (knowledge) and *seva* (voluntary service).

“I regard you as all related, all akin, all fellow citizens - by nature, not by convention. For like is by nature akin to like, but convention, a tyrant over mankind, ordains many things by force contrary to nature.”

Plato (429 – 347 B.C.E.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

In recent decades, we have seen a resurrection of debates concerning what it means to be a citizen. Developments such as transnational migrations, rising socio-economic inequalities, the "War(s) on Terror", and political movements based on absolutist ideologies continue to raise broader questions of justice, governance, equality, quality of life and social cohesion. We live in a world where people speak more than 6000 languages and identify with thousands of ethnicities. Most of these citizens of the world also possess religious identities: 2.2 billion Christians followed by 1.6 billion Muslims and 1 billion Hindus; and there are of course numerous other faith traditions and interpretations both within and outside these religions. Even so, these and other features of human diversity are housed, politically, inside roughly 200 nation-states. Thus, the contemporary reality of human diversity - consisting of thousands of languages and ethnicities as well as religious identities - far exceeds the number of nation-states in the current international order (W. Kymlicka 1995). Globally speaking, a diverse citizenry is an unavoidable fact of most nation-states across the planet. Furthermore, such a diverse citizenry must imply a shared, as well as, a diverse set of perspectives, and values that are important to the citizens of these polities. In this regard, a reoccurring source of consternation in democracies is how best to deal with different groups and co-cultures, which is in sync with the decisions of the majority or those who sway political power.

In response to such trends, countries such as Australia, Canada, and Britain have committed themselves to teaching citizenship through their national curriculums. Moreover, all European Union member states have integrated some form of citizenship education into their primary and secondary curriculums. Acknowledging such developments, this book uses discussions with citizenship educators as a backdrop for a critical analysis of various conceptions of citizenship: e.g. liberal, civic-republican, cosmopolitan and multicultural citizenship. There is also analysis of how these educators approach the contemporary reality of nation states, which are richly composed of a diverse citizenry. Given Britain's transformation into a multi-ethnic and multi-faith society, this book develops, as a case study, an understanding of how to deal with religious and cultural

difference. What makes this work unique is that it gleans ideas and research from a wide field of international scholarship: from political science, philosophy, education, diversity and cultural studies, as well as from citizenship educators in England. One feature of this research is that it uses the q-methodology, a research method used to study people's viewpoints, to reveal some shared perspectives on citizenship. In doing so, this five-year research journey has led to the discovery of spaces where citizenship educators- despite their ethnic/religious diversity - display 'common ground' on certain values, beliefs and aims related to citizenship.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that even though this book has benefited from the generously contributed ideas of citizenship educators in England, its scholarly research, lessons, arguments, analysis and suggestions, which focus on multi-faith and multi-ethnic societies, might also be useful elsewhere. It is hoped that this book will be a useful resource for academics, educators and political leaders, as well as interfaith and civil society professionals at large.

MOTIVATIONS FOR THIS RESEARCH

I was born in India where I spent the first seven years of my childhood. Thereafter my parents immigrated to the United States, the land of tremendous opportunities, as well as challenges. In addition to being exposed to English at school, I became aware of my mother's Bengali heritage and Gujarati from my father's side. Being surrounded by such a multi-cameral inheritance enriched me with experiences that have shaped my outlook. Of course, language for me is not just about communication, but a gateway to literature, ways of understanding (both rational and emotive), and most importantly, forms of living that consciously and subconsciously influence our lives. In addition to this, I have always had an innate interest in philosophy and religion, which was always supported and encouraged in my family. Over time, I began to accumulate questions, the responses to which were ample at home, in my school and my community, but always unsatisfying to a certain degree. For instance, I have always been fascinated by questions like what does a just society look like? How can people of difference find common ground? Somewhere during my formal studies in philosophy I was exposed to the ideas of John Hick and what he referred to as pluralism. Interestingly enough, these ideas were not foreign to me, since it was something that I had witnessed in my family and my community growing up. I have memories of my maternal grandfather studiously watching the Hindu Mahabharata epic on TV, being immersed in the Quran, as well as a variety of philosophical literatures. When I was in India, I recall my father taking me to his workplace, where we would distribute mithai (Indian sweets) in celebration of Hindu, as well as Muslim festivals. My mother perhaps had the most profound impact on my views. In addition to the pedagogy I would receive from her at home, she would encourage me to go to the library and read whatever I desired, and I took the fullest advantage of this. I believe education has tremendous power to alter society. It has, on one hand, the power to reproduce the same problems, prejudices, and practices of generating inequalities of preceding generations or it can inspire creativity, inculcate the desire for harmony with humankind and nature, and excellence in the pursuit of equality, justice, and improving the quality of life for not just a select few, but for everyone.

