

# Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship – Who is doing what today?



T-Kit  
on  
European Citizenship

Having explored different ways of understanding European Citizenship, and how the concepts have unfolded over the years, we now move on to look at how we educate for European Citizenship. As in the earlier chapters, we first see what we can learn from the experience of past and present approaches, and then outline our suggestions for good practice.

## **Education for European Citizenship – A Few Words Of Warning!**

As in all discussions about citizenship and European Citizenship, in academia or in practice, the debate on “education for citizenship” is influenced by political interests, conflicting concepts of the “good citizen” and opposing ideas of how best to educate people. According to Professor Bogdan Suchodolski, of the Polish Academy of Sciences, who is a survivor of the Holocaust, “I saw educated doctors give deadly injections to children, I saw educated lawyers in command, I lived in barracks built by educated architects and I saw educated students running the death camp” (quoted in Lauritzen, 2001). The good and just of this world are not the only ones who use citizenship education. Fascists also have a concept of what is a “good citizen” and educate for it.



How would you define a “good citizen”?



As you have already seen in this T-Kit, the notions of “citizenship” and “European Citizenship” are contentious, often controversial. A consensus on what they are, and should be, does not exist. As if things were not complicated enough for youth workers interested in this area, the concept of education for citizenship is just as unclear.

In most books, the discussions on this theme are largely “normative”, which means they discuss what “education for citizenship” *should* be, rather than how it is actually practised today and what its content *is at the moment*. In addition, the debate on “education for citizenship” is mostly dominated by theorists and practitioners of formal or in-school education. Their concerns are largely related to how to “teach” national citizenship in the first place.

It is only in some exceptional cases that European Citizenship (or, to be more precise, the European dimension in education for (national) citizenship) is actually referred to or explored. People refer relatively rarely to the fact, that non-formal educational contexts (such as the activities of youth organisations, and the educational programmes organised by youth workers), and informal educational situations (such as young peoples’ experiences of everyday life through music, peer-groups, culture and consumption) are also “sites of citizenship” (DECS/CIT (98) 38 rev.)<sup>3</sup>, where young people experience citizenship and learn how to practice it.



Where were you first encouraged to think about the terms and concepts Citizenship and European Citizenship?



This section of our T-Kit attempts to describe some of the educational concepts and practices used when dealing with citizenship issues. It takes as its starting point the two conceptions of citizenship education which are most commonly referred to as underlying programmes that aim to educate for citizenship in Europe. As a second step, we will attempt to summarise the commonly accepted objectives of this education, critically exploring the concepts and practices of citizenship which the literature proposes.

3. Term coined by the Council of Europe project on “education for democratic citizenship”. Sites of citizenship are defined as “...new, or innovative, forms of management of democratic life. The sites consist of any initiative (centre, institution, community, neighbourhood, town, city, region, etc) where there is an attempt to give definition to, and implement, the principles of modern democratic citizenship. The site is a practice, or a set of practices, which will illustrate the modern day meaning of citizenship and the structures which support it

**A History of Europe and Citizenship**

**Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship**

**Future Developments**

**Our Conceptual Framework**

**Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship**

**Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship**

**Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples**



Thirdly, we will take a look at the whole issue of Europe in relation to citizenship education, and reflect on the European dimension in citizenship education programmes. Again, a critical eye will help us to understand better the existing practices in relation to the European dimension of education. Lastly, we will attempt to outline «Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship» consisting of some general reflections (based on the integral, dynamic and complex nature of European Citizenship that we propose in this T-Kit) and of some competencies that we feel are key contents of education for European Citizenship today.

### ***Education for Citizenship – Common Driving Forces and Objectives***

According to the literature which we consulted, there are two main and differing schools of thought about “education for citizenship”, which are inspired by two historically dominant conceptions of national citizenship in democratic societies. The first school of thought is known as “Communitarian” or “Civic Republican” and the second is known as “Individualist”. Both of these schools of thought have developed out of the larger philosophical movement known as “liberalism”.

Each of these schools has developed a concept of national citizenship, through which they define what they think a “good citizen” is, and on that basis they define how to educate these “good citizens”. As we will outline below, the two schools differ quite radically in what they understand by citizenship, the idea of the “good citizen” and the objectives and content of “education for citizenship”.

