

Higher Education, Educational Policy and Citizenship Development

Wiel Veugelers

Isolde de Groot

University of Humanistic Studies Utrecht

Silvia Llomovatte

Judith Naidorf

University of Buenos Aires

Abstract

Given the fact that countries can differ in their educational policy and practice and that these national contexts are influenced by international developments makes it interesting to do comparative research into policy and practice of different countries. In this article we present the results of a comparative inquiry into citizenship and citizenship education policies and practices in different countries. The study was conducted in the context of the RIAIPE3 project (Teodoro & Guilherme, 2014) in which universities of Europe, Central America and Latin America cooperated in research on the role of universities in stimulating equity, social cohesion and democracy. This study aimed to gain an insight into the policies and practices in European and Latin American countries on citizenship development in higher education, thus providing **novel** insight into the commonalities and differences among these countries.

Keywords: citizenship; higher education; global developments; national policy

Introduction

Education in a country depends on the national culture, the national policy and grassroots movements. But these national articulations are influenced by international developments. This interaction between local and global is analysed by scholars with different concepts. Rudd and Goodson (2014) use the concept of refraction to analyse how international developments are accommodated in a national context. Ozga

(2005) uses the concept of travelling policy to show that countries adapt policy of other countries in their own system.

Spring (2004) analyses this interplay of national and international developments on the content that is at stake. In his book 'How educational ideologies are shaping global society' Spring (2004) distinguishes three ideologies that are influencing national educational policy. The first he calls 'Nationalist education in the age of globalization'. In this ideology emphasis is placed on the own national history, culture and language. Nations use this ideology for nation building, reproduction and social integration. This ideology is popular amongst national policy makers. The second ideology 'Schooling workers for the global economy' focuses on international competition and comparison. It's about standardization of education in a technical sense. It's a neoliberal market view on the so called 'knowledge society'. This ideology is promoted by organizations as the World Bank, IMF and OECD. In nations this ideology is popular among policymakers who support a neoliberal approach to society and who have concerns about the position of their country in the global market. Spring calls the third ideology 'Globalizing morality', this ideology focuses on human rights, democracy and sustainability. This ideology is popular among UNESCO and NGO's. In concrete educational policies and practices these ideologies go together and fight for hegemony. Each country has a special mix of the three ideologies.

Given the fact that countries can differ in their educational policy and practice and that these national contexts are influenced by international developments makes it interesting to do comparative research into policy and practice of different countries. In this article we present the results of a comparative inquiry into citizenship and citizenship education policies and practices in different countries. The study was conducted in the context of the RIAIPE3 project (Teodoro & Guilherme, 2014) in which universities of Europe, Central America and Latin America cooperated in research on the role of universities in stimulating equity, social cohesion and democracy. This study aimed to gain an insight into the policies and practices in European and Latin American countries on citizenship development in higher education, thus providing novel insight into the commonalities and differences among these countries.

Theoretical Framework

A more transformative higher education

Sociology of education makes a distinction in three functions of education: personal development, preparing for the labour market, and preparing for living in society. The articulation of these functions can

differ, depending on the ideology of the people involved and the conditions in each specific context. We are in particular interested in students' preparation for living in society. Nowadays citizenship is the concept that expresses this preparation for society. Citizenship as concept is in theory and in policy not anymore restricted to the national state, but encloses regional conglomerations (f.e. European citizenship) and even the whole world (global citizenship). Also citizenship is not limited to the political level, but includes the social and cultural level.

Citizenship can be articulated in different ways. In earlier theoretical and empirical studies we found three different types of citizenship: an adapted one, an individualized one, and a more critical democratic one (Veugelers, 2007; Leenders, Veugelers & de Kat, 2008a). These types of citizenship differ in political orientations, and relate to different pedagogical goals and educational practices. In actual policies and practices of citizenship and citizenship education there will be a mix of these orientations. Policy and practice of citizenship and citizenship education can change over time, depending on changes in ideology and developments on the international, regional and national level.

In this study we will focus on debates and practices on citizenship, and the role education – in particular universities – can play in citizenship education and the civic engagement and responsibility of their graduates. Universities, like other educational institutes, are always implicit and often explicit, contributing to the development of the citizenship identity of students. Universities can formulate an own vision on citizenship and citizenship education. For example, at the RIAIPE3 conference in Bolivia in 2011, several speakers made a strong plea for the contribution of university graduates to society. According to them, university graduates have an extra duty in helping building a democratic and sustainable society. Such ideas are an expression of a desire for a more transformative, critical, and society-oriented focus on higher education.