It is the pursuit of further education that led me to England in 2006. During my graduate studies in London, I researched the aspirations of parents with a Muslim cultural heritage and what they desired for their children's education. Here, I began to better understand the challenges they faced, both as individuals and as members of minority communities, which were also common to many groups in society. It is there I became aware that the ideas I studied in philosophy and cultural studies intersected in the domain of citizenship. Since 2002, Citizenship has become a statutory subject to be taught in schools in England. Citizenship deals with issues of a just society, citizenship deals with aspirations of minority groups and citizenship deals with finding common ground on the challenges that we all face living on a planet that has limited resources. And so this research is an amalgamation of my interests and experiences and a deeper desire to find responses to the questions that have haunted me for a large part of my life.

PREFACE

Many people have heard of the term citizenship, yet it is probably one of the most elusive concepts to describe. Someone might refer to it when they claim “I am a citizen of the United States of America”, or it might mean that your heritage is linked to a native tribal-nation within Canada or elsewhere. A person may also imply it when they say, “Good citizens do not litter!” When people make such statements, they are, in fact, referring to the various dimensions that this concept has come to be associated with. Integral to citizenship are notions of rights and moral duties, of community, of identity, of religion, culture and education.

Additionally, citizenship is in no way a static phenomenon, but rather it is contested and is continuously being shaped within the public realm. Since 2002, Citizenship became a statutory subject to be taught in schools in England to deal with some major dilemmas in society today that are plaguing democracies around the world. In recent years, all of the European Union has declared its commitment to teaching this subject in some form and 2013 is hailed as the European Year of Citizens. In addition to this, over the decades, countries such as Canada and Australia have put increased focus on this subject.

This book uses a discussion with citizenship educators as a backdrop to analyze different conceptions of citizenship and how they approach the contemporary reality of nation-states, which are richly composed of a multi-ethnic and multi-faith citizenry. As a case study and given this nation’s transformation into a multicultural and multi-faith society with far-reaching implications for citizenship, this work pursued the task of developing an understanding towards dealing with religious and cultural difference in the sphere of education. Finally, it deserves repeating that even though the key focus of this research was primarily based on data gathered in England, the lessons, arguments, analysis and suggestions, which focus on multi-faith and multi-ethnic societies, might also be useful elsewhere.

Chapter 1 will provide some context and parameters for what will follow by introducing various historical conceptions of citizenship and

some of the surrounding debates, which have significance for (multi-ethnic/faith) societies like England and beyond. Next, the chapter will also examine education within the context of England to identify those vital societal concerns that were hoped to be addressed by the introduction of *Citizenship* as a National Curriculum subject, to be taught in schools.

Bernard Crick[1], who chaired the British Government's Advisory Group on Citizenship, highlighted the importance of learning from the past, specifically drawing attention to the "active" nature of citizenship in ancient Athens. Citizenship, as Crick explained, had "its origins specifically in ancient Greece and is a key part of our civilization" (Crick, Essays on Citizenship 2000, 4). Today "active citizenship," which is a mantra for the civic-republican conception of citizenship, has become a buzz phrase in society. However, one could probe a bit further and also ask what exactly did such a notion of citizenship bestow for most of the people in ancient Athenian democracy and Greek society as a whole? Critically examining the nature of citizenship within this context may help us to understand further how this concept is articulated both in its ideals and practices, especially if it is a "key part of our civilization." For such reasons, Chapter 2 will scrutinize the nature of citizenship in one of the oldest democracies in the world. Furthermore, it will open a critical discussion about the interplay between public views of the 'Self' in relation to the 'Other', and social practices (including pedagogical ones), as a key dynamic of citizenship; something, which was not just a phenomenon of the world's earliest democracy, but an occurrence that takes on diverse forms today.

