Gender Equality and Citizenship Education

Contents

Madeleine Arnot

1. Introduction

> "The transformation of human rights from a feminist perspective is
> crucial to addressing global challenges to human rights in the twenty-
> first century. This should be seen in the context of the growth and
> evolution of women's movements internationally in the past two
> decades. Women are taking leading roles in redefining social
> concepts and global policy issues in areas such as development,
> democracy, human rights, world security, and the environment. This
> means not just looking at what have been called 'women's issues' –
> a ghetto, or separate sphere that remains on the margins of society –
> but rather moving women from the margins to the center by
> questioning the most fundamental concepts of our social order so
> that they take better account of women's lives" (Bunch 1995, 11).

One of the most important issues in teaching democratic values for a sustainable
society is ensuring that what is considered 'democratic' is inclusive of all citizens in
society. A vibrant civic life in which male and female citizens are engaged in all aspects
of society is critical to the flourishing of democratic institutions, and an important
precondition for promoting social justice and human rights. Citizens' rights,
responsibilities and duties/obligations to society are premised upon individuals, groups
and communities having access to and being represented in national
political/governmental structures and being able to participate fully in the range of
economic, cultural and political structures of decision-making in society. Without such
equality, democracies – even many advanced Western European democracies – should
be considered as 'immature' (Arnot et al. 1996).

Education systems, as we know, play a crucial role in the formation of citizens. Schools, for example, both educate the citizen and provide education for citizenship. Without education, individuals cannot develop their full potential, nor can they participate fully as citizens in society. Educational institutions also contribute to civil society by offering individuals a chance to better their lives. Educational qualifications are a form of social and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1997) which can be converted into economic capital in the labour market. However, in terms of citizenship, such qualifications are a two edged sword. If unequally distributed, qualifications can increase the gap between those who already are advantaged and those citizens who are disadvantaged or marginalised. Education therefore can empower some citizens as well as providing an apparently neutral device for the social exclusion of groups of citizens. The distribution of education, therefore, has considerable significance for those groups in society, such as women, who still need to access what is their civic entitlement in the modern world.

As international agencies and world funding agencies are now aware, female access to education globally is central to the project of social progress. However, the right to access education is not sufficient to meet feminist egalitarian goals. Even though gender equality is one of the great democratic principles, the model of democratic citizenship on which educational systems are built paradoxically often excludes gender concerns. All too often discussions of citizenship are abstracted from real social (gender) relations and little attention is paid to the gendered nature of citizenship ideals. Feminist educationalists therefore have sought in many different ways to redefine what is meant by 'democratic', exploring and exposing in particular the limitations of liberal democratic educational traditions and its sometimes negative consequences for women. Democratic education from a feminist perspective involves at a far deeper level a challenge to the social conditions which have sustained women's second-class citizenship and their experiences of violence, harassment, and exploitation.

These debates have moved into new political spaces – significantly, they can now be found in the context of discussions about the nature of citizenship education – a subject that appears to have increased importance as a mechanism for sustaining nation-state identities as well as global economic development. Many nation-states are currently considering the role of education in the creation of citizens in the 21st century (Cogan, Derricott 2000). In response new centres for civic education have been set up; there is, for example, an Asian network of civic education, Commonwealth countries are being encouraged to consider citizenship education and the Council of Europe suggests it is time to consider what values and skills individuals will require in the 21st century (ibid.).

Paradoxically, these curricular initiatives can also provide the mechanism for re-establishing women's subordination. National concepts of citizenship by definition are based on a concept of belonging that is fundamentally exclusionary. Women, minority ethnic groups, refugees and asylum seekers, the disadvantaged and those with disabilities often find that their needs and concerns are marginalised from state policy but also that they do not have access to the rights of citizenship either formally because of their status as 'non-citizens' or because of their lack of economic, social and cultural resources which deny them opportunities to participate in formal political structures (such as voting) and civic associations (e.g. unions, political parties) and state

institutions (e.g. educational opportunities). Abstract notions of 'the citizen' can divert attention away from the need to address such social inequalities and forms of social exclusion. If governments are not alert, citizenship education becomes the political device with which to mask the stratificational and destructive effects of performance and managerialist cultures in schools. It represents an attempt arguably, in Durkheimian terms, to counter the anomie the normlessness of a globalised economy by recreating the bonds of social solidarity. Through this regulative and integrative work, citizenship education can perform the task of masking the differentiations and hierarchical values of society within notions of the 'common good'.

