

Human Rights and Citizenship Education

Human Rights and Citizenship Education:

An Intercultural Perspective

Edited by

Nektaria Palaiologou
and Michalinos Zembylas

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Human Rights and Citizenship Education:
An Intercultural Perspective

Edited by Nektaria Palaiologou and Michalinos Zembylas

This book first published 2018

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

Copyright © 2018 by Nektaria Palaiologou and Michalinos Zembylas
and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without
the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-1645-8

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-1645-8

To my beloved parents Yiouli and Efstathios

Nektaria

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	x
Introduction	1
Human Rights Education and Citizenship Education: An Intercultural Perspective Nektaria Palaiologou and Michalinos Zembylas	
Part One: Human Rights Education	
Chapter One.....	12
Human Rights Education and Critical Pedagogy for Marginalized Youth. <i>Monisha Bajaj, Melissa Canlas and Amy Argenal</i>	
Chapter Two.....	29
Rights, Regulation and Recognition: Studying Student Leaders' Experiences of Participation and Citizenship within a South African University <i>André Keet and Willy Nel</i>	
Chapter Three.....	58
Building Intercultural Understanding of Human Rights Through the Body: An East Asian Response <i>Ruyu Hung</i>	
Chapter Four.....	73
Human Rights Through the Eyes of Greek-Cypriot Teachers: The 'Interplay' Between Transnational Discourses and Ethno-National Demands <i>Michalinos Zembylas, Constadina Charalambous, Panayiota Charalambous and Stalo Lesta</i>	
Chapter Five.....	91
Principles for Building Human Rights-Infused Intercultural Competencies <i>Felisa Tibbitts</i>	

Chapter Six.....	118
The Limits of Human Rights in the Educational Battle against Violent Extremist Voices: A Case Study <i>Barry van Driel and Miguel Prata Gomes</i>	
Chapter Seven.....	131
Competences for Democratic Culture: A New Education Initiative by the Council of Europe <i>Martyn Barrett</i>	
Part Two: Citizenship Education	
Chapter Eight.....	144
The Challenge of Migration and Europeanisation: A Comparison of Citizenship Education in England, Germany, Greece and Ireland <i>Daniel Faas</i>	
Chapter Nine.....	155
School Learning Architecture for Active Citizenship and Social Justice Based on Organisational Meaningfulness <i>Despoina Karakatsani and Evangelia Papaloi</i>	
Chapter Ten.....	180
Different Ministers, Different Curricula: Socio-political Changes in Israel and their Impact on Citizenship Education <i>Halleli Pinson and Nir Koren</i>	
Chapter Eleven.....	200
Re-forming the Curriculum Towards a ‘Democratic Socially Responsible Citizen’ in Greek-Cypriot Education: At the Nexus of European and Intercultural Education Discourses <i>Stavroulla Philippou and Eleni Theodorou</i>	
Chapter Twelve.....	224
Intercultural and Citizenship Education: Engaging with Certainties and Uncertainties <i>Leslie Bash</i>	

Chapter Thirteen.....	237
Citizenship Education from an Intercultural Perspective: Theories, Approaches and Practices in the Italian context <i>Marco Catarci</i>	
Chapter Fourteen.....	258
Citizenship Issues and Leadership in Education <i>Fred Carlo Andersen</i>	
Epilogue.....	280
Continuing the Exploration of the Intersection between Intercultural, Human Rights and Citizenship Education <i>Michalinos Zembylas and Nektaria Palaiologou</i>	
Appendix I.....	284
Useful Sources	
Appendix II.....	287
About the Authors	

PREFACE

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION, HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION AND INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

MARTYN BARRETT

The contemporary world appears to be undergoing unprecedented levels of political and social change. Whether the rate of change is actually greater than that experienced in all other historical periods is a moot point, but it is certainly the case that, over the past 25 years, globalisation and migration have fundamentally altered the nature of the societies in which we live, particularly in terms of their cultural diversity. Given the extraordinary flows of migrants and refugees across the world that are being generated by a variety of highly complex factors, it is clear that this diversity is here to stay. However, at the same time, cultural diversity places enormous strains on societies that are labouring under economic hardship and austerity, with intolerance, prejudice, stereotyping, discrimination and scapegoating towards minority ethnic and religious groups being all too common phenomena.

The presence of hostile attitudes towards migrant and minority groups poses a serious threat to the stability, security and well-being of our societies. These attitudes raise important questions concerning the most appropriate policy approaches that should be adopted for managing cultural diversity in order to achieve more cohesive and inclusive societies. Many sectors have an important role to play in this regard, but the education sector, and the policymakers and practitioners who work within this sector, have an especially crucial role to play. This is because education—particularly citizenship education—is key for combating intolerance, breaking down stereotypes, developing mutual understanding and trust, and fostering the values and competences that are needed for living peacefully together in culturally diverse societies.