But there are other views on education. Often higher education is considered a space for intellectual cultivation and identified as a space separated from society. In this vision, sometimes called *Bildung*, intellectual development is considered as studying the great cultural traditions, the great books. This vision is presented as 'high culture' and considered as value-free. In fact, as Aloni (2003) showed it is a traditional view on culture, celebrating an elite culture and individuality, and neglecting the societal and political conditions of human life. Another, more 'modern' view on higher education, consider education as instrumental in contributing to knowledge, technical and economic advancement. This view embodies technological and economic devel-

opment as the motor of societal development, even more important than human development. There are, however, views on higher education that focus on equity, social cohesion and democracy. These views stress the importance of social change and social justice, and the importance of empowering people. Such education tries to create a different kind of intellectual and citizen: one that is more critical and socially engaged.

These critical perspectives are articulated in Latin America, as shown in the pedagogy of Paulo Freire (1973) and in 'Critical Pedagogy', the theoretical tradition that came out of his work. Critical pedagogy includes a wide range of theoretical orientations and practices (Veugelers, 2011c). Critical pedagogy is a movement that has been founded on the educational and philosophical traditions of Freire, the Frankfurter Schule (Habermas), French philosophy (Foucault), Pragmatism (Dewey), and Cultural Activity Theory (Vygotsky). '.

In the RIAIPE3 project scholars tried to develop a critical pedagogical perspective on higher education: a vision that is transformative, with an emphasis on social justice and a critical-democratic orientation; an education that reflects critically on the kind of intellectual that higher education is producing. Such a transformative intellectual is educated not for his or her own career and benefit, but for societal well-being: for a contribution to the 'common good' of a 'just society' (see also Llomovatte & Naidorf, 2014; Naidorf, 2014).

Theory and Practice of Citizenship in Higher Education

There is a fast-growing body of research on citizenship education. Most studies focus on secondary education, and international review studies are concentrating on students of secondary education, for example the ICCS study on citizenship. We did a review on the literature on citizenship education in universities. Most of the studies we found were theoretical and present only an outline for future work. See, for example, Englund (2002), Patiño-González (2009), Fernandez (2005), Watson (2008), Zgaga (2009). Most of these studies refer in general terms to the societal role of universities and mention that universities should contribute to citizenship development. However these studies do not define a specific articulation of the concept of citizenship and how this articulation correlates with educational practices, and what kind of learning outcomes they desire. There is hardly any empirical research and even the more practice-oriented articles present more theories than proven practices. The most practice-oriented study in higher education is the work of Anne Colby and colleagues at Stanford University. Their focus is on moral development, and they relate morality to civic development (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont & Stephens, 2003).

We made an analysis of the websites of all universities in the Netherlands for activities that can be seen as part of citizenship education. Our analysis showed that Dutch universities don't have many activities that contribute explicitly to citizenship development. The focus is on preparing students for labour or academic rigour. And this preparation is not explicitly linked to the role of intellectuals in society. There is currently no citizenship policy in the curricula at Dutch universities. Of course many universities organize debates on social topics and have 'studium generale' programs, but these activities are separated from the formal curriculum and are voluntary. In fact, only a small amount of students is involved in such activities.

The Concept of Citizenship and its Practices

Broadening and deepening of the concept of citizenship

The concept of citizenship has recently been broadened and deepened, both in public debates and in academic work. By 'broadened' we refer to citizenship as not only linked to the national state but also to a regional identity such as European citizenship, Latin American citizenship, or Global citizenship (Veugelers, 2011a). The concept of citizenship has crossed national borders and can refer to a more regional or global identity (Banks, 2004). In the national context, the concept of citizenship is embedded in regional and global contexts and in societal and political power relationships.

"Deepening" the concept of citizenship means that the concept has been extended from the political level to the social and cultural level. Because of this deepening of the concept, current ideas about citizenship encroach more and more upon the personal identity of people. In Dutch politics we see this expressed through the emphasis on desired manners, on national identity and on attention for religions and worldviews. The government even specifies the manners, formal and informal, it desires. It does the same for the identity of the country, by referring to "cultural heritage" and "canon". With regard to religions and worldviews the Dutch government is more reserved, but schools are required to foster respect for different religions and worldviews.

