

4. Towards a theory of inclusive participative citizenship

Dina Kiwan

-----> Introduction

In this chapter, I examine the inter-relationship between human rights, participation and diversity through an analysis of the conceptions of citizenship held in the English citizenship education policy and curriculum development process in secondary schools, introduced in 2002. I aim to contribute to theories of active citizenship that accommodate ethnic and religious diversity in an inclusive manner, in a way that is appropriate to the United Kingdom's multicultural context.

In 1998, a policy review of citizenship education was undertaken in England by the Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools, set up by David Blunkett, then Secretary of State for Education, and chaired by Sir Bernard Crick (QCA, 1998). The main recommendation of the Advisory Group (known as the Crick Report) was that citizenship education should be made a statutory subject (QCA, 1998). Whilst citizenship as an educational aim of the state is not a new idea (Fogelman, 1997), with the history of citizenship education in England typically traced back to the 19th-century Victorian context (Batho, 1990; Lawton, 2000), it is of note that until its introduction in 2002, citizenship education had never formally been part of the school curriculum in England (Fogelman, 1997).

Historically, a defining feature of traditional theories of citizenship has been that they draw boundaries, clearly excluding certain categories of individuals from membership (Heater, 1990). However, with the relatively recent expansion of citizenship to include all members of society, there has been an increasing interest in considering citizenship and diversity in a theoretically more explicit and integrated way (for example, Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2000). In this chapter, I limit my scope to a focus on ethnic and religious diversity for practical reasons. The pertinence of this focus can be witnessed by the national and international contemporary socio-political context over the last five years, where issues relating to ethnic and religious diversity have taken on a heightened profile in the media, as well as within education and public policy agendas. This can be understood in the context of national events in the United Kingdom such as the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry and its recognition of institutional racism (Macpherson, 1999), as well as the occurrence of inter-ethnic group violence in a number of cities in England in the summer of 2001. In addition, there is the international context



of increased globalisation, increased migration, and increased social pluralism (Home Office, 2001), as well as the occurrence of key international events such as 11 September 2001, and more recently, the London bombings in July 2005.

Inherent in the relationship between the individual and his or her political community is the role that identity, or a sense of belonging, plays within this relationship. I am particularly interested in the role that identity, or a sense of belonging, plays in this relationship between citizens and their political community. This is because the motivation for citizens to participate in their political community is logically predicated on a sense of belonging to, or “identification” with, the context where they are participating. Osler and Starkey’s (2005) definition of citizenship is useful in this regard, where they define citizenship as “a status, a feeling and a practice”. I propose that citizenship as “feeling” and citizenship as “practice” are inextricably linked, and also mutually enhancing: just as a sense of belonging may promote participation, the experience of participation can enhance a sense of belonging. In addition, conceptualising citizenship in diverse societies such as the United Kingdom – which aim for a model of inclusive and participative citizenship, necessitates a consideration of the diversity of identities of its citizens and how this relates to their participation within their political community.

In this paper, I argue that the dominant theories of citizenship have implications for ethnic and religious diversity, even though these may not be articulated explicitly. For example, France is often cited as the exemplar of civic republicanism, where ethnicity and religion are expected to operate only in the private sphere, and not in the public political sphere (Brubaker, 1998; Delanty, 2003). Crick (2000) in his seminal work, *In Defence of Politics*, provides a view of politics that holds theoretically greater potential for an accommodation of ethnic and religious diversity in a model of citizenship as active participation. He defines politics as “the process of practical reconciliation of the interests of the various groups which compose a state” (Crick, 2000, p. 24). However, he does not explicitly address the issue of ethnic and religious diversity, nor does he consider whether political institutions in their current form can accommodate such diversity. Other approaches include Kymlicka’s (1995) liberal theory of minority rights – drawing on the multicultural Canadian context, where he proposes that certain groups should have special group rights, in addition to the usual package of individual rights. Another approach can be seen in contemporary “communitarian” theories, which have critiqued liberalism’s conception of the human being, and have developed an argument that a conception of the human being needs to be situated in context – identity and participation being important aspects to consider in how individuals relate to their political community (Delanty, 2000; Mulhall and Swift, 1994). There have also been calls for “multicultural” citizenship to be underpinned by human rights (Osler, 1999). Most recently, a number of influences – such as the challenge of cultural rights, globalisation, the decoupling of citizenship and nationality, and the conflation of the public and private spheres (Williams, 2002) – has contributed to the emergence of a range of more universalist or “cosmopolitan” theories; these theories have also developed in reaction to liberal and communitarian theories.