#### **Communitarian or Civic Republican understandings of Education for Citizenship**

Communitarians and Civic Republicans believe that citizenship involves “membership of a community entailing a juridical status which confers formal rights and obligations, such as equality under the law, the right to vote, paying taxes or otherwise contributing to the social and economic welfare of the community. The concern is over the extent to which these are safeguarded in law and government, and also over whether citizens practice these formally established rights and obligations...” (Gilbert, 1996). Community membership is the most important characteristic of this approach to citizenship. The members of the community must have some common values, interests and obligations in order to form a community. In this view, citizenship is seen as more than a status: it is an activity and it should be practised. Without practising your citizenship it is not possible to be a citizen. In fulfilling the tasks of citizenship, a person’s identity as a member of the community is maintained and sustained.

This approach to citizenship implies that education for citizenship should empower and support people to practice citizenship, by providing information, skills and resources so that they are capable of taking the opportunity and using the possibilities which are provided. However, it should also promote the obligations of citizenship, and encourage loyalty and obedience to the community’s shared values. So in this view, education for citizenship should “be concerned with ensuring that citizens can and do contribute to the practice of citizenship” (Gilbert, 1996).

According to Derek Heater (1990), citizenship education should help citizens to understand their role, which for him involves status, loyalty, duties and rights “not primarily in relation to another human being but in relation to an abstract concept, the state” (p.2). For Heater, citizenship is defined by two characteristics – “identity and virtue”, and these should be at the heart of the citizenship education project. Identity can be based on many different senses of belonging, such as ethnicity or gender, but citizenship is the identity of identities, and “helps to tame the divisive passions of other identities” (ibid. p.184). Virtues such as respect for procedural rules, and a sense of responsibility and loyalty towards the community are key to citizenship in Heater’s view.



---

Citizenship education, in this view, could have the following objectives:

- To familiarise individuals with the values of the community to which they belong and to which they owe their rights as citizens (today, this community is usually the nation state, and so the values of the community would be so-called “national values”);
- To develop a sense of common responsibility among citizens for the well-being and continual development of the community;
- To familiarise individuals with their roles and obligations, as well as their rights, under the terms of their citizenship;
- To provide individuals and groups with the instruments and capacities (e.g. skills, intellectual resources) to actively carry out their citizen’s obligations towards the rest of the community;
- To develop a sense of loyalty and obedience among individuals to the community which has granted citizenship.



To what extent do you agree with these objectives?



### **Individualist understandings of Education for Citizenship**

Individualists believe that citizenship is a status that confers rights on individuals and sovereignty over their own lives. Hence, the function of the political sphere is to provide space for citizens to exercise their rights, and to protect them to do that. Citizens should be left to follow whatever collective or individual interests they consider appropriate, and political arrangements are made to allow for this. These arrangements, however, are largely utilitarian in nature. Hence, citizens have the right to participate politically, but it is up to them to choose how and when they do so within the limits of the political arrangements made to facilitate their participation (like welfare or special access for the disadvantaged). It is equally the right of the citizen to choose not to be active politically.

This idea of citizenship has one major advantage, which is that it does not propose one and only one definition of the “good life”. In this account, the guarantor of individual freedoms is the political system, and people are limited in the pursuit of their individual or collective interests only by being obliged to respect the autonomy of others and the institutional arrangements put in place to guarantee that freedom (Oldfield, 1990 in Gilbert, in Demaine and Entwistle, 1996).

This view of citizenship implies that education for citizenship should focus on the rules and procedures put in place for political and other forms of participation, so that people know how to participate. Developing citizens skills such as the ability to resolve conflicts without infringing on the rights of others, to express opposition to a particular course of action proposed by government, to defend one’s rights and maintain one’s individual autonomy are central to Individualist approaches to education.

However, such approaches do not concern themselves with “substantive rights or common values” (Gilbert, in Demaine and Entwistle, 1996) or with encouraging people to come up with alternative solutions or propositions to those they oppose. Citizens are to be educated to be able to participate if they want to and not to infringe upon the freedom of others.

So, citizenship education in this view could have the following objectives:

- To provide individuals with knowledge and skills that allow them to exercise their rights to the full, without infringing upon the autonomy of other individuals;



**A History of Europe  
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary  
Approaches  
to Citizenship**

**Future  
Developments**



**Our Conceptual  
Framework**

**Contemporary  
Approaches  
to Education  
for European  
Citizenship**

**Our Educational  
Approach  
to European  
Citizenship**

**Citizenship  
Scenarios –  
Project Examples**

- To provide individuals with the capacity to express opposition to courses of action and political developments that they do not consider to be in their interest or in the interest of society as a whole;
- To provide individuals with the required confidence and competence to participate in the political sphere within the constraints imposed by the rules of political engagement put in place;
- To provide individuals with the means to defend their rights as citizens.


 To what extent do you agree with these objectives?
 

**Problems and dilemmas**

These differing objectives imply that the approaches in developing citizenship education curricula are likely to be different, and that the results and benefits brought by these curricula will be different. In terms of content, Communitarian approaches to education for citizenship differ from individualist approaches because they propose what the values binding the community together should be and Individualist approaches do not. Hence, Communitarian education for citizenship can encounter accusations of both moralism and paternalism. In addition, it suffers from the fact that today's society is marked by increasingly different value systems being present within one community – people believe different things and today express this openly.

The problem is that Communitarian approaches to education for citizenship propose one dominant set of values to which the community as a whole is supposed to subscribe. And they do this despite the fact that people are more and more aware of diversity within the society as a whole, as well as between and within individuals. Hence, Communitarian education for citizenship remains faced by the problem of how to define the criteria for membership of the community, whilst at the same time being aware of the potential for exclusion.

Individualist approaches to education for citizenship are also faced with a number of problems. They are weak in providing a sense of belonging or identification for the citizenship they propose, because they avoid any discussion of values and norms. In addition, they may alienate people by their specific attention to procedure and rules. And while they wish to develop the capacity for critical thinking and opposition by the individual, they do not advocate that individuals propose alternative courses of action.

These approaches share some problems in common. The first is that they are both so-called “protective models” (Hogan, in Kennedy et al, 1997). Both these approaches aim to provide citizens with possibilities and skills for participation, even for criticism. However, the actual extent to which citizens *can* participate has an effect on the kind of education for citizenship provided or proposed. In most contemporary democracies, opportunities for direct access to decision-making procedures, the heart of political participation, comes regularly but only rarely, in the form of elections.

In both approaches to education for citizenship, individuals are to be taught how to use the right and obligation to “participate”. This could be equated with teaching about elections and voting. They may, however, not be taught how to articulate their interests vis-à-vis political decision makers or to propose alternative solutions to the problems that concern them. In our contemporary systems of pluralist democracy, participation is considered good, but only to the extent that it does not undermine the foundations of the society and the political system. In other words, revolutionary activity is not considered in either of these approaches as an act of citizenship.

Secondly, both approaches remain quite distant from today's realities, in particular the realities of young people. In the case of communitarian approaches, they propose value systems which come close to being exclusive, that cannot live up to the diversity of contemporary society and life. In the case of individualist approaches, they propose no values whatsoever, except for the autonomy of the individual and, therefore, do not provide any means for young people to express their identifications in a positive and socially constructive manner. And the education that both propose remains largely focused on providing skills for negotiating participation in the public domain and formal politics.



These educational approaches do not sufficiently consider the potential other forms of identification of young people, and their desire for cultural expression. They, therefore, have difficulty taking into account the more alternative forms of political engagement of young people (e.g. cultural and identity politics, environmental protection or anti-racism, music and lifestyle movements) and as a result find it difficult to validate, prepare for and work with the civic potential of such forms of participation.

Thirdly, there is the problem of motivation. Both approaches have difficulty detailing how individuals can be and remain motivated to carry out the duties, and practice the rights of citizenship. In the case of communitarian approaches, education faces the challenge of developing the motivation of individuals to carry out their citizen's obligations. In the case of individual approaches, education faces the challenge of motivating individuals not to limit the autonomy or freedom of others in exercising their own rights as citizens.

Ironically, both schools of thought resort to arguments made by the other to provide answers to the motivation problem. Communitarians suggest individual self-interest.

For the individual the benefits of carrying out their citizen's obligations are larger than if they do not carry them out. Individualists suggest commitment to common values and community solidarity as the reason for individuals not to limit the freedom of others in the exercise of their rights. If we accept that there is a motivation problem for national citizenship, which is arguably easier to identify with for most people than some abstract notion of European or trans-national citizenship, then it follows that we also face a motivation problem when dealing with European Citizenship.



How can we motivate young people to practice European Citizenship?



The following table compares the advantages and disadvantages of the two approaches as explained above in summary form:

*Figure 12 – Table of Individualist and Communitarian Approaches to Education for Citizenship*

	Advantage	Disadvantage
<b>Individualist</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community membership is technical rather than value based, so less likelihood of exclusion</li> <li>Citizenship as a status conferring rights, no obligation to perform duties in order to be considered a citizen</li> <li>Can work with diversity</li> <li>Allows for critical thinking and opposition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak in providing sense of identification due to "no values" approach</li> <li>Can alienate by focus on procedure and rules</li> <li>Does not provide for alternative ideas</li> <li>Protective model</li> <li>Far from realities of young people</li> <li>Motivation problem</li> <li>Problem of individual self interest</li> </ul>
<b>Communitarian</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides values with which to identify</li> <li>Develops sense of responsibility and duty to the community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes one over-riding set of values binding the community together – problems of paternalism, moralism and exclusivity</li> <li>How to define criteria for entry into the community</li> <li>Requires obedience and loyalty</li> <li>Protective model</li> <li>Far from realities of young people</li> <li>Motivation problem</li> </ul>



Which elements of these approaches do you most identify with?





Debate about what the content of citizenship education should be is very lively. Both approaches face a common dilemma when trying to identify how best to educate citizens. The question on everyone's lips is: "should education for citizenship be a subject of its own or should it be a transversal educational priority and approach?" Much of the scholarly literature available on education for citizenship explores how citizenship education can be achieved through the existing curriculum of the average school, placing particular attention on the teaching of history (national, European and world), languages (native and foreign, modern and classical), cultural studies, area studies and geography, but also clearly marking out a role for social and political studies and even the natural sciences.

The aim of this approach is to incorporate the development of citizenship attitudes and core skills for the practice of citizenship into the existing school curriculum, without endangering the quality and standards of general education. The other approach, where citizenship is treated as a subject matter of its own, and is referred to under a variety of titles including Human Rights Education, Civic Education, Values Education, Education for Citizenship or Education for Democratic Citizenship, Personal Education, Social Education, as well as Environmental Education, views citizenship as a definable body of knowledge and skills for which educational institutions can offer a range of courses of study, both compulsory and optional.

No consensus has been reached on which of these two approaches is more effective in providing young people with the knowledge, skills and motivation to act as citizens and participate in the development of their polities and societies. And while this question is largely debated in the literature about formal education, there is plenty of evidence that this is also a debate of concern to non-formal educators and educational institutions.

**“ Should education for citizenship be a subject of its own  
or should it be a transversal educational priority and approach? ”**

***The European Dimension to Education for Citizenship***

When speaking of the European dimension to Education for Citizenship it would be wise to remember that the language used in the scholarly literature in this regard is very clear. While we may wish for a more "European" approach to education (which can mean everything from an approach which is more cosmopolitan to more human rights centred), we are faced with the reality that the "European" remains only one, and only a young, dimension of education for citizenship in most national curricula, a dimension that is considered additional to national citizenship, if referred to at all.

The concern of educators to include a European dimension in citizenship education has developed from the reality of living in "Europe" (understood in most literature as living in the European Union). It is acknowledged that the community is a wide concept encompassing much more than the nation state, where regions find themselves defined across national boundaries and where individuals are becoming more and more aware of decisions made at European and world level as having a direct influence on their daily lives, whether that be in material terms or in terms of individual capacity to exercise certain rights, such as the freedom of movement.

The difficulty with this understanding is that citizens of the different nations of Europe also live in the world and are significantly affected by world events and developments (in particular all events related to the globalisation of markets and economies, as has been mentioned earlier). So far, it is difficult to say that "world citizenship" has a meaning for most people, despite the best efforts of organisations such as UNESCO and other UN agencies who wish to promote it. Hence, this understanding of European Citizenship more or less ignores the global dimension of citizenship and has the tendency to be largely Euro-centric.



The definitions current in different European Institutions have a bearing on what can be understood as European Citizenship and, therefore, education for it. In the European Union, European Citizenship has until very recently been exclusively defined in procedural terms: a status conferred on all those holding the citizenship of any member state of the EU, providing certain additional rights to such citizens – freedom of movement within EU territory, the possibility of directly electing Members of European Parliament and so on. In the Council of Europe, on the other hand, values such as human rights protection, pluralist democracy, democratic stability and security and social cohesion, as well as cultural diversity in a geographical Europe have been and remain the defining parameters of European Citizenship.