In this inquiry, I will centre the discussion of citizenship on certain focal points. First, the praxis of citizenship cultivates certain shared beliefs, views and ideals in society. Second, a crucial (pedagogical) link could be made between the beliefs and practices of citizenship, where such shared beliefs and views, in a Durkheimian sense, serve to socialize people towards regulating certain behaviours and practices in society. Third, although citizenship in one of the world's oldest democracies exhibited many virtues, it was not without its faults and perhaps examining some of its deficiencies could help us understand the limitations of the civic-republican tradition which it inspires today. Hence, such an exercise could

[1] In 1997, Sir Bernard Crick was appointed as the Chairman of the Advisory Group on citizenship. Based on the advisory group's work, the Crick Report led to the introduction of Citizenship as a core subject in England's National Curriculum in 2002.

be helpful in both broadening our understanding of citizenship, as well as provide us with some insight into how we can productively deal with the feature of difference in contemporary societies.

From here, we will turn to Chapter 3, which will explore the different conceptions of citizenship through discussions with citizenship educators. The citizenship educators who participated in these discussions associated to a variety of religious identities including Jewish, Muslim, Roman Catholic, Anglican, and other Protestant traditions; moreover, several of the teachers indicated that they had no religious associations. Additionally, the cultural/ethnic heritage of these men and women included White English, Welsh, Pakistani, Punjabi, Indian, Irish, Bangladeshi, Ghanaian, mixed-race, etc. The focus of this chapter will be to reveal the "shared perspectives" of citizenship held by these contemporary citizenship educators and the conceptions of citizenship that inform these perspectives. The citizenship educators, who participated in this research, taught in schools across England and many of the issues that they tackled in the classroom, as we will see, are, in fact, being discussed and debated by academics, researchers, politicians, as well as a variety of citizens both within and beyond the geopolitical borders of England. Additionally, this book will illustrate how these citizenship educators drew from beliefs and aims emanating from a variety of conceptions of citizenship such as cosmopolitan citizenship, civic-republican citizenship and liberal citizenship to inform these shared perspectives. In addition to this, chapter 3 will also discuss the limitations and critiques associated with these conceptions in perceiving and dealing with contemporary societal challenges. Thereafter, chapter 4 will illustrate the places where all of these citizenship educators, despite their diverse ethnic/religious/non-religious backgrounds exhibited "common ground" in terms of their views on citizenship.

Chapter 5's theme will build on previous chapters to illustrate the ways in which visions of the 'Self' in relation to the 'Other', have a substantial link to the kinds of citizens and society we are shaping. In this chapter, I will propose a framework of visions of citizenship, which include the exclusivist, inclusivist and pluralist ways of perceiving and dealing with religious/cultural difference. Additionally, we will examine how some of these visions of citizenship can, to a considerable extent, lead to the construction of insider and outsider groups within the society. Based on this, we will explore the views of the citizenship educators and attempt to understand what groups they believe to be excluded or disenfranchised.

Moreover, through the analysis of the concerns of these teachers, we hope to understand better what they perceive to be barriers in dealing with difference. Thereafter, the chapter will report on what citizenship educators recognize to be the goals and strategies to counter the 'Othering' and to improve social cohesion.

From here we will proceed to Chapter 6, which will offer some reflections on the research as well as, discuss possible implications of the findings. Additionally, I will propose a strategic approach regarding the conceptualization and the pedagogy of citizenship for multi-faith/multi-ethnic societies. In all, it is hoped that these discussions with citizenship educators, models, arguments, analysis and suggestions, which glean from a variety of international sources, might be a useful resource for multi-faith and multi-ethnic societies, which are grappling with questions of citizenship and diversity.

CHAPTER ONE

HOW DID WE GET HERE? SETTING THE STAGE FOR CITIZENSHIP AND APPROACHING DIVERSITY

Conceptions of citizenship

Citizenship as a heritage of humanity that deals with understandings of solidarity, identity, rights, duties and even ethics/morality has a long-standing historical tradition. One of the earliest glimpses into this tradition can be observed at the headquarters of the United Nations in New York, where a replica of the Cyrus Cylinder can be found. The Cyrus Cylinder (which now resides in the British Museum) was produced around 539 BCE by Cyrus the Great of the Achaemenid Persian Empire and is recognized as the first human rights document (United Nations 2008). One salient theme of this declaration was that the citizens of the empire would be allowed to practice their religious beliefs freely. In addition to this, the ancient Greeks were also amongst the earliest to contribute to the tradition of citizenship. "Politeia" in Greek means the city, the civic body and citizenship. Here, a citizen was a member of the community, which was defined by autonomy and which gave itself its own laws (Magnette, Paul et. al. 2008, 8). Moreover, within this context, one of the earliest systematic attempts to develop a theory of citizenship is often attributed to Aristotle, who in *Politics* (1274b38) proclaimed, "We must examine, therefore, who should be called a citizen and who the citizen is" (Aristotle, Robinson and Keyt 1996, 3). Despite the prominence of these early discourses on citizenship, neither the ancient Persians nor the Greeks have had the final word on citizenship. In fact, the last two thousand years have revealed a contribution of various individuals and societies who have attempted to offer a response to this question both in theory, and in practice.

Most recently, within the Anglo-European context, citizenship has increasingly become concerned with the shaping of laws and decisions of

society in dealing with individuals and groups both inside and outside the paradigm of the nation-state. Within the British context, T. H. Marshall (1964, 71-72) through his essays argued that citizenship is a status that involved access to various rights and powers, which included civil, political and social rights. Despite such pronouncements, Marshall explicated that in pre-modern times, citizenship was limited to a small elite group (male landowners) (Marshall 1964, ix). However, in Marshall's view the process by which the fruits of citizenship would be accessible to greater numbers of people would expand over centuries of struggle. The demands for equal citizenship would lead to developments such as the Magna Carta for instance, which acknowledged rights such as to be tried by a jury through the law of the land, instead of some arbitrary punishment consigned by the ruler (Linebaugh 2008, 11,28). Additionally, the American declaration of independence (from Britain) would assert that certain truths were "self-evident," that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."[1] In the eighteenth century, as Marshall contended, demands for citizenship emphasized rights needed for individual freedom, which could be protected by the law. These rights included freedom of speech, equality under the law, and the right to own property. In the nineteenth century, citizenship came to include the right of parliament or having access to the decision-making process within a polity.

Even so, Marshall's principal concern was that legal rights were inadequate without rights of participation, and these had limited value, especially where inequalities of wealth and power prevented a large number of citizens from taking advantage of their citizenship entitlements (Archibugi, Held and Kohler 1998, 131). One response to this predicament was the creation of welfare institutions and services by the nation-state. Thus in the twentieth century, social rights such as welfare, security and education became a major element of the definition of citizenship (Marshall 1964,72,74). Such an approach implied a certain amount of redistribution of wealth, which involved the loss of liberty for some. Here, some would ask, could such a loss of liberty be justified?

One justification was argued by John Rawls, who in his *Theory of*

[1] The political philosophy expressed in the US Declaration of Independence was not completely new, but was informed by the ideals and values expressed by past thinkers such as John Locke and other Continental philosophers (National Archives 1776).

Justice stated that social and economic inequalities should be arranged so that they are both "(a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged and (b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of equality of opportunity" (Rawls 1971, 302). However, such a justification did not satisfy everyone. Opposing the social-liberal or social-democratic conception of citizenship was the neo-liberal tradition, which contended that services such as education, law and order and healthcare should be transferred to the private sector and left to market forces to determine their direction (McNaughton 2009, 17). During the 1970s and 1980s, neo-liberalism was often associated politically with the New Right conservative movement and championed in the British context by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and in the US by President Ronald Regan.

Critics of such a political-philosophical conception asked if the market forces could be trusted to decide what is best for society. Also, if formal government takes a step back in direct control, who would fill in the gap in dealing with the society's needs? Through advocates such as Phillip Pettit (1997), another tradition that saw a revival was the civic-republican conception of citizenship, which emphasized that among the hallmarks of citizenship, is the active life of the citizen. Such a formulation attached primary importance to civic virtue or the citizens' willingness to "subordinate and sacrifice their private interests to the common good of society" (Weithmatt 2003, 704). However, such a conception has been criticized for having the tendency to assume that all citizens in the modern world possess the knowledge, skills, time and wealth necessary for the practice of "active citizenship" (Oldfield 1990, 156). It also neglected the fact that a number of modern societies have minority groups that are often legally, socially or economically marginalized from taking part in the equal co-authoring of society. Although Marshall may have recognized certain emerging trends in citizenship, critics have contended that issues of civil, political and social rights are far from settled. Additionally, many of these critiques of liberal and civic-republican citizenship fall under the banner of communitarian citizenship. Moreover, one particular strand of the communitarian way of shaping society has pursued a variety of aims, practices, and policies supporting the recognition of multiple identities, groups and cultures in society, and is commonly referred to as multicultural citizenship.[2] Multicultural citizenship has advocates such as Will Kymlicka, Amy Gutmann and Tariq Modood, all of whom have

[2] This conception is also referred to as "communitarian-liberal" by David Miller in *Citizenship and National Identity*, 2005, 102-107. Moreover, conservative citizenship is referred to as the "communitarian right" conception.