In the following section I briefly outline my methodology, before examining the two most “dominant” conceptions of citizenship in the English citizenship policy and curriculum development process, and their implications for ethnic and religious diversity. As becomes evident throughout my contribution, the two “dominant” conceptions of citizenship are the “legal” and the “participatory” conceptions, with the participatory conception being the most pervasive. Whilst I note many positive

features of the “participatory” conception of citizenship – that it is a necessary part of a model of active citizenship – I argue that it is not sufficient in a multicultural society, and that a “participatory” conception must be coupled with a “multicultural” conception of citizenship. Through the analysis of my interview data and policy and curriculum documentation, I propose an inclusive model of citizenship, developing and extending in particular participatory conceptions of citizenship. In the concluding section, I propose some implications for policy and practice.

-----> **Methodology**

My research aimed to examine key players’ conceptions of citizenship in the policy and curriculum development process of citizenship education in the English secondary school contemporary context. I am interested in how these conceptions draw on theoretical conceptions of citizenship throughout the policymaking process, in particular the extent to which these conceptions address ethnic and religious diversity, both theoretically and in practical terms.

My methodology entailed interviewing 30 participants involved at different stages of the policy-making process, whom I identified and selected from three main categories: firstly those who have had substantial influence in formulating policy, developing the curriculum, and/or developing teaching resources in relation to citizenship education in England; secondly, those who have a stake in the issue but were not involved or included in the process and thirdly, those who have been involved in related initiatives or domains, which may have theoretical and/or practical implications for the citizenship education initiative. Interviewees included David Blunkett, former Secretary of State for Education, and Sir Bernard Crick, an academic and longstanding campaigner for political literacy in schools. Semi-structured interviews were conducted, covering a range of themes including interviewees’ perceptions regarding the nature of their involvement in the process, their perceptions regarding representativeness and decision making, their perceptions of the aims of citizenship, issues regarding policymaking procedures, conceptions of citizenship and conceptions of diversity and their perceptions on how these relate to one another. In addition, I have analysed the Crick Report (QCA, 1998), as well as the Key Stage 3 (KS3) curriculum documentation, the KS3 Programmes of Study (QCA, 2000) and KS3 Schemes of Work (QCA, 2001).² Whilst interviewees and the Crick Report address the whole secondary school range, for pragmatic purposes, my analysis of curriculum documentation was limited to a focus on Key Stage 3 curriculum documentation.³

-----> **“Dominant” models of citizenship**

What emerged from the analysis of the interview data, as well as key policy and curriculum documentation, was that there were two “dominant” conceptions of citizenship – which I refer to as the “legal” and “participatory” conceptions of citizenship, with the “participatory” conception being the most dominant of these conceptions.⁴

The “legal” conception

A number of writers in the field of citizenship education argue that human rights provide an ideal basis to underpin citizenship education (Alderson, 2000; Osler, 2000; Osler and Starkey, 2005). The terms of the Crick Advisory Group make

explicit reference to rights; however, the term “human rights” is not used – but rather “rights of individuals as citizens” (QCA, 1998, p. 4).

I have argued elsewhere in detail that this conflation of citizenship and human rights is theoretically problematic (Kiwan, 2005). In the Crick report, rights are presented as an included component of citizenship rather than being presented as its theoretical underpinning. This is an important distinction to be made between a more universalist approach and an approach where citizenship is defined in political terms. Underpinning human rights is the notion of common humanity based on ethical and legal conceptualisations of the individual. In contrast, citizenship rights are underpinned in relation to a political community, based on political and legal understandings of the individual. It is appropriate that the terms of reference of the Crick Report do not make the theoretical mistake of conflating universalist ethical understandings of the individual with political understandings of the individual.