Dewey (1923) spoke already about democracy 'as way of life', and argued that human relationships in society should be focused on democratic practices. He made strong arguments for more democratic relationships in all aspects of human life. Today, citizenship on the cultural and social level attains much attention in public debate. However not in a 'Deweyan' transformative sense; the focus is on strengthening the national culture. On the social level it means regulating social norms and social behaviour.

More critical and transformative practices are however possible in contemporary societies. The work of Freire (1973) and other critical pedagogues show clearly that citizenship is embedded in daily discourses and habits, and that transformative practices to change social, cultural and political power relations need active involvement, a social justice orientation, and the empowerment of all human beings in their daily social, cultural and educational life. When this empowerment is fostered in an educational context, education will not only reproduce existing power relations, but it can bring about some changes in a transformative sense. In this article we will link policies and educational practices.

Different types of citizenship and citizenship education

In research projects, both quantitative and qualitative, we presented pedagogical goals to teachers, school leaders, students and parents (Veugelers, 2007; Leenders, Veugelers & de Kat, 2008a; 2008b, 2012). We asked them how important they find these pedagogical goals, how much attention is paid to them in practice and which learning effects they could observe. In analysing the data we found three clusters of goals: discipline, autonomy, and social commitment. We could link, by a person-centred factor-analysis, these goals to three types of citizenship: an adaptive one, an individualistic one, and a critical-democratic one.

- The adaptive type of citizenship tries to adapt people to existing social and political power relations, without taking a critical stance.
- The individualistic type of citizenship embraces personal autonomy of the individual and neglects social commitment.
- The critical-democratic type of citizenship focuses on building social commitment and democracy and tries to stimulate an active and critical engagement of citizens.

We can also connect the type of citizenship with educational practices:

1. The adaptive citizenship development has mostly whole classroom instruction with the transfer and reproduction of fixed knowledge. The pedagogical approach is characterized by following the rules set by the authority.
2. The individualistic citizenship development focuses on personal autonomy, selection, competition and individual performance. The knowledge development is seen as constructive but not from a societal perspective.
3. The critical-democratic citizenship development asks for dialogue, diversity, critical reflection, analysis of power relationships, and social action. Cooperative, dialogical, and reflective learning and knowledge construction as social-constructivism are central in this pedagogical approach.

Of course in every educational practice there is a mix of these pedagogical approaches of citizenship education. Our empirical research shows clearly that citizenship is not a linear concept from bad to good citizenship. In citizenship different political orientations can be made. Our analytical split-off shows that choices can be made and different practices can be aspired.

There are other researchers who make a distinction between types (orientations) of citizenship and show how citizenship and citizenship education can be conceptualized and practiced in different ways. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) distinguish between a personally responsible citizen, a participatory citizen and a social-justice-oriented citizen. Westheimer and Kahne argue for including social justice in citizenship. For them, citizenship and in particular democracy is not only a social and political way of organizing society, but it should have a moral and social political focus by addressing social justice. Not only is the concept of citizenship in the centre of academic debates but also the concept of democracy is being examined. de Groot (2011; 2013) for example theorized about differences between thin and thick (strong) democracy. And in the Freirean tradition democracy has been linked to empowerment and social change (Morrow & Torres, 2002). The concept of citizen addresses ideas such as knowledge development, skills development and attitude development. The process of giving meaning is 'coloured' by the political orientations involved and expressed in personal narratives.

Differences between goals, practices and effects

Many teachers, school leaders, students, and parents, claim that the critical-democratic citizenship is very important; however, in practice these goals are not so well realized (Veugelers, 2011b). In practice there is a lot of focus on discipline, and on the adaptive citizenship. Also, the individualistic type of citizenship is strongly embedded in educational practices of many modern neoliberal societies: in its selective education system, its educational segregation, its personally-oriented pedagogical style, its celebration of the unique individual, its focus on individual expression, etc.

In many countries and educational institutions there is a gap between pedagogical ideals and educational practices. This gap becomes noticeable in particular between the critical pedagogical goals and the more adaptive and individualistic practices. To put it in a more sociological perspective: even if many transformative ideas are emphasized in policy and sometimes even put into practice, the economic reproduction forces in society and in education are often stronger. However, the balance between reproduction and transformation is not fixed, but dependent on social and political change processes. In educational change

processes both a strengthening of reproduction and a strengthening of transformation is possible. International comparative studies including different countries and regions show that there are similarities and differences between countries. A country can express its own citizenship policy. Of course a country responds to international developments and ideologies, but they it can make its own refraction.