In sum, citizenship education – both the *education of citizens* and the *education for citizenship* (Beck 1998) – represents a vitally important core to the educational system and its social purposes. The establishment of 'mature' democracies is dependent upon national/international educational institutions offering full access *and* recognition to women, minority ethnic and religious groups, and other marginalised groups. The more that women break through the barriers of sex discrimination and claim new political and economic territory, the more complex the task of citizenship education becomes. The political spaces it offers women are fraught with ambivalence.

The education of citizens through national citizenship education programmes is now the focus of feminist challenge, revealing how complex an affair it is. In this paper, I would like to illustrate the nature of these developments by drawing on my recent critique of English and Welsh initiatives on citizenship education, which drew on civic republican and liberal democratic traditions (Arnot 2004) and more recent concerns about the gendering of global citizenship education.

2. English and Welsh Citizenship Educational Initiatives

In 2002 all secondary schools in England and Wales were instructed to deliver, in whatever form, the basis of citizenship education – a newly defined programme of study that would represent approximately five percent of the compulsory curriculum (Advisory Group on Citizenship 1998; DfEE/QCA 1999; QCA 2000 and 2002; Crick 2000a and 2000b). Not surprisingly, there was a wide national debate about what constitutes the nature of this curriculum. The gender elements of that debate, despite being integral to the teaching of human rights, were nevertheless rather muted and the citizenship education programme itself was also strangely silent about issues of gender (Osler, Starkey 1996). The new body of political educators was negligent in not engaging with a major body of Western political thought – feminist political theory, and feminist educationalists seem to have lost an important opportunity to achieve national recognition for gender equality as a guiding principle of citizenship education. Therefore, the implicit gender dimensions of this curriculum initiative were just as important as this overt neglect of gender equality (Arnot 2004).

The English example is important since it represents a well-articulated example of a public compromise between civic republican and liberal ideas. It represents an

important tension between the civic republican model of the 'active' participating citizen and the liberal model of the 'good citizen'. Sir Bernard Crick, who was asked to lead the initiative, had a long track record in relation to civic republicanism, encouraging a form of political education in school which distanced itself from simple notions of political literacy. He argued for a rich, or what T. McLaughlin (1992) called a maximal, model of citizenship in which children would be prepared for political participation, agency and commitment. The model had all the ingredients of an education for the good citizen but also of a more challenging notion of an active participating and potentially sceptical citizen. Paradoxically, this compromise between civic republicanism and liberal democracy had the effect of marginalising if not removing egalitarian concerns. It was significant that the concept of social 'equality', although initially included in the guidance to schools (QCA 2000), did not appear to be even mentioned in recent documentation. The development of an intellectually informed scepticism was thought to be more likely to aid egalitarian goals rather than the teaching of second order constructs such as social equality in schools (Crick 2000b, 71).

Some hope of political engagement with egalitarian concerns was found in Crick's personal conviction that the new citizenship education, defined by its liberal 'softly, softly but gently' approach to the conduct of government and its potentially powerful pedagogy of civic republicanism, might open Pandora's Box. The "irritatingly more unpredictable" free citizens (Crick 2000a, 114) "might become more demanding and more knowledgeable about how to achieve their demands" as a result of "the more disruptive, unpredictable civic republican theory" (ibid. 115). One could not preclude the ensuing development of a struggle for greater rights and power. Young citizens would be empowered by scepticism, on the one hand, and knowledge and strategic thinking, on the other.

Critics, however, were not convinced and argued that the development of the English and Welsh version of citizenship education and its associated curriculum guidance and schemes of work suggested an ambivalence, if not a discomfort, about the place of egalitarian goals within the frameworks of political literacy. The result of this stance appeared to be:

> "… an almost total absence of concern for structured inequalities, especially economic ones; a misrecognition of the political, social and educational hierarchies embedded in social relationships, networks and associations; and the invisibility of inequalities of power as an issue for social justice" (Garmarnikov, Green 1999, 120).