As has been discussed in more depth in “Contemporary Approaches to European Citizenship”, the difference between these two approaches, in both conceptual and theoretical terms, is very simple: in the EU definition, European Citizenship is a status conferred automatically on those who are already citizens of a member state of the EU and is accompanied by additional rights to those conferred by national citizenship. In the Council of Europe definition, European Citizenship is an attitude or behaviour one develops through adopting certain values (human rights, democratic security, social cohesion and the rule of law<sup>4</sup>) and their practice, regardless of one’s nationality or citizenship status. In theory, according to this latter definition, even those who are stateless can be European citizens. Of course, practice tells a different story, because without a relationship to a state and the civil and political rights that are conferred on individuals by that relationship, marginalisation is practically unavoidable. It is no surprise, therefore, that in their translation into educational programmes these two approaches differ considerably.



What have been your experiences of education for European Citizenship, if any?



### European Union and Council of Europe Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

In terms of the content of national curricula, the European dimension of education for citizenship is full of conceptual difficulties. In the European Union, and in countries now in the process of accession to the EU, the European dimension of citizenship education is largely defined by teaching and training knowledge and skills that allow citizens and potential citizens of the EU to understand the institutional reality of the European Union, the rights conferred by EU citizenship (including the right to vote in European Parliament elections and, if resident in another member state of the EU, to participate in local or municipal elections) and the procedural functioning of the European Union institutions<sup>5</sup>.

In other countries, in particular in the many member states of the Council of Europe, that so far are not even considered potential candidates for EU accession, the concern is to find common points of interest among citizens of a wider Europe. In countries of the former Soviet Union and in South East Europe, “European Citizenship” is attractive but illusory, as it is bound up with perceptions of material well-being, freedom of movement and absence of war or violent conflict that the safe haven of the EU represents in the collective mind’s eye.

The approach of the Council of Europe also has its drawbacks, as no consensus exists in many of its member states as to the historical and cultural reasons binding them to so called “European values”. The advantage of the Council of Europe approach, however, is that in promoting a value based identity, understood in terms of a citizenship that is European, individuals and groups can freely promote those values without reference to status, ethnicity, geography or history. Educational programmes can also promote such values, and therefore, have the possibility to define themselves as “European”.

On the European level, the educational programmes of both the Council of Europe and the European Union (in particular in the youth field) have come much further in exploring the

4 For more information on the values and mission of the Council of Europe, please refer to its web site: [www.coe.int](http://www.coe.int)

5 For more information on the European Union institutions and their mandates and roles, please consult the EU website: <http://europa.eu.int/>.

**A History of Europe and Citizenship**

**Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship**

**Future Developments**

**Our Conceptual Framework**

**Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship**

**Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship**

**Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples**



“European Citizenship” maze and in developing practices reflecting the values based approach. In terms of curricula, both the EU and the Council of Europe have developed youth programmes that promote the values of a European Citizenship that is constructed as a choice and as a practice. The EU programmes that promote European Citizenship or use education for European Citizenship as an approach to work with young people are seen as complementary to national educational provision (both formal and non-formal) and are intended to promote a European Union that is closer to its citizens, one concerned with the betterment of the lives of all the people living within the territory of the Union, whether citizens of the Union or not. Hence, in the practice of European Citizenship, as promoted by such programmes, status is less of an issue. The continual enlargement of the youth and education programmes of the Union, to include accession countries and so-called “third countries” (countries that are neither members of the Union, nor accession countries, nor programme members) is further proof of good intentions. Some of the more prominent examples of such programmes in the EU are Socrates, Leonardo Da Vinci, Erasmus, and the Youth Programme (including the European Voluntary Service Programme)<sup>6</sup>.

**“ European Citizenship should be constructed  
as a choice and as a practice ”**

In the Council of Europe, programmes which address education for European Citizenship are seen as standard setting test sites for the development of new and innovative approaches and practices which can eventually be adopted and adapted by national education and training institutions and youth policy actors. In the Council of Europe, European Citizenship, as defined above, is one of the main priority fields of action of the youth sector for the years 2003 to 2005. It is emerging out of a thirty year history of developing youth participation at all levels of society, and is motivated by the ongoing concern that participation and active citizenship among young people has to find explicit expression in youth policy at the European level. In the Council of Europe, the Education for Democratic Citizenship Project, the History Text Book Project, the Participation and Democratic Citizenship programme of the Directorate of Youth and Sport and the European Youth Worker Training Programme in partnership with the European Commission, are good examples<sup>7</sup>.