promoted the belief that minority groups and cultures in multination-states may need “group rights” and/or protections from economic or political decisions of the majority culture. As Gutmann explains:

> Full public recognition as equal citizens may require two forms of respect: (1) respect for the unique identities of each individual, regardless of gender, race, or ethnicity, and (2) respect for those activities, practices, and ways of viewing the world that are particularly valued by, or associated with, members of disadvantaged groups, including women...etc
>
> (Taylor 1994, 8)

That said for others, dealing with such questions and issues requires a substantial shift in perceptions, strategies and resources that look beyond the traditional framework of the nation-state. Cosmopolitan citizenship stems from an impulse that many of the problems in society are not confined to the nation-state and require ethics, associations and institutions of an international nature. As Archibugi et al. argued:

> Few decisions made in one state are autonomous from those made in others. A decision on the interest rate in Germany has significant consequences for employment in Greece, Portugal and Italy. A state's decision to use nuclear energy has environmental consequences for the citizens of neighbouring countries. Immigration policies in the European Union have a significant impact on the economic development of Mediterranean Africa. All this happens without the affected citizens having a say in the matter.
>
> (Archibugi, Held and Kohler 1998, 204, D. H. Archibugi 1995)

Based on such an understanding, advocates of cosmopolitanism affirm that citizenship should support the attempt to create and support institutions and structures that enable the voice of an individual citizen to be heard in global affairs. Cosmopolitan citizenship also requires the active attempt by an individual to inform himself or herself of local and global issues and concerns; furthermore, it binds a citizen to responsibilities that go beyond the nation-state. That said one critique of cosmopolitanism is that it takes away attention from local priorities and concerns. What might be necessary to communities in Mumbai, India might not necessarily be of concern to people in Dallas, Texas.

For those who espouse the conservative conception of citizenship this means a focus on creating a community. If, for liberal citizenship, communities should facilitate choice, for conservative citizenship,

communities are a source of authority and provide a substantive way of life that the citizen should adopt (Miller 2005, 104). In such a conception, the nation-state is the ideal community that can provide citizens with what they need to succeed. This entails distancing all social or cultural associations and preferences that are not directly linked to the national identity. The focus on the nation-state implies a common language and history. Therefore for conservative citizenship this means "one must promote a restrictive approach to immigration" (Miller 2005, 104-106). Furthermore, loyalties outside the nation-state are a cause for concern within such a framework. For instance, conservatives like Scruton (2006) have asserted that "the domination of our national Parliaments and the EU machinery is partly responsible for the acceptance of subsidised immigration, and for the attacks on customs and institutions associated with traditional and native forms of life…" In response to such concerns, the conservative conception of citizenship sponsors a nation-centric focus in institutions, which is supplemented by an inward looking identity that minimizes loyalties to all associations (tribal, ethnic, etc.) that are external to the nation-state.[3] Additionally, conservative citizenship seeks to build a strong nation-state, where society's security needs trump the rights of individuals. Later chapters will go deeper into all of these conceptions of citizenship and seek to understand how they propose to deal with contemporary realities and challenges and the kinds of citizens they seek to create.

In all, these conceptions of citizenship denote specific values, beliefs and ideals that often stand fervently in opposition to one another. So when the discussion of citizenship education is raised, or the question is asked: how should we educate our children in this matter? Such a question can evolve into a polemical issue itself because citizenship also involves the shaping of identities. In schools, this means the identities of our children who are learning from teachers what it means to be a (good) citizen.

Defining citizenship

Bearing all these dynamics in mind, Sir Bernard Crick declared that citizenship carries four meanings: the first is correlated to rights and duties as related to a state; second, it can refer to a belief (liberalism, civic-

[3] There is an inherent tension within such a conception, where it at times presupposes specific dominant identities as being more native or indigenous than others. This issue will be examined further in later chapters.

republicanism, etc.); third, it can refer to an ideal, and fourth, it can refer to an "educational process" (D. B. Heater 2004, Foreward). Be that as it may, what one finds is that today, citizenship is frequently referred to as a legal status. Often, it implies being part of a political community or carrying a particular passport. For instance, a person could declare "I am a citizen of the United States." Such a legal status provides a person a place in society specific to the polity, such as the nation-state. In relation to the law, the status bestows upon the citizen certain rights and duties, such as the right to work and earn income to provide for a family and participate in the building of his or her society's future. However, as many people have discovered, merely carrying a passport is not sufficient to effectively participate in one's society. That citizenship in reality requires certain knowledge and skills to effectively contribute towards and receive the benefits of such a membership. For this reason, all European Union member states have integrated some form of citizenship education into their primary and secondary curriculum.[4] Additionally, in 2013, the European Commission proclaimed the "European Year of Citizens" to raise awareness about their citizens' rights in shaping the future of Europe. Moreover, because the education of citizenship implies the shaping of identity, specifically the identities of children or future citizens, it draws considerable attention and interest.