These authors suggested that what seemed to have disappeared in this example of Third Way politics with its emphasis on social capital and neo-liberalism was the social democratic agenda put forward in the post-war period and "any notion of serious struggle for rights in relation to both the state and other structures of power; citizenship as changing relations of power; and citizenship as fundamentally compromised by systemic, structured inequalities" (ibid. 120). The concepts of the 'empowered' or the 'educated' citizen replaced or displaced any central social justice concerns. Citizens, rather than the state, therefore were called upon to take responsibility for economic

renewal and for building social cohesion. Thus, contemporary liberal progressive tendencies were more likely to sustain rather than challenge globalised and dehumanising economies and "polarising social inequalities" (ibid. 121).

I argued that the neglect of gender equality at some level was not unexpected. Civic republicanism, despite its many great assets, had already proved problematic to feminist egalitarian concerns. The historical failure of civic republicanism to include, in any substantial way, civic society and the quality of life, even references to the family and the labour market, meant that it was not likely to recognise gender relations in anything other than the public/political sphere. Yet even in this sphere, there has been a tendency to elitism implied by the high level of participation required in formal politics, and militates against feminists aligning themselves with this approach. Western European civic republican traditions of participatory democracy offer a model of the citizen that was linked historically "with the involvement of men in formal politics, their association with the civic virtues of military valour and political activism" (Heater 1999, 91-2). Being a citizen and engaging in the practice of citizenship was assumed to be "a uniquely male function" (ibid. 92). Women were excluded from participation in nation-building since the dominant image of the citizen is framed by male narratives of nationalism and/or militarism (Turner 2001).

However, the separation of public and private spheres and the masculine associations of citizenship were not unique to civic republicanism – liberalism, that other influence on the Anglo-Saxon notion of citizenship, was equally gendered as a political philosophy. Jo-Anne Dillabough and I have suggested a range of gender difficulties associated with liberal democratic models of citizenship (Dillabough, Arnot 2002 and 2004). One key element in this critique has been, as Carol Pateman (1988) has so adeptly analysed, the form of social contract which was defined as the basis of liberal democratic philosophy, and was premised upon this public-private distinction. The social order of men was constructed over and above the alleged 'disorder of women' implied by their inferred emotionality, subjectivity and closeness to nature. Associated with the social contract was a second exploitative contract – what she called the *sexual contract*. Whilst the social contract formed the basis of a *brotherhood of man,* a political fraternity which controlled the political order, the sexual contract assigned men the right to women through marriage and control over the household. This latter contract controlled what was represented as the 'disorder' of women with their naturalistic, emotional and subjective qualities (Pateman 1989). Such a philosophy, whilst signalling the centrality of citizen rights, nevertheless constructed marriage and motherhood outside of the sphere of such rights and hence of citizenship. Women were allocated second-class citizenship with the prospect that their entry into the public civic world would only be achieved through the massive disruption of this public-private division. The conditions for women's inclusion in liberal democratic citizenship were their subordination to men and their exclusion from the public sphere. For women to achieve full citizenship status, the separation between male public and female private spheres would have to be removed.

With these gendered philosophical underpinnings, the 'silence about gender relations' in the new English citizenship curriculum was not surprising, even if it was a little

disappointing. References to gender were well hidden in a text which employed the language of 'discrimination', 'human rights' and 'equal opportunities' without any specific reference to the under-representation of women in public life, the need to encourage female leaders, the importance of women's engagement in civic decision-making or the encouragement of men's civic duties in relation to private life and fatherhood. There was a silence about the importance of challenging a historical legacy that marginalised the sphere of everyday family life (and indeed of motherhood and female virtues) from discussions about rights, duties, justice and freedom. De facto, the main focus of the curriculum subject was the male-centred public sphere.