***Education for European Citizenship in Practice***

While a survey of the practices of the European dimension of citizenship education in the national curricula of all European countries is impossible to undertake in this publication, the European level programmes offer some significant food for thought, in particular for those who are interested in developing non-formal education activities for young people on European Citizenship or using European Citizenship as an approach<sup>8</sup>.

In terms of content, all the European level programmes mentioned above have a number of important features in common. Interestingly, despite their different starting points and philosophies, the European Union and the Council of Europe agree on a number of core values and competencies that education for European Citizenship should educate for. The following section will attempt to provide a description of the core features of education for European Citizenship, as expressed in the programmes of the two institutions.

6 For more information on EU programmes promoting European Citizenship, please refer to the following website: <http://europa.eu.int/>

7 For more information on Council of Europe programmes promoting European Citizenship, please refer to the following website: [www.coe.int/youth](http://www.coe.int/youth) and [www.coe.int](http://www.coe.int)

8 For further information on the content of national education systems and the place of citizenship education within them please refer to the following website <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/Databanks/Dossiers/mainfram.htm> which provides general information on the education systems of all UNESCO member states



---

For these two institutions the core competencies are grouped according to four interlinked dimensions of the practice of citizenship (Veldhuis, 1997)<sup>9</sup>:

### **Political and legal dimension**

This dimension implies that education should address the knowledge, attitudes and competencies needed for individuals to exercise their rights, and carry out their duties in the context of the political and legal systems governing citizenship, whether national, international (i.e. Council of Europe) or supra-national (i.e. European Union). This implies that education for European Citizenship should be concerned with developing knowledge concerning political and legal systems (for example, civil and political rights, other human rights, civic obligations), skills for participation in those systems and constructively critical attitudes towards them, attitudes favourable towards democracy and its development through individual and collective action and competencies for active participation in the life of the public sphere, including the European public sphere.

### **Social dimension**

This dimension implies that education for European Citizenship should address the ways in which social relations develop and are carried out between individuals and groups. Covered by this dimension are issues and values such as solidarity and mutual respect, valuing the contribution of all individuals to society, and having equal opportunity to contribute to the development of society. Social competencies such as negotiation skills, empathy, active tolerance and mutual support should be educated for.

### **Economic dimension**

Although often little acknowledged, economics plays a determining role in the extent to which people can act as citizens. The “have-nots” of society are often the target of specialised programmes to develop their capacity to participate as active citizens. However, under this dimension, all citizens would be socialised to the development of the economic competence necessary to actively participate, including knowledge of how economics function, in particular knowledge of the growing global dimension of economic life, the role of consumption in the production of sites of citizenship and knowledge of the world of production and employment. In addition, it would educate citizens to understand and try to change the economic mechanisms that exclude others from full participation and by implication, active citizenship.

### **Cultural dimension**

Under the cultural dimension would be placed all skills pertaining to the development and practice of the common values espoused under European Citizenship. It refers to high cultural aspects such as knowledge of European and world history, different cultures and peoples and languages. However, more importantly, it also refers to the interior side of European Citizenship, to varied but complementary senses of belonging within a common heritage and to values such as the universality of human rights, environmental protection, non-discrimination and respect for others.

While all of these dimensions of the European Citizenship education project as understood by its two main sources (Council of Europe and European Union), imply a strong cognitive, knowledge based approach, the *practice* of education for European Citizenship in the non-formal

<sup>9</sup> These four dimensions of Citizenship were developed by Ruud Veldhuis, in “Education for Democratic Citizenship: Dimensions of Citizenship, Core Competencies, Variables and International Activities”, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1997, document DECS/CIT (97) 23. See also on pp. 32-34



**A History of Europe  
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary  
Approaches  
to Citizenship**

**Future  
Developments**

**Our Conceptual  
Framework**

---

**Contemporary  
Approaches  
to Education  
for European  
Citizenship**

---

**Our Educational  
Approach  
to European  
Citizenship**

**Citizenship  
Scenarios –  
Project Examples**

---

educational contexts and programmes of these institutions has shown that there is more to this kind of education than just factual knowledge. The European Citizenship education coin has two sides, one relating to cognitive development and the other relating to the development of attitudes. There is even reason to believe that of the two sides of the European Citizenship education coin, the attitudinal side is the more important in addressing some of the difficulties of education for citizenship mentioned above, such as the motivation problem.

Having looked at how other people and institutions are approaching education for European Citizenship, the next chapter explores our ideas for how to go about it.



Which do you feel is more important – developing attitudes or knowledge?

