Language Learning for Human Rights and Democratic Citizenship

Hugh Starkey

The rhetoric employed in justifying the importance of the teaching and learning of languages is often highly idealistic. In Britain and Europe (which are the focus of this chapter), policy documents are suffused with claims that a knowledge of other languages and cultures can help to make a better world. However, whilst language policy may have challenging political implications, language teaching and learning in practice are predominantly apolitical and fail to challenge a complacent and essentially monolingual status quo. Since the nineteenth century, nation-states across the world have used language as a key to access the privileges of citizenship. Secondary and higher education, administrative services and political influence frequently require the ability to operate efficiently in the national language. Assimilationist nationalistic ideologies have tended to ignore or suppress the realities of multilingualism.

Language education policy and practice have developed through a nationalist paradigm that aligns nation-states with national languages and stresses international understanding; for example, the content of English-language courses typically provides cultural context from Britain or the USA. In order to be fit for purpose in a post-colonial, globalized and multilingual world, however, language policy needs to emancipate itself from this historical straightjacket. One of the claims of language policy in the UK and Europe is that it can contribute to citizenship education, or what is referred to in European contexts as 'education for democratic citizenship' (EDC) and 'human rights education' (HRE). Yet EDC / HRE is subject to the same tensions as language learning, in that it pursues both a nationalistic tendency and an idealistic emancipatory rhetoric. This dilemma can be resolved theoretically, by drawing on the concept of cosmopolitanism, since education for cosmopolitan citizenship promotes inclusion whilst resisting total assimilation. Similarly, language policy can benefit from a shift in paradigm from the nationalist to the cosmopolitan. This is not without significant political implications, making language education a site of struggle. This chapter shows how recent policy developments in language education are articulated with citizenship education, and considers some of the tensions between, on the one hand, the humanistic and cosmopolitan ideals promoted by these policies and, on the other hand, the widespread conception of language learning as primarily concerned with transmitting or celebrating so-called national cultures.

Nationalism and Monolingualism

Historically, the association of languages with national identities is a recent phenomenon. Cosmopolitan perspectives were prevalent during the Enlightenment period and 'pluri-lingualism was the unremarked and normal state' (Lo Bianco 2003: 31). It was only in the mid-nineteenth century, with the rise of modernism and nationalism, that nationalistic perspectives and racist stereotypes were deliberately promoted in educational institutions, to erase feelings of a common humanity (Dewey

1

2002). Language education was an essential part of a nationalist agenda and organizations such as the *Alliance française* (and, later, the British Council) were set up to promote an idea of language study as a means to accessing a culture or *civilization* associated with imperial power, and thus implicitly superior. The *Alliance française* was founded in 1884 to spread the use of the French language in the colonies and elsewhere overseas. It continues to recruit and train teachers to run classes or provide tuition and it organizes conferences and supports the production of teaching material. It has a strong institutional position in the teaching of French as a foreign language and has been influential in helping to define the cultural content of language courses. The British Council was set up in the 1930s and has also been very influential in language teaching. There is thus a continuous link between language teaching from the colonial era to the present day. It may still be possible to discern a slightly colonial flavour in the way that national cultural institutions are inclined to present their national cultures, through language and literature, in a broadly positive, uncritical light (Starkey & Hassan 2000). It appears that only very modest progress has been made since Stern's warning that the predominant understanding of language learning 'is still based on a nineteenth-century view of popular education' (1970: 3).

The tying together of languages and national cultures, however, sits uneasily with the demographic realities of the twenty-first century. The mobility that has enabled extensive migration to Britain and France, for example, has produced multicultural and multilingual cities where 'mixtures and a variety of hybrids are created and used by different diaspora groups, who develop complex loyalties, complex identities and complex language varieties' (Shohamy 2006: 143). In this context of mobility, it becomes increasingly evident to observers with any linguistic sensitivity that, as Adama Ouane observes, 'multilingualism is the natural order of things whereas monolingualism corresponds to a construction imposed for political and educational reasons as the linguistic ideal' (2003: 451).

In Britain, language-learning policy for schools and higher education has clung to the model of studying languages in conjunction with national cultures, in spite of the fact that this plays to the agenda of the xenophobic sectors of the press and a predominantly anti-European political class. A study of the experiences of migrant teachers of languages to adults in Britain includes evidence of the xenophobia they have encountered on a daily basis when their accent is perceived as foreign (Starkey 2007). As Shohamy notes: '[E]specially when the public has negative attitudes towards the languages and their native speakers, to begin with[,] learning these particular languages may lead to increased negative attitudes and low achievement' (2006: 144). The decline in the number of 14- to 16-year-olds studying languages successfully in England (Dearing & King 2007) can thus be seen as a predictable result of the failure to rethink a strategy for languages and move away from the nationalist paradigm. This failure of language-learning and language-awareness policies has resulted in the prevalence of institutional monolingualism in many countries, including the UK. For example, the workplace is frequently a place where people of a predominantly monolingual mindset encounter, and often manage, colleagues who use the resources of several languages in their daily lives. Language policy in the UK and Europe has focused on a powerful drive to ensure that migrant workers are proficient in English or the national language, and that they are prepared for (national) citizenship. However, little has been done to address the issue of a largely monoglot population. As Pachler argues, this not only threatens European

integration but it presents 'a major stumbling block to mutual understanding as well as to cultural diversity' (2007: 5).