These discourses of male gender power are detrimental and obstruct the very forms of political, civil and social engagement encouraged by the English citizenship curriculum. Without specific advice to schools to address such gendered biases, women's historic struggle for citizenship could be assumed to have been resolved with female suffrage, and contemporary languages of citizenship and their strong gendered representations of male and female citizens will be left unchallenged (see Arnot 2004).

3. Citizenship Issues in the Affective and Private Domains

What lies at the heart of the feminist difficulties with the modernist concept of citizenship is that, whilst it represents a socially unifying force whether within nationalist, socialist or liberal democratic frameworks, it is deeply ambivalent about the status and role of *collective identities* and collectivities and how to address issues of *difference* (Fraser 1995). These issues are especially difficult in liberal democratic models of citizenship which stress, for example: the importance of the individual over community and social/collective groups, and the centrality of individual choice over social intervention in the name of the common good. This begs the question about how to discuss the communality of women's experience and whether to frame policy on behalf of women as a social group. As Martha Nussbaum (1999) points out, what is at issue for feminists in relation to liberal democratic citizenship are the assumptions behind the abstract notion of the individual which cannot easily recognise pluralism – the differences between men and women in terms of life situations and experiences. Admittedly there is always the danger that by recognising gender differences, beliefs about essential biological/natural sex differences are legitimated. Nevertheless, recognition of the particular circumstances which have shaped women's lives and the contributions they can and have made to the development of society is central to the achievement of gender justice. At a minimum level, this entails teaching about men's and women's social positions, values and expectations. It means thinking about the gender assumptions behind current notions of citizenship.

Related to these points is the significance often attributed in discussions of citizenship to the notion of rationality and the resulting exclusion of 'the affective domain' (Nussbaum, Glover 1995) – the field of personal/emotional relationships from civic discourse. The focus on rationality as the basis of civic life results in the failure to value 'the caring ethos' and maternal values (Noddings 1988) found in the private and familial

sphere which might provide alternative models of citizenship and civic virtues. The late Sue Lees (2000), for example, when exploring the ways in which the 'personal' is divorced from the 'political' in the new English citizenship education programme challenges the failure to recognise complex changes in gender relations. Shifts in family life which are very relevant to the civic activity and the social rights of female and male citizens have been well documented. By the early 1990s, 27 percent of births in England and Wales were to unmarried mothers; women were marrying later and getting divorced earlier. Divorce has increased sixfold over the last 30 years. Citizenship rights for women as heads of household and single parents nevertheless are limited. Indeed female single parents are now classified as "an excluded group" (ibid. 261-2) – in other words a group which is unable to benefit from citizenship rights such as educational and employment opportunities. Such societal change in gender relations should surely be central to the civic project. Yet the normative stance taken by the citizenship education in relation to marriage is problematic, not least because of its confusions and obfuscations. For example, the Statement of Values produced by the National Forum for Values in Education and the Community for the Conservative government encourages schools to engage with the diversity of moral values but at the same time to support family and marriage, on the basis that there is a "general agreement" in schools about such pro-family values (QCA 2000, 195). Also in the new citizenship curriculum, there are only passing references to the need for young people to be taught about changes in personal relationships – "about the impact of separation, divorce and bereavement on families" (QCA 2000, 193).

National security is often sustained through a form of citizenship education which protects a stable model of good citizenship based upon heterosexual (married) nuclear families (Richardson 1998). As a result, lesbians and gay men carry an uncomfortable relationship to the 'nation' to which they belong but to which they are considered a threat. The restraints on teachers which prevent the schools promoting alternative life styles are symptomatic of such a moral panic. Tolerance of gay and lesbian groups is only on the condition that they remain within the boundaries defined by society. Lesbians and gay men are only 'partial citizens' since they are often excluded from civil, political and social rights (e.g. marriage, adoption of children), left unprotected from discrimination and harassment on grounds of sexuality by the law and the police, and experience prejudicial treatment in relation to social rights of welfare. Lesbians and gay men are thus 'dehumanised' by a 'disembodied' concept of citizenship (ibid.). Yet such contemporary debates about sexuality and citizenship, whilst often openly discussed in government, have not challenged the conventional political view of citizenship reproduced in the new citizenship curriculum. The programme sustains conventional models of heterosexuality. Had it not done so, the curriculum reform might not have been acceptable to government or particular constituencies.