Policy and Practice of Citizenship Higher Education
A comparative study in Europe, Central America and Latin America

In the second, more empirical part of the paper, we focus on the policy and practice of citizenship education in universities in different countries of Europe, Central America and Latin America. We inquired the policy development in the participating countries, the educational policy, the social relevance of education, and the policy and practice of citizenship education in the universities.

Method

We asked academic experts on citizenship education in higher education about the policy and practice of citizenships education in their country. The experts were research coordinators in the project RI-AIPE3. As example and as point of reference we presented them our judgment about citizenship education in the Netherlands. In the mail to the respondents we formulated their task as follow:

“We require a brief summary of key approaches and policies relating to citizenship education and civic participation in each national context. As argued in the paper presented at the conference we can distinguish three types of citizenship:

- Adapted citizenship: a focus on discipline and adaptation to the community
- Individualised citizenship with a focus on personal autonomy and personal responsibility
- Critical democratic citizenship: a focus on social commitment and critical participation in democracy

Can you mark on a scale from 1 to 10, how strong each type is stimulated in educational policy in your country and in educational practice, in particular of universities?” As example, and point of reference, we (the researchers) gave the data for the Netherlands (see figure 1). There was also space to describe changes and to give some comments.

Figure 1: Citizenship education and Civic Participation

Country	Netherlands
Adapted citizenship	Policy: 7 Practice: 7
Individualised citizenship	Policy: 6 Practice: 6
Critical Democratic citizenship	Policy: 4 Practice: 3
Important changes in last 10 years.	A stronger focus on national identity and personal responsibility, less on social justice"

Results

We received data from 14 countries (Six of Europe, Three of Central America and Five of Latin America). We haven't received data of six participating countries (Three of Central America and three of Latin America). We will present the results starting in North Western Europe (see table 1), then South Western Europe (see table 2) followed by Central America (see table 3), then in Latin America first the Andes region (see table 4) and then MERCOSUR (see table 5). In the analyses we will focus on similarities and differences.

Table 1: North Western Europe

	Adapted		Individualised		Critical Democratic	
	Politics	Practice	Politics	Practice	Politics	Practice
Netherlands	7	7	6	6	4	3
UK	7	7	8	6	4	4

Table 2: South Western Europe

	Adapted		Individualised		Critical	
	Politics	Practice	Politics	Practice	Politics	Practice
France	6	7	5	8	3	3
Italy	6	7	6	6	4	3
Spain	6	6	5	5	3	3
Portugal	6	4	6	5	5	4

In both North Western European countries there is in the citizenship education orientation a rather strong adaptation combined with individualization, in particular in the UK. A critical-democratic orientation is not strong: in both politics, and practice. The pattern for policy and practice shows the same orientations. There are hardly any differences between policy and practice. The main changes of the last 10 years in Netherlands revolve around the strengthening of national identity and personal responsibility. Social justice has little role in the discussion of educational policy and practice.

In the countries in South Western Europe there is not a strong policy of citizenship education in universities. Even less then in North Western Europe. The focus is on adaptation, and – to a certain extend – on individualisation, not so much on a critical-democratic orientation. Regarding the practice, the same pattern is visible with even a stronger

practice to individualisation in France. Interesting is that in all South Western European countries there is not much difference between politics and practice. Analysing the most significant changes in the last 10 years of higher education systems we found that the predominant model is the adaptive citizenship. The individualist model also has a great impact both on policy and educational practice of the South Western European universities. A democratic oriented commitment or social justice approach has not been predominant in any of the countries in the region. Particularly in Spain, we can observe an expansion of conservative and neoliberal policies that encourage delegation of responsibility from the State to the individuals; establishing individualistic models at the expense of social justice approaches. In Italy the situation is similar, education policy focuses on national identity. While France has come through a process of fragmentation of the higher education system at the same time as a constant expansion of it, the main concern revolves around unemployment, establishing the citizenship-adapted model as the dominant one, with strong individualistic practices. Finally, in Portugal, the emphasis is placed on national identity and personal responsibility; although there is an incipient development of de critical citizenship model. Let's now go on to Central America.