The arguments in favour of giving significant attention to tackling monolingualism are moral, political and economic. Language education (whether for migrants or for the majority), when it recognizes and values languages as part of the cultural landscape in post-colonial and globalized economies, contributes to education for democratic citizenship and will potentially promote social justice, equity and widening participation. The plurilingual repertoires of fellow citizens provide a resource of potential benefit to the economy and to society. The denial of recognition to language skills is a source of exclusion and possible social tension. Language education policy in a democracy has the capacity to promote greater understanding of, and a respect for, languages, not least those of minorities and the less widely spoken and taught national languages. In practice, however, language education policy often privileges a very limited selection of languages that have historically had economic and political significance. In fact, in England only 4 per cent of 16-year-olds took an examination in a language other than French, German or Spanish in 2009 (CILT 2010); the school curriculum remains decidedly Eurocentric when it addresses languages.

Language Education Policies and Citizenship

Language education policy in Britain and Europe embraces a rhetoric of democracy, social cohesion, mutual understanding, and global citizenship. However, issues of power are never addressed (Tollefson 1995) and the basic model of providing language-learning opportunities is left untouched.

At a transnational level, the Council of Europe (a grouping of 47 member states, all signatories of the European Convention on Human Rights) develops policy concerning cultural matters and education, including both citizenship education and language learning. Language policy experts note the overlapping agendas:

> The teaching of languages has aims which are convergent with those of education for democratic citizenship: both are concerned with intercultural interaction and communication, the promotion of mutual understanding and the development of individual responsibility. (Beacco & Byram 2003: 18)

However, the political implications for language policy resulting from its alliance with citizenship education are entirely overlooked in this assertion. Language learning and awareness are seen as a personal matter linked to 'individual responsibility' and individual 'intercultural interaction'. There is no suggestion, for example, of language policy as a means to attain social justice.

In England, official policy documents and curriculum guidelines advocate the development of feelings of cosmopolitan citizenship as a key role of language learning. It is implicitly acknowledged as underpinning language education policy in the UK at a national level. The national curriculum for England at the turn of the century included the following aims for the learning of languages:

> Through the study of foreign languages, pupils understand and appreciate different countries, cultures, people and communities – and as they do so,

> begin to *think of themselves as citizens of the world* as well as of the United Kingdom. (DfEE & QCA 1999: 14, my emphasis)

Whilst the cosmopolitan perspective of the world citizen is commended, the implied paradigm is still a national one. Appreciation of 'different countries' is an invitation to simplistic and essentialized portrayals, such as those that are often found in text-books.

At about the same time, a high-level report on the future of language teaching and learning in Britain recommended that

> direct links should be established in school education between language learning and education for citizenship, so as to foster notions of equality and acceptance of diversity in children's minds at the earliest possible age. (Nuffield Languages Inquiry 2000: 32)

This recommendation makes a specific and formal link between citizenship education and language learning. The aim of both is considered to be the promotion of the key human rights principles of equality and diversity. 'Equality' is perhaps code for social justice, and 'diversity' for multiculturalism; and such an education would clearly be transformative, given the inequalities in Britain and in the wider world, as well as the considerable ambient xenophobia. However, this political dimension is not developed and this guidance is presented as uncontroversial.

The contribution of language education to promoting global citizenship is acknowledged in the statement of aims and purposes of languages in the current version of the national curriculum for England:

> Languages are part of the cultural richness of our society and the world in which we live and work. Learning languages contributes to mutual understanding, a sense of global citizenship and personal fulfilment. Pupils learn to appreciate different countries, cultures, communities and people. By making comparisons, they gain insight into their own culture and society. (QCA 2007)

The statement is clearly referenced in the US *Standards in Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* that are based on the 'five Cs' of communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2006). However, the British version inevitably recognizes and endorses the nationalist paradigm, adding the sixth 'C' of 'countries'.

A Scottish report on languages, *Citizens of a Multilingual World,* also spelt out the potential contribution to citizenship education, but managed to avoid the international paradigm by promoting intercultural education instead:

> We consider that education in languages at school has an essential role to play in preparing all students for citizenship of the wider society. If it helps them become sensitive to the languages and cultures of others and develops in them sufficient confidence and competence to be able to use their languages, however modestly, in their interactions with other citizens, then we believe they are more likely to understand others and to be respected by them. In this way the wider society becomes more open, democratic and inclusive. (Ministerial Action Group on Languages 2000: 2)

This statement goes some way towards acknowledging a political purpose, since the aim is a more 'democratic' and 'inclusive' society.

Language Education Policy and Community Cohesion

Following the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in 2001 and disturbances in some northern British towns provoked by far-right activists (Home Office 2001), concerns for national security started to influence education policy in Britain. The promotion of so-called community cohesion became a priority and both citizenship education and language learning were given a role. As Cooke & Simpson observe, 'the relationship between national security, immigration, integration, social cohesion and language is becoming progressively tighter' (2008: 10). Debates about diversity and belonging are echoed around the world (Osler 2008). Although most policy responses target migrants, official concerns have been raised by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) about the dangers and disadvantages of prevailing monolingualism:

> In the knowledge society of the 21st century, language competence and intercultural understanding are not optional extras, they are an essential part of being a citizen. For too long we have lagged behind as a nation in our capability to contribute fully as multi-lingual and culturally aware citizens. (DfES 2002: 5)

However, whilst this may be interpreted in terms of better relations between citizens within the nation, the DfES's strategic guidance later reverts to the nationalist paradigm:

> Language skills are also vital in improving understanding between people here and in the wider world, and in supporting global citizenship by breaking down barriers of ignorance and suspicion between nations. (DfES 2002: 12)

The government paper implies that the dominant group can benefit from learning languages because it is an activity that can provide a global perspective. This could be understood as a commitment to equality and human rights worldwide. However, in this formulation, language learning is actually framed in terms of contributing to a diplomatic effort based on international relations. The barriers that need to be broken down are between nations and not, in this case, between people.