Citizenship education in English and Welsh schools has been linked largely with personal, social and health education, but here again, we find the failure to engage in questioning gendered power relations. Adolescents are to be taught to be 'aware of exploitation in relationships' and:

– To challenge offending behaviour, prejudice, bullying, racism and discrimination assertively and take the initiative in giving and receiving support;

– To be able to talk about relationships and feelings;

– To deal with changing relationships in a positive way, showing goodwill to others and using strategies to resolve disagreements peacefully (QCA 2000, 193).

Yet as Lees noted, the failure of this particular citizenship education programme to interconnect sexuality education and citizenship education (despite the latter's recognition of the importance of civic dimensions in personal and social education) means that young people are not encouraged to develop, in the context of civic rights:

> "… an understanding of their sexuality, the choices that flow from it and the knowledge, understanding and power to make those choices positive, responsible and informed" (Hanson, Patrick 1995, quoted in Lees 2000, 262).

Citizenship education in the broad sense could become an invaluable space in which young men and women are taught about the way sexual identities are constructed and how they shape sexual behaviour/orientation. The rights to know about such things should be just as important as the mechanics of contraceptive devices. Extensive sociological research is now available for teachers and schools to draw upon to demonstrate how young people construct femininity and masculinity and relate to each other. The institutional and cultural constraints which shape sexual identities and the role of sexual performance in relation to normative notions of compulsory heterosexuality could be addressed. With this sort of education, the 'issues of responsibility and moral choice' (which are mentioned in the government reports on citizenship education) could be related, not just to political and economic rights, but to questions of sexual power relations, and to the different forms of male and female moral reasoning, and conflicting male and female responsibilities in society.

The international human rights community, according to Bunch (1995), has begun to recognise "gender-based violations as pervasive and insidious forms of human rights abuse" (17). However the mass violation of women's human rights through such gender-based violence is not generally considered an appropriate topic for citizenship education in schools. The battery of women, their physical and psychological imprisonment in the home, the violent entrapment of women in prostitution, pornography and domestic service, compulsory pregnancy, rape, female infanticide and the malnutrition of girls are human rights violations that demand urgent attention. Even the most critical models of liberal democratic citizenship education are simply not sufficient to address such issues. Citizenship education requires far more extensive politicisation in order to address such real but usually hidden gender injustices in the private sphere.

4. Conclusions: Critical Pedagogies and Women's Agency

It is important to note that the gender and education debate has swung into the global development context with the new Millennium Development Goals that promote gender parity in 2005 and gender equality in 2015. Yet there are still serious disparities in the experiences of men and women in European societies. As the Council of Europe seminar on 'A New Social Contract between Men and Women' argues, these disparities,

> "… compromise human rights for both men and women, including the right to participate fully as equal partners in all aspects of life. These disparities also have consequences for our societies which are consequently too often deprived of women's contribution in the public arena and men's contribution in the private sphere. These disparities eventually result in various forms of dysfunction that impact on men and women's lives and will tend to be perpetuated unless we succeed in bringing about a change in the relationship between women and men and in involving men in the struggle" (Council of Europe 2000, 2).

Critical engagement with men and women's status and experiences as citizens requires far more imaginative citizenship education programmes which consider what it would mean to have equal partnerships between men and women, equal pay, and a concept of male duty in relation to domestic work. The concept of a new social contract for men and women implies even more than this – it implies the promotion of new notions of civic agency – to think through what it would mean for girls firstly to acquire a sense of their own agency (Arnot, Dillabough 2000; Dillabough, Arnot, 2002 and 2004) and, secondly, to develop what Nancy Fraser (1995) called the 'principle of recognition'.