School and identity formation

Kramer (2001) has argued that starting in the nineteenth century national identity became the new religious identity. Henceforth, the nation-state, sought to bind its citizens with a new secular identity distinguishing itself from other pre-existing identities (e.g. religious, ethnic, etc.). Wherefore, the school, as an instrument of the state, became a primary institution where such a transformation towards a national identity could be achieved. Specifically in the UK, Ross (2000, 150) contended that through the language and rhetoric of the Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency (QCA),[5] the National Curriculum attempts to:

[4] The United Kingdom is a signatory of the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education (Council of Europe 2010).

[5] QCA was the predecessor to the Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency (QCDA). In March, 2012 the QCDA was replaced by the Standards and Testing Agency (STA), which took over its functions.

> Define its citizens primarily as individuals owing obligations and duties to the State and these duties are prior to and independent of any rights and to minimize alternative identities (of class, ethnicity or gender – or regional and supra-national affinities).[6]

However, within the discourse of identity, such a view is not the only way of perceiving oneself. There are those that perceive identity as singular or homogenous, having one primary fixture or loyalty, and others who see it as plural or fragmented having multiple simultaneous alliances and associations to groups, cultures, and communities. In *Britons*, Linda Colley (2009, xxvii) explains that:

> People in the past often consciously or unconsciously dealt in multiple identities. Thus, a resident of Edinburgh might cherish her civic patriotism, but also view herself in some circumstances as a proud Lowland Scot. And additionally in other contexts feel fervently British, and so forth.

Nevertheless, some have asserted that even if it is accepted that individuals have multiple identities, within this repertoire of identities, there is one that is primary (Ross 2000, 289, Jenkins 2008), and for those like Ernest Gellner (1983, 6), this primary identity would necessarily be the national identity:

> A man must have a nationality as he must have a nose and two ears; a deficiency in any of these particulars is not inconceivable and does from time to time occur, but only as a result of some disaster, and it is itself a disaster of a kind.

Another example of such identity shaping processes could be seen in the formalization of legal citizenship or the movement of status from "subjects" to "citizens," which in the UK, was a sluggish development. It was only in 2002, that a new citizenship pledge was formalized into law, and which added a pledge to respect the rights and freedoms of the United Kingdom and its inhabitants, to uphold democratic values, observe its laws and fulfil duties of citizenship (Crick 2002, 104).

In all, the teaching of citizenship ultimately involves explicitly or tacitly espousing certain views of identity, while marginalizing others. Thus, as these discussions and debates on citizenship carry on, one could gather that different conceptions of citizenship entail shared ways of

[6] Ross, A. (2000). *Curriculum, Construction and Critique*. London: Falmer Press, 150.

defining the citizen, her identity, as well as ways of dealing with others and the world at-large. Eventually, these debates have an influence on and permeate into the education system. Later chapters will investigate the views of citizenship educators with regard to such issues. However, to give some context to such discussions, the next section will explore the societal triggers that inspired citizenship, as a subject to be taught in England.

Why citizenship education?

In the last few decades, we have seen a resurrection of debates concerning what it means to be a citizen. Trends such as globalization, urbanization, environmental degradation, accelerated transnational migrations, rising socio-economic inequalities, the "War(s) on Terror," repeated breaches of the right to privacy, as well as political movements based on absolutist ideologies, continue to raise broader questions of justice, equality, human rights, patriotism, and social cohesion. Since dealing with such trends has become a vital concern of many, the field of citizenship is regarded as that of both deliberation and contestation between a rising number of stakeholders. As a result, the study of citizenship has grown to be increasingly interdisciplinary, attracting historians, sociologists, political scientists and many others who are raising questions, and sometimes offering solutions to come to terms with the challenges that are both local and global in character. Within the discourse of citizenship, the site that has attracted attention from both the intellectual or political elite, as well as the popular masses is education.