In order to promote tolerance, mutual understanding and trust, it is vital that citizenship education encourages students to appreciate that all

human beings are of equal worth, have equal dignity, are entitled to equal respect, and are entitled to exactly the same set of human rights and fundamental freedoms. In other words, human rights provide the necessary value foundation upon which tolerance, understanding and trust have to be built. Citizenship education therefore requires, as an essential complement, human rights education.

In addition, citizenship education needs to foster openness to, sensitivity towards, curiosity about and willingness to engage with other people and other cultural perspectives. Mutual understanding cannot be achieved in the absence of intercultural openness—without it, students will fail to appreciate the lifestyles, perspectives and world views of other people, and will instead develop stereotypical perceptions which are likely to lead to suspicion, prejudice, intolerance and discrimination. As suggested by the title of the current book, human rights education and citizenship education are inherently interlinked, and both need to be harnessed to an intercultural perspective.

The challenges here for teachers are enormous, and they carry a significant burden in relation to the future of the societies in which they are living and working. As such, teachers need strong institutional support to enable them to fulfil their responsibilities. Teacher training institutions must train future teachers and support existing teachers in an appropriate manner. This is not simply a matter of transmitting knowledge to them. Rather, it involves developing teachers' competences in such a way that they possess the necessary values, attitudes and skills to implement a culture of respect, tolerance and intercultural understanding within their classrooms and in their schools more generally, and to foster tolerance, understanding and respect in their students. Among other things, this involves equipping teachers with the competences needed to review curricula and teaching materials, to employ appropriate experiential and cooperative learning methods, to provide opportunities for active participation by students both within their schools and their wider communities, to create inclusive school environments, and to ensure that citizenship, human rights and intercultural objectives are effectively embedded in both the ethos and the formal institutional missions of their schools. Teacher training institutions have a vital responsibility for equipping teachers in a suitable manner for all of these tasks.

In assembling the current book, Nektaria Palaiologou and Michalinos Zembylas are to be congratulated in compiling such an important and impressive collection of chapters. I very much hope that the present book will be just the first step in forging strong and indissoluble bonds between citizenship education, human rights education and intercultural education.

I welcome the contribution that is made by the book, and I strongly recommend it to everyone who is concerned with the challenges currently facing the culturally diverse societies in which we all live.

Martyn Barrett
London, June 2018

INTRODUCTION

HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: INTERCULTURAL PERSPECTIVES IN AN INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

NEKTARIA PALAIOLOGOU
AND MICHALINOS ZEMBYLAS

“I am a citizen of the world [kosmopolitês]” (Diogenes Laertius VI 63)

The first philosopher in the West to give an explicit expression to cosmopolitanism was the Cynic Diogenes in the fourth century BCE. When Diogenes was asked where he came from, inspired by Socrates, he replied¹, “I am a citizen of the world [kosmopolitês]” (Diogenes Laertius VI 63).

In contemporary times, citizenship issues are at the forefront of the political agenda for many countries around the world. This is because citizenship is associated either explicitly or implicitly with a series of high priority issues such as displacement, poverty, human rights, immigration, refugeedom, and security.

In 2018 in Buenos Aires, the thirteenth meeting of Group of Twenty (G20) leaders worldwide will be held. It will be the first G20 Summit to be hosted in South America. At the previous G20 summit, which took place in July 2017 in Hamburg, Germany, the leaders of the world promised² “to tackle common challenges to the global community, including terrorism,

¹ Note: Any cosmopolitan expectations of a good Athenian extended only to concern for those foreigners who happen to reside in Athens. Source: Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy entry on "Cosmopolitanism"

plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/ (accessed on 16th April 2018)

² <https://g20.org/en/calendar> (accessed on 4th June 2018)

displacement, poverty, hunger and health threats, job creation, climate change, energy security, and inequality including gender inequality, as a basis for sustainable development and stability.”

In these challenging times, the role of modern Paideia gives prominence to human rights and citizenship education, which on the one hand, will empower students to realize the value of acknowledging and respecting one another’s rights, no matter what the perceived ethnic, religious or other similarities or differences are. On the other hand, human rights and citizenship education will inspire students to acquire a global, cosmopolitan view, to become global citizens, to build an *intercultural persona*³ (Palaiologou and Dietz 2012).