Table 3: Central America

	Adapted		Individualised		Critical Democratic	
	Politics	Practice	Politics	Practice	Politics	Practice
El Salvador	5	5	6	8	8	8
Honduras	9	8	8	7	10	10
Cuba	5	8			8	5

In particular in Honduras there is a very strong focus on citizenship development in higher education. In both El Salvador and Honduras there is a very strong focus in politics and practice on a critical-democratic citizenship. Education is considered as a mean for transformation of society. The individualised type is also very important. Adaptation is important in Honduras, not so much in El Salvador. In the case of Central America we see a strong commitment to include the model of critical and democratic citizenship. In El Salvador the model also penetrated practices but coexists with actions from the individualistic model, which still have a strong presence in higher education.

We also have data from Cuba, a Central America/Caribbean country with a communist regime. The individualistic citizenship is not recognized in both politics and practice in Cuba. There is in politics a strong focus on a critical-democratic citizenship, but not in practice. In practice the focus is on the adaptive model. This adaptive orientation we don't find in politics. The citizenship education profile of Cuba differs

really from the profile of the other participating countries. Let's go on to Latin America, first the Andes region.

Table 4: Andes region

	Adapted		Individualised		Critical Democratic	
	Politics	Practice	Politics	Practice	Politics	Practice
Colombia	9	8	6	5	3	3
Bolivia	6	7	7	7	8	8
Chile	7	7	6	6	4	3

Table 5: Mercosur

	Adapted		Individualised		Critical Democratic	
	Politics	Practice	Politics	Practice	Politics	Practice
Brazil	6	5	8	5	8	7
Argentina	2	2	7	5	8	6

Regarding citizenship education in higher education we see different patterns in the Andes region. In Colombia there is a very strong focus on an adaptive type of citizenship, in Bolivia a very strong focus on a critical-democratic citizenship education. Both orientations are visible in politics and in practice. In Bolivia there is in general a strong focus on citizenship education. The policy and practice in Chile is on both adapted and individualisation. Both in Colombia and in Chile there is a weak attention for a critical-democratic citizenship. As the table shows, in Chile the predominant model is individualistic. Neoliberal policies penetrated within the Chilean higher educational system establishing strong positions. The other models have some kind of involvement but are marginal.

Brazil and Argentina have a strong politics on a critical-democratic citizenship, and also quite a strong practice. In these countries is the model of critical and democratic citizenship, which takes precedence. A model that seeks social engagement and democratic practices is installed both in policy and practice. The countries in the region (MERCOSUR) represented in this study have come through significant changes in higher education systems in recent years. In these systems, implementing educational policies that recognize the diversity and plurality set the orientation and define policies adopted with the will to expand the rights of minorities in access, retention and graduation in higher education. The incorporation of ethical dilemmas and discussions regarding the formation of active citizens committed to social justice within the higher education systems and work suggests the formation of students as political subjects to respect the diversity of approaches to critical multiculturalism.

Conclusion and discussion

We can summarize the outcomes of our study on citizenship and citizenship education in the following overview in figure 2.

Figure 2

Region	Citizenship	Type
North Western Europe	A bit	Adaptation and Individualisation
South Western Europe	Weak	Adaptation
Central America	Very strong	Critical Democratic
Cuba	Quite strong	Politics critical-democratic, in practice adaptive
Andes Latin America	Quite strong	Mixed picture: Bolivia critical-democratic
Mercasur	Strong	Brazil and Argentina critical-democratic

Countries differ in how strong the politics and practices of citizenship education are. They also differ, and often very strongly in the type of citizenship they are working on. Many countries emphasize in politics and practice an adapted type. An individualistic type is also emphasized in most countries. The greatest differences are in the area of critical democratic citizenship. Some countries, and in particular in Latin America really support and practice this type of citizenship. The studies show that countries can and do make choices in politics and practice of citizenship education in universities.

As presented in the introduction Spring distinguish three ideologies that are influencing national educational policy. The first 'Nationalist Education in the age of Globalization' emphasizes the own national history, culture and language. The second ideology 'Schooling workers for the global economy' focuses on international competition and comparison. It's a standardisation of education in a technical sense. It's a neoliberal market view on the so called 'knowledge society'. The third ideology 'Globalizing morality' focuses on human rights, democracy and sustainability. All the three ideologies also express ideas about citizenship and citizenship education. The nation building ideology stimulates an adapted type of citizenship; the global economy stimulates an individualised citizenship and the global morality a critical-democratic citizenship.