Specifically in England, the introduction of citizenship in education seems to have risen from two prominent concerns. First, researchers in England and Europe at large have repeatedly reported on what is perceived as the youth's feelings of alienation and apathy from mainstream politics and civic life (Andrews and Mycock (2007); Wilkens (1999); Wilkens (2003); Furnham & Gunter (1989); Kerr, McCarthy, & Smith (2002); Kiwan (2005); Osler (2001)). Political apathy was in one instance reflected in 2001, when Britain recorded its lowest turnout ever in voting since 1918 - with only 59% of the population voting (Electoral Commission 2002, 6). Additionally, according to a MORI social research institute survey, out of all the young people in Britain who were eligible to vote in 2001, only 39% did so (ibid). This, of course, raises some serious concerns about the legitimacy of a democratic polity, if a large number of citizens are not voting; could such a polity still be considered a real

democracy? In addition to concerns about political apathy, there was a wider anxiety about the rise in xenophobia, racism, Islamophobia[7] and issues of social cohesion in society (Runnymede Trust (1997); Werbner and Modood (1997); Torres and Mirón and Inda (1999); Wilkens (1999) (2005)). In 1997, *Ethnic Minorities in Britain: Diversity and Disadvantage* (fourth national survey) recommended that "an explicit idea of multi-cultural citizenship needs to be formulated for Britain" and that "a more plural approach to racial disadvantage requires forms of citizenship which are sensitive to ethnic diversity and offer respect both to individuals and to the social groups to which they feel they belong" (QCA 1998, 17).

Such concerns would culminate in 2001, with an intense period of riots in various parts of England, including Bradford, Oldham and Burnley, where tensions between ethnically minority communities and the majority "white" communities became increasingly apparent (BBC 2001). Commissioned by the Home Office, the Cantle report (2001, 9) stated that it was struck by the depth of "polarisation of our towns and cities" or the lack of integration between citizens of different ethnicities. The report further articulated the benefits for different communities to mix and learn about different religions and cultures. Developments such as these in England, as well as in Britain and Europe at large would seek to in some satisfactory sense, respond to such anxieties and concerns, and eventually resulted in the formalization of citizenship education.

Context of citizenship education in England

With Britain becoming increasingly plural, some key changes in education were initiated to respond to the needs of a more diverse society. The Education Reform Act of 1988 stipulated that locally agreed syllabuses should have national conditions so that they had to reflect the predominant Christian traditions of the country; however, they also had to take into account other principal religions that were now part of the nation-state (IFN-UK 2006, 5). Another key development in the educational sphere was the National Curriculum. The Education Act (1996), section 351, stated that all schools funded by the government are required to provide a balanced and broad-based curriculum that promotes:

[7] The Runnymede Trust Report (1997) defines Islamophobia as "the dread, hatred, and hostility towards Islam and Muslims perpetrated by a series of closed views that imply and attribute negative and derogatory stereotypes and beliefs to Muslims" (J. L. Esposito 2011, 235).

> The spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils at the school and of society, and (b) prepares pupils at the school for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life.

Within such a framework, initially it was thought that citizenship as a subject was to be approached in a cross-curricular manner through a variety of subjects (e.g. English, geography...etc.). However, in 1998, the Qualification and Curriculum Authority committee, headed by Bernard Crick, proclaimed that the teaching of citizenship could no longer be left to uncoordinated local initiatives that varied considerably in terms of content and delivery methods. Additionally, the committee emphasized that there must be a "statutory requirement on schools to ensure that it is part of the entitlement of all pupils" (QCA 1998, 7). Since 2002, Citizenship as a subject has become a component of the National Curriculum as a statutory foundation subject for pupils aged 11-16 in secondary schools. As for primary schools (pupils aged 4-11), citizenship education remains part of the statutory cross-curricular theme of Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE). That said, it has been reported that despite having a common curriculum on citizenship, there are differences in the ways in which this is implemented within the UK. For instance, the education systems of England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales have differing views on how to deal with citizenship education in their curriculum, assessment, and expected pedagogical and social outcomes. Yet, all four nations seem to agree that citizenship education should "increase political engagement amongst young people and encourage an inclusive framework of civic identities" (Andrews and Mycock 2007, 74). Thus, here again, the emphasis on civic participation and inclusive identities (as opposed to racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic...etc.) are served as fundamental goals to be achieved through the introduction of citizenship education.

Additionally, there are a variety of ways in which citizenship education is delivered in England. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) report (RR416) based on a national first cross-sectional survey described that schools employ a variety of delivery methods in implementing citizenship education (Kerr, D. et al. 2003). Here, it was commonly reported by school leaders that such teaching occurs predominantly through citizenship topics in Personal, Social and Health Education [PSHE: 90% of it]. However, other delivery methods included a cross-curricular approach, where citizenship related topics were taught in subjects such as religious education, history, geography and English (Kerr, D. et al. 2003, iii).

To comply with the Crick Report (1998), the majority of schools indicated they planned to use PSHE and religious education (RE) subject teachers as providing key roles to deliver this curriculum (ibid, 52). Here, 75% of schools indicated they had appointed a coordinator for citizenship education and instead of dedicating a specific time slot, planned to teach citizenship in RE, PSHE and through tutorial periods (Kerr, D. et al. 2003, iii). Even so, the majority of teachers (71%) indicated they had not received any training in relation to citizenship education (ibid, iv). Thus, the majority of teachers teaching citizenship are non-specialists; however, the number of specialists is gradually growing (Keating 2009, 72).

One way to understand the importance given to citizenship education is by looking at the time stipulated for the teaching of this subject. Firstly, there do not appear to be any statutory requirements for time allocated to citizenship in Key Stage 3. That said, DfES recommendations suggested 3% of teaching time per week to be dedicated to citizenship (QCA 2002, 25); this would be approximately 45 minutes per week or 27 total hours per year. Compared with this, subjects such as Math, English and Science are allocated 12% or 108 hours a year per subject. Within such a recommendation, citizenship educators seem to have a great degree of discretion on how the teaching time for citizenship is actually utilized. Here, it is worth mentioning that citizenship teachers indicated that often they used their own ideas/self-produced material and media sources to plan citizenship related topics and lessons. Thus, it wasn't a complete surprise in the initial years after the introduction of the programme, when the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) reported that there was an uneven development of citizenship education in schools, where teachers and school leaders delivered this subject using a variety of different approaches and with only a "small number" having very good practice (Kerr, D. et al. 2004, 24). Furthermore, Ofsted also reported on the lack of confidence among many teachers in teaching this subject and that these teachers sought reassurance that their approaches were proper (ibid). Despite this, over the years, teachers and school leaders have become more confident about citizenship education, where they have cited positive impacts on student participation in community activities, skills, and awareness (Cleaver, E. et al. 2005, iii, Keating 2009, 10-14). Additionally, Ofsted has confirmed that many schools gave opportunities for some students to participate in volunteer projects and influence change in school and beyond (Ofsted 2010, 6).

Even so, research indicates that citizenship teaching is generally poor,

and large-scale studies have shown that teachers feel they need more training - both in the knowledge of the subject and the teaching of it (Dunn and Burton 2011, 176, Kerr, D., & Great Britain 2007, 45). According to a 2008 survey, 50% of citizenship education staff had not received any training in citizenship education and, a significant number of teachers indicated a desire for such training (Keating 2009, iv).

In addition to this, Ofsted inspectors found that in a number of schools, when teaching citizenship, teachers focused on identity and diversity in a satisfactory way, yet the link between citizenship and the duty to promote community cohesion was often not explicit (Ofsted 2010, 7). This finding overlaps another study that compares citizenship education between two similar contexts. Evan (2006) also reported on the views of teachers from Canada and England on citizenship education. This research revealed that generally speaking teachers emphasized knowledge acquisition or understanding things like rights and duties and being informed about civic-life as being the central focus of the subject (2006, 418-19). Aside from this, the study found that teachers in England tended to put more emphasis on duties and legal responsibilities, rather than one's rights, whereas Canadian teachers tended to focus on beliefs and values related to living in a culturally diverse society. In all, these findings offer a better understanding of the context of citizenship education in England, which has been generally described as fragmented and uneven.

Thus, within such an assorted context, one question becomes particularly relevant: what shared perspectives of citizenship are held by educators who teach citizenship? This would give some indication to the kinds of citizens that are being shaped in schools. As discussed previously, the introduction of Citizenship into the National Curriculum followed some pressing concerns. Consequently, understanding the perspectives of citizenship educators and critically examining the conceptions of citizenship that inform these perspectives seems to be an essential task and a worthy aim of this work.

The Crick report declares that the aim of citizenship education is to develop "values, skills and understanding." Even if that is the case, ultimately the curriculum is interpreted by citizenship educators who may prioritize certain beliefs, concentrate on certain topics and marginalize others. Clearly there is a need to ask what citizenship means to these teachers, and in what ways they propose to deal with the issue of difference, specifically religious and cultural difference in society?