Human beings have the possibility to give meaning to their lives and to create coherence in experiences. Present-day humanism strongly focuses on personal development in relation to others. It is this tension between personal development and advancement of humanization, that is creating the opportunities for the personal development of every world citizen. Humanism is about personal autonomy, moral responsibility, and about solidarity with humanity. The tension between autonomy and social involvement is the core of humanism. Education can support persons in their moral and personal identity development.

The authors brought together in this book all address issues of developing autonomy and humanity in educational practices. All the chapters try to link theory and practice. They either make theoretical ideas more practical or they use practical experiences and concerns to rethink theoretical notions. Together the chapters in the book give a broad overview of theoretical foundations, concrete research, and practices in education. The book shows a diversity that can inspire scholars and practitioners in further developing their perspectives. Creating meaning is an essential part of all education. Focusing on the linking of autonomy and humanity is the humanist perspective in it.
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Education is a moral enterprise that shapes human development. The pedagogical visions of educators can be inspired by different worldviews, cultural experiences and political ideas. Moral values are at stake at the level of educational systems, of schools and of individual teachers. At each of the distinguished levels own articulations in moral values, pedagogical goals and suggested practices can be made. In this book we bring together authors who are inspired by humanist ideas. Humanism is an open worldview that stresses personal autonomy and humanity. Within humanism there is diversity in thinking, and ideas are developing under different cultural, social and political conditions. Education from a humanist perspective focuses on developing rationality, autonomy, empowerment, creativity, affections and a concern for humanity. This concern for humanity expresses the relation to other people. This social component can range from empathy to solidarity, and from the own community to the global world. Appreciating diversity and democracy are humanist ways of living together as human beings.

A challenge in humanist thinking and acting is the linking of autonomy and humanity. Autonomy is not isolated individuality but it is the way a person relates to the other. It’s the agency of the situatedness of people. It implies the possibility of taking responsibility for your own life and your own ideas.

Humanity is the condition that gives people the possibility of developing human capabilities: of being a reflective and dialogical person, of getting the sources to live a good life, of living together ruled by moral values, of helping others to live a good life too.

Developing autonomy and humanity is not a natural process, but an interactive process between people under social and political power relationships. Enhancing autonomy and humanity is part of social, cultural and political developments. Like autonomy that can not be separated from humanity, human development can not be separated from social, cultural and political struggle for a world of social justice.

LINKING DIFFERENT PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS

Humanistic education has different philosophical foundations. Aloni (2002) distinguishes the cultural-classical, the naturalistic-romantic, the existential and the critical-radical approach. From the cultural-classical tradition we can learn that devel-
oping rationality, autonomy and knowledge about human traditions can strengthen a persons’ agency and develop efficacy in learning and in the world as a whole. The naturalistic-romantic tradition sees learning as affective and creative and shows that giving space to personal interest can make learning meaningful to the learner and gives the feeling of authenticity. The existential tradition lets us realise that a human being has to develop his own meaning system, worldview and practice and that one has the moral obligation to live a human life and take care of humanity. The critical-radical tradition shows that possibilities for flourishing, learning and living a human life are not equally distributed in the world. Individual development is embedded in a social world of unequal social and political relations. Changing possibilities for flourishing and empowerment should enhance the possibilities for learning and development for all, in particular people with less social and political power.

At the heart of humanistic education is this tension between personal autonomy development and social change (Veugelers, 2007). From a humanist point of view social change is not possible without strong and critical autonomous people. Autonomy development without an embedding in social change is glorifying the individual not humanity. Autonomy and social concern should be considered as interlinked. Autonomy development should be embedded in social change processes (Freire, 1985). For education this means that learning is not a technical-instrumental rationality but identity development in a reflective and dialogical way in a social context; it is morally social constructivism

MEANINGS OF LIFE AND MORAL VALUES, A HUMANIST PERSPECTIVE

Human beings have the possibility to give meaning to their lives and to create coherence in experiences. Making meaning gives direction and signification to ones own life and to a personal view on life (Baumeister, 1991). The development of moral values of people takes place through meaning giving and people can contribute to the development of norms in their neighbourhood, in groups and cultures, and in society as a whole. Education, in the family, in civic institutions, and at school, can contribute to young people’s meaning giving processes.

Personal meaning giving might be inspired by worldviews. Religions are worldviews, but also nonreligious views on life that are shared by many people are worldviews. Humanism is one of these, but also the more political worldviews like liberalism and socialism. A humanist perspective on giving meaning is based on personal responsibility, not on insights provided by a God, and on repeatedly trying to realize human potential (Derkx, 2002). It is an attitude of mind of striving for humanity, for humanization. Humanism is regarded as an open worldview. There is no fixed, absolute criterion for what higher humanity is, for what is beautiful or true. The normative criterion is the never finally concluded dialogue in which everyone involved participates and where one also reflects on the unique context of this dialogue itself.
Besides a cognitive and a moral aspect, every worldview also has motivating, inspiring or spiritual aspects. What might be called a ‘humanist spirituality’ refers to humanism as ‘art of living’ (Dohmen, 2003). It is drawing strength from beauty, from the life stories and imaginations of people, and from the experience of belonging. It is the experience of belonging without feeling restricted. Within humanism there is much attention for the development of the Ancient Greek culture, the Renaissance, the French Revolution and the emancipation movements of the twentieth century (Aloni, 2002). These are examples of humanization and active meaning giving processes of people involved.

Present-day humanism strongly focuses on personal development in relation to others. It is this tension between personal development and advancement of humanization, that is creating the opportunities for the personal development of every world citizen, that dominates the current debate on humanization. Humanism is about personal autonomy, moral responsibility, and about solidarity with humanity. Human solidarity restricts autonomy and connects the individual and his environment. It is always about the dynamics between autonomy and social involvement. These dynamics can still have a large diversity of theoretical and practical interpretations. The diversity should be judged as positive, because it will contribute to a lively communication about moral values and will prevent that the values of one group are all too easily established as the norm for everyone. Diversity challenges everybody to reflect on one’s personal values (Veugelers, 2008).

WHAT CONNECTS PEOPLE?

The source of autonomy can easily be localized. It is, after abandoning God, falling back on oneself. Autonomy is an achievement, acquired by social movements like the Enlightenment (Aloni, 2002). The achieved autonomy challenges people to make their own choices, to take their own responsibility. In modern times one is even forced to make choices, to develop personal life-politics (Giddens, 1981). The existential approach in humanistic education too denies a predestination and argues that man can only try to make the best of it all. There is no human script, but there is a human responsibility to shape one’s personal life.

The concept autonomy is problematic though. Autonomy can not be created without the other. From two different theoretical positions both Levinas and Vygotsky clearly show that human development is only possible in relation to the other. Man is per definition a relational being. One relates to the other. This relation can take very differing forms: from oppression through ignoring to a form of involvement. Involvement can again have several qualities, from empathy through sympathy to solidarity with certain groups. Human beings actively position themselves in cultural practices and discourses (Haste, 2004; Veugelers & Oser, 2008).

What are the sources of this social dimension? Biology and modern brain research are assiduously searching the biological sources of involvement. Biologists like De Waal have shown that some animals display forms of empathy (Verbeek,
The neurosciences show us that several moral qualities can be localized in the brain. Even with an embedding of morality in the brain, social and cultural processes can have produced this brain source of morality. The growth of the brains could have resulted from a long-term human training in this form of involvement that led to its lodging in the brain. This would be similar to the development of certain muscles by an athlete in a specific sport, or populaces with certain physical habits that became embedded in the body.

With moral human capabilities like the facilities for empathy and dialogue, still specific motives are needed for developing and strengthening these capabilities. When subjecting to the word of a God is no longer the motive, other sources must be found. In the humanistic tradition there has always been much attention for examples that actively shaped autonomy, like in the Bildung tradition. There is also much attention for exemplary figures who connected the development of autonomy with social development, for instance Montaigne, Erasmus and Spinoza. Or in the ethics of care of Tronto and Noddings. There is furthermore attention for people who have resisted oppression, like Hanna Arendt, Etty Hillesum, Primo Levi and bell hooks or people who criticised a dominant western cultural orientation like Edward Said and Amartya Sen; or who proposed more political forms of involvement, like Antonio Gramsci and Paulo Freire.

The broad list of moral examples shows that the social dimension of humanization can take many forms: from a mainly affective empathic capacity to advancing social justice and to a political struggle of solidarity with powerless people, and to a shift in power relations. The articulated forms express different combinations of autonomy and social involvement. Characteristic for this humanistic relation is that one of the poles is never disconnected from the other. Autonomy without social involvement would imply an extremely individualistic position. Social involvement without autonomy would merely imply adaptation. The tension between autonomy and social involvement is the core of humanism.

Education supports persons in their development. The authors brought together in this book all address issues of developing autonomy and humanity in educational practices. All the chapters try to link theory and practice. They either make theoretical ideas more practical or they use practical experiences and concerns to rethink theoretical notions.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CHAPTERS

In the first chapter *A Humanist Perspective on Moral Development and Citizenship Education* Veugelers presents a humanist perspective on the development of values and norms. He shows how discourses on values have changed in the last decades and what the possibilities are for a humanist perspective on both autonomy and social involvement. Instead of focusing on autonomy he pleads for a critical-democratic citizenship with a strong focus on meaning-making, diversity, bridging, and embedding morality development in political processes of social justice.
The identity development of both students and teachers needs to be reflective and
dialogical, aiming at enhancing a social situated self that supports justice-oriented
social, cultural and political change. Reflective learning, dialogical learning and
democratic learning are at the heart of humanist education.

In *Humanistic Education: From Theory to Practice* Aloni brings his theoretical
ideas expressed in his well know book ‘Enhancing Humanity’ (Aloni, 2002)
into practice. He stresses the importance of the professional self-image of inter-
personal trust, cultural idealism and personality. These ideals can be developed in
a humanistic school culture of security, fairness, dialogue and social involvement.
The curriculum should translate knowledge into life-literacies that allow learners
to identify the value-laden messages of issues discussed in classes and to plan their
actions with greater reason and responsibility.

The next three more theoretical chapters focus on fundamental concepts of a
humanist perspective of education. First on the personal human being, second on
Ubuntu as interconnectness of human beings, and third on democracy as a way of
living together as human beings.

In *Moral Education from a Humanist Perspective* Buxarrais and Esteban ana-
lyse the liberal-communitarian debate and design a moral education in postmodern
times. They propose a model that accounts for the uncertainty of the human being
as the foundation of their being human; the desire towards excellence as typical
human; reason as the guide for the critical spirit and action; and the widening of
horizons. This model asks for pedagogical conditions of presence, planning, incon-
venience, patience and individualization. Starting from theoretical work the authors
end with practical descriptions of teachers’ pedagogical acting.