A formal review of language teaching and learning in England was initiated following the collapse in the number of examination entries for languages, which occurred when their study was made voluntary for the final years of compulsory secondary education in 2004. Dearing & King's 2006 consultation document, produced for the DfES, highlights a concern for situating language learning in the context of relations between citizens within Britain, but it does not develop the point, and largely loses it in the more traditional concern for trade and diplomacy:

> Inter cultural [*sic*] awareness has never been more important than in Britain's multicultural society and as it becomes evermore involved in, and dependent

> on, trading within the framework of a global economy and on the decisions taken by multinational companies. Understanding other cultures is also critical to issues of peace and war in this volatile world. (Dearing & King 2006: 21)

In fact, this interim report does contain a hard-hitting and trenchant analysis of the damage caused by predominant monolingualism:

> More broadly we need languages for our national social wellbeing and inclusion. The issues of welcoming cultural and ethnic diversity, and yet achieving community cohesion have become matters of concern. So too have issues of disaffection amongst youths in areas of social and economic deprivation. Without language competence, and the related recognition and valuing of different languages and cultures it is inconceivable that we will be able to resolve these critical issues for contemporary society. (Dearing & King 2006: 22)

However, the final report published in 2007 makes no mention of 'ethnic diversity', 'community cohesion', 'disaffection' or 'deprivation'. Again, the tendency is to tone down and depoliticize, and so the emphasis is on the clearly more acceptable and apolitical formulation that language competence is

> a key to multicultural awareness in our own country and in the world, and increasingly relevant to the prospects of our young people in a world of multinational companies where linguistic skills are valued. (Dearing & King 2007: 6)

It is clearly perceived that the powerful political argument will be economic, far more than social.

Government policy for language learning by migrants is also recognized as preparation for (national) citizenship. The Adult ESOL core curriculum in England acknowledges that the education of future citizens is a prime aim of the programme:

> If Britain is to fulfil its aim of being an ethnically diverse but fully inclusive society, everyone should have the skills to participate and be successful at work, at home and *as citizens*. This means that good quality English language provision must be available to support people who have a first language other than English. (DfES 2001: 5, my emphasis)

Since 2005, migrants whose first language is not English and who aspire to naturalization as British citizens have had to follow a programme of citizenship education delivered as part of their language education. However, the actual syllabus for the citizenship content of the ESOL curriculum is somewhat different to that for school students. Adult migrants are expected to learn about the monarchy, the established church and customs and traditions, none of which feature in school citizenship education. The guidance provided to teachers suggests that there is a clear intention for migrants to be encouraged to integrate into a somewhat conservatively defined national culture (Home Office 2004; Han, Starkey & Green 2010).

Starkey, H. (2011). Language Learning for Human Rights and Democratic Citizenship. In C. Ros i Solé & J. Fenoulhet (Eds.), *Mobility and Localisation in Language Learning: A View from Languages of the Wider World* (pp. 79-106). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Political and Apolitical Approaches to Language Education

The analysis of text-books reveals the extent to which stereotypes and misinformation are conveyed to language learners (Byram, Gribkova & Starkey 2002); what has become known as the 'target culture' is presented in text-books and other language materials in a simplified and essentialized form. As a Canadian language specialist has observed:

> Reductionism is a problem inherent in all teaching material and it is all the more inevitable where the number of words available to cover a topic is sometimes limited to a few lines, particularly in specially written material. In such a context it is difficult to convey the diversity of cultural practices. (Fleig-Hamm 1998: 464, my translation)

Perhaps it is not surprising, given its origins and traditions, that the British Council has found it difficult to find ways of presenting Britain that reflect the diversity of the population. An evaluation found that, although a booklet about England published in summer 2000 made reference in the text to 'the diverse backgrounds and traditions of ethnic peoples [*sic*] who have made their home in Britain', the imagery 'implies that the distinctive thing about so-called ethnic peoples is that they have dark skins and colourful clothes and customs'. In fact there are few black or Asian people represented and there are 'far more images of trees, fields and country villages than of cities, and the last large image in the booklet is of a cricket bat' (Richardson 2005: 53).

When viewed from the perspective of its contribution to EDC, language learning and teaching is part of a political context. Everything that language teachers undertake is in some way political, and both the questioning by language teachers and the questions printed in text-books often focus on language structures, rather than on the truth. For example, a content analysis of materials produced in the late 1990s accompanying a course for adult learners of French in the UK noted a task in which students were asked to manipulate a sentence to illustrate the sequence of tenses following 'if' (Starkey & Osler 2001). Starting from the given sentence: 'On the whole, if immigrant families speak French they adapt more easily to their new life', students were expected to produce the following sentences:

- *In years to come, if immigrant families speak French they will adapt more easily to their new life.*
- *Historically, if immigrant families spoke French they adapted more easily to their new life.*
- *Most people think that if immigrant families spoke French they would adapt more easily to their new life.*
- *If immigrant families had spoken French on arrival, they would have adapted more easily to their new life.* (2001, my translation)

These sentences are correct grammatically but the exercise clearly reinforces the view that 'immigrant families' are inadequate, and in particular that they are handicapped by a lack of linguistic skills. Given the fact that migrants are often multilingual, the exercise, suggesting a generalized language deficit, is misleading.

Although the course from which this example is taken intended to present France in a positive light as a multicultural society, this example shows how the linguistic exploitation of the course material may counteract its socio-cultural objectives. The linguistic and cultural dimensions are meant to reinforce each other, rather than one undermining the other. It would be quite possible to produce the same linguistic task whilst emphasising the capacities of the newcomers, rather than their inadequacies. For instance, the starting point could be: 'If French people are welcoming, immigrant families adapt more easily to their new life'.