Of course in each country there is a specific combination of ideologies and of types of citizenship. In our overview of citizenship and citizenship education in Europe, Central America and Latin America this combination is visible. Each country has a specific configuration. In Europe there is still a lot of focus on adaptation. Nation building is not seen as building a new nation but as restoring the old tradition; the great old times in which the Western European countries were very influential at the international level. Nowadays this adaptation is mixed with a neoliberal market orientation, in particular in North Western

Europe (Rudd & Goodson, 2014). The critical-democratic orientation used to be quite strong in Southern Western European countries, but has diminished quite fast in the past decades. In Central America and in MERCOSUR there is a strong critical-democratic orientation, in which universities are getting an active role in building a more democratic, inclusive and social justice society. Schools, and in particular universities educate intellectuals, to get an interest and engagement in contributing actively to society, often in a social justice orientation. Changes in the educational systems of the MERCOSUR countries represented in this study, Brazil and Argentina, show that they have incited a path to a critical democratic model in both policy making and practice. This model coexists in Argentina in theory and practice with a model of 'Trade University' and the privatization of knowledge installed since the 90s (Naidorf, 2012).

In the case of Chile (Andean country) the gap is more evident. A model strongly driven by individualism prevails (both in practice and in politics). The adaptive model has some presence, while the critical-democratic model, which has been put forward by student sectors since 2011, has no significant incidence yet. In Central America and countries represented by MERCOSUR we find a strong initiative in university policies for the incorporation of a critical-democratic approach. In the case of Cuba there is still a predominantly adaptive educational practice despite a critical-democratic policy discourse.

Reinventing the past in citizenship education

Citizenship in this study has focused on democracy and the influence of global developments on national citizenship and citizenship education. However the concept of citizenship, in particular in its cultural and historical context, is more complex and local influences refraction as well citizenship and citizenship education. In Europe we see a restoring of the old traditions and an attempt to continue global domination in a neoliberal market orientation. Central America and Latin America try to find their specific place in globalization and struggles with their history of colonization and decolonization and the position of indigenous people. For understanding these specific Central America and Latin America developments we used the work of Schugurensky (2006) on the difference between citizenship as status and citizenship as identity. This difference is evident in the case of nations that were built from processes of conquest and colonization, where displacement, domination and even elimination of the groups living there took place. In the Americas, for example, indigenous people are legal citizens of different nation-states. Some have documents (identity documents, passports), however in many cases their members are considered members of First Nations (indigenous peoples or indigenous) and not nec-

essarily of these new nation states that were established after a painful and often violent occupation, with a long history of discrimination and assimilation. Schugurensky's differentiation between citizenship as status and citizenship as identity makes it possible to analyse significant transformations in Latin America, which is a process of recognition of diversity and multiculturalism. Based on the recognition of the multinationality of their people (the clearest example is the Plurinational State of Bolivia) they work on social justice and trying to implement the new legislation. The conception of citizenship as identity allows recognition of the other in an inclusive and pluralistic way.

Citizenship is closely related to democracy, and democracy is inseparable from issues of equality, participation and self-government. An education for a comprehensive citizenship must address the four dimensions of citizenship that Schugurensky puts forward (status, identity, civic virtues and agency); and these all for the purpose of creating a more inclusive and pluralistic society. To achieve critical-democratic citizenship with social justice it is necessary to confront ideas, have the will to face different positions, address 'tough questions' with the confidence that the discussions and interchanges will become a collective ability to confront and change power structures. Volunteering actions, indigenous universities, jobs for minorities and financial aids for low-income students are some of the policies that address social change and strengthen the more democratic citizenship models. An interesting question is if the growing multiculturalism in Western Europe requires revisiting the concept of citizenship and if the distinction between citizenship as status and citizenship as identity is necessary in this new context as well.

Who can learn?

In this comparative research we were able to recognize differences between countries in the critical-democratic type of citizenship education. The political orientation in countries can make a difference; the global morality can dominate the neoliberal knowledge society. Another world with more transformative universities that educate critical and social engaged intellectuals is possible. Countries can make a difference and even at the level of the region there are and can be differences between countries. In addition, over time, countries can change their orientation towards the more critical-democratic type or moving away from this type.