The exclusion of women from public democratic discourses does not necessarily imply the failure of women to engage actively with politics. In a major collaborative European project which I and my colleagues in Spain, Portugal and Greece conducted (Arnot et al. 1996 and 2000; Arnot 2002), female student teachers explored hegemonic representations of public and private life and the forms of femininity associated with each. Women were not seen as powerless agents – in fact three sources of female power were identified: the power of women as mothers and heads of household; female sexual power; and, feminism as power, that is feminist challenges to male dominance. Yet the recognition of women's power and the promotion of female agency and power are tasks which have hardly been discussed in relation to citizenship education. The encouragement by schools of female participation in school councils is only the tip of the iceberg. Recent research has shown that although there are some spaces in schools in which agency, negotiation, avoidance, opposition and resistance can be developed, these pedagogic spaces are limited, especially for girls (Gordon, Holland, Lahelma 2000). Often the spheres in which female agency can be developed are constrained by conventional definitions of femininity and the regulation of girls' sexuality. The rhetoric of equal and democratic participation which characterises much of

citizenship education adds to this by placing girls in a contradictory relationship to civic activity. The apparently neutral model of the 'active citizen' I have discussed in the English context sustains masculine conceptions of citizenship premised upon the subordination of women. Jo-Anne Dillabough and I argued for the importance of working with a deconstructed concept of citizenship which would employ a critical notion of female agency and equity, one that was not linked to masculine notions of rationality and autonomy but to alternative understandings of female political selfhood. Female citizenship would be based on the materiality of women's lives, their recognised social action, reflexivity, intersubjectivity and ethical communities (Dillabough, Arnot 2002). If politics were taken not in an instrumental or pragmatic sense, but as a horizon which "opens up the possibilities of human action and which is a contested symbolic, material and factual terrain", then political education would offer the opportunity to create new social identifications and forms of action (Morrow, Torres 1998, 22, quoted in Dillabough, Arnot 2002, 82).

By educating girls, they learn that they are respected as individuals and as members of a community; they learn that they have control over their own lives as individuals in their own right and that they are acquire the confidence to act. And, if girls acquire an appropriate form of political literacy, a full sense of civic (moral and social) responsibility and a commitment to become active citizens in the society in which they belong, then once adults, arguably they will be in a stronger position to achieve those egalitarian reforms required in the name of human rights and social justice. For this to be achieved, women need to be ensured 'privacy, protection and autonomy' within the educational system as well as outside (Yuval-Davies, Werbner 1999). The principle of gender equality should be built into the educational fabric and supported through civic curricula. Providing education for both girls and boys is only the first step to recognising that, first and foremost, women have a legitimate place as citizens in a democratic society.

Nancy Fraser (1995) notes that social justice for men and women must also entail a 'recognition of diversity' in the fullest sense, not just recognition of gender difference. This cultural recognition of diversity complements the redistribution of economic opportunities and privileges. It acknowledges and can even celebrate the material, cultural and symbolic differences between groups of women and between men as a result of religious, social class, ethnic and sexual dimensions. Not only are such differences becoming increasingly important as social relations change globally, but, for example, gender relations are also changing *within* social class cultures and ethnic or religious communities (Arnot, David, Weiner 1999). Citizenship education, therefore, can play a major role in helping young people address contemporary changes, in line with the principles of human rights and social justice. But in order to play such a role, a new model of the 'citizen' is required which is flexible, contestable and adaptable. Civic education programmes in schools could do worse than bring out into the open, illustrate and discuss these political and gender tensions for a new generation of both male and female youth.

Such is the importance of global change that the discussion about citizenship education is rapidly moving out of and away from national citizenship education programmes. Global citizenship education increasingly is positioning itself to replace national