Human rights are a dominant theme in the KS3 Programme of Study and the KS3 Schemes of Work; they are prominently presented as the first item under the “knowledge and understanding” heading where “Pupils should be taught about: (a) the legal and human rights and responsibilities underpinning society” (QCA, 2000). In the KS3 Schemes of Work, Unit 3 focuses on human rights (QCA, 2001), where pupils are taught that the Human Rights Act is “underpinned by common values” (QCA, 2001, Unit 3, p. 2). What is not explained is the conceptual relationship between human rights and citizenship: for example, whether the “common values” underpinning the Human Rights Act are distinctive to citizenship in the UK context, in contrast to other nation–state settings. The curriculum guidance for teachers must be explicit in its presentation of the relationship between human rights and citizenship if teachers are to effectively communicate this to pupils.

The “participatory” conception

“Active participation” is the most central conception of citizenship in the Crick Advisory Group’s Final Report (QCA, 1998). In the Introduction to the Report, paragraph 1.5 is a pivotal paragraph in explicitly stating its ambitious aims:

“We aim at no less than a change in the political culture of this country ... for people to think of themselves as active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in public life ... and to extend radically to young people the best in existing traditions of community involvement and public service, and to make them individually confident in finding new forms of involvement and action among themselves.” (QCA, 1998, pp. 7-8)

The Advisory Group’s conception of citizenship is elucidated theoretically with reference to the Greek and Roman conceptions of citizenship as “involvement in public affairs” (QCA, 1998, p. 10). This political conception of active participation is also used to explain voluntary activity in that it helps to develop informed citizens, with reference to John Stuart Mill in this context. The concept of “active citizenship” is related to the three proposed strands of citizenship, social and moral responsibility, political literacy and community involvement (QCA, 1998, p. 11). The KS3 Programme of Study is divided into three subheadings, with the third sub-heading being “Developing skills of participation and responsible action” (QCA, 2000). The theme of participation is reflected in many of the units of the KS3 Schemes of Work (QCA, 2001), which I discuss below.

The stated aims of the KS3 Schemes of Work, Unit 1: “Citizenship – what’s it all about?” are that this unit introduces pupils to “key ideas that are central to developing an understanding of what active citizenship is all about” (QCA, 2001, Unit 1, p. 1). Under the theme, “what is school like?” it is expected that pupils reflect on ways they already participate in their school and communities. This is then linked to notions of democratic decision making, and an understanding of the idea of a “democratic community”.

Unit 14: “Developing skills of democratic participation” focuses on issues of decision making and representativeness in the school context. Pupils are asked to identify different ways of making decisions, and what might constitute “fair ways” of making decisions (QCA, 2001, Unit 14, p. 3). The idea of pupils’ voices being heard on school issues is considered and compared with decision-making processes in the wider societal context. In the introduction to the unit, it states that “Pupils explore ... how to ensure representation for diverse groups within society” (QCA, 2001, Unit 14, p. 1). However, in the section “Where the unit fits in”, where it relates the Schemes of Work to the relevant components of the Programme of Study, it does not include 1b “the diversity of national, regional, religious, and ethnic identities in the United Kingdom”. The issue of diversity of representation is presented as a straightforward issue, in terms of developing skills of listening, communication and organisation (QCA, 2001, Unit 14).

The focus of Unit 18: “Developing your school grounds” is on the practicalities and skills of pupils’ “planning, devising and implementing ways” (QCA, 2001, Unit 18, p. 1) to make improvements in their school. Under the theme, “How can you meet the needs of people using the school grounds?”, it is positive that there is reference to “the diversity of religious and ethnic identities within the school”. However, this is only considered in relation to “thinking how this can be reflected in the features and usage of the school grounds” (QCA, 2001, Unit 18, p. 5). Although it is positive that the curriculum is promoting sensitivity to the needs of others, this is not the same as ensuring that there are mechanisms to enable those “others” (e.g. those with special needs) to participate so that they themselves are empowered to bring about change, and “speak” for themselves.