The political dimension of language teaching was clearly in the minds of those working for the DfES, who drew up the core curriculum and guidance for Adult ESOL (English as a second or other language). This can be illustrated with two examples from Adult ESOL level 2. The sentence chosen to illustrate word order for emphasis in complex sentences is:

> Although the Prime Minister said that the environment was important in his election campaign, he has done very little to improve it since he came to office. (DfES 2001: 35)

Like the previous example from the French course, this example, coming from an official government source, is highly political. The prime minister in question is not named, nor is the date of the supposed election campaign given, but the incumbent's name might well spring to the mind of the reader or learner. The sentence raises the issue of the two simultaneous types of learning in language classes: there is the syntactical question of word order for emphasis, and there is the political question of environmental policy and the extent to which political leaders keep their promises.

That this politicized example is no accident is confirmed in the illustration of noun phrases, particularly of the use of 'zero' article with a wide range of countable and uncountable nouns. This time, the example is one that has the potential to mobilize all ESOL teachers:

> Colleges say that they will struggle to provide citizenship training for refugees unless significant resources are pumped in. (DfES 2001: 37)

The political context is a tension between colleges who provide ESOL language courses for migrants and who are expected to implement the new citizenship programme as part of the courses, and the ministry (DfES) that had been unwilling to fund sufficient courses to meet the demand. To discuss this in the language class seems to be recognized as a perfectly legitimate activity, and it serves as a reminder of the potential of language teaching to contribute to citizenship education.

A Canadian civil society group, the Calgary Immigrant Women's Association (CIWA), produced materials and teacher guidance for ESOL with an explicitly political intension, based on the pedagogical approach of Paolo Freire ([1970] 1996). This was adapted and published for the UK by the London-based NGO Actionaid. Describing the Canadian initiative, the authors of the British version observe that

> groups discussed topics such as family violence, poverty, immigration law, health, parenting, social services, etc. thus spreading the impact far beyond language learning. (Cardiff, Newman & Pearce 2006: 4)

However, this critical approach to ESOL remains under-represented in published materials (Cooke & Simpson 2008).

In school language classes in England, the failure to link languages and citizenship may be partly responsible for the declining interest in language learning. A review of the oral language tests administered at age 16 (GCSE) noted that they were based on 'conversation topics that students do not perceive as relevant or interesting' (QCA 2008: 8) and found that students 'would like to have proper conversations on topics they care about' (QCA 2008: 11). An ostensibly promising topic entitled 'social issues' was part of the syllabus for several years. However, judging by the suggested vocabulary, it was essentially a diluted and normative health education about the dangers of alcohol and tobacco. This was replaced from 2010 by topics that have no discernible political or global dimension other than a nod to the environment, centred on local recycling (AQA 2008). Given the overwhelming influence of examinations on curriculum content, such a disconnection between languages and citizenship seriously vitiates any policy claims that the two should be related.

Citizenship Education: Aims and Purposes

Increasing linguistic and cultural diversity amongst populations in Europe has led to social tensions and the scapegoating of migrants, as it did in previous generations. One policy-response to these tensions is related to education, namely the introduction in schools of programmes designed to promote a common understanding of citizenship. In 1999, the Council of Europe adopted a policy to promote EDC, which has since included a substantial programme of research and development anchored in human rights education (HRE) (Council of Europe 2000, 2002, 2003; Birzea 2004; Osler & Starkey 2005, 2010).

The aims and purposes of EDC, as defined collectively by European states, are summarized in a ministerial recommendation, in which the ministers express their concerns about social trends and those political forces that attempt to undermine the democratic basis of citizenship. Amongst the dangers to democracy that need to be addressed, the ministers are particularly concerned by

> the growing levels of political and civic apathy and lack of confidence in democratic institutions, and by the increased cases of corruption, racism, xenophobia, aggressive nationalism, intolerance of minorities, discrimination and social exclusion, all of which are major threats to the security, stability and growth of democratic societies. (Council of Europe 2002)

This formulation is very significant: the ministers recognize that it is not the migrant communities that are the problem for European states, but rather the inability of majority populations (the dominant communities) and traditional structures to adapt to diversity. It is not the migrants who are 'major threats to the security, stability and growth of democratic societies'; what is undermining democracy and security is, rather, the attitudes and behaviours of the dominant communities within these countries, including 'corruption, racism, xenophobia, aggressive nationalism, intolerance of minorities'. However, members of dominant communities, whose views may be reinforced by xenophobic media, do not always share this analysis.

The purpose of EDC is to support the development of a democratic and peaceful society. Since this education is designed for all those who live in the demographically diverse space that is Europe, it requires some generally accepted principles. Within Europe these principles are encapsulated in the European Convention on Human Rights (Council of Europe 1950), which derives directly and explicitly from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (UNO 1948). These principles and minimum standards are entitlements that underpin citizenship in Europe, where they are guaranteed through a system of laws and the European Court of Human Rights. However, since the adoption of the UDHR in 1948, they may be claimed by anyone anywhere in the world. In other words, the underlying principles of democratic citizenship, which is about living together, are in fact universal. EDC aims to promote a culture of human rights by providing opportunities to learn about these based on an acceptance and acknowledgement of the essential equality in dignity of all human beings.

Since the implementation of citizenship education is the responsibility of national governments, there is, across the world, a tendency to define the content and aims of such programmes in terms of national unity. This may also be reinforced by state-initiated or -required ceremonies (saluting the flag) and celebrations (national days) that assume adherence to nationalist symbols and rites. Just as language policy has been framed in national terms, contrasted with languages that are 'foreign', so citizenship education is often also based on an assimilationist model (Osler & Starkey 2001, 2009).