According to UNHCR statistics (December 2017) there were 5,437,603 registered refugees from Syria alone, spread out across multiple countries. The majority were residing in Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan. Half of them were under the age of 18. Based on these UNHCR statistics, the number of people forcibly displaced from their homes across the globe is presently the highest since World War II. Although the number of refugees and asylum seekers arriving in Europe has decreased since its apex in 2015, numbers are still high. In 2016, 1.2 million people applied for asylum in the EU. Not surprisingly, this number of refugees and asylum seekers creates major challenges for education authorities across Europe. For instance, Germany has been faced with the integration of some 400,000 refugee children since 2015. Similarly Greece has faced the challenge of integrating several thousand refugee children into mainstream schools.

The aforementioned situation makes us realize that citizenship education nowadays is more important than ever before, as it is called on to help meet the needs of communities and governments at regional and national levels by promoting the values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination (EC, 2015).

As editors of this volume, we are highly appreciative of the contributions from our international colleagues included in this volume, offering diverse perspectives from different continents.

We are also grateful to our colleague Martyn Barrett for his preface and for his contribution which refers to the New Education Initiative on Citizenship Education by the Council of Europe. This is a flagship project entitled “Competences for Democratic Culture” for the Council of

³ Palaiologou, N., Dietz, G. 2012. Mapping the Broad Field of Multicultural and Intercultural Education Worldwide: Towards the construction of the new citizen. CSP. Cambridge.

Europe⁴, producing a new European reference framework of the competences that young people require to participate effectively in democratic culture.

The European Commission has initiated a series of publications as official reports about Citizenship Education,⁵ with the latest one published in October 2017. According to this report (2017: 3) “Citizenship education is education in a subject area which aims to promote harmonious co-existence and foster the mutually beneficial development of individuals and the communities in which they live. In democratic societies, citizenship education supports students in becoming active, informed and responsible citizens, who are willing and able to take responsibility for themselves and for their communities at the national, European and international level”.

Having as a priority in its agenda the Paris Declaration and the Key Competences Framework (2006) the EU has expressed its commitment to citizenship education through a number of policy initiatives which are mentioned as sources in the Appendix.

It is also important to acknowledge the contribution of the European Commission, Education and Training 2020 Working Group on *Promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education*⁶. The Working Group’s mandate of promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education is to provide a forum for exchange of key policy issues falling under the scope of the Paris Declaration (March 2015). Its main policy priorities are the four pillars of the Paris Declaration:

- Enhancing critical thinking and media literacy to develop resistance to all forms of discrimination and indoctrination
- Ensuring that children and young people acquire social and civic competences

⁴ For further information, please see www.coe.int/competences

⁵ This Eurydice brief report presents the main findings of the Eurydice report *Citizenship Education at School in Europe – 2017*, published in October 2017 and produced under the auspices of the European Commission. Data is based on existing regulations and recommendations gathered by the Eurydice Network in 42 education systems, complemented by findings from the academic literature and by interviews with relevant actors at national level

<https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/83c330f0-c847-11e7-9b01-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-search>

⁶ https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/expert-groups/citizenship-common-values_en (accessed on 1st June 2018)

- Fostering the education of disadvantaged children and young people and combating discrimination
- Promoting intercultural understanding through all forms of learning

The Working Group on *Promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education* is composed of government representatives from 36 countries, including EU Member States, Iceland, Norway, Switzerland, Albania, Serbia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Turkey as well as representatives of European social partners, stakeholder associations and international organisations. It started in February 2016 and its work will be extended until 2020. The group supports Member States in identifying and implementing measures to pursue the national level objectives of the Declaration through peer-learning and the exchange of good practices. The work of this group is closely coordinated with the other ET 2020 working groups, contributing also to the follow-up to the Paris Declaration within their respective areas of competences. Moreover, this working group explores synergies in the priorities and work of international organisations, such as Council of Europe and UNESCO.

The Working Group outputs, which have just been delivered in June 2018, address amongst others the following main areas:

- Promoting civic, intercultural, and social competences, mutual understanding and respect, and ownership of democratic values and fundamental rights at all levels of education and training (Priority Area 2.iv).
- Tackling discrimination, racism, segregation, bullying (including cyber-bullying), violence and stereotypes (Priority Area 2.i).
- Addressing the increasing diversity of learners and enhancing access to good quality and inclusive mainstream education and training for all learners, including disadvantaged groups, such as learners with special needs, newly arrived migrants (N.A.M.), people with a migrant background and Roma (Priority Area 2.i).
- Fostering cooperation by stimulating engagement of learners, educators, parents and the broader local community such as civil society groups, social partners and business (Priority Area 3.ii).

We refer to these reports and policy initiatives at the European level because they provide important sources for reflecting on the ongoing challenges and opportunities in considering issues of citizenship and

human rights across the world. The contributions of this edited volume also address many of these challenges and opportunities, thus having much to offer to ongoing debates in Europe about best practices and policies around issues of citizenship⁷ and human rights in education (Banks 2017).

The volume is divided into two parts: the first one focuses on contributions that shed light on human rights education, while the second part addresses citizenship education. This division is not absolute, of course, but it is offered for heuristic purposes, although, as will become obvious, the issues of citizenship, human rights and interculturalism are often entangled and the boundaries among them are not always clear.

The first chapter is entitled “Human Rights Education and Critical Pedagogy for Marginalized Youth” by Monisha Bajaj, Melissa Canlas, and Amy Argenal. The authors argue that the co-curricular space is an important site for authentic and transformative human rights education, particularly in diverse and intercultural contexts. The authors draw from 9 months of data from a human rights education program they run after-school with immigrant and refugee youth in an urban center in the United States. The chapter focuses on two dimensions of the co-curricular space, namely flexibility and the primacy of relationships, as approaches that facilitate critical pedagogy, an essential feature of “transformative” or “critical” human rights education. The authors review key components of the human rights club including its design, participants, and curriculum, as well as the relational dimensions of the researchers’ engagement with the school and the students. The chapter ends with a discussion of the possibilities and limits of the co-curricular approach in human rights education globally as well as recommendations for further research.

In chapter two, titled “Rights, Regulation and Recognition: Studying Student Leaders’ Experiences of Participation and Citizenship within a South African University”, André Keet and Willy Nel present an interesting study which focuses on the experiences of South African university student leaders as members of the student representative council (SRC) during transformation processes taking place at the university. The

⁷ These challenges, the ongoing debate about citizenship education in times of global migration is reflected within James Banks’ recent edited book (2017) which is a valuable source of information to the readership, including chapters that describe the problems that 18 nations around the world are experiencing today trying to create and implement effective civic education programs for students from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups and case studies of effective ways that teachers and other educators are working to resolve these problems.

authors emphasise the importance of participation linked to student politics and the democratisation of university governance.

In chapter three, an East Asian perspective and approach is offered by Ruyu Hung entitled “Building Intercultural Understanding of Human Rights Through the Body: An East Asian Response”, where the author elaborates on the value of human dignity as a significant approach to the concept of human rights, which, to his view, could be shared by the Western and Eastern Traditions. The “living body,” as the author calls it, is more appropriate than the thinking self for teaching and learning about human rights.

Michalinos Zembylas together with Constadina Charalambous, Panayiota Charalambous and Stalo Lesta in chapter four entitled “Human Rights Through the Eyes of Greek-Cypriot Teachers: The ‘Interplay’ Between Transnational Discourses and Ethno-National Demands” examine the interplay between transnational discourses of human rights and the particularities of local conceptualisations of human rights within the context of a conflict-affected society: ethnically-divided Cyprus. This interplay is examined through a qualitative study of primary school teachers’ understandings of human rights and human rights teaching in Greek-Cypriot schools, focusing on the tensions that seem to arise between transnational and local discourses of human rights, when the latter discourses are influenced by ethno-nationalist perspectives. An exploration of this interplay has the potential to make a contribution to research and practice in human rights education, because it reveals the macro- and micro-influences that shape the localization of human rights discourses within a conflict-affected setting. At the same time, this chapter examines the extent to which human rights teaching is re-framed and nationalized as a result of being appropriated by nation-state ideologies.

Felisa Tibbitts’ contribution in chapter five, entitled “Guidelines and Rights-Based Programming: Principles for Building Human Rights Infused Intercultural Competencies,” is a conceptual piece that has been suggested to UNESCO to extend their 2013 framework on intercultural competencies to encompass a human rights-based approach. .

Are there any “Limits of Human Rights in the Educational Battle against Violent Extremist Voices?” This is the question which Barry van Driel and Miguel Prata Gomes pose in chapter six, where the authors describe their efforts to show video clips and films about human rights in the Anne Frank House. The main aim of their intervention was for students (mostly 13-16 years of age) to understand the importance of human rights in their own lives and in their communities, but to also think where certain rights might clash with each other, or with democratic

values. This was intended to allow students to reflect on the possible boundaries of freedoms we often take for granted, and the restrictions some have to live with. Their analysis shows the complexities in participants' responses and discusses the implications of such interventions for addressing issues of extremism and radicalization in the classroom and beyond.

Finally, the last contribution in Part I, chapter seven, is entitled "Competences for Democratic Culture: A New Education Initiative by the Council of Europe" by Martyn Barrett. The main component of the framework is the conceptual model of the competences which students need to acquire in order to operate as interculturally competent democratic citizens. This is an important framework which highlights the necessity for education systems to give priority to developing democratic competences in their students as well as to provide teacher education and training that addresses these intercultural values.

Part II starts with chapter eight, entitled "The Challenge of Migration and Europeanisation: A Comparison of Citizenship Education in England, Germany, Greece and Ireland" by Daniel Faas. This chapter examines how cultural diversity and Europe are intertwined in citizenship education curricula in England, Germany, Greece and Ireland (Faas 2011). This question is explored through a case study of curriculum content of compulsory schooling in all four countries. Curriculum analyses have hitherto largely focused on either national and European dimensions or multicultural and global dimensions. The study provides new insights into how these dimensions intersect and their combined effect on citizenship education in European societies.

"School Learning Architecture for Active Citizenship and Social Justice Based on Organisational Meaningfulness" is chapter nine, a joint contribution by Despoina Karakatsani and Evangelia Papaloi. This chapter discusses the concept of active citizenship and the connection to participation by investing in the notion of organisational meaningfulness in educational communities. The first part of the chapter focuses on the role of secondary education in promoting active citizenship through participation, especially through the role of school councils and school rules. Furthermore, the main axes of European policy regarding democratic education are analysed, while the impact of participation on students' perception of citizenship is underlined. In the second part of the chapter, the authors depict a model of school learning architecture which contributes to students' achievements and the cultivation of civic attitudes, placing schools in a direct dialectic relationship with society's demands and prosperity. More specifically, organisational meaningfulness is

analyzed as a key-concept which connects organisational practices, strategies and behaviours of all actors involved with transformative leadership for social justice.

Chapter ten, entitled “Different Ministers, Different Curricula: Socio-Political Changes in Israel and their Impact on Citizenship Education”, by Halleli Pinson and Nir Koren, focuses on the changes that took place under the leadership of two Israeli Ministers of Education who were especially invested in citizenship education: Yuli Tamir, of the Labour party, who was a Minister between 2006-2009, and her predecessor, Gidon Sa'ar, from the Likud party, who acted as a minister between 2009-2013. The chapter examines the politicization of citizenship education in Israel under these two ministers. Through the analysis of official documents, the differences between these two Ministers is explored in relation to the actions they took and the changes to citizenship education introduced under their leadership. Moreover, the authors focus on the dialectic between professionalism and politics as constructed by both ministers when justifying their actions, aiming to demonstrate how the terms “political” and “politicization” receive different meanings depending on the speaker’s position vis-à-vis the suggested change.

Chapter eleven is entitled “Re-forming the Curriculum Towards a ‘Democratic Socially Responsible Citizen’ in Greek-Cypriot Education: At the Nexus of European and Intercultural Education Discourses”, and is written by Stavroulla Philippou and Eleni Theodorou. The findings of the study the authors undertook indicate that the concept of “citizenship” has been historically associated with the promotion of European Education in the Greek-Cypriot educational system, the more recent emergence of Intercultural Education and the sedimentation of Health Education discourses. The intersection of the three creates a pathway towards the “democratic socially responsible citizen” – the ideal future citizen envisioned in the Reform in general and in Citizenship Education in particular. As this intersection enables and constrains the formation of particular types of citizens towards particular directions, the chapter concludes with a discussion of the policy and curricular challenges it produces.

“Intercultural and Citizenship Education: Engaging with Certainties and Uncertainties”, is the title of chapter twelve by Leslie Bash. As the author states, notions of citizenship, in part deriving from the European nationalist movements of the 19th century, to a large extent began to define the burgeoning nation-states of Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, and the Middle East. The framework presented in this chapter stimulates more creative thinking about developing school leaders who are in touch with

reality – a reality that is diverse in many ways, including in a linguistic and cultural sense, regardless of what certain prominent politicians may say concerning their beliefs about multiculturalism.

“Citizenship Education from an Intercultural Perspective: Theories, Approaches and Practices in the Italian context” is chapter thirteen by Marco Catarci. The author discusses, from an intercultural perspective, the approach to citizenship education which has been developed in Italy during the last decade. After referring to the roots of these practices, which are contained in the principles enshrined in the Constitution of the Italian Republic (1947), the theoretical and didactic characteristics of this approach are presented. Emphasis is given to “second generation” immigrants, who continue to be excluded from the acquisition of Italian citizenship. The author discusses the educational implications of his analysis, especially in relation to the need to develop critical citizenship education.

“School Leadership in a European Multicultural Context – A dream from Disneyland?”, by Fred Carlo Andersen, is the last chapter of the book. This chapter initiates a delineation of a framework for analyses and practices of school leadership in a linguistically and culturally diverse context, based on research and literature derived from critical theory. According to the author, school leaders within multicultural landscapes need a framework through which they can identify, describe, analyze, understand, and take action in order to contribute to ensuring that the linguistically and culturally diverse student population has access to equity and socially just education.

Closing the volume, in the Epilogue the editors discuss the intersection between intercultural education, human rights education and citizenship education. In particular, the discussion focuses on some reflections about the approach followed in the book and new challenges for the future. It is argued that these challenges provide unique opportunities to reimagine the transformative potential of the intersection among intercultural, citizenship and human rights education in different situations and contexts.

Nektaria Palaiologou, University of Western Macedonia, Greece
and International Association of Intercultural Education (IAIE)
Michalinos Zembylas, Open University of Cyprus
and Nelson Mandela University, South Africa

Athens & Nicosia, June 2018

Reference

Banks J.A. (2017) *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*, edit., AERA Publishing, USA

Acknowledgements

The editors of this volume would like to thank the Commissioning Editors' team at Cambridge Scholars Publishing (CSP) and Laurence Pitfold (UCL, University of London) for the professional proofreading he made in this volume that presents authors' works from different countries all over the world. The completion of this book coincides with the elections at the International Association for Intercultural Education for the new Executives Board, after the loss of Jagdish Gundara, former President of IAIE, Emeritus Professor at the former Institute of Education, University of London; a mentor to Nektaria since the early start of her post-graduate studies.

PART ONE:
HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

CHAPTER ONE

HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION AND CRITICAL PEDAGOGY FOR MARGINALISED YOUTH

MONISHA BAJAJ, MELISSA CANLAS
AND AMY ARGENAL

Introduction

Human rights education has undergone many elaborations and adaptations since the concept was first alluded to in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948. Noting the potential for education to contribute to unspeakable evil the world over, the framers of the UDHR argued that “education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups...” (Article 26 of the UDHR). From government reforms, school-based initiatives, and programs run by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to the individual efforts of teachers and community activists, human rights education (HRE) is neither singular nor homogenous. It is as diverse as the locations and settings globally where it can be found in practice.

This chapter asks the question: How can human rights education promote active citizenship and authentic learning among recently arrived immigrant and refugee youth in the United States? We pay particular attention to how critical pedagogy forms the basis of such authentic and active learning through the analysis of a weekly human rights club set up by our research team. The term “intercultural” refers to contexts where different “cultures” come into contact; we complicate this by exploring how power and social location privilege some and marginalize others, implicating students and teachers in public schools in the production of

sites of belonging and of exclusion in distinct moments. Thus, intercultural contexts are shaped by larger state policy, educational reforms, and the micro-politics of everyday interactions in highly diverse settings such as the one we discuss here.

In the sections that follow, we review the rise of human rights education and models that have emerged in global scholarship. We then highlight the methods utilized in our multi-year study of human rights and civic identity in a high school for newcomer youth in the U.S. Subsequently, we offer data on two important themes that emerge at the intersection of critical pedagogy and HRE in this setting: the primacy of the relational dimension in building authentic learning, and the flexibility of the co-curricular space. We conclude with a discussion of the research and its implications for the larger field of HRE and citizenship education.

Human rights education

Human rights cultures have long been in the making by the praxis of victims of violations, regardless of the mode of formulation of human rights standards and instruments. The single most critical source of human rights is the consciousness of peoples of the world who have waged the most persistent struggles for decolonization and self-determination, against racial discrimination, gender-based aggression and discrimination, denial of access to basic minimum needs, environmental degradation and destruction ... Clearly, Human Rights Education (HRE) must begin by a commissioning of a world history of people's struggles for rights and against injustice and tyranny. (Baxi 1997, 142)

Human rights education gained momentum in the 1990s as the United Nations sponsored various activities and a decade on HRE, bringing attention and creating linkages among officials, activists, and educators. Since then, there has been a proliferation of initiatives, reforms, textbook revisions, manuals and scholarship on HRE. Scholars have generally identified three dimensions as central to HRE: the cultivation of knowledge about human rights; the fostering of attitudes and skills with respect to human rights; and the development of action-oriented strategies for intervening in situations of abuse locally or globally (Flowers et al. 2000; Tibbitts 2008).

Scholarship in the fields of education, sociology, and political science has: (1) offered models for HRE (Bajaj 2011; Keet 2010; Tibbitts 2002); (2) interrogated the role of the state in human rights education (Bellino 2014; Cardenas 2005); (3) documented the rise of human rights content in civics courses and the conceptual shifts towards global citizenship (Meyer et al.

2010; Suarez and Ramirez 2004; Suarez 2007); and (4) offered description and evaluation of human rights education programs in practice across the globe (Claude and Andreopolous 1997; Flowers 2003), noting diverse constituents (students, police, military officers and judges, among others) and curricular approaches (e.g. formal, non-formal, community-based). Finally, (5) empirical research has clarified how participants make meaning of participating in HRE, highlighting how diverse social locations have impacted the enactment of human rights (Bajaj 2012; Hantzopoulos 2016; Zembylas 2014), as well as exposing the gaps between human rights instruction and actual practice (Bellino 2014; Khoja-Moolji 2014; Mejias 2013; Wahl 2014). This article contributes to the growing empirical literature that highlights the localization of HRE and insights gleaned through that process.

Schools are but one site for human rights education as many community-based examples also exist. Even within schools, the modes in which HRE can take place vary, and, as we will argue further, affect the space for critical thinking and pedagogy to ensue. In HRE scholarship, various forms are discussed (Müller 2009): explicit human rights education through a mandatory course; implicit or integrated HRE where human rights are included across subjects and within the ethos of a school setting; and co-curricular camps, clubs, theater projects, and special events that focus on human rights. Thus one holistic vision of HRE, Amnesty International's Human Rights Friendly Schools program, argues that four components of school life must align with human rights principles: (1) the structures of school participation and governance; (2) the approach to and nature of community relations; (3) the curriculum; and (4) the extra-curricular domain and school environment (Amnesty International 2009).

While various models have been put forward for HRE, the data presented in this chapter draw on the research team's approach to human rights education, one that aligns most closely with "critical" (Keet 2007) and "transformative" (Bajaj 2011; Mackie and LeJeune 2009; Tibbitts 2002) HRE models. Such approaches privilege notions of dialogue (Freire 1970), individual and "coalitional" agency (Bajaj 2012; Keet 2010), and seek to create the conditions for participants to engage in processes of empowerment. HRE scholar Andre Keet identifies several questions that critical human rights education poses, including:

- How can HRE speak truth to power?
- How does HRE mobilize for human rights?
- How can HRE contribute to developing human agency?
- How can HRE assist vulnerable people to change their material

- conditions and life experiences?
- How can understanding human rights lead to [efforts to] change unequal cultural, political, social and economic relations? (Keet 2010, 36).

The outcome of critical and transformative HRE is active and participatory citizenship aimed at challenging forces of domination and unequal citizenship, similar to the goals of critical pedagogy (Freire 1970; Giroux 2006).

With the global rise of neoliberal forces bearing down upon public education (Kumashiro 2012), the explicit and implicit space for transformative content *and* pedagogy related to activating a “critical human rights consciousness” appears to be decreasing (Meintjes 1997). Thus, this chapter focuses on how to bring critical pedagogy into the co-curricular space as a way to foster HRE for enhancing student agency within an intercultural context. Critical pedagogy is about maximizing student agency through the teaching-learning process (Giroux 2006), but teachers and students are under increasing pressure, in the United States and elsewhere, to prepare for high-stakes tests that are often closely linked to teacher pay and student advancement. This relegates some of the flexibility, dynamism and agency-enhancing approaches of critical pedagogy to learning spaces that are not bound to the mandates of state ideologies. The after-school club described in the sections that follow sought to leverage this opening of possibility.

Setting and methods

In recent decades, educational policies in the U.S have been shifting increasingly towards neo-liberal frameworks that prioritize numerical measures of success and frame the purpose of education as a way to stimulate the U.S. economy (Hantzopoulos 2016; Kumashiro 2012). Educational “reform” policies such as No Child Left Behind, and the increasing emphasis on high stakes standardized testing have resulted in punitive measures for teachers and schools whose numerical scores are not up to par. These educational policies reduce the dynamic processes of teaching and learning to a narrow, dehumanizing focus on test scores. In our study with immigrant and refugee youth, students often described themselves as being heavily stressed by schoolwork. A repeated refrain throughout the year was students’ anxiety about a state sponsored high school exit exam required in order to receive a high school diploma, even if students had completed (or even excelled) in their coursework. These

policies also attribute educational ‘success’ or ‘failure’ to the individualized behavior of teachers and students, rather than focus on how the complex histories and structures of systemic inequalities create widely disparate educational experiences, particularly for marginalized communities (Ladson-Billings 2006). Within these educational environments, human rights curriculum and content are often relegated to “elective” course material, if this content is included at all.

In the U.S., teachers, students, and parents have been increasingly protesting high-stakes testing in the classroom. Given this educational climate, we turned our attention to a co-curricular space as a site for HRE. The choice to conduct our research in an after-school program was a collaborative decision made by the researchers and school administrators.

In 2014, our research team launched a human rights club of five to ten students meeting weekly for 1.5 hours in a high school that was specifically created to serve the needs of “newcomer” refugee and immigrant youth. The school defined newcomers as students who had come to the United States—through authorized or unauthorized processes of migration—within the past four years. The school had 400 students from over 35 different countries. We complemented data from the club with observations of the everyday life of the school, participant observation in special events at the school, and interviews. The data presented in this chapter draw on 12 months of data from this multi-year project.

The human rights club met over 30 times during the school year (2014-2015) and took five field trips where students delved further into human rights issues. We developed interactive lessons related to human rights and prioritized students’ experiences in the club’s content, structure, and practice. Our curriculum was flexible and was revised to respond to students’ interests and concerns. The research team also participated in school events as part of an ongoing collaboration rooted in the principles of community-engaged scholarship (Giles 2008).

Our primary focus in this research was to examine how marginalized communities engage critically and make meaning of human rights by reflecting on their own lived realities. By engaging on a personal level with human rights, students were also able to negotiate dynamic and complex frameworks of culture, power, and citizenship. Working in this context with immigrant and refugee youth in an urban public high school required a critical human rights pedagogy.

Critical pedagogy and the human rights club

The critical question here is whose future, story and interests does the school represent? Critical Pedagogy argues that school practices need to be informed by a public philosophy that addresses how to construct ideological and institutional conditions in which the lived experience of empowerment becomes the defining feature of schooling. (Giroux 2006, 54)

Critical pedagogy is central to an engaged and transformative human rights education. Literature on critical pedagogy has noted four components of its practice: (1) transcending disciplinary boundaries and creating new knowledge; (2) interrogating relationships of power and exploring ways of reclaiming marginalized identities (race, gender, class, sexuality, nation, etc.); (3) making the curriculum relevant by bringing in student realities and the knowledge of communities; and (4) giving “primacy [to] the ethical in defining language that teachers and others use to produce cultural practices” (Giroux 1999).

Our approach to the human rights club intentionally intersected HRE with the theories and praxis of critical pedagogy in order to create a space for immigrant and refugee students to engage critically and dynamically with human rights. The opportunities for intersecting the tenets of critical pedagogy with transformative HRE are numerous. Like transformative HRE, critical pedagogy affirms that education should not be a mere transfer of knowledge from “expert” teacher to passive student (Freire 1970). Rather, a critical education is one that is a dynamic, fluid process that centres student knowledge and experiences and that is focused on addressing injustice as well as the material realities and concerns of students. With this in mind, we approached human rights documents and covenants not as sacrosanct documents, but rather as a frame through which students could question, critique, and make meaning of their experiences.

We structured each of our club meetings to be as student-centred as possible, and to allow for dialogue, engagement, and community building. Club meetings would always start with a “check-in” question/discussion, to give each participant (and also us as facilitators) a chance to speak about their feelings, moods, or responses to a specific question relating to human rights. We would follow this with a team-building activity and then introduce a topic or activity (e.g. visual/drawing activity, film viewing) and end with a discussion and at times, a written reflection. Topics and activities for the weekly club meetings included: creating life maps; human rights collages; defining our human rights s/heroes, discussing

intersections between human rights and civil rights movements, viewing films on human rights issues, with a specific emphasis on films set in the local and global communities to which our students specifically belonged. As the year progressed, and as our relationships with students deepened, our discussions often diverged and we adapted, or even willingly discarded our planned lessons to accommodate the interests and questions of students.

In the following sections, we explore two dimensions of the co-curricular space: the primacy of relationships in teaching human rights, and the flexibility in curriculum allowed to us within this space. We follow with a section on how students personalized their learning through the avenue of the human rights club. The goal of the club was to make human rights come alive for the students and allow them to see the content and pedagogy as relevant and useful in making sense of their migration experiences and current realities living on the margins of U.S. society.

The relational dimension of HRE

The country that I come from has a civil war happening so I've always been really interested in human rights. But in my country, the government has all the control; we do not have freedom of speech or anything. We cannot share our opinions. When I came here, I really wanted to share, but I was limited in my English. I did not get the chance to share and discuss until I joined this Human Rights Club. ... Every week, every activity, every field trip, we learn something from that. Every little action was meaningful for us, and I learned that a lot of people are fighting for human rights. Also, I learned there are many kinds of human rights that we have to fight for. It is a great club, and I'm really happy to be in it."
Seng, 19 year old high school student, refugee from Burma

As critical educators, we understood that teaching human rights begins with humanizing our students in order to build connections to human rights and to one another. Humanizing our students specifically meant allowing them to feel both safe and brave enough to share their personal experiences. We prioritized building relationships and community, both in and outside club meetings, as central to developing trust and facilitating learning. For example, we did team building exercises and went on field trips that created camaraderie among the group.

Our co-curricular, after-school space allowed us to form reciprocal, authentic, caring relationships that are often challenging to achieve in a large, high stakes test educational culture (Noddings 1984). Although each of us has over ten years of formal teaching experience, in this less-formal,