The Crick Report makes an explicit link between participation and democracy, evident from the title of the report, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (QCA, 1998). The terms of reference for the Crick Group, set out by David Blunkett, then Secretary of State for Education and Employment, explicitly focused on education for citizenship to include “the nature and practices of participation in democracy” (QCA, 1998, p. 4).

Whilst the tone of the Crick Report reflects the perception that there is a direct link between citizenship education and upholding democracy, other interviewees were more tentative about presenting this as an explicit aim of citizenship education. Crick, especially, in his academic writings, has warned against the ideological and non-political usage of the term “democracy” (Crick, 2002). He has argued that politics must be “defended” from democracy, warning that “if taken alone and as a matter of principles, it is the destruction of politics” (Crick, 2000, p. 56). This is because Crick defines politics as an activity involving negotiation between different interests within a political community; this diversity must not be compromised by democracy turning “harmony into mere unison”, reducing “a theme to a single beat” (p. 73). There is typically a lack of conceptual clarity when talking about democracy, with it often being conflated with the concepts of liberty, individualism and equality (Crick, 2000). This conceptual confusion is

evident in the KS3 Schemes of Work, where, for example, in Unit 1, democracy is predominantly defined in terms of equality (QCA, 2001, Unit 1, p. 5).

There is an examination of unequal power relations in relation to democracy in Unit 12: “Why did women and some men have to struggle for the vote in Britain? What is the point of voting today?” (QCA, 2001, Unit 12) However, the approach used indicates what I call a “pedagogy of acceptance” approach with pupils being expected to engage with these issues in terms of “identifying” and “discussing”, rather than in terms of developing participative skills in relation to these issues.

-----> **Legal conceptions: the implications for diversity**

A human rights approach to citizenship is essentially a legal conception, based on a modern liberal idea of the state and citizenship, emerging with doctrines of state sovereignty and individuals conceptualised as being “free and equal” with natural rights (Held, 1993). The focus of a human rights approach is on the idea of the state protecting individuals, a tradition which can be traced back to Hobbes and Locke (Held, 1993). In the introduction I refer to the case of France as an exemplification of a definition of citizenship which centres on a universalist conception with the premise that everyone is equal regardless of ethnicity, religion or gender. As such, it does not recognise difference (Kiwan and Kiwan, 2005). Citizenship education has always been at the heart of the French Republican education project, with the aims of citizenship education being to integrate the diverse population of France into a homogenising and common culture, based on the values of the Revolution: *liberté, égalité, fraternité* (Osler and Starkey, 2001). Since the 1980s there has been an increased emphasis on human rights with citizenship education (Starkey, 2000).

Although this universal and legalistic approach to citizenship, which is based on an abstract notion of equality, might be well intentioned, in reality it does not engage with issues of structural disadvantage (Kiwan and Kiwan, 2005). Instead of school being a shelter from societies’ social injustices, students perceive that it is school itself that creates these injustices (Dubet and Martuccelli, 1996). As a consequence, students are unlikely to be motivated to take part as active citizens within the school community if they perceive it to be a factor contributing to their marginalisation (Barrère and Martuccelli, 1998). I argue that human rights as a universal legalistic approach can not adequately take into account ethnic and religious diversity and may be ineffective in the empowerment and active participation of citizens because such approaches do not engage with the issue of the differential motivations to participate. I further propose that identity may be a key influence in promoting active participation. This is discussed and developed in a subsequent section of this paper, where I propose an inclusive model of active citizenship.

-----> **Participatory conceptions: the implications for diversity**

The Crick Report, in highlighting the important role of education in promoting active participation, implicitly relies on what Pattie, Seyd and Whiteley (2004) call a choice-based approach to understanding political participation, and in particular “cognitive engagement theory”, which hypothesises that participation depends on access to information and willingness to act on that information,

rather than socialising to certain norms and values. However, a weakness of cognitive engagement theory is that it does not address what motivates people to participate.