narratives about the individual and the state. Arguably, a gender-sensitive, global citizenship education within a national school curriculum has much to offer. It has considerable potential to help women actively contribute to cross-national global thinking, providing a space for addressing gender-related issues and by empowering students to engage critically with contemporary concerns. In the more economically rich countries, it can encourage non-exploitative forms of intercultural communication and sharing with countries that might experience economic or humanitarian predicaments on a more significant scale. The goals of global citizenship education encapsulate the key themes of justice, equality, tolerance and peace and are now being adopted by a variety of countries. The aims are to ensure that children are educated about the most important social and economic issues in the world. In global citizenship education curricula, there are attempts to address gender equality and to show how female citizenship issues affect global, national and local communities. Organisations such as the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), for example, have issued mandates which recognise that multilateral institutions have a responsibility to understand and respond to the need to "build women's capacities to advocate their own interests" and to bring "the women's movement's experience with empowerment into the context of multilateral policy making" (Marshall, Arnot 2005). Women have made a major contribution to the promotion of global peace and social harmony and have contributed substantially to national development. Arguably, gender-sensitive global citizenship education programmes can provide the political spaces in which their contribution can be valued. Similarly, virtual global communities can offer women opportunities to experience autonomy and independence and can facilitate active involvement in global alliances (Kenway, Langmead 2000).

If gender equality is to become more than just a silent dimension of both national and global citizenship education, then official support must be given to developing an appropriate egalitarian agenda for schools. The starting point for this could fall under any or all of the following initiatives:

– The formation of appropriate international networks for the development of national and global citizenship education in relation to gender equality;

– The development of, and cross fertilisation of comparative research studies on gender and national and global citizenship education;

– The promotion of appropriate forms of national and global citizenship education for trainee teachers and educational practitioners as a means of highlighting and addressing contemporary gender concerns; and,

– The development of appropriate national and global citizenship education curricular guidance and material in which gender equality is integral.

References

Advisory Group on Citizenship. 1998. Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools – Final report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship 22 September 1998 (QCA – The Crick Report). London. (http://www.qca.org.uk/downloads/6123_crick_report_1998.pdf) published 22.09.1998

Arnot, Madeleine. 2002. Teachers' Conceptualisation of Men and Women in the Public Sphere. In: Gender Research Forum (Equality Research Network). (http://www.womenandequalityunit.gov.uk/research/gender_research_forum/grf_papers_feb_june/cabinettalkd9.pdf) published 11.02.2002.

Arnot, Madeleine. 2004. Citizenship Education and Gender. In: Lockyer, Andrew; Crick, Bernard; Annette, John, eds. Education for Democratic Citizenship – Issues of Theory and Practice. Aldershot, 103-119.

Arnot, Madeleine; Araújo, Helena; Deliyanni-Kouimtzi, Kiki; Rowe, Gabrielle; Tomé, Amparo. 1996. Teachers, Gender and the Discourses of Citizenship. In: International Studies in Sociology of Education, vol. 6 (1), 3-35.

Arnot, Madeleine; Araújo, Helene; Deliyanni-Kouimtzi, Kiki; Ivinson, Gabrielle. 2000. Changing Femininity, Changing Concepts of Citizenship in Public and Private Spheres. In: The European Journal of Women's Studies, vol. 7 (2), 149-168.

Arnot, Madeleine; David, Miriam; Weiner, Gaby. 1999. Closing the Gender Gap – Postwar Education and Social Change. Cambridge.

Arnot, Madeleine; Dillabough, Jo-Anne, eds. 2000. Challenging Democracy – International Perspectives on Gender, Education and Citizenship. London,

Beck, John. 1998. Morality and Citizenship in Education, London.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1997. The Forms of Capital. In: Halsey, Albert H.; Lauder, Hugh; Brown, Phillip; Stuart Wells, Amy, eds. Education – Culture, Economy, Society. Oxford, 46-58.

Bunch, Charlotte. 1995. Transforming Human Rights from a Feminist Perspective. In: Peters, Julie; Wolper, Andrea, eds. Women's Rights, Human Rights – International Feminist Perspectives, New York, 11-17.

Cogan, John J.; Derricott, Ray. 2000. Citizenship for the 21st Century – An International Perspective on Education. London.

Council of Europe 2000. A new Social Contract between Women and Men – The Role of Education, Proceedings of the Seminar, Strasbourg 7.-8. September 2000, EG/ED (2000) 13.

Crick, Bernard. 2000a. Essays on Citizenship. London.

Crick, Bernard. 2000b. The English Citizenship Order – A temperate reply to critics. In The School Field, vol. 11 (3/4), 61-72.

Crick, Bernard. 2002. Democracy – A very short Introduction. Oxford.

DfEE – Department for Education and Employment/QCA – Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. 1999. Citizenship – The National Curriculum for England, Key Stages 3-4. London.

Dillabough, Jo-Anne; Arnot, Madeleine. 2002. Recasting Educational Debates about Female Citizenship, Agency and Identity. In: The School Field, vol. 13 (3/4), 61-90.

Dillabough, Jo-Anne; Arnot, Madeleine. 2004. A Magnified Image of Female Citizenship in Education – Illusions of Democracy or Liberal Challenges to Symbolic Domination. In: Demaine, Jack, ed. Citizenship and Political Education Today. Basingstoke.

Fraser, Nancy. 1995. From Redistribution to Recognition? – Dilemmas of Justice in a 'Post-Socialist' Age. In: New Left Review Ser. I, vol. 212, 68-93.

Gamarnikow, Eva; Green, Anthony. 1999. Social Capital and the Educated Citizen. In: The School Field, vol. 10 (3/4), 103-126.

Gordon, Tuula; Holland, Janet; Lahelma, Elina. 2000. Making Spaces – Citizenship and Difference in Schools, London,

Hanson, Barbara; Patrick, P. 1995. Towards some understanding of Sexuality Education. In: Inman, Sally; Buck, Martin, eds. Adding Value? – Schools' Responsibility for Pupils' Personal Development. Stoke-on-Trent.

Heater, Derek 1999. What is Citizenship? Cambridge.

Kenway, Jane; Langmead, Diana. 2000. Cyberfeminism and Citizenship? – Challenging the Political Imaginary. In: Arnot, Madeleine; Dillabough, Jo-Anne, eds. Challenging Democracy – International Perspectives on Gender, Education and Citizenship. London, 312-329.

Lees, Sue. 2000. Sexuality and Citizenship. In: Arnot, Madeleine; Dillabough, Jo-Anne, eds. Challenging Democracy – International Perspectives on Gender, Education and Citizenship. London, 259-276.

Marshall, Harriet; Arnot, Madeleine. 2005. Competing Curriculum Agendas for Gender Justice – The Implications of National and Global Citizenship Education and EFA for the School Curriculum. Paper presented at the UKFIET Conference on Education and Development – Learning and Livelihood, September 13-15, 2005, Oxford.

McLaughlin, Terence H. 1992. Citizenship, Diversity and Education – A Philosophical Perspective. In: Journal of Moral Education, vol. 21 (3), 235-250.

Morrow, Raymond; Torres, Carlos A. 1998. Education and the Reproduction of Class, Gender and Race – Responding to the Postmodern Challenge. In: Torres, Carlos A.; Mitchell, Theodore R., eds. Sociology of Education – Emerging Perspectives. Albany, 91-119.

Noddings, Nel. 1988. An Ethic of Caring and its Implications for Instructional Arrangements. In: American Journal of Education, vol. 96 (2), 215-230.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 1999. Sex and Social Justice. Oxford.

Nussbaum, Martha C.; Glover, Jonathan. 1995. Emotions and Women's Capabilities. In: Nussbaum Martha C.; Glover, Jonathan, eds. Culture and Development – A Study of Human Capabilities. Oxford.

Osler, Audrey; Starkey, Hugh. 1996. Teacher Education and Human Rights. London.

QCA – Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. 2000. Citizenship at Key Stages 3 and 4 – Initial Guidance for Schools. Suffolk.

QCA – Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. 2002. Citizenship – A Scheme of Work for Key Stage 4. Sudbury, Suffolk.

Pateman, Carole. 1988. The Sexual Contract. Cambridge.

Pateman, Carole. 1989. The Disorder of Women. Cambridge.

Richardson, Diane. 1998. Sexuality and Citizenship. In: Sociology, vol. 32 (1), 83-100.

Skinner, Quentin. 1998. Liberty before Liberalism. Cambridge.

Turner, Bryan S. 2001. The Erosion of Citizenship. In: British Journal of Sociology, vol. 52 (2), 189-209.

Yuval-Davis, Nira; Werbner, Pnina. eds. 1999. Women, Citizenship and Difference. London.