Defining Citizenship

In Britain, legal definitions of the word 'citizenship' have been developed as part of immigration policy. In legal contexts associated with migration, the term 'citizenship' is used to distinguish those entitled to formal nationality and residence from those who have no legal right to the benefits of nationality. However, this is a relatively recent usage. The concept of British citizenship only appeared in statute in 1981 (Gardner 1997; Tyler 2010). The significance of the legal concept being developed as part of immigration policy is that, by definition, citizenship is bounded and exclusive. This creates potential antagonisms between those who possess the status and those who do not.

In the context of formal education policy, as opposed to immigration policy, there are many reasons for requiring a more inclusive definition of citizenship. Since 2002, citizenship education has been included in the national curriculum for England and is the entitlement of all pupils in schools, many of whom have nationalities other than British. It follows, then, that democratic citizenship education is required to be inclusive rather than exclusive. However, as Dewey warned early in the twentieth century, national education systems have been based on promoting nationalist agendas across the curriculum, including for languages. They deliberately privilege the national perspective over wider ones:

> Education became a civic function and the civic function was identified with the realization of the ideal of the national state. The 'state' was substituted for humanity; cosmopolitanism gave way to nationalism. (Dewey 2002: 108)

Although nationalist education is the education of citizens, it aims to transmit a particular view of national identity and culture, rather than enabling reflection on plural identities. This model is often known as 'civic education' and is based on education for assimilation into a given national culture. It survives in many contexts in the twenty-first century (Hahn 1998, 2005). An assimilationist approach is increasingly challenged by those who identify the potential dangers of xenophobia which may be associated with a nationalist perspective (Kymlicka 2003), and it is also resisted in classrooms by alienated or bored students (Crick 1999). A broader definition of citizenship, one that connects with Enlightenment struggles against absolutism, is that citizens are subjects with rights. 'Subject' is used here in its grammatical sense of 'agent'. Citizens have agency: they can act autonomously and collectively in the world. It is the fact that they have rights (universal entitlements as well as locally defined national rights) that distinguishes the subject citizen from the citizen as object. A non-exclusive definition of citizenship such as this is required when civic education for assimilation is replaced by EDC, which is founded on notions of both unity and diversity (Banks 2004; Banks et al. 2005). EDC is, amongst other things, a response to globalization. Increased migration has led to nation-states across the world becoming visibly heterogeneous in their demographies. This in turn has led to a concern for so-called community cohesion (Home Office 2001), as cultural diversity within states challenges old nationalist paradigms and structures which many assume to have the authority of tradition, but which in reality have been politically constructed.

Freed from the constraints of too close an association with nationality, citizenship is thus a universal. It can be characterized as having three dimensions: feeling, status and practice (Osler & Starkey 2005). The first element of this definition of citizenship is that it is based on a feeling of belonging or identity: citizens feel that they belong to a community or, more usually, to various communities. For Etzioni, a nation can be conceived of as a 'community of communities' (1995: 160); a formulation taken up by an authoritative but politically controversial report on the *Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain* (Runnymede Trust 2000, 2001).

Secondly, citizenship is a status, as a national and as a person. A personal, as opposed to national, status as citizen is derived from the rights of any individual as a human being. National citizenship of the UK guarantees rights such as entitlement to residence and freedom of movement in the European Union. Citizens of the UK, therefore, officially already have both British and European citizenship. Many of them, however, hold dual nationality. Yet nationality may be simply an instrumental citizenship; moreover, many dual nationals may have affective ties to, and patriotic feelings for, more than one country. If citizens are defined as 'subjects with rights', however, citizenship becomes a universal, because all human beings are entitled to human rights. The basis for this claim is the moral authority of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UNO 1948), which proclaims in its preamble that the

> recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.

In order to access 'equal and inalienable rights' it is necessary to be aware that universal human rights exist. Where individuals have this awareness they may be considered citizens, that is, subjects with agency.

Citizenship, then, is a feeling of belonging and the possession of the status of a national and/or of a person with rights. It is also, thirdly, a practice. The practice of democratic citizenship centres on intervention: citizens have a sense that they are entitled and empowered to act in the world, in order to defend their own rights or the rights of others. This sense of agency both stems from, and is in a dialectical relationship with, a sense of identity which includes one's identity as a citizen.

Citizenship Education and Identities

The programme of study for citizenship education in England was originally conceptualized in terms of three main themes, namely: rights and responsibilities; communities and identities; government and democracy (DfEE & QCA 1999). The first of these themes emphasizes the universal standards set out in human rights instruments, the second invites the consideration of identities and the third is concerned with the development of political literacy, or a sense of agency. Subsequent revision has retained the concept of identities, linked to diversity, but in the national context of 'living together in the UK' (DfES 2007).

The conceptualization of citizenship education based on an interaction between the understanding of rights and the consideration of identities has been developed by McLaughlin (1992) and Osler & Starkey (1996, 2005). Citizens require knowledge of their rights and of the possibilities of political action, and such knowledge can be provided by traditional civic education programmes. Civic education becomes citizenship education, however, when a cultural and personal dimension is added, thereby creating a space for reflection on feelings and identities. It thus provides opportunities to recognize an identity as a citizen as only one of many other identities, for instance those related to family, ethnicity, religion, nationality, or political affiliation. A citizen-identity implies a recognition of one's responsibilities to society and to communities.

If citizenship is conceptualized solely in terms of a national paradigm, such a consideration of identity and belonging emphasizes who is included within the definition of nationality, and therefore also who is excluded. This is the either/or model that forces individuals to choose: citizens are British *or* French; Canadian or Nigerian; German or Japanese, for example. However, the realities of a world of complex and multiple identities suggest that this model is either simplistic or coercive. Identity can equally be both/and. An outstanding example of a well-known figure with multiple identities is the late Edward Said, a distinguished American university professor and intellectual of world-wide influence. Born in Jerusalem during the British mandate in Palestine and having emigrated to the United States as a teenager, he was for many years a member of the Palestine National Conference. His *New York Times* obituarist wrote that he

> was an exemplar of American multiculturalism, at home both in Arabic and English [...]. Though a defender of Islamic civilization, Mr. Said was an Episcopalian married to a Quaker. (Bernstein 2003)

This example illustrates the concept of 'multidimensional citizenship': multidimensional citizens recognize an identity as a citizen in the context of public settings; they see themselves as members of overlapping communities, local and global, and they have a sense of the interactions of past, present and future time (Parker et al. 1999). Recognition of this, and the uncoupling of identity from 'nationality', can potentially contribute to justice and peace in the world (Appiah 2006; Sen 2006).

Language education conducted alongside citizenship education can be part of the problem, but also has the potential to become part of the solution to violence and conflict, as a study for the Council of Europe concludes:

> Language education is inextricably involved in the construction of new, or in the enshrining of existing identities. Understanding language education as a practice of intercultural exploration, competence-acquiring processes for dealing with otherness and as local experimentation in global difference, we can confidently place both, language education and identity, as prominent vehicles in forging new worlds. (Lo Bianco 2003: 32)

Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship

Education for citizenship encourages the development of citizenship as an identity: the educational process helps learners to see themselves as citizens. Whilst all human beings have the capacity to be citizens, they only become citizens when they are able to recognize themselves as such; in other words, they need to understand the concept of citizenship. They can then move from a passive, or potential, identity as a citizen to an active, or conscious, one (Hudson 2005).

As the example of Edward Said illustrates, it is possible to practise citizenship in any number of locations, from the local to the global. His linguistic skills enabled him to operate in contrasting contexts and to mediate between them. Whilst holding a chair at a US university and acting out his citizenship in that local community, he simultaneously participated directly in the political process of the struggle to create a Palestinian state. This involved interacting both with political structures in the Middle East and with a global diasporic community. Hence, in a globalized world, transnational identities imply multiple sites of citizenship. In the context of mobility, many language learners will feel multiple affiliations and exercise their citizenship in their new environment, whilst engaging in collaborative activities that may be forms of citizenship with widely scattered family, friends and organizations.

There is thus a tension in citizenship education, as in language education, between an emphasis on the national, and the realities of multidimensional citizenship and the complexity of overlapping identities. This can be resolved through the concept of cosmopolitanism (Beck 2000; Habermas 1996; Held 1995; Kaldor 2003) and restoring to education the aim of promoting cosmopolitan perspectives (Osler & Starkey 2003, 2005, 2010). As Dewey noted, cosmopolitanism was squeezed out by nationalism; it is, however, an ideal that neatly encapsulates the vision contained in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Its manifestation in the twenty-first century can be defined as follows:

Starkey, H. (2011). Language Learning for Human Rights and Democratic Citizenship. In C. Ros i Solé & J. Fenoulhet (Eds.), *Mobility and Localisation in Language Learning: A View from Languages of the Wider World* (pp. 79-106). Oxford: Peter Lang.

> The cosmopolitan ideal combines a commitment to humanist principles and norms, an assumption of human equality, with a recognition of difference, and indeed a celebration of diversity. (Kaldor 2003: 19)

Kaldor's definition derives directly from human rights, since these are the pre-eminent expression of what she refers to as 'humanist principles and norms'. Moreover, her formulation of 'an assumption of human equality' is the very basis of human rights.

Since EDC is based on human rights and recognizes diversity and multidimensional identities, its intention should perhaps be recognized as education for cosmopolitan citizenship. Whereas in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries cosmopolitans were an élite, it is now often in the poorest sections of the community, such as recent migrants and refugees, that we find a clear recognition of multiple loyalties and a sense of cosmopolitanism. Language learners with experience of mobility will easily see themselves as cosmopolitan. In settled communities, too, language learning may be the key means by which people can discover cosmopolitanism. Although nationalist ideologies have denigrated cosmopolitanism, there is no necessary conflict between patriotic and cosmopolitan perspectives. As an international panel noted:

> Pride in one's own heritage can co-exist with appreciation for other traditions and loyalty to the human family. A reflective national or ethnic identity does not exclude a cosmopolitan outlook, but may be a pre-requisite for a broader perspective. (Banks et al. 2005: 24)

The recommendation of the Council of Europe on EDC, cited above, noted the prevalence within Europe of attitudes of xenophobia and racism. What is perhaps needed is an education for global awareness and an understanding of human rights. This may be termed 'education for cosmopolitan citizenship' (Osler & Starkey 2003: 243, 2005: 23), and one approach to language teaching in this context would be to provide opportunities for learners to reflect on their own identities by exploring other cultures through language. This is certainly the intention of some policies and the expectation of many language teachers. Teachers of languages are unlikely to disagree that their key role is to broaden perspectives; my own research suggests that this is a major source of motivation for language teachers who are, almost by definition, mediators very much aware of their own multiple and complex identities. As one informant language teacher expressed it, language learning offers 'a window onto another way of life – a mind-expanding experience if you haven't had it' (Starkey 2007: 63). A cosmopolitan perspective may be second nature to many language teachers.

Conclusion

Language education policy in Britain and Europe aims to broaden horizons, break down barriers between people and peoples and promote a vision of potential world citizenship. Language learning policy, particularly in its emphasis on intercultural communication, acceptance of equality and diversity and commitment to anti-racism, has been explicitly identified as an important site of citizenship education. However,

Starkey, H. (2011). Language Learning for Human Rights and Democratic Citizenship. In C.
    Ros i Solé & J. Fenoulhet (Eds.), *Mobility and Localisation in Language Learning: A
    View from Languages of the Wider World* (pp. 79-106). Oxford: Peter Lang.

programmes of study for citizenship education, when part of a nationalized curriculum, are commonly formulated in terms that assume the primacy of a national identity.

Language education policy rightly addresses the key issue of learning to live together. By definition, language education invites a reconsideration of identities, and it is based on the premise that core aspects of other people's identities, including their language, are cultural features that can be borrowed or acquired. Learning a new language gives access to potential new identities and challenges the notion that citizenship should be associated primarily with monolithic national identities. Language learning policies therefore have the potential to promote a cosmopolitan ideal, as do elements of citizenship education, such as a commitment to universal human rights. The expressed aim of language education, namely to help learners situate themselves as citizens of the world, is a cosmopolitan perspective. In a multilingual world of increasing hybridity, the learning of both language and citizenship potentially provides a space for learners to reflect on and develop new complex identities, and articulate these with their understanding of citizenship. Such processes can be defined as 'education for cosmopolitan citizenship', and the model of citizenship that this presupposes is thus cosmopolitan, rather than national.

However, these humanistic aims are in tension with predominant traditions of language education, which are based on international understanding rather than cosmopolitanism. By definition, international understanding is a concept that privileges national over cosmopolitan perspectives. Education for (national) citizenship presupposes the primacy of a national identity. International understanding is a political or diplomatic concept, involving relationships between representatives of distinct nation-states. For individuals, 'international understanding' thus reinforces a sense that there are barriers to be overcome in relations between people from different nation-states. This static perspective loses any conceptual credibility, however, when faced with the mobilities and migrations of the twenty-first century. By contrast, education for cosmopolitan citizenship admits the reality of complex and multiple identities, and allows a space for the exploration of identity in the context of citizenship. When this articulates with language education policy, language learners may be emancipated from their ascribed roles as national ambassadors. The experience is no longer framed as 'international', but rather as a personal exploration of intercultural perspectives.

Starkey, H. (2011). Language Learning for Human Rights and Democratic Citizenship. In C. Ros i Solé & J. Fenoulhet (Eds.), *Mobility and Localisation in Language Learning: A View from Languages of the Wider World* (pp. 79-106). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Bibliography

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 2006. *Standards in Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (Yonkers, NY: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project)

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2006. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (London: Allen Lane (Penguin))

Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA). 2008. 'GCSE Specification French for Exams, 2010 Onwards' >http://web.aqa.org.uk/qual/newgcses/languages/new/french_materials.php?id=11&prev=11< [accessed 31 March 2010]

Banks, James A. (ed.). 2004. *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass)

Banks, James A., Cherry A. McGee Banks, Carlos E. Cortes, Carole Hahn, Merry Merryfield, Kogila A. Moodley, Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu, Audrey Osler, Caryn Park, & Walter C. Parker. 2005. *Democracy and Diversity: Principles and Concepts for Educating Citizens in a Global Age* (Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, University of Washington)

Beacco, Jean-Claude & Michael Byram. 2003. *Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe: From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe)

Beck, Ulrich. 2000. *What Is Globalization?* (Cambridge: Polity Press)

Bernstein, Richard. 2003. 'Obituary of Edward Said', *New York Times*, 25 September.

Birzea, Cesar. 2004. *Education for Democratic Citizenship Activities 2001-2004: All-European Study on EDC Policies* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe)

Byram, Michael, Bella Gribkova & Hugh Starkey (eds). 2002. *Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching: A Practical Introduction for Teachers* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division)

Cardiff, Piers, Kate Newman & Emma Pearce. 2006. *Reflect for Esol* (London: Actionaid)

CILT, *see* National Centre for Languages

Cooke, Melanie & James Simpson. 2008. *Esol: A Critical Guide* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Council of Europe. 1950. *European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe)

— 2000. 'Project on "Education for Democratic Citizenship". Resolution Adopted by the Council of Europe Ministers of Education at their 20th Session, Cracow, Poland, 15–17 October 2000' (Strasbourg: Council of Europe)

— 2002. *Recommendation Rec (2002)12 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on Education for Democratic Citizenship* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe)

— 2003. *Adopted Texts on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe)

Crick, Bernard. 1999. 'The Presuppositions of Citizenship Education', *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 33: 337–52

Dearing, Ron & Lid King. 2006. *Languages Review: Consultation Report* (London: DfES)

— 2007. *Languages Review: Final Report* (London: DfES)

Starkey, H. (2011). Language Learning for Human Rights and Democratic Citizenship. In C. Ros i Solé & J. Fenoulhet (Eds.), *Mobility and Localisation in Language Learning: A View from Languages of the Wider World* (pp. 79-106). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA). 1999. *The National Curriculum for England Key Stages 3 and 4* (London: Stationery Office)

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). 2001. *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (London: DfES)

— 2002. *Languages for All: Languages for Life. A Strategy for England* (London: DfES)

— 2007. *Diversity and Citizenship: Curriculum Review (Ajegbo Review)* (London: DfES)

Dewey, John. 2002. 'Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education', in *John Dewey and American Education Vol. 3* ed. by S. J. Maxcy (Bristol: Thoemmes Continuum)

DfEE, *see* Department for Education and Employment

DfES, *see* Department for Education and Skills

Etzioni, Amitai. 1995. *The Spirit of Community* (London: Fontana)

Fleig-Hamm, Christiane. 1998. 'La francophonie dans les manuels de français Langue seconde: apports et limites' ('Francophony in French Second Language Textbooks: Contributions and Limitations'), *Canadian Modern Languages Review / La revue canadienne des langues vivantes* 54: 461–74

Freire, Paolo. 1996. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

Gardner, J. P. (ed.). 1997. *Citizenship: The White Paper* (London: British Institute of International and Comparative Law)

Habermas, Jürgen. 1996. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* (Cambridge: Polity)

Hahn, Carole. 1998. *Becoming Political: Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education* (Albany: State University of New York Press)

— 2005. 'Diversity and Human Rights Learning in England and the United States', in *Teachers, Human Rights and Diversity: Educating Citizens in Multicultural Societies*, ed. by Audrey Osler (Stoke on Trent: Trentham) pp. 23–40

Han, Christine, Hugh Starkey & Andy Green. 2010. 'The Politics of ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages): Implications for Citizenship and Social Justice', *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 29: 63–76

Held, David. 1995. 'Democracy and the New International Order', in *Cosmopolitan Democracy*, ed. by Daniele Archibugi and David Held (London: Polity) pp. 96–120

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

— 2004. *Life in the United Kingdom: A Journey to Citizenship* (London: Stationery Office)

Hudson, Anne. 2005. 'Citizenship Education and Students' Identities: A School-Based Action Research Project', in *Teachers, Human Rights and Diversity: Educating Citizens in Multicultural Societies*, ed. by Audrey Osler (Stoke on Trent: Trentham)

Kaldor, Mary. 2003. 'American Power: From 'Compellance' to Cosmopolitanism?', *International Affairs* 79: 1–22

Kymlicka, Will. 2003. 'Multicultural States and Intercultural Citizens', *Theory and Research in Education* 1: 147–69

Starkey, H. (2011). Language Learning for Human Rights and Democratic Citizenship. In C. Ros i Solé & J. Fenoulhet (Eds.), *Mobility and Localisation in Language Learning: A View from Languages of the Wider World* (pp. 79-106). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Lo Bianco, Joseph. 2003. *A Site for Debate, Negotiation and Contest of National Identity: Language Policy in Australia* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe)

McLaughlin, Terrence. 1992. 'Citizenship, Diversity and Education: A Philosophical Perspective', *Journal of Moral Education* 21: 235–50

Ministerial Action Group on Languages. 2000. *Citizens of a Multilingual World* (Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department)

National Centre for Languages (CILT). 2010. 'GCSE Languages by Key Stage 4 Pupils – All Schools in England, 1994-2009' (London: CILT)

Nuffield Languages Inquiry. 2000. *Languages: The Next Generation* (London: Nuffield Foundation)

Osler, Audrey. 2008. 'Citizenship Education and the Ajegbo Report: Re-Imagining a Cosmopolitan Nation', *London Review of Education* 6: 9–23

Osler, Audrey & Hugh Starkey. 1996. *Teacher Education and Human Rights* (London: Fulton)

— 2001. 'Citizenship Education and National Identities in France and England: Inclusive or Exclusive?' *Oxford Review of Education* 27: 287–305

— 2003. 'Learning for Cosmopolitan Citizenship: Theoretical Debates and Young People's Experiences', *Educational Review* 55: 243–54

— 2005. *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education* (Maidenhead: Open University Press)

— 2009. 'Citizenship Education in France and England: Contrasting Approaches to National Identity and Diversity', in *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*, ed. by James A. Banks (New York: Routledge)

— 2010. *Teachers and Human Rights Education* (Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham)

Ouane, Adama. 2003. 'By Way of Conclusion: The Normality of Multilingualism and Its Political and Educational Implications', in *Towards a Multilingual Culture of Education*, ed. by Adama Ouane (Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education)

Pachler, Norbert. 2007. 'Choices in Language Education', *Cambridge Journal of Education* 37: 1–15

Parker, Walter C., Akira Ninomiya & John J. Cogan. 1999. 'Educating World Citizens: Toward Multinational Curriculum Development', *American Educational Research Journal* 36: 117–45

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA). 2007. *The National Curriculum: Statutory Requirements for Key Stages 3 and 4* (London: Department for Children, Schools and Families)

— 2008. *Report of Investigation into the Assessment of Speaking for GCSE Modern Foreign Languages* (London: QCA)

Richardson, Robin. 2005. 'Representing Britain as a Diverse Society: The Work of the British Council', in *Citizenship and Language Learning: International Perspectives*, ed. by Audrey Osler & Hugh Starkey (Stoke on Trent: Trentham) pp. 41–58

Runnymede Trust. 2000. *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report.* (London: Runnymede Trust)

— 2001. *Reporting on a Report: Runnymede Bulletin 326* (London: Runnymede Trust)

Sen, Amartya. 2006. *Identity and Violence. The Illusion of Destiny* (London: Allen Lane)

Starkey, H. (2011). Language Learning for Human Rights and Democratic Citizenship. In C. Ros i Solé & J. Fenoulhet (Eds.), *Mobility and Localisation in Language Learning: A View from Languages of the Wider World* (pp. 79-106). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Shohamy, Elena. 2006. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches* (Abingdon: Routledge)

Starkey, Hugh. 2007. 'Language Education, Identities and Citizenship: Developing Cosmopolitan Perspectives', *Language and Intercultural Communication* 7: 56–71

Starkey, Hugh & Xavière Hassan. 2000. 'Civilisation', in *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*, ed. by M. Byram (London: Routledge) pp. 108–10

Starkey, Hugh & Audrey Osler. 2001. 'Language Learning and Antiracism: Some Pedagogical Challenges', *Curriculum Journal* 12: 313–29

Stern, Hans Heinrich. 1970. *Perspectives on Second Language Teaching* (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education)

Tollefson, James (ed.). 1995. *Power and Inequality in Language Education* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Tyler, Imogen. 2010. 'Designed to Fail: A Biopolitics of British Citizenship', *Citizenship Studies* 14: 61–74

United Nations. 1945. *Charter of the United Nations* (New York: United Nations)

United Nations Organization. 1948. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (New York: UNO)