In general the countries in Central America and Latin America are now more oriented to a critical-democratic type of citizenship education. Often the suggestion is given that the non-Western world should learn from the Western world and adapt their historical and political

heritage. This research shows that even for the concept and practice of democracy the Western world can learn from central and Latin America. Europe, and other parts of the world, can learn from them, and hopefully these critical examples will help to save the old continent. This study also shows the relevance of the role that intellectuals can play in society and in contributing to public life and democracy. It is therefore relevant to have national and international debates on the role of universities and on the kind of intellectual we want to educate.

References

- Aloni, N. (2003). *Enhancing humanity. The philosophical foundations of humanistic education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2004). *Diversity and citizenship education, global perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E. & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dewey, J. (1923). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*
- Englund, T. (2002). Higher education, democracy and citizenship: the democratic potential of the university? *Studies in Philosophy and Education*. 21(4), 281-287. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1019840006193>
- Fernandez, S. (2005). Towards European citizenship through higher education. *European Journal of Education*. 40(1), 60-68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3435.2004.00210.x>
- Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: MacMillan.
- de Groot, I. (2011). Why we are not democratic Yet. In: Veugelers, W. (Ed.) *Education and humanism* (79- 93). Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: SensePublishers.
- de Groot, I. (2013). *Adolescents' democratic engagement*. Utrecht: University of Humanistic Studies. Academic Dissertation.
- Leenders, H., Veugelers, W. & de Kat, E. (2008a). Teachers' views on citizenship education in secondary education in the Netherlands. *Cambridge Journal of Education*. 38(2), 155-170. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057640802063106>
- Leenders, H., Veugelers, W. & de Kat, E. (2008b). Moral education and citizen education at pre-university schools. In: Oser, F. & Veugelers, W. (Eds.). *Getting involved* (57-74). Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: SensePublishers.
- Leenders, H., Veugelers, W. & de Kat, E. (2012). Moral development and citizenship education in vocational schools. *Education Research Journal*.
- Llomovatte, S. & Naidorf, J. (2014). Equity, social cohesion and relevance in higher education. In: Teodoro, A. & Guilherme, M. (Eds.). *European and Latin American higher education between mirrors* (197-211). Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: SensePublishers.
- Morrow, R. & Torres, C. A. (2002). *Reading Freire and Habermas*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Naidorf, J. C. (2014). Knowledge utility: From social relevance to knowledge mobilization. *education policy analysis archives*. 22(89)
- Ozga, J. (2005) Traveling and embedded policy: the case of post-devolution Scotland within the UK, in: D. Coulby & E. Zambeta (Eds) *Globalization and nationalism in education* (London, Routledge Falmer)
- Patiño-González, S. (2009). Promoting ethical competencies: Education for

- democratic citizenship in a Mexican institution of higher education. *Journal of Moral Education*. 38(4), 533-551.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057240903321980>
- Rudd, T. & Goodson, I. (2014). *Studying historical periodisation*. In: Teodoro, A. & Guilherme, M. (Eds.). *European and Latin American higher education between mirrors* (139-154). Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: SensePublishers.
- Schugurensky, D. (2006): Adult citizenship education: An overview of the field. In: Fenwick, T., Nesbit, T. & Spencer, B. (Eds.). *Contexts of adult education: Canadian perspectives* (68-80). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing Inc.
- Spring, J. (2004). *How educational ideologies are shaping global society*. Mahwah, NJ: LEA.
- Teodoro, A. & Guilherme, M. (Eds.). (2014). *European and Latin American higher education between mirrors*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: SensePublishers.
- Veugelers, W. (2007). Creating critical-democratic citizenship in education: empowering humanity and democracy in Dutch Education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*. 37(1), 105-119.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057920601061893>
- Veugelers, W. (2011a). The moral and the political in global citizenship: Appreciating Differences. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*. 9(3-4), 473-485. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605329>
- Veugelers, W. (2011b). Theory and Practice of Citizenship Education. *Revista de Educacion*. 2011, 209-224.
- Veugelers, W. (Ed.). (2011c). *Education and humanism*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: SensePublishers.
- Veugelers, W., de Groot, I. & Nollet, F. (2014). In Teodoro, A. & Guilherme, M. (Eds.). *European and Latin American higher education between mirrors*. (179-196). Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: SensePublishers.
- Watson, D. (2008). The university in the modern world: ten lessons of civic and community engagement. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. 3(1), 43-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1746197907086718>
- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*. 41(2), 237-269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002237>
- Zgaga, P. (2009). Higher education and citizenship: The full range of purposes. *European Educational Research Journal*. 8(2), 175-188.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/eeerj.2009.8.2.175>