I argue, however, that understanding what motivates people to participate is crucial to developing an inclusive conception of citizenship (Kiwan, 2007). Pattie, Seyd and Whiteley (2004) refer to “general incentives” theory – a synthesis of rational choice and social-psychological accounts of participation, where the argument is that actors need incentives to participate. I propose that what is not sufficiently addressed in a participatory conception of citizenship is the question of whether a focus on active participation without a concomitant focus on people’s diversity of identities can achieve an inclusive empowerment of all types of young people. Osler and Starkey’s (2005) definition of citizenship as “a status, a feeling and a practice” is useful to draw upon in this regard, where citizenship as “feeling” refers to a sense of belonging to the larger community. In order to be motivated to participate (citizenship as “practice”), one must be able to identify with, or feel a sense of belonging to, the larger community. This suggests that citizenship as “feeling” and citizenship as “practice” are inextricably linked, and are mutually enhancing. Indeed, Osler and Starkey (2005) cite research evidence that participation can enhance motivation. Citizenship education must therefore logically incorporate what Pattie, Seyd and Whiteley (2004) call the “general incentives” aspect explicitly in its participatory conception of citizenship.

The focus of the Crick Report and subsequent Programmes of Study and Schemes of Work on the accessibility to information and developing participatory skills is certainly necessary, but it is not sufficient, as it does not address what enables or motivates different groups and individuals to participate. Drawing on the example of citizenship education in the French educational system, by not explicitly challenging and instead merely learning about issues of structural disadvantage (Kiwan and Kiwan, 2005), and how this may be related to ethnic and religious identity,⁵ citizenship education may fail to achieve a more substantive participation of young people of different ethnic and religious identities.

-----> **Developing an inclusive participatory model of citizenship**

In this section, I propose an inclusive model of citizenship, by drawing both on my empirical data, and by developing certain relevant themes raised in the politico-philosophical literature on citizenship (Kiwan, 2007).⁶ This model consists of two main components – firstly, I propose the concept of “institutional” multiculturalism, constituted as a process. Secondly, I propose that citizenship education must redirect its emphasis to the citizen–state relationship, relative to the emphasis on the relationship between individuals and groups from different backgrounds and cultures which is the predominant focus of “interculturalism” (Gundara, 2003; Kymlicka, 2003).

“Institutional multiculturalism”

Implicit within the different conceptions of citizenship are different perceptions of the aims of citizenship education. In theoretical and practical terms, there may be inherent tensions between the different aims of citizenship education. For example, maintaining democracy may emphasise the neutrality of the public sphere, in contrast to the aim of promoting equality and diversity, which emphasises the inclusiveness of the public sphere (Modood, 2005). These aims

need not necessarily be in tension, yet the use of terms such as “maintaining” and “upholding” in conjunction with democracy and public political institutions suggests a “maintaining the status quo” approach, rather than being open to a truly more inclusive approach (Kiwan, 2007).

Elsewhere I have discussed how the theme of shared values was frequently referred to in the interviews (Kiwan, 2006; Kiwan, 2007). I argue that, whilst shared values are not necessarily problematic in an ethnically and religiously diverse society, what has typically been neglected is a consideration of the process by which these shared values are reached – both at societal level and at school level (Kiwan, 2007). Therefore “multiculturalism” must be operationalised, rather than merely being a term to describe a given society. Just as there has been an acknowledgement of the concept of institutional racism, I would propose that the concept of “institutional multiculturalism” is a means to go beyond the problem that multiculturalism is generally perceived to be about and for “minorities”. Rather, it must be a proactive process, with outcomes not only at the level of the individual, but at the level of society itself.

Although diversity is inherent to Crick’s conceptualisation of a participatory politics as he conceives of politics arising because of diversity, this is limited to political diversity rather than ethnic and religious diversity. For an inclusive model of citizenship in a multicultural society like the UK, I propose that a model of “institutional multiculturalism” must supplement the “participatory” model of citizenship advocated in the Crick Report (QCA, 1998). Whilst human rights are an important component of citizenship, theoretically they can not underpin citizenship (Kiwan, 2005). Similarly, whilst political knowledge and skills are important for citizenship, a “participatory” model alone is not sufficient for a model of active citizenship in a multicultural society. Such models do not address the impact of differential power between groups, which can lead to a lack of motivation to participate for those historically marginalised groups. Unless more inclusive models are developed, citizenship education will fail to achieve a more substantive participation of young people of different ethnic and religious backgrounds (Kiwan, 2007).

-----> **Focusing on the citizen–state relationship**

In the Crick Report, citizenship is framed implicitly in terms of a civic identity or a political national identity (QCA, 1998). The Crick Report consultations reported that there was a perception that European and global citizenship had been relatively neglected (QCA, 1998). Indeed, we are witnessing simultaneous strengthening of identification both above and below the national level, with decreased identification at the national level (Hall, 1992). In contrast, the KS3 Schemes of Work provide teachers with examples to illustrate the relationship between local and global levels of citizenship (QCA, 2001), with relatively less of a focus at the national level. Demaine (2002) has argued that whilst it is important to develop understandings of the local and international levels, there must be a recognition that individuals operate from within the legal and political structures of the nation–state. I argue that elucidating the relationship between the local and national levels, and the national and international levels, must not be neglected and indeed be prioritised.

It has been has argued that intercultural education’s focus on developing individuals’ attitudes and skills for living in an ethnically and religiously diverse

context does not however advocate which groups, or what level (local, national, or global), should be the priority (Kymlicka, 2003). From the term “intercultural” education itself, it can be seen that the emphasis is on engagement and dialogue between cultures. The emphasis is directed towards personal self-development relative to a more “political” education examining more explicitly the relationship between the citizen and the state (Wylie, 2004).

It is clearly important to develop reasonably good individual relationships between citizens so that inter-group conflict does not arise. However, Spinner-Halev (2003) suggests that the relationship between citizen and state – what he calls the “vertical” relationship – be cultivated, as he argues so that identity and belonging can be inculcated through developing identification with the state, rather than primarily developing good individual relations between citizens. This may be more appropriate especially in the case of divided societies such as Northern Ireland and Israel (Spinner-Halev, 2003; Wylie, 2004), where it is more realistic to develop a strong vertical relationship between the citizens and state, whilst accepting that horizontal relations between individuals of different groups show tolerance and a level of acceptance, rather than expecting to develop strong horizontal relations between individuals of different groups. In the final section, I suggest some implications for policy, curriculum and pedagogic practice.

-----> **Implications for policy and practice**

At the level of public policy, mechanisms to achieve institutional multiculturalism need to be developed. There is a growing awareness of the need to address religion in the context of the public sphere. Modood (2005) has proposed that a moderately, rather than a radically, secular state is the most appropriate in terms of claims of recognition by different religious groups. Building on this, I propose that an “inclusive citizenship” policy task force could consider how to incorporate the “moderately” and “culturally” religious into the public political sphere. This may foster the development of a sustainable process of shared political values, as well as provide role models for young people (Kiwan, 2007).

With regard to educational policy, it is important to ensure that there is an ethnically and religiously diverse staff to represent a diverse student population. This would ensure that pupils come into contact with a variety of ideas and beliefs as part of their personal development (Johnson, 2003), and it may also provide a source of motivation to participate for pupils through providing role models from a range of different backgrounds. Given my proposals regarding the need to focus on the vertical relationship between citizen and state, I suggest the introduction of schemes linking the local and the national. For example, this could involve linking schools in different parts of the country, and also between England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

At the level of curriculum, it is important that pupils develop clear conceptual understanding in this domain. For example, in the KS3 Schemes of Work, this might entail an explicit examination of the relationship between a range of related concepts, such as immigrants, refugees, asylum seekers, citizenship, human rights, and democracy. Multiculturalism should be operationalised in the curriculum and addressed explicitly in the public political sphere. In addition, I propose that this be in terms of an inclusive and participative process.

Finally, with regard to pedagogy, I have argued that a “pedagogy of acceptance” must be avoided, an approach that was evident in the KS3 Programmes of Study and KS3 Schemes of Work (QCA, 2000; QCA, 2001). Rather than merely “learning about” or even critiquing the status quo, it is important that teachers are explicit that multiculturalism is not “culturally agnostic” (Kalantzis and Cope, 1999, p. 262). Such a pedagogy advocates that pupils learn discourses of power in order to facilitate political access.

-----> References

Alderson, P. (2000) Citizenship in theory and practice: being or becoming citizens with rights. In Lawton, D., Cairns, J. and Gardner, R. (eds) *Education for Citizenship*. London, Continuum, pp. 114-135.

Barrère, A. and Martuccelli, D. (1998) La Citoyenneté à l'école: vers la définition d'une problématique sociologique. In *Revue française de Sociologie*, 39 (4), pp. 651-671, cited in Kiwan, D. and Kiwan, N. (2005) Citizenship education: the French and English experience. In Pole, C., Pilcher, J. and Williams, J. (eds) *Young People in Transition: Becoming Citizens*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 136-158.

Batho, G. (1990) The history of the teaching of civics and citizenship in English schools. *The Curriculum Journal*, 1 (1), pp. 91-100.

Brubaker, R. (1998) Immigration, citizenship and nation-state in France and Germany. In Shafir, G. (ed.) *The Citizenship Debates*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, pp. 131-164.

Crick, B. (2000) *In Defence of Politics*. 5th edn, London and New York, Continuum.

Crick, B. (2002) *Democracy: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Delanty, G. (2000) *Citizenship in a Global Age*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Delanty, G. (2003) *Community*. London and New York, Routledge.

Demaine, J. (2002) Globalisation and citizenship education. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 12 (2), pp. 117-128.

Dubet, F. and Martuccelli, D. (1996) *A l'École: sociologie de l'expérience scolaire*. Paris, Seuil, cited in Kiwan, D. and Kiwan, N. (2005) Citizenship education: the French and English experience. in Pole, C., Pilcher, J. and Williams, J. (eds) *Young People in Transition: Becoming Citizens*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 136-158.

Fogelman, K. (1997) Education for democratic citizenship in schools. in Bridges, D. (ed.) *Education, Autonomy and Democratic Citizenship*. London, Routledge.

Gundara, J. S. (2003) *Intercultural education: world on the brink?* Professorial lecture. London, Institute of Education, University of London.

Hall, S. (1992) The question of cultural identity. in Hall, S., Held, D. and McGrew, T. (eds) *Modernity and its Futures*. Milton Keynes, Open University, pp. 274-316.

Heater, D. (1990) *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education*. London, Longman.

Held, D. (1993) *Political Theory and the Modern State*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Home Office (2001) *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team (Cantle Report)*. London, Home Office.

Johnson, L. S. (2003) The diversity imperative: building a culturally responsive school ethos. *Intercultural Education*, 14 (1), pp. 17-29.

- Kalantzis, M. and Cope, B. (1999) Multicultural Education: Transforming the Mainstream. in May, S. (ed.) *Critical Multiculturalism: Rethinking Multicultural and Anti-racist Education*. London, Falmer Press.
- Kiwan, D. (2005) Human rights and citizenship: an unjustifiable conflation? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 39 (1), pp. 37-50.
- Kiwan, D. (2006) An inclusive citizenship? Conceptions of citizenship in the citizenship education policymaking process in England. PhD Thesis, University of London.
- Kiwan, D. (2007) Developing a model of inclusive citizenship: 'institutional multiculturalism' and the citizen-state relationship. *Theory and Research in Education*, forthcoming.
- Kiwan D. and Kiwan, N. (2005) Citizenship education: the French and English experience. in Pole, C., Pilcher, J. and Williams, J. (eds) *Young People in Transition: Becoming Citizens*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 136-158.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2003) Multicultural states and intercultural citizens. *Theory and Research in Education*, 1 (2), pp. 147-169.
- Lawton, D. (2000) Overview: citizenship education in context. in Lawton, D., Cairns, J. and Gardner, R. (eds) *Education for Citizenship*. London, Continuum.
- Macpherson, W. (1999) The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry: Report of an Inquiry by Sir William Macpherson of Cluny. London, HMSO.
- Modood, T. (2005) *Multicultural Politics: Racism, Ethnicity and Muslims in Britain*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Mulhall, S. and Swift, A. (1994) *Liberals and Communitarians*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Osler, A. (1999) Citizenship, democracy and political literacy. *Multicultural Teaching*, 18 (1), pp. 12-15.
- Osler, A. (2000) The Crick Report: difference, equality and racial justice. *The Curriculum Journal*, 11 (1), pp. 25-327.
- Osler, A. and H. Starkey, H. (2001) Citizenship education and national identities in France and England: inclusive or exclusive? *Oxford Review of Education*, 27 (2), pp. 287-305.
- Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2005) *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education*. Maidenhead, Open University Press.
- Parekh, B. (2000) *Rethinking Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke and London, MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Pattie, C., Seyd, P. and Whiteley, P. (2004) *Citizenship in Britain: Values, Participation and Democracy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (1998) *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools*. London, QCA. (Crick Report).
- QCA (2000) *Programmes of Study*. [cited 20 October 2000] <http://www.nc.uk.net/>

QCA (2001) *Schemes of Work*. [cited 7 September 2001] <<http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/local/schemes/citizenship/schemes.html>>

Spinner-Halev, J. (2003) Education, reconciliation and nested identities. *Theory and Research in Education*, 1 (1), pp. 51-72.

Starkey, H. (2000) Citizenship education in France and Britain: evolving theories and practice. *The Curriculum Journal*, 11 (1), pp. 39-54.

Williams, J. (2002) Introduction, in Section 1: The ideal of global citizenship. in Dower, N. and Williams, J. (eds) *Global Citizenship: A Critical Reader*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, pp. 11-14.

Wylie, K. (2004) Citizenship, identity and social inclusion: lessons from Northern Ireland. *European Journal of Education*, 39 (2), pp. 237-248.

-----> Endnotes

1. This term is used by Delanty (2000), which he further categorises under the four sub-headings: “internationalism”, “globalisation”, “transnationalism”, “post-nationalism”. Whilst he does not refer to conceptions of citizenship, such as “sexual” citizenship and “diasporic” citizenship, I am using the term “cosmopolitan” citizenship to also cover these terms, as I would propose that they could be conceptualised as coming under the sub-heading “post-nationalism”.
2. KS3 refers to the school age range of 11 to 14 years old, with Programmes of Study outlining expected learning outcomes, and the Schemes of Work providing fuller guidance materials for teachers.
3. My choice of analysing KS3 curriculum documentation is primarily a means for examining and illustrating conceptions of citizenship, the theoretical implications for diversity and the relationship to key policy documentation (QCA, 1998), as opposed to the focus being on KS3 per se.
4. In contrast, interviewees also referred to “underplayed” conceptions of citizenship, supported by my analysis of key policy and curriculum documentation (QCA, 1998; QCA, 2000; QCA, 2001). Elsewhere I refer to this cluster of conceptualisations as “identity-based conceptions”, as they are inherently concerned with “identity”, or forms of identification at different levels. These include national, European, and global framings of citizenship, as well as citizenship presented as a framework for anti-racist education, and finally, “multicultural” citizenship (Kiwani, 2006).
5. As well as gender and social class.
6. For a full elaboration of this argument, please refer to D. Kiwan, Developing a model of inclusive citizenship: “institutional multiculturalism” and the “citizen-state relationship”. *Theory and Research in Education*, forthcoming.