In *The Philosophy of Ubuntu and Education in South Africa* Le Grange shows
how the concept of Ubuntu functions in public and philosophical debates in South
Africa and what the possibilities are for working with this concept in education.
Ubuntu means that each individual expression is ideally expressed in relationship
with others. Ubuntu is a concrete manifestation of the interconnectedness of human
beings. Le Grange shows how different philosophical trends balance between the
universalism of the concept and its meaning interwoven in cultural practices and
lived experiences of African peoples. It is the deconstructive/reconstructive poten-
tial of Ubuntu that might have transformative effects on education, in particular in
South Africa.

Democracy as way of living (Dewey, 1923) can be seen as a humanist way of
organizing society and social life. In the chapter *Why We Are Not Democratic Yet:*
The *Complexity of Developing a Democratic Attitude* De Groot analyses the con-
cept of democracy, in particular its psychological and social conditions. De Groot
distinguishes five dimensions. First, an elaborate understanding of democracy and
diversity, with a sensitivity to social justice issues. Second, the development of ca-
pacity with internal and external efficacy. Third, the development of active relations
by commitment and connection. Fourth, the willingness to transform, openminded-
ness and doubt. Five, the ability for empathy and dialogue. Experiences, reflection
and dialogue on practices and ideas should encourage this democratic citizenship development.

The book continues with more practice oriented chapters in which authors analyse current educational practices and try to translate theoretical concepts into recommendations for a more humanistic education.

Westheimer in Practicing Democracy argues against the narrowing of the curriculum by testing, pathologizing of dissent and de-professionalization of teachers. Westheimer pleads for more democratic educational practices and for learning from multiple perspectives and on real-world problems.

Gora describes in Significance of Humanist Education in Developing Countries the theoretical foundations and practical work of the humanist movement in India. In the Atheist Centre, in schools, in study camps and through media they support freedom of speech, rationality, humanity, and the significance of atheism and humanism as a positive way of life. The priority in their adult education and social work is on liberating people, in particular women, and to empower them socially.

In Literary Humanism in Multicultural Education Schreurs follows Said (2004) in criticizing classical Bildung for the dominance of a Christian humanist culture. Instead he pleads for a postmodern view on Bildung in which different cultures are valued more equally. In teaching in a multicultural class he tries to practices a literary humanism that gives voices to different perspectives.

In Teachers’ Training towards Active Involvement in the Public Domain Yogev shows the theoretical foundations and practical work on educating students to become public involved and democratic intellectuals by participation in community life and by ethical and sociopolitical reflection. Nurturing political literacy and experimental service learning are integrated in this teacher education programme.

Bakker explores the normative professionalism of teachers in Humanistic Teaching in Practice. She presents an empirical study on the experiences of humanistic teachers and the affective characteristics of these experiences. The teachers express many personal valuations which influence their work and they are much connected to their work. The outcomes of the study stress the importance of the professional’s personal meanings as a substantial part of normative professionalism.

In Forstering Humanity through Interpretive Dialogue in Teacher Communities Frydaki develops a theoretical framework for researching teachers in dialogical learning communities. She demonstrates the application of her framework in a case-study on the influence of supportive educational contexts on the moral values and professional development of a teacher. This study highlights how teachers’ participation in dialogical meaning making processes can generate new shared values and value communication processes.

Leeman and Wardekker developed materials that help teachers to develop a moral perspective on teaching. In The Moral Side of Education they show that nowadays for many teachers it is quite difficult to talk about the moral sides of education and that their thinking is fragmented. Narrative professional identity development should therefore include moral qualities. By the use of statements and dilemmas
teachers are challenged to articulate and discuss moral values. A group approach advances reflection, multi-perspectives and dialogue.

Coene gives in *The Challenges of Multiculturalism. Educational Dilemmas for Humanists in Flanders* a historical overview of humanist education in Flanders. Students in public schools can choose for nonconfessional ethics organized by the freethinking humanist community. This course balances between neutrality and an explicit humanist philosophy of life. The complexities of our contemporary multicultural society asks for active pluralism. A humanist perspective, Coene argues, should therefore include a dialogue between different religions and worldviews.

Together the chapters in the book give a broad overview of theoretical foundations, concrete research, and practices in education. The book shows a diversity that can inspire scholars and practitioners in further developing their perspectives. Creating meaning is an essential part of all education. Focusing on the linking of autonomy and humanity is the humanist perspective in it.

**REFERENCES**


**Wiel Veugelers**

*Department of Education*

*University of Humanistic Studies Utrecht*

*Graduate School of Child Development and Education*

*University of Amsterdam*
A HUMANIST PERSPECTIVE ON MORAL DEVELOPMENT AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Empowering autonomy, humanity and democracy

Worldwide there is currently an enormous interest in values and norms and in the role of education in this matter. This interest stems in particular from the postmodern situation of a lack of common values and norms. The positive side of the postmodern development is the greater autonomy individuals have in constructing their own identity and morality. The problematic site of this postmodern development is the uncertainty about which values are important to live and the difficulty of constructing norms together. Value construction is a psychological process that involves the personal life. Constructing norms together is a sociological process of living together, of dealing with differences and jointly constructing social life and society. Processes of value and norm constructions are important for the individual, for social and cultural groups, and for society. Cultural groups articulate which moral values are important for them and how norms can be constructed.

In this chapter we want to present a humanist perspective on these processes and on the role education can play in developing moral values and social norms. We will demonstrate that there are different ways of thinking about values and norms and the associated task of education. These different ways are grounded in different social-political and philosophical ideas. We opt for a humanist perspective with a focus on both autonomy and social concern. We will outline the contours of a more humanist pedagogical approach for moral and citizenship education which, more than is currently the case, stresses the development of personal moral values and social norms. Our work is embedded in the context of the Netherlands. However, we will analyse the Dutch developments in more global perspectives.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VALUES AND NORMS

In the public debate the terms values and norms are usually mentioned together, although they are actually two very different concepts and individuals have a different relationship with values then with norms. Moral values are opinions based on an idea of what is good and bad. They refer to concepts of the ‘good life’. Moral values are not personal preferences based on taste, but are more or less explicit and fully developed ideas about how a person relates to his or her life and social and natural
Moral values are affectively loaded cognitions related to behaviour, these values drive behaviour (Berkowitz, 1995; Oser, 1997; Veugelers & Vedder, 2003). Moral values are personal choices and are situated on the cultural level. Each person constructs his own value configuration. This construction can be more or less reflective, often however this process is implicit and hidden. Moral values give meaning to personal life. It’s a process of creating personal meanings of life.

People who support the same values may congregate in subcultures, ideologies, religions or other worldviews. Together they can live and celebrate their common values. They can inspire each other, create a moral community that binds together and gives the participants a moral home. These moral communities give the participant a feeling of belonging and helps in constructing a personal value system. These moral communities can be ‘thin’ or ‘thick’, they can be connected loosely or strictly, they can be horizontal or hierarchical. People also participate in different communities.

*Norms* are different from moral values. Norms are encapsulated in rules. Norms are standards which are based on values, and are highly context dependent and have the attributes of agreements (Joas, 2002). Norms are developed within every group in society, for example in a family, a sport team, a school class, a local community, a worldview organisation, in a country, or in the United Nations. The development or construction of norms is a process in which the moral values of the different participants struggle for hegemony. This is not an open communication and competition; in these struggles power relations are at work (Mouffe, 2005; Castells, 2009; Todd, 2009).

In norm construction the values of the dominant group are elevated, to a greater or lesser extent, to the norm of the whole group. Norms are like values that are imposed on all concerned. Norms may be formulated very broadly and give participants the possibility for a personal articulation, but norms may equally be very restrictive and demand only adaptation. Norms are implicit and explicit agreements on attitudes and on particular behaviour, while moral values are developed by an individual, in a process of giving meaning to life.

Attributing significance, sense making and giving meaning are human capacities. Human beings have the cognitive possibility for sense making and to reflect on values and norms, human beings can develop moral values. Because of these cognitive and social capacities human beings can in reflective and dialogical processes jointly create norms. Education can stimulate these reflective and dialogical processes of personal value development and social norms development. Education can challenge people to reflect on their value construction, to get engaged in moral dialogues and to jointly build norms.

**CHANGES IN EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSE ON VALUES AND NORMS**

Attention for values and norms and educational discourses and practices change over time and are part of larger cultural struggles and social and political devel-
opments (Apple, 1996; Goodson, 2005). After the Second World War, values and norms have been visible in various forms in Dutch education, educational policy, and educational discourses. The developments in the Netherlands are part of the developments in the Western world and of globalization worldwide.

What is special about the Dutch society is the strong denominationalism. Dutch civic society is, and in particular has been, organised along denominationalized lines. Protestant churches and the Catholic Church each have their own broadcast, their own schools, and sometimes even their own leisure activities. There is also a Jewish denomination, and in the last decades the Muslim immigrants created their own Islamic denomination. 70% of all Dutch schools are religious schools, mainly Protestant and Catholic schools. These schools are fully funded by the national government. All schools have to follow the national curriculum, except for the subject of religious studies. These schools can however select their own teachers and students.

The humanist movement has been recognised in the Netherlands, in the Fifties, as a formal worldview. As a reaction to the Second World War a strong moral and ethical humanist movement emerged. The humanist movement has its own social and cultural institutions. In education it has its own university, the University of Humanistic Studies (see e.g. Halsema & Van Houten, 2002). For primary and secondary education the humanist movement has not opted for own schools, arguing that it was better if children of different worldviews all come together in the public school. In public schools the parents can ask for worldview education, like humanist worldview lessons. About 1/3 of the public schools have this humanist worldview education.

There are also schools based on pedagogical views like Montessori, Dalton, Steiner, etc. Often these schools favour humanist ideas and work closely together with the University of Humanistic Studies and the organisation for humanist worldview education (HVO). All public and political debates on values and norms in the Netherlands are strongly influenced by this denominationalism. For the different religions, the school is a very important pedagogical environment. Many pedagogical debates circle around issues of worldviews.

What have been the developments in moral practices and discourses after the Second World War? In the 1950s, the denominationalism in society was still identifiable in evidence. Established values and norms were transferred within the individual denominations, also in their educational institutions. In the rebuilding of the Dutch nation and civic society after the German occupation, the religions and the humanist worldview took a lead. Protestant and catholic denominations reconstructed their institutions, in particular in education, to reinforce their moral values and to influence the norm development in society.

In the 1960s, the discussion on moral values took another turn. There was a growing awareness in the so-called ‘Sixties’ that values are personal choices and that norms should therefore be based on consultation and dialogues with all concerned. In this view, values are considered to be dynamic entities in constant development,
which could crystallize in group processes into social norms. And these norms are continuously being questioned and reformed. Romantic views on personal development like in humanistic psychology (Maslow, Rogers, Fromm) and in child-centred pedagogy influenced discourses on education and values and norms. In line with the modernisation project, personal development, or personal emancipation, attained a central focus. The modern individual abandoned social and cultural traditions and tried to become the ‘master of his own universe’. Present reviews of the ‘Sixties’ mostly stress this personal emancipation. This is however only a partial reading of social and cultural history.

The 1960s – actually the period from 1965 to 1975 which is generally referred to as the ‘Sixties’ – had a broader social, cultural and political project: both the personal and the collective emancipation had centre stage. Collective emancipation was concerned with eliminating, or at least reducing inequality in society and creating possibilities for personal emancipation for all. Society was expected to create through collective emancipation the conditions for everyone’s personal emancipation. In this political project, social class, gender and ethnicity should not restrict personal emancipation – neither in the Netherlands nor in the rest of the world. Personal emancipation and collective emancipation were linked and further democratization of society was seen as a necessary condition for human flourishing. Much attention was given to moral values like social justice and equality. Educational theories of empowerment like those of Freire and Illich were influential, as well as the German political education movement of Negt and the critical ‘Bildung’ of Von Hentig and Rolfh. In the Netherlands the work of the sociologist Matthijsen, the psychologist Deen and the pedagogue Van Gelder were significant in this emancipatory educational movement.

Educational ideas and practices relating to a collective emancipation like project-based learning, linking learning in school with learning outside school, political education, student involvement and democratic education, provoked considerable resistance in society. The collective emancipation function of education, which in fact had just started to develop, came under increasing political pressure and was marginalized in policy, theory and in practice. The formal argument was that education should be neutral and not be politicized and education should, in line with the discourse on personal emancipation, be child-centred. In many Western countries like the Netherlands the political control over secondary education and vocational education was tightened – through standards, national curricula and central assessments. The paradox is that the political has been abandoned by political means that were presented as neutral.

Education in the Eighties became, more than before in history, characterized by a process of rationalization and by a technical-instrumental way of thinking. It was not only education that was oriented towards collective emancipation that suffered from this process of rationalization. All value-laden education, also religious education, was strongly neglected in the technical discourse. Education should in this view be considered as neutral and value-free. The traditional transfer of values – in
so far as it still existed in education – was also obstructed and made ‘hidden’ by the
denial of the moral nature of education. The contribution of education to identity
development was no longer content and values-oriented, but only aimed at psycho-
logical processes of control and well-being.

Personal emancipation in education was still permissible in the 1980s. Personal
emancipation was incorporated in the new spirit of the times, the rational and the
technical-instrumental with the emphasis on established knowledge and skills, and
oriented to easily measurable output. Personal development in education increas-
ingly became the individual and personal exploitation of opportunities. Values were
reduced to individual well-being and disappeared from the curriculum, especially
from the subject matter. The teacher increasingly became a knowledge manager and
a supervisor of learning processes. The moral element only came into view when
order, or the norm, was disturbed by for example bullying.

The dominance of technical rationality meant that there was little explicit atten-
tion to values in education: neither in the sense of a transfer of values, nor in the
sense of value development or construction. Attention to norms was reduced to
enforcement and therefore the imposition of values. This adapting value orientation
in education is still present to this day, especially through all manner of rules and
forms of discipline.

In the 1990s, the technical-instrumental thinking was mixed with the ‘market-
ning’ of education. The discourse on education and the organization of education
had to be more market oriented (Apple, 1996; Giroux, 2001). Students, teachers
and schools should take more responsibility for their own learning process, teach-
ing and school organization. The central concept was self-regulation, on the level
of students and teachers and on the level of the school (Bandura, 1995; Veugelers,
2004). In terms of citizenship, in educational practice and in educational policy the
developing of values was oriented to adapting and conforming to society, whereas
the one-sided orientation on autonomy led to an individualistic citizenship. Almost
no attention was given to the development of critical-democratic citizenship, ori-
ented to both autonomy and social concern. Adaptive socialization was in particular
achieved by the ‘hidden curriculum’. An explicit moral message was mostly disap-
ppearing from the curriculum.

At the end of the past millennium the discourse changed. Increasing apathy – in
particular among youngsters – towards politics and civic society; violence in public
life and more calculating behaviour in all parts of society resulted in a renewed
interest in the moral task of education. These ‘moral and social crises’ were articu-
lated strongly. These crises in society were posed as educational challenges. Educa-
tion was asked to renew its pedagogical task and to compensate for its instrumental
approach. That education was invited to reinvent their moral task was an expression
of the new landscape of ideological apparatus. The socializing effects of politically
led institutions like social services and the switch from compulsory military serv-
iece to a voluntary service had diminished. In civil society, the Christian religions
had lost a major part of their members, and those who stayed on favoured a more
personal choice and even a personal religious ‘bricolage’. Compared with the other ideological institutions, education was, even after decades of technical rationality, considered to be a strong moral education institute.

Till the end of the past millennium moral education was separated from multicultural education. In practice, politics and in the academic world, the moral was not linked to cultural diversity. In multicultural education itself, all students had to learn about the cultural activities and ideas of the different ethnic groups in the country, in particular the nonwestern immigrants (Leeman, 2006). Teachers had difficulties in realising these pedagogical goals. It was not easy for multicultural education to go beyond just the most visible differences between cultural practices. Learning about the more fundamental ideas underlying these cultural practices and analysing identity development as a complex and multifaceted process was not part of the curriculum in most schools. ‘9/11’ and other forms of terrorism and their accompanying social, cultural and political debates have challenged multicultural issues strongly, and contributed to a change in the discourse on moral education and citizenship education (Veugelers, Derriks & De Kat, 2006).

In many Western countries citizenship education became in the beginning of the 21st century a formal task of education. The pedagogical function of education was restructured in the light of these cultural challenges. In the Netherlands the aims of citizenship education were formulated as ‘active participation and social integration’. Citizenship was not seen as a dynamic interplay of people creating society, but as adapting to a traditional national citizenship. Moral education no longer aimed at developing individuals but mainly focused on adapting to the traditional national citizenship. What became the position and articulation of citizenship education in educational policy and practice?

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN IDEOLOGICAL DISCOURSES AND PRACTICES

Nowadays the moral and social function of education is articulated by the concept of citizenship education. In public debate, policy and academic work, citizenship is not limited to the political level. The concept has been deepened into the social and cultural levels, the concept has also been broadened by crossing over the national borders and speaking of European citizenship and global citizenship. Citizenship education has been incorporated into educational policy and practice.

Educational policy is the result of public discourses and political decision making about education. Spring (2004), in his book How educational ideologies are shaping global society, distinguishes three important educational ideologies: ‘Nationalist Education in the Age of Globalization’; ‘Schooling Workers for a Global Free Market’ and ‘Globalizing Morality’. The nationalist educational ideology emphasizes the native language, the national culture, the national history, nation-building and security. The global free market ideology emphasizes comparability and standardizing, economic and technological development, and the international competitive position of countries. In subject matter the emphasis is placed on languages, on
mathematics and science. This ideology is strongly promoted by organizations like the World Bank and the OECD. The globalizing morality ideology emphasizes human rights, democracy, cultural diversity and sustainability. In content, the emphasis is on moral development and a morally founded sustainable world citizenship. This ideology is especially promoted by UNESCO and NGO’s.

According to Spring (2004) each educational system possesses a specific combination of these ideologies. He presents case studies from several countries. Which ideological mix is found in the Netherlands, especially in relation with citizenship education? With some caution we present the following analysis. The nationalist ideology with its emphasis on the national culture and history and much attention for security and safety is strongly present in the Dutch educational policy discourse on citizenship education. There is also attention for the global morality ideology, but this is not as strong as for the nationalist ideology. The global free market ideology is dominant in the Dutch political educational discourse and is even strong enough to marginalize the nationalist ideology in educational policy. The emphasis in Dutch educational policy is on the international competitive position and the ‘knowledge society’: languages, mathematics and science. Citizenship education in it’s global, and especially in its nationalist perspective, is important in Dutch national policy, but subsidiary to education for the ‘knowledge society’.

Citizenship and moral values

What is the practice of citizenship education and what are its goals? Citizenship as a system of rules has to do with norms, but for an active and lived citizenship moral values are important. Moral values give the person a drive to contribute in making norms or to accept existing norms. Moral values are important for the persons involved in developing citizenship. Different perspectives on values and value development are possible. Values may be oriented towards adaptation, personal emancipation or a more collective emancipation (Giroux, 1989; Veugelers, 2000). Citizenship relates not only to the formal political domain, but also to daily life. Dewey (1923) speaks of citizenship as lifestyle. It is concerned with how a person stands in society; the meanings of life on the personal, the interpersonal and the sociopolitical levels.

Over the past ten years we have conducted much research into moral values in education. Parents, teachers and students were asked whether any of a wide variety of values should be educational objectives and whether they are practiced. We consistently find three clusters of objectives:

– ‘Disciplining’, where the objectives include obedience, good manners and self discipline;
– ‘Autonomy’, where the objectives include forming a personal opinion and learning to handle criticism;
– ‘Social concern’, where the objectives include empathy, showing respect for people with different views, and solidarity with others.
These clusters of objectives have many similarities with the three fundamental characteristics of moral behaviour identified earlier by Durkheim (1923): discipline, attachment to or identification with the group, and autonomy. The above mentioned clusters of educational objectives can be linked in a specific way with the three types of citizenship (see for the empirical studies Leenders, De Kat & Veugelers, 2008a; 2008b):

- The adapting citizen attaches great importance to discipline and social concern and relatively little to autonomy;
- The individualistic citizen attaches great importance to discipline and autonomy and relatively little to social concern;
- The critical-democratic citizen attaches great importance to autonomy and social concern and relatively little to discipline.

The individualistic and the critical democratic citizenship are two variants of an autonomous citizenship. The individualistic type reasons more from the individual, whereas the critical-democratic type reasons from an involvement with others. A survey among teachers in Dutch secondary education showed that 53% of the teachers aim at a critical-democratic type of citizenship, 39% at an adaptive type, and 18% at an individualizing type. In vocational education the emphasis was slightly more on adaptation, while in pre-university educations an individualizing type was slightly preferred (Leenders et al. 2008a).

It is remarkable that parents, teachers and students alike, indicate that the cluster of discipline is more easily realized than the clusters of autonomy and social concern. They argue that a really well founded and self-regulated autonomy is more then just giving your opinion and is therefore a difficult to realize pedagogical developmental task. The social concern is also difficult to realize in particular in its more engaged and social justice oriented forms. And youngsters have problems in balancing autonomy and social concern, autonomy is very important for contemporary youngsters (Veugelers, 2008). Even if the pedagogical goals are aiming at a critical-democratic citizenship, the practice and the effects are strongly adaptive and individualized.

The three types of citizenship have a differing emphasis in their goals and are connected with differing pedagogical and didactical practices. Methodically, the adaptive type emphasizes the transfer of values and the regulation of behaviour; the individualizing type independent learning and developing critical thinking in a neutral way, and the critical-democratic type cooperative learning, developing critical thinking through social inquiry and dialogue, and on questions of social concern and humanity (Leenders & Veugelers, 2006). Westheimer and Kahne (2004) found a similar three-split in citizenship (see also Westheimer, 2008 and Johnson & Morris, 2010). Westheimer and Kahne identify a personally responsible citizen, a participating citizen and a citizen who strives for social justice. These studies on differences in citizenship show that developing citizenship is not a linear process from passive to active, but that citizenship can have different meanings and sociopolitical orientations.
What do students feel about moral and citizenship education? The results are very diverse (Veugelers, 2008). Students think that it is the teacher’s task to discipline the students, preferable of course the other students. And students like to further develop their autonomy through moral and citizenship education. Autonomy development is very important for youngsters. Social involvement and developing a critical-democratic citizenship is overall less important to them. In several studies we found however that students like to broaden their horizon. Interesting is the result that students, even more than the teachers, want to discuss politics in the classroom. Our research also showed that students have the opinion that teachers should not interfere too much with their identity development. In their pedagogical relations, teachers must find a balance between on the one hand providing space and keeping their distance, and on the other hand supporting students in their identity development.

INDIVIDUALIZATION AND DEMOCRACY IN MODERN SOCIETY

These struggles around morality, citizenship and citizenship education take place in a changing society in which the relation of the individual to society has altered strongly. The Enlightenment process of rationality and personal responsibility resulted in the individualization of society. At first modernization was oriented to structuring society, whereas now it is oriented to individualization (Beck, Giddens and Lash, 1992; Bauman, 1993). Life development was considered to be linear, in the sense of following rules. Life development is now more a question of finding rules and of reflective judgment. Human beings can, and even must make an increasing number of choices. People construct their own life-politics, they even have to do this, and they can not escape of it!

These social and personal developments seem in line with the humanist plea for autonomy, that people have the freedom to make choices for themselves and take responsibility for their own life. Humanist thinkers, among them Dutch philosophers like Erasmus and Spinoza, have continuously argued for developing human capacities and the agency of living an own life. Sociological analyses of modernization stress more the falling apart of societies and communities into individuals than the gain of modernity and humanity to create more possibilities for living a personal life. Sociologists focus more on the problematic aspects of modernization. A human characteristic is that human beings can reflect on their relationship with other human beings. An interesting question is: How can human beings people live together in these modern conditions that are full of contradictions (Halliwell & Mousley, 2003; Said, 2004)?

Human beings themselves must increasingly organize their own lives and bring their own order into the chaos. This begs the question of whether it is still possible to integrate highly individualized societies. Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (2002) reject two possibilities: First, the integration through shared values – the old way. The difficulty with this is that the very diversity of cultural orientations has swept away the foundations on which the traditional value societies formed and constantly
renewed themselves. Secondly, the cultivation of a national awareness. This is not only awkward in view of the polarization between individualization and globalization; it is also too abstract in relation to actual and highly tangible differences between groups.

Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (2002) put forward two proposals: First, developing a clear understanding of the problem of how to keep a strongly individualized society together; secondly, attempting to mobilize and motivate people for the challenges that exist at the centre of their lives (for example, related to work, the destruction of nature, and life itself). These proposals mean that society has to be continuously reinvented, with new forms of politically open and creative links. Creating society and linking human beings is a permanent process. Society itself is in this perspective what Bauman (2008) calls a ‘liquid identity’.

These processes of building links and building society implies, in our conceptual framework, that space has to be given to value development (creating meaning) and to the construction of norms – norms that have to be constantly reformulated. Constructing norms is finding possibilities for humanising interpersonal relations, communities and society. To participate in these constituting processes people have to acquire reflective, dialogical, and action skills that enable them to construct norms. But behaviour is not only a question of skills or competencies. Participative behaviour depends on an intention, on a will to act. This sense oriented intention is value-driven. Again we are back at the moral level. Moral values are necessary to drive participation human beings in society.

Social concern and democracy

Linking the individual and the society is currently formulated by European politicians in terms of integration and social cohesion. We opt for the term ‘democracy’, which expresses more active participation and involvement of citizens and dynamic social processes in which power relations are at stake. Following Dewey (1923) and Freire (1985) democracy can be considered as a humanistic way of life that emphasizes humanising processes and creates space for giving meaning to life.

Real democracy needs citizens that are both socially involved and autonomous; therefore we use the concept of critical-democratic citizenship. The addition of ‘critical’ expresses the dynamic process and the right to take one’s own stance. Democracy as lifestyle relates not only to the political but also to the interpersonal level, the daily interaction in schools, in work organizations and in the public domain (Touraine, 1997). Democracy is not a fixed state, the final stage of a social and political process. Democracy must be repeatedly won and maintained. Society has to be developed by means of democracy, also in the individualized modern era. Democracy, and in particular democracy as a process, can stimulate, organize and connect value development and norm development (see also the chapter of De Groot). The social concern in critical-democratic citizenship can range from affective empathy to engagement and political action for social justice.
Democracy must not be equated with consumer behaviour, market operation and privatization (Giroux, 2001). Therefore topics such as empowerment, power relations, ethics and giving meaning to life must be reintroduced into the public debate and into education. Through citizenship development, education is able to equip young people with the competencies to participate in the social and political domains, but education should also attempt to make young people morally prepared to use these competencies, that is to say, to develop social concern and humanity, to show civic courage and critical-democratic citizenship.

Contemporary society, characterized by individualization and globalization, continuously demands value development and the active and creative dialogical and joint formulation of norms. A continuing democratization of society, so people on all levels are able to participate actively, must be the fertile ground for this value development, development of norms, and identification and engagement with norms. The quality of the education should be assessed, according to this view, not only in terms of individual ‘academic’ school performance of students, but also on the contribution education makes to social justice and motivation for social change.

CREATING EDUCATIONAL SPACE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF VALUES AND NORMS

How can education practice these ideas? Contrary to what is often stated, education must not first and foremost pay attention to knowledge and skills also in the moral and cultural domain, but to the development of a personal identity – for giving meaning to life. Education should challenge students to think about values and norms and their own moral development. Of course students should relate in this process of reflection to important value systems. Relevant knowledge must be transferred, but it is more important that attention is given to the moral development of young people: to their values and social norms, their process of giving meaning to life, and their skills for thinking about values, to communicate about them, to act accordingly, and to reflect on this action. These cultural processes are the heart of education (Bruner, 1998) and are part of identity development (Goodson, Biesta, Tedder & Adair, 2010). Often students have to experience these processes ‘hidden’, nonreflective and without feedback of teachers and other students.

We think it is desirable in educational practice to create more space for giving meaning to life, personal meaning construction, and the development of a personal life view, and that attention is created for the social environment and for the processes of power and inequality that entail these dialogical processes of meaning making. Education should challenge students to relate to the world around them and to the ‘global world’; to learning how to assess differences and being able to deal with and to appreciate those differences. To be constantly working with the tension between autonomy and social concern.

Students should be given the opportunity to explore domains in the curriculum and to further develop their values in these domains. Attention to different per-
perspectives is important in order to develop values in a dialogical way (Schuitema, Veugelers, Rijlaarsdam & Ten Dam, 2008). Students need to have the opportunity to become familiar with value orientations woven into cultures. Students develop their personal values in a dialogue with the values that are woven into the subject matter. By interacting with other people or with materials, students develop skills for moral reasoning, moral action and reflection on that action. Students should perceive education as a moral practice in which they are challenged to further develop their own values and getting engaged with values (Veugelers & De Kat, 2002).

Developing values is one part of the story, developing norms is the other part. Students develop norms when they have to reach agreement with others. This development of norms as part of the educational teaching process may take place in the school and in the outside world. During their education, students must be given many opportunities in and outside school to develop norms with each other, with the teacher, and with fellow-citizens. The process of developing norms is dialogical in seeking for agreements, of course contradictions will remain but the intention is to give voice to everybody, to accept differences and to find ways to live together and to jointly build communities.

Whereas dominant educational thinking first emphasized the knowledge paradigm, it now emphasizes using skills to acquire knowledge. The more radical variants focus on knowledge construction. Even when there is attention for constructive processes the personal moral is mostly outside the scope of education. The challenge for education and educational studies is the incorporation of values into the educational learning process, and the creation of pedagogical practices in which students are able to work in a reflective and dialogical way on the development of values and norms, on sense making and humanising their own world and the global world.

SOURCES FOR A HUMANIST EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVE: MORAL EDUCATION, CRITICAL PEDAGOGY AND DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION

This morally embedded humanistic critical-democratic citizenship education is not that easy to realise. We need a more dynamic view and practice of human development and education, of interaction between the individual and the environment, between the individual and structure, and between the individual and culture. Nascent forms of this can be found in various academic educational traditions such as pragmatism, cultural activity theory, moral education, critical pedagogy and democratic education. We will concentrate on the significance of moral education, critical pedagogy, and democratic education for more humane practices.

Moral education

A number of issues from the moral education tradition are relevant to pedagogical practices oriented to critical-democratic citizenship:
With procedures such as value communication, where students learn to think and to act with respect to values, it is necessary to take account of moral values as criteria (McLaren, 1994; Veugelers, 2001; 2010a). Moral judgement necessitates the use of criteria (values) for assessing behaviour, in particular a value such as justice (Power, Higgins & Kohlberg, 1989);

Values drive behaviour, the affective component of moral development therefore deserves attention. Concern, involvement (‘caring’) and engagement are the affective components in the social domain (Noddings, 2002);

To find out where moral values are at stake, the development of moral sensitivity, and being able to deal with emotions is important. (Tirri, 2008);

Some current approaches to moral education in the educational field are characterized by an integrated approach to acquiring skills for value communication, stimulating certain values – often oriented to critical-democratic citizenship – and attention to the school as a community (Solomon, Watson & Battistisch, 2001; Veugelers & Oser, 2003).

Critical pedagogy and democratic education

Critical pedagogy sets out to provide social relevant education and to give the participants more control over their own lives. In the tradition of Dewey and Freire it argues for transformative practices where both personal and collective emancipation are worked on. The work of Giroux (1983, p. 168) fits best with the classical Greek definition of citizenship education, in which:

a rationality can be identified that is explicitly political, moral and visionary.

In this model, education is seen as intrinsically political, developed to educate citizens to be intelligent and active participants in society. Furthermore, intelligence is seen as a supplement to ethics, a manifestation and demonstration of the principles of the good and just life. Its goal was to form a sound character oriented to the permanent search for freedom.

Giroux (1983, p. 202) lists six points that are from a critical pedagogy perspective essential to educational practice:

– Active participation,
– Critical thinking,
– Developing an individual autobiography,
– Tracing values that are woven into human existence,
– Learning about the structural and ideological forces that obstruct opportunities for development,
– Show how to jointly make political structures that challenge the status quo.

This type of critical pedagogy must be influenced by a passion and optimism that appeals to opportunities. The concept ‘democratic education’ refers to an educational practice based on critical pedagogy. In this tradition there is a lot of attention
for organizing democratic processes in education and in linking school and social action (Goodman, 1992; Apple & Beane, 1996; Parker, 2004; Veugelers & O’Hair, 2005).

TEACHERS’ NORMATIVE PROFESSIONALISM AND MORAL VALUES

Till now we have been speaking in particular about educational concepts and practices. In these sections we spoke a lot about teachers. In this part we will concentrate on the position of teachers in relation with moral values. In all education the teacher has a crucial position, in value embedded education this role is complex. Teachers can work in different ways with moral values (Veugelers, 2010a). Based on a review of the literature we distinguish the following perspectives: Value transfer, reflective practitioner, moral sensitivity, participation and dialogue, and moral politics. The various perspectives have different ideas about the teaching and learning of moral values, the kind of citizenship society needs and the very task of education. The perspectives articulate different educational practices that assume different types of methodology and pedagogical goals of teachers. When presenting the five perspectives, we articulate what makes this approach unique.

Value transfer

This approach focuses on the transfer of moral values in education (Sockett, 1993). In this view, morality consists of virtues, of traits that support good behaviour. Being a good moral example, and teaching students about good moral people are important teaching methods in this approach. Student reflectivity is not really strengthened. The value transfer method is part of a pedagogical vision that has well-defined ideas about the good life and about important cultural traditions. The focus is more on getting youngsters involved in existing cultural practices rather than on challenging them to position themselves in an open, multicultural and changing society. This approach can be situated in a national educational system that is concerned about its cultural heritage, or in a tradition that is based on a religious worldview that perceives its worldview to be more static than dynamic.

Reflective practitioner

According to many sociological analyses, modern society needs citizens who are flexible and reflective. Many professions require professionalism based on what Schön referred to as reflection-in-action. In education this calls for a practice in which youngsters reflect on their behaviour, take responsibility for their actions, and try out new behaviour in an experimental and reflective manner. The reflective paradigm has had considerable influence on the thinking about teachers and teacher education. In reflective-oriented teaching, teachers are continuously challenged to inquiry their beliefs and their teaching behaviour. The emphasis in the
reflective practitioner approach is on reflection on one’s own professional behaviour (Korthagen, 2004). The assumption is that one's personal beliefs influence one’s pedagogical-didactic behaviour. Teachers should learn to consciously handle their methods and actions. Moral values can be part of the reflection process, but the method is presented more as a process than a moral content.

Moral sensitivity

Moral values are abstract and are normative because they say something about the good life, about good and bad. Moral values are embedded in all narratives and practices, but how to detect them? Following the reflection perspective we can ask questions about why you choose for a certain alternative. We can do it critically and ask on which moral values the statement or behaviour is based. For moral reasoning and acting you must not only know cognitively that moral values are involved, you must also have the sensitivity to feel and be aware of where moral values are at stake. The third perspective is therefore moral sensitivity (Campbell, 2003; Tirri, 1999). Teachers should develop the awareness to detect when moral values are involved and how meaning is giving to them. This implies seeing how students position themselves; give meaning to their experiences and the world around them, and how they work with the values involved. Teachers should incorporate this moral sensitivity in the art of their teaching.

Participation and dialogue

More cultural-oriented analyses of society argue that youngsters need to develop dialogical competencies and an active action-oriented participation in society. Education should therefore pay more attention to dialogical learning, learning by experience, and activity-oriented learning. Dewey’s pragmatism and Vygotsky’s cultural activity theory have influenced the development of this perspective. From a Deweyan perspective, participation itself is not enough; experiences should lead to the transformation of knowledge and active processes of knowledge construction and competence development. A dialogical approach, based for example on the discourse theory of Habermas, has always been an important element in Kohlberg-oriented moral education (Oser, 1994). Students should be involved in communication actions that challenge their ideas, deconstruct the values interwoven in their ideas, and this can help them reconstruct their own personal beliefs. A perspective aimed at participation and dialogue, as mentioned above, can create dialogical learning and change. Hansen (2001) shows how moral assumptions are manifest in rituals, such as classroom beginnings, in teachers’ style and in the curriculum. Hansen argues for more attention for moral knowledge and moral judgment in education. Participation, action and reflection should include concern about moral values involved.
Moral politics

We refer to the fifth perspective as moral politics. Morality, in this view, is seen as embedded in a political context, and the aim of education is formulated as political action for social change. Teachers’ work and social action are linked in this perspective. Beyer (1996) speaks of democratic education, Oakes and Rogers (2006) use the concepts teaching for changing the world, and teaching for social justice. Empowerment of people and working on structural changes that enhance humanity and change at grassroots level are considered to be pedagogical goals. The work of Dewey, Freire and Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy has influenced the development of this perspective. Teachers attempt to create democratic classrooms, to include minorities’ perspectives in the curriculum, and organize participatory social inquiry in and outside the school. Teaching is seen as social and moral engagement and as creating a better and more just world. Reflection and action are linked and aimed at realizing these moral goals. Teachers are clear in their critical emancipatory view, and their particular choice for schools that serve disadvantaged children. They choose for this kind of education.

We can argue that the five perspectives all have their particular strengths depending on the goals one has with education and the corresponding teaching method. If one wants to focus in education on character building and on making clear which values one finds important, then the value transfer perspective is the most useful perspective. When education is seen as very flexible in its content, structure and teaching methods, and in which teachers are autonomous and considered to be professionals, then a more reflective perspective is necessary. If this kind of education considers the development of morality as crucial and important, then the moral sensitivity perspective is desired. If learning is seen as transforming practices and learning by doing and dialogue, then the participation and dialogue perspective is needed. And if this transforming practice is seen as part of a struggle for social justice and democracy, then the moral politics perspective is useful. We are aware of the fact that concrete practices will often show a unique combination of elements of these perspectives. A humanist perspective embraces at least the moral sensitivity and the participation dialogue perspectives. If a more political social justice position is taken then the moral politics perspective can be part of it as well.

CRITICAL ISSUES IN CONTEMPORARY EDUCATION

Realising the ideas outlined in this chapter in educational practice encounter the context and institutionalisation of education. In this section we will discuss three very relevant topics in contemporary education that influence the possibilities for a humanist perspective on education:

– Religions and worldviews in education;
Religions and worldviews and education

Education can not expel worldviews from schools. Even when there is a formal distinction between education and worldviews like in France, worldviews are embedded in educational practices and students are developing identities. How can education pay attention to worldviews? We developed four models that may provide a better insight in the relation of worldview and education (Veugelers, 2010b). We call these four models:

1. Educating for a worldview
   The student is socialized within a worldview. The student gets acquainted with its tradition, learns its basic principles and becomes familiar with its rituals. The emphasis is on growing into the worldview. There is hardly any attention to other worldviews and there is no critical reflection on one’s own worldview.

2. Learning about different worldviews
   The student gets to know the important traditions in religions and worldviews. Learning is strongly cognitive and oriented towards knowing and identifying important events, stories and rituals in various traditions. The emphasis is on ‘knowing about’, not on judging the various worldviews.

3. Personal development of a worldview within a tradition
   The student is supported in his or her development of a worldview. It is acknowledged that the student makes his or her own choices in this process of developing that worldview. The student learns about several worldviews, but especially about the tradition that is adopted by the school. The influence of that tradition is fairly large in learning about rituals, stories and events (the ‘hidden curriculum’), especially in the school’s daily practices.

4. Personal development of a worldview within a democratic framework
   The school is, in a formal sense, neutral with regard to the various worldviews. The student is responsible for his or her choices in the development of a personal worldview. The school approaches worldviews from a democratic stance with an emphasis on civic rights like freedom of speech, freedom of religion and a ban on discrimination. Reflection and action on a personal worldview is aimed at the peaceful solution of conflict, respect for minorities, and a joint agreement on public
affairs. The school stimulates the student to critically compare various worldviews and to participate in a dialogue on worldviews, and supports the student in his or her development of a personal worldview.

In an empirical study we interviewed teachers about their practice. The interviews show that in many religious secondary schools there is a stage between models 3 and 4, between ‘personal development of a worldview within a tradition’ and ‘personal development of a worldview within a democratic framework’. The distinguishing factor is how strong the adherence is to the tradition of the worldview of the school and the teachers. The argument to stay close to model 3, ‘within a tradition’, can be derived from the denominationalism in Dutch education. From the viewpoint of a divers society, an argument to stay close to model 4, ‘within a democratic framework’, can be derived from the cultural and denominational diversity in the Netherlands and the democratic rights of freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

The denominational schools based not on a religion but on pedagogical ideas can make the same choice. Some of these schools in the Netherlands are very interested in a humanist perspective and choose for model 3 ‘personal development of a worldview within a tradition’ in which they combine their own pedagogical views with humanist ideas, in particular autonomy. Public education is supposed to give attention to worldviews without taking a position. They can organize, if parents ask for it, special lessons in religious studies or humanist ethical education (HVO). In particular public schools can promote democratic values. Public schools especially could express model 4, ‘personal development of a worldview within a democratic framework’. There are good arguments to call this perspective very humanistic: it enforces both autonomy and social concern.

The Dutch educational system gives religious schools the possibility to work from their own pedagogical and religious worldview. These schools however have to prepare students for a divers society in which these youngsters need to live in a democratic society with people that have other religions and worldviews. These private schools have to bridge the own worldview with pluralism and democracy. Public schools and nonreligious private schools are not so much involved with religions and worldviews, but they too have to help students in developing an identity and in living in a plural and democratic society. Education can not avoid worldviews, even in a secular state with a separation of education and religions schools have to pay attention to worldviews and have to support students in their identity development.

The moral and the political

A second issue is the relation of the moral and the political. The concept of citizenship itself is continuously broadened and deepened. It is broadened in the sense that citizenship is no longer limited to the own country, but also relates to the continent and even to world. Citizenship. From a critique on the linking of the concept of citizenship to one’s own country, a more morally inspired cosmopolitan citizenship has
been advocated (Nussbaum, 1997). This concept is about moral values that concern responsibility for the whole world and all its inhabitants. An open attitude towards other people is one of its important aspects (Hansen, 2008). Recently this morally inspired global citizenship has been criticized for its lack of attention for political power relations (Mouffe, 2005; Thayer-Bacon, 2008; Todd, 2008). A stronger relation between the moral and the political are advocated here: moral values should be analysed within social and political relations. Moral values get, due to power relations, different connotations. Abstract values hide contradictions in reality.

In a recent research project we studied the views of teachers with regard to global citizenship (Veugelers, 2011). In the theoretical orientation a distinction was made between an ‘open global citizenship’, a ‘moral global citizenship’ and a ‘social-political global citizenship’. We also formulated seven elements of global citizenship. On the basis of the empirical part of the study (interviews with teachers), we are able to connect these elements and forms of global citizenship.

Open global citizenship
a. As a result of globalization, people have become closer connected. Therefore they need knowledge of other cultures in order to work together (knowledge).
b. Global citizenship expresses that you are focused on the world as a whole and that you are open to new experiences (open attitude).

Moral global citizenship
c. Global citizenship means that differences between people and groups are being appreciated (diversity).
d. Global citizenship expresses that you are prepared to cooperate in increasing the opportunities of all people to enjoy a decent existence (increasing opportunities).
e. Global citizenship expresses that you take responsibility for the world as a whole and for humanity (taking responsibility).
f. Global citizenship has a global and a local component. At the local level as well, one should acquire knowledge, openness, take responsibility, create opportunities and appreciate differences (local component).

Social-political global citizenship
g. Global citizenship involves social and political relations and works towards more equal relations (equality in relations).

The interviews with the teachers have shown that these distinctions are useful, and also that the three types of global citizenship that were distinguished are connected with different educational practices. For pedagogical reasons, teachers usually opt for a moral global citizenship. They feel that an open global citizenship neglects its moral dimensions. A moral global citizenship, on the contrary, does pay attention to moral values like diversity, increasing opportunities, and taking responsibility.
Teachers also try to connect the global and the local, but they do not make a clear choice for a social-political global citizenship. Teachers acknowledge though, that global citizenship is embedded in social and political relations and that a political stance is always implicit. But the teachers do not want to put too strong an emphasis on political relations because politics is a rather sensitive area in education and because of the age of their students.

An explicit choice for social change, i.e. reducing social inequalities, is not made by these teachers, because according to them that would mean a reversal to forms of value transfer, even if it is in a transformative way. The social-political nature of global citizenship is therefore at the same time present and not present in secondary education. Present, because moral values are always embedded in social and political relations. Not present, because teachers are reluctant to explicitly stress this embedment and because they do not want to impose their own opinions on the students. Teachers try to develop a moral consciousness in their students, along lines as involvement and appreciation of diversity.

Social-political global citizenship as one of possible perspectives

Teachers are reluctant to work from a social-political global citizenship. A social-political global citizenship presents itself only when the moral global citizenship is embedded in concrete contexts and when these contexts are analysed for their social and political power relations. This happens seldom, according to the teachers. In education there is always a tension between forces that focus on social reproduction and forces that focus on social transformation (Veugelers, 2008). In most countries however the reproductive forces are much stronger then the transformative forces (Apple, 1999). This is also the case in the Netherlands. It restrained the teachers in their possibilities to choose for a social-political global citizenship.

Given the strong reproductive tendency in citizenship education policy and practice and the reluctance of teachers in the social-political domain what would be pedagogical possibilities for a more critical form of global citizenship education? Instead of a social-political global citizenship practice where teachers put values in a social and political context we would plea for a more multi-perspective approach by showing that a social-political global citizenship is one of the possible perspectives. It implies that global citizenship can be interpreted in several ways and that a social-political view is one of these perspectives. In such a multiplied pedagogical approach, the teachers will tend to show less explicitly which view of global citizenship they personally have. They will show that different perspectives are possible, including a social-political view. The fear of over-politicizing global citizenship education seems to have led to an over-moralizing of global citizenship. Demonstrating the moral in the political, without emphasis on one’s own political choice in these power relations, might achieve that the social-political will become part of a dialogue on global citizenship in schools: that the social-political is recognized as one of the perspectives.
Schools, community and segregation: Bonding and bridging

In educational discourses the notion of linking school and community is very popular. The school should strengthen the contact with the local community. This is a statement that everyone is enthusiastic about. But a one-sided social and cultural composition of the local community is an inwardly directed contact, as opposed to one that is oriented to the plural society. It is therefore important to make a case for widening horizons, for acquiring new and different experiences.

Due to denominationalism, the different school types and the free school choice there is a strong social and cultural segregation in Dutch education. The introduction of students to other social and cultural groups is however seen as an important aspect of citizenship education. In the framework of citizenship education, schools are explicitly asked by the Ministry of Education to bring different groups of young people together in order to introduce them to each other, to promote their mutual understanding and appreciation, and to further the cooperation between groups. Two theoretical debates are relevant to this topic: ‘bonding and bridging social capital’ of Putnam (2000) and the ‘contact hypothesis’ of Allport (1954). Putnam (2000) points out that a person’s social capital is composed of bonding (exclusive) and bridging (inclusive). Bonding is a social-psychological necessity for a person in order to join and hold one’s own in a cultural group. What Putnam calls bridging, connecting with other people, is what a society needs to function as such, to create social cohesion. Bridging can take on various forms: being considerate, being involved, or showing solidarity with others. In social psychology much research has been done into the conditions under which such meetings of differing groups does promote understanding and appreciation (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). These studies show that this kind of learning processes are rather complex and that the results are usually not predictable. Schuitema and Veugelers (2011) studied several projects in which students from different social and ethnic groups meet each other. The study shows that effects are hard to prove, but that it is important that joint activities are undertaken during the meetings and that there is interaction at the individual level. The contacts between students in the projects could under favourable conditions stimulate an open attitude and awareness of one’s preconceptions about the other groups. Most of these programmes are however very limited in time and scope and cannot compensate for the segregation of students in different schools. Segregation and its social and cultural effects should be a really concern in a humanist perspective on education.

CONCLUSIONS: LEARNING CRITICAL-DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP IN EDUCATION

Humanist thinking has always contributed an important role to education, either in the meaning of Bildung, human development or empowerment (Aloni, 2002). A contemporary humanist approach needs to balance these approaches. It should de-
velop a more dynamic view that links on the individual side autonomy and empower-
ment and on the social dimension humanity, care and solidarity. For citizenship
development this implies the development of a critical-democratic citizenship, with
the stimulation of humanitarian, social and democratic values. At the same time,
education must stimulate students to gain increasing control over their own process
of giving meaning to life. Autonomy development should be a process of increasing
empowerment and efficacy.

We started the chapter with an outline of the developments regarding values and
norms in recent decades. We pointed in particular to the disappearance of the
explicitly moral element from education, especially from the subject matter. We gave
three reasons for this: the declining influence of denominationalism on the content of
education, the rejection of a more political content oriented to collective emancipa-
tion and the dominance of a technical-instrumental rationality. We argued that the moral
element should be explicitly reintroduced into education. Not in the form of the trans-
fer of values – neither from the perspective of a collective emancipation – but through
supervising processes of giving meaning to life by students, the young people’s own
values development. Students should learn to relate to important ideological, social
and cultural traditions. They should learn to position themselves in modern society
and to learn to use moral criteria in reflecting on their own opinions and actions.

Norms are the rules that apply in a group. These norms are continuously being
reformulated. Students should not in the first place be obliged to acquire knowl-
edge of which norms are dominant in society, but must acquire an understanding
of the development of norms and be able to try out the development of norms in the
school and in extramural learning activities organized by the school. In addition,
students should acquire insight into how norms have changed through the activities
of groups of people in the course of time. From the perspective of a critical-demo-
cratic citizenship, particular attention is desired for emancipation, democracy and
empowering humanity. Insight into and experience with the development of norms
is a better preparation for social participation in society than acquiring knowledge
of the dominant standards in society. Education of this kind demands opportunities
for a more active participation of students in school, much extramural learning, and
teacher supervision of this identity development and dealing with social norms.

All education stimulates certain values and in doing so works on the develop-
ment of morality and citizenship. The adapting type of citizenship is already en-
couraged in that students have to comply with the norms of the school. Individual-
istic citizenship is already encouraged through a meritocratic educational system
oriented to individual performance, in which an individual is personally responsible
for success or failure at school. Only the critical-democratic type of citizenship
received hardly any attention in education. Stimulating humanitarian, social and
democratic values and autonomy should be given more attention in education. The
pedagogical goal is to educate young people to have a critical, enquiring attitude,
to have the courage and the creativity to tread new paths, who wish to scrutinize all
knowledge – including their own knowledge – for the norms and underlying power
structures it contains, and who are alert to the relationship between autonomy and social concern.

**Challenging students' identity: autonomy and social concern**

As a humanist perspective on education we want to stress challenging of students’ identities by developing their reflective and dialogical competencies. This challenging should help them in constructing their identity in which they combine social-psychological elements and social-political elements. The social-psychological elements are efficacy, self-regulation, trust, confidence, the feeling of agency, moral courage and to stand for their own personal worldview. More cognitive competencies like critical thinking, reflective action and dialogical thinking and acting should found these more affective social-psychological elements.

The social-political elements constitute how the individual relates to the other, to the community, to society. It articulates the relation between the person and the other. A humanist perspective on these social-political elements is on developing social concern, on caring, on building connectivity, on bridging, on empowerment, and on building a democratic way of life. Creating humanity for all is the leading goal. In contemporary research on moral development and citizenship, diversity is considered to be a moral value (Parker, 2003; Haste, 2004; Leeman, 2006; Oser & Veugelers, 2008). Appreciating diversity is a linking of autonomy and social concern. It is a concern about the autonomy of others: that other people can live the life they want to live.

In this chapter we focused on the social functioning of human being, of being part of community and on getting control on their own life, on empowerment. In this social functioning the creation of meaning and human development takes place. Of course there are more personal intimate feelings and concerns, but the human being is a social being. The self is always situated and linked with others. As we showed, in many pedagogical ideas and practices the social has been neglected by celebrating the individual, the self. We are not arguing to neglect the self in the social but to develop a social situated self.

The types of learning a humanist perspective on moral education and critical-democratic citizenship education needs are: reflective learning; dialogical learning and democratic learning. They are three elements of learning that should support each other.

**Reflective learning**

- Articulate one’s own interests, feelings, ethical and aesthetical concerns, meaning making, and moral values
- Inquire into the own identity development and reflect on the own learning process
- Regulate the own learning process and taking responsibility for own autonomy and giving meaning
Dialogical learning
- Communicate in an open way with other people
- Analyse and compare different perspectives
- Analyse the social, cultural and political power relations involved

Democratic learning
- Concern for others and appreciation of diversity
- Openness to jointly building agreements (developing norms)
- Stand for your own autonomy and critical thinking and action
- Involvement in enlarging humanity and in building democracy as a permanent process

These reflective, dialogical and democratic learning processes are at the heart of humanistic education.
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HUMANISTIC EDUCATION:
FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

Starting from the existing consensus regarding the theoretical tenets of humanistic education, the present chapter faces the challenge of translating it into educational practice. Based on Aristotle's insight that the supreme test of education is in actions and results, the present chapter undertakes to bridge the gap between theory and practice. This ‘bridge’ is deployed in four stages. The introduction presents the current consensus regarding the essential foundations of humanistic education. The second stage focuses on changing the professional self-image and pedagogical presence of teachers and the challenges such a change involves. The third stage discusses the translation of the humanistic worldview into educational policy, in terms of moral values and citizenship education. In the last stage, various educational principles, crucial for the creation of a humanistic school culture, are presented.

INTRODUCTION

Over a period of 2,500 years, the humanistic tradition has been offering various models of ‘humanity at its best’ (what the Romans called *humanitas*). In the classical discourses of the West (Judeo-Christian and Greco-Roman) as well as of the East (Confucian and Buddhist), this ideal comprised the central virtues of wisdom, justice, humanness, peace and harmony. More specifically, we find in these traditions (in different proportion and emphasis) the qualities of broad-minded education, reflective thinking, noble character, good taste, amiability, benevolence, and social responsibility. Modern humanist discourses – naturalist, liberal, existentialist, progressive, critical and radical – have added to the humanist ideal the following qualities: personal autonomy and authenticity, self-actualisation, critical thinking, creative imagination, respect for persons, empathetic caring, involved democratic citizenship, as well as adherence to global ethics of human rights, multiculturalism, and environmental responsibility.

Towards the end of the first decade of the 21st century, it seems that beyond differences in emphases and formulations there is a wide agreement that humanism consists of a cosmopolitan worldview and ethical code that posits the enhancement of human development, well-being, and dignity as the ultimate end of all human thought and action; namely, giving priority to the values of human dignity, equity, growth and solidarity over any alternative set of values – religious, ideological,
economic or national. It further entails a commitment to form a pluralist and just
democratic social order, devoted to both human rights and social solidarity: provid-
ing every individual with a fair opportunity to enjoy a full and autonomous life,
characterized by personal welfare, broad education, cultural richness, self-actuali-
sation, and involved democratic citizenship.

Broad consensus exists not only regarding the ethical and pedagogical aims of
humanism, but also regarding the means to achieve them. The main idea is that
the goal does not justify all means. In other words, unlike authoritarian educa-
tional traditions, which condoned physical or psychological humiliation of unruly
students, humanistic education is above all committed to a social and intellectual
climate protecting students from intellectual oppression, physical punishment, and
dishonour. Based on the humanistic stance that people’s unique dignity lies in their
critical reason, moral sensitivity, creative imagination, autonomous will and unique
personality, it is essential for humanistic education to prioritise the value of human
dignity – including freedom of thought, moral autonomy and personal authenticity
– over any other religious, nationalistic, economic, or ideological set of values. For
an in depth discussion of the history and theory of humanistic educations see Aloni
(2003), Enhancing Humanity.

In view of Aristotle’s well-known observation that the most significant test of
practical wisdom – in ethics, politics, and pedagogy – is not in its formal under-
standing but in its practical realization (Aristotle, 1980), the principal challenge fac-
ing educators today is to translate the above-mentioned theoretical consensus about
objectives and means into practical models of humanistic education.

The present chapter attempts to cope with this challenge in the following man-
ner. First, I will deal with the need to change the professional self-image or profes-
sional identity of teachers as well as their modes of pedagogical presence. Then, I
will present the implications of a humanistic world-view for an educational policy
in the areas of knowledge, values, and virtues. I will conclude with some aspects
constituting the humanistic school culture – a culture capable of empowering stu-
dents in their progress towards a sovereign and complete humanity of significance,
quality, and self-actualisation.

THE PROFESSIONAL SELF-IMAGE AND PEDAGOGICAL PRESENCE OF
TEACHERS

In the introduction to Education under Siege, Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) write:
‘Education should be more political, while politics should be more educational.’ In
a certain sense, this may be interpreted in view of Adorno’s famous adage – ‘after
Auschwitz, one cannot write poetry anymore.’ (Adorno, 1981). These two quotes
are founded on the realization that the human race has produced such abominable
atrocities, that we may no longer live our life as if it were just a matter of daily rou-
tine. The fact that political regimes in the 20th century promised a life of power and
prosperity but, in fact, sentenced millions to death, agony, exile and misery requires
educators to adopt a more activist political approach in creating mechanisms supporting the sacredness of life and the dignity of humans. In other words, the modernization of propaganda and control mechanisms – Orwellian politics, commercials and religious and ideological brainwashing – has meant increased possibilities and opportunities to depersonalise and transform people into fanatic soldiers, submissive workers and addicted consumers. The defence against these historic trends can only be conducted by those who identify them and see the proverbial writing on the wall: educators, academics and intellectuals who will organize themselves as an elite in service of society, and undertake to develop ‘immunizations’ to protect its younger citizens from hegemonic establishments that consider and treat people and ‘usable and abusable’ tools for achieving greater wealth and domination (Aloni, 2008a).

From an educational point of view, the first obvious implication is the need to change teachers’ professional self-image and professional identity from that of ‘passive conduits’ for messages of political establishments to that of agents of social transformation and ‘active shapers’ of educational messages – messages that educational theory and research has identified as promoting personal growth and social welfare. This change means the substitution of educational ethics for political ideology as the highest instance in the formulation of educational policy – no more blind devotion to political regime and economic manipulation, but a focus on the development, dignity and welfare of the young; no more submissive socialization to the values of present society, but also active transformation into desirable society. As suggested by Postman and Weintgartner (1969) already in the late sixties and later by critical theorists like Giroux (1988) and Gur-Zeev (2007), such a move means that in a reality where instrumental manipulation and ideological ‘normalization’ have become the dominant modes of interaction and communication – in politics, religion, commercials and the mass media – the educator is required to ‘equip his/her students with crap-detecting kits’, to provide forms of ‘counter education’, and empower them with cultural, critical, media and political literacies as immunization against the deceptiveness of power structures and public opinion shapers.

Such a critical pedagogy, combining classical idealism with postmodern disillusionment, will reconstitute the teachers, in keeping with their original humanistic ideal, as experts in ‘training the young in the art of living’. Just as physicians take the Hippocratic oath to treat any person whatever the circumstances, and no official may dictate their medical code, educators should also establish an infrastructure of knowledge and values to serve as an overarching frame of reference for the practice of education. While such educators, who know where they’re coming from and wither they are heading – cultured, autonomous, and professional educators – may encounter some resistance by the establishment, they will also reaffirm their dignity and prestige. As suggested by Kant (1996), serious education always goes against the grain: against children’s natural rebelliousness; against parents who prefer their children to succeed in the present society – shallow and corrupt though it may be; and against the political, religious and economic establishments who seek submis-
sive people that can be ‘bought cheap’, rather than educated and critically minded citizens who stand up for their rights. Such educators, said the educational psychologist Mordechai Nissan (1997), will be better qualified for, will find more meaning in, and will be more satisfied with their job; they will also be far more immune to pressures and manipulations on the part of students, parents and authorities.

Besides the importance of professional wide-awakeness – moral, political and pedagogical – as a basis for educational activism and professional backbone (Greene, 1973), the change in educators’ self-image must also find its expression in pedagogic presence. I mean to say that in order for teachers to have an educative effect on their students, they must adopt unique modes of being, expression, and communication. I will explain this with the help of Martin Buber (1971), who sheds light on three qualities, which render the teacher’s presence educative: trust, idealism and personality. The first trait, interpersonal trust, is essential to any educational success: winning the students’ trust, making them feel that the teachers are on their side, for them and truly concerned with their growth and well-being. Without trust, the teacher is perceived as a stranger, as an oppressive enemy who must be tolerated, but never listened to or truly learned from, and with time, should the opportunity present itself, even ‘brought to account’. Conversely, when students trust the teacher as a person – when they have faith in her honest caring and concern for their dignity, growth and well-being – an infrastructure is being laid for goodwill and openness, empathy and mutual respect (including concern by the students for the teachers’ own well-being), for true pedagogical dialogue and meaningful educational work. Importantly, such trust must not be won through cheap tricks of fraternization, flattery, and a subservient lapse into a ‘child-centered’ approach, marginalizing everyone else. It’s about a friendly ‘good morning’, extra-curricular activities, caring for the student and her family, noticing changes in appearance or mood, reading body language and facial gestures, offering help beyond strictly academic tasks – in short, authentic manifestations of basic humanity and pedagogic caring (Aloni, 2008b).

The second trait is cultural idealism: the awareness, on the one hand, that some good and precious things are ‘worth getting up for in the morning’, worth making an effort to achieve and enjoy; and that, on the other hand, other things are so base, ugly and vile that one should steer clear of them and under no circumstances come to terms with. Whether we dub this trait ‘pedagogic Eros’ or human perfectionism, I mean those wonderful combinations of passions and sensitivities with insights and sensibilities, which prod man not to compromise and accept the shallow, the mediocre, the routine, the standard, the common and automatic, but strive for higher standards of meaning, knowledge, morality and refinement. When this cultivated passion disappears, it is very easy to lapse into vulgarity and barbarism, into an egocentric and hedonistic attitude of total contempt for accepted norms of thinking, talking and behaving. On the other hand, when this passion is truly felt, it suddenly becomes important to find out what is true, what is the best way of stating a claim, who indeed is right, what is really beautiful, how to build a just society, and
most importantly, how I take responsibility for my own life and turn it into something precious, interesting and worthy. The problem is that such cultural idealism or ‘pedagogic Eros’ cannot be ‘triggered’ in the students by means of sober thought or scholarly lectures. In order to make it happen, the teachers must be present for their students as culture ‘freaks’: to share with them, in words and gestures, their excitement, impressions, interpretations, anger, enthusiasm, joy, gladness, acts of commission and of omission vis-à-vis cultural creations and social events. In brief, the teachers’ excited idealistic presence may trigger such a trait in their students, while an indifferent, flat and uncommitted teachers’ presence might only increase poverty of mind, alienation, and moral desolation.

The third Buberian characteristic of the educator’s presence is personality. This means, above all, the virtue of ‘practicing what you preach.’ In his daily and public conduct, with no special intentions or highbrow talk, the educator personifies the qualities that dignify any person. Such an educator, says Buber, is most effective educationally when not trying to educate at all: he is simply ‘there’, as a sensitive, fair, intelligent, reasonable, responsible, balanced and controlled person. This pedagogical mode of being is especially evident in times of crisis – when a student is physically or verbally violent, facing an aggressive parent, in embarrassing moments, or when someone tries to insult or offend another. It is then that the educator’s personality comes to light, when she or he manages to steer the situation towards solutions without ‘great sacrifices’, articulating standards of right and wrong, but under no circumstances demeaning to the teacher or offending the dignity of anyone involved.

EDUCATING FOR VALUES: PROMOTING A HUMANISTIC AND DEMOCRATIC CULTURE

It is a commonly known fact that children’s education always begins with socialization to their culture and community, and only later – upon their exposure to other communities and acquisition of universal intellectual assets – do they adopt the ideas and practices of general culture. In view of this fact, it seems obvious to me why a humanistic and universally oriented education is preferable to an ethnocentric and provincial education. In the field of psychology we speak of the individual’s development from the primal or primitive phase of egocentrism through a familial, tribal, national, and religious phase of ethnocentrism to the highest phase (not reached by everyone) of recognizing the complete and equal humanity of every person. In an analogous fashion, we can speak of a trajectory leading from dogmatism and parochial narrow-mindedness to communality in the level of universal human achievements in science, morals, law, politics, and art. Cosmopolitan humanism doesn’t necessarily seek to diminish or extinct local communal bonds and cultural heritages – whether religious, socio-ideological, or political – but it does seek to influence and qualify them in the light of common standards of human dignity and democratic culture (Nussbaum, 1998, 2002; Hansen, 2009).
The main reason for fostering cosmopolitan humanism lies in the realization that it would be irresponsibly naïve to expect humanist and democratic virtues to develop naturally. On the one hand, the motivation is to assist everyone in realizing their potential and leading a sovereign life of meaning and quality; on the other hand, we are well aware that both as individuals and as collectives, human beings tend to perceive themselves as better, more just or deserving privileged access to resources denied to other groups. Since such selfish, ethnocentric, or even racist attitudes usually mean offending the humanity or denying the human rights of other groups, humanism seeks the universal application of basic norms of human dignity and equality. The Biblical ethics is a prime example for such norms. It opposes egoistic and ethnocentric tendencies with the such teachings as: ‘Steer away from falsehood and slay not one who is righteous and just… and take no bribe… and oppress no stranger’; ‘thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty: but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbour. … love thy neighbour as thyself’ (Leviticus, 19:15,18); ‘But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt’ (ibid., 34); ‘Do not unto your neighbour that which you hate’; ‘May your neighbour’s honour be as precious to you as your own’.

Though it may certainly be objected that even those humanistic checks and balances entail some coercion over the individual, such coercion is far more limited than any alternative imposition of religious, ideological or political contents – limited to such aspects and boundaries allowing everyone to actualise their mental potential and enjoy equal opportunities to influence the character and practices of their social community. Naturally, those educating for universal humanism are usually disparaged by nationalist leaders or religious fanatics as betraying their unique heritage, since they want their flock reduced to submissive devotees of the single truth that they cherish and represent. We are fortunate, nevertheless, in that after millennia of religious wars, ideological violence and brutal racism, the family of nations has finally, on December 10th 1948, determined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that ‘without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth of other status… Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.’

The value of humanistic principles has recently received support, of all sources, from empirical studies on the quality of life in various countries. As opposed to the authoritarian bias of many that there is something unrewarding, ‘weakly’ or artificial about the virtues of reflective thinking and social justice, empirical data provided by the UN’s Human Development Index as well as by the OECD’s PISA international achievement tests indicate clearly that it is those countries which uphold humanism’s idealistic virtues are also those who offer their citizens the highest quality of life. The Scandinavian countries, for example, have been in the lead for many years, both in standards of public welfare, health, and education services, and in standards of individual liberties, social equity, gender equality, and political
integrity. An examination of the fundamental values of these societies shows that they practice the fundamental humanistic elements: comprehensive education in the spirit of science, critical reasoning and the liberal arts, open and pluralistic democracies, and supportive and caring welfare societies that ensure no one loses his or her human dignity upon becoming impoverished.

In sum, based on the humanistic philosophy of human dignity as well as on empirical findings regarding the prerequisites of quality of life, we are called to shape an educational policy having the following arch-objectives: (1) An intellectual approach based on open-mindedness and broad education, autonomous and critical thinking, logical reasoning and factual evidence; (2) A moral standpoint characterized by attributing equal human worth to others, striving for social justice and peaceful neighbourliness and showing respect, fairness and consideration for others; (3) Active democratic citizenship evidenced by social responsibility and political involvement, as well as by the dispositions of pluralism, tolerance and self-restraint; (4) Cultural richness supported by active curiosity, broad intellectual horizons, experiential depth, commitment to excellence and cultural diversity; (5) Being a ‘world citizen’, consisting in being informed and concerned not only about one’s local community and culture, but also about other cultures and about ethical and ecological issues that are of global and international concern.

DEVELOPING A HUMANISTIC SCHOOL CULTURE

Apart from the significant change required from teachers in the areas of professional awareness, pedagogic presence, and normative commitment, it is very important to focus on some aspects of the school culture, so that this may serve as fertile ground for promoting the objectives of a humanistic education. In the following paragraphs, I will briefly discuss seven crucial aspects thereof: (1) multifaceted cultivation of student personality; (2) developing a social climate of security and fairness; (3) using various types of dialogue with the students in order to reach out to and empower them; (4) developing a community approach and social involvement; (5) developing the students’ intellectual powers by means of general and liberal education; (6) developing teaching techniques in which ‘the tree of knowledge’ becomes the students’ and the community’s ‘tree of life’; (7) ensuring a safe and hospitable physical infrastructure.

1. Multifaceted Cultivation of Student Personality

The humanistic principle of multifaceted cultivation of students’ personality is grounded in an old tradition – from the days of Athenian education in the complementary disciplines of gymnastics (physical education) and music (spiritual or mental education) to the recent innovations in the area of multiple intelligences, life skills, and ‘multifaceted literacy’. In view of this heritage, I believe I can point to seven critical facets or fundamental aspects of personality cultivation:

(a) Helping the students develop a positive self-image or a sense of self-worth
that they are worthy, important, accepted and capable – as a prerequisite for their faith in their own ability to lead a life of quality and meaning.

(b) Foster their interest in both their human and their natural environment, in order to cultivate their joie de vivre and personal involvement in social activities and cultural contents.

(c) Develop their emotional intelligence as well as their capacity for empathy, moderation and self-mastery.

(d) Develop the intellectual virtues of curiosity, critical and reflective thinking, sense of measure, sound judgment, creative imagination, and sensitivity to values.

(e) Foster an autonomous standpoint of independent thought, personal accountability and perseverance in dealing with intellectual issues, social pressures and personal desires and urges.

(f) Cultivate an authentic, personal voice, producing its own contents and shaping itself through an interpersonal dialogue of self-nurturing and self-motivation.

(g) Develop the courage to be ‘imperfect’ and act also in ambiguous situations defying simple solutions.

2. A Social Climate of Security and Fairness

Paraphrasing the American humanist psychologist Abraham Maslow, the child’s social climate is akin to a goldfish’s aquarium conditions: for both, primary and basic conditions of security and well-being that are essential for survival, let alone thriving. Optimal conditions also prevent, or at least considerably reduce, students’ hostility and aggression, together with all the other disciplinary problems that encumber academic and educational success. In general, the optimal conditions forming a social climate of security and well-being include norms of humanity, fairness, transparency, rationality and dialogue. Specifically, the following conditions are crucial:

(a) A sense of physical, emotional and mental security, which translates into relaxation and personal well-being.

(b) A family atmosphere of caring and empathy, together with personal attention by the teachers and a sense that the student is truly dear to them as a person.

(c) A sense of belonging and partnership reinforced by active involvement in decisions related to the school culture.

(d) Norms of reason, fairness, dialogue and transparency which minimize any sense of arbitrariness and authoritarianism.

(e) Norms of mutual respect and caring about others as well as about social and environmental justice.

3. Empowering Dialogues

By this I mean unique modes of pedagogic discourse and interpersonal communication that enrich the routine instruction with elements and content that enhances and
empower the students’ personality above and beyond the subject matter learned. Educational tradition has offered empowering dialogues of various kinds. I suggest the following typology:

(a) The Socratic dialogue which is intellectually empowering in that it does not offer regurgitated knowledge and ready-made answers, but creates discomfort concerning a given issue or dilemma and guides the student in a process of self-discovery and critical reasoning with a constant feeling of being ‘on the way’.

(b) The Nietzschean dialogue which empowers the student’s autonomy and authenticity by rejecting the option of mass conformity and encourages the alternative of building the students’ selfhood based on self-definition and self-creation.

(c) The Buberian dialogue which develops a caring and empathetic sensitivity in interpersonal relationships by substituting professional and hierarchic alienation with sincere and attentive encounters, in which both the teacher’s and the student’s personality are completely present.

(d) The Rogersian dialogue which enhances the individual’s faith in her ability to lead a successful life by tuning in and getting to know oneself;

(e) The Freireian dialogue which helps students from weak and oppressed social groups to free themselves of inhibitory and regressive forces through the development of active knowledge and critical literacy and their application in a political struggle for social justice and equal opportunities.

(f) The ecological dialogue, reinforcing empathy for one’s natural environment, so that the student’s self-awareness of the necessary conditions for personal growth and well-being leads to caring for a thirsty tree, a drooping stalk, a turtle helpless on its back, a beached whale, endangered and confined animals, polluted oceans and rivers, and the beauty of nature.

4. A Communitarian Approach and Social Involvement

In the early 20th century, the educational philosopher John Dewey called for dismantling the barriers separating school from society and education from democracy. A century later, it seems that the communitarian approach and the democratic spirit have become an integral part of the living culture of most schools. This trend comprises the following aspects:

(a) Greater involvement by parents and students alike in shaping the school’s characteristics and contents – including parental contribution in curricular enrichment and students contributing in the form of tutorship programs and determining school regulations.

(b) Support systems for culturally deprived, economically disadvantaged or physically and mentally challenged students.

(c) Collaboration with other social organizations in the community, such as culture clubs, youth movements, kindergartens, nursing homes and animal rights and environmental organizations.
(d) Active citizenship intent on abolishing social injustices and ensuring the integrity and propriety of both the public arena and the natural environment.

5. General Education and Cultural Foundations

‘Without knowledge there is no reason – for there is nothing to reason about’; ‘if we do not get to know past cultures we shall have no tools for deciphering the present and no vision with which to create a future.’ These two popular sayings articulate the great danger of ignorance, cultural mediocrity, conceptual barrenness, linguistic poverty, and associative shallowness – the lack of cultural context and frame of reference essential for any serious comparison, valid observation, balanced assessment, and responsible judgment. In referring to foundations of education and culture, I mean a system of comprehensive and ordered knowledge which, together with capacities for reasoning, observation and articulation, allows people to decipher the reality of their lives and act within it in a complex, effective and meaningful way. In order to cultivate such infrastructures, I believe the following elements are necessary:

(a) Linguistic literacy, including comprehension and expression skills, the ability to analyse complex texts, organized and reasoned presentation of ideas, and the ability to discuss a wide range of issues.

(b) A broad education, including knowledge about world-views and cultural heritages, basic concepts and research methods, current affairs and art.

(c) Knowledge in curricular subject matters.

(d) Cognitive skills evident in reflective and critical rationality, mental flexibility and creativity, the identification of relevant contexts and the ability to judge facts and values.

(e) A philosophical approach which fosters caring for truth and justice, together with scepticism of whatever is being taken for granted and clarity and method in thought and expression.

(f) Artistic literacy, taking pleasure and finding meaning in experiencing artworks as well as in exercising one's creative imagination and artistic skills.

6. The Tree of Knowledge as a Tree of Life

In the spirit of Ecclesiastes – ‘wisdom giveth life to them that have it’ (KJV, 7:12) – and in accordance with such diverse educational theories as those of Plato, Aristotle, Seneca, Montaigne, Rousseau, Nietzsche, Dewey, Whitehead and Korczak – learning must not be seen as a goal in itself, but as a means to the overarching end of training for the art of living – of an optimally developed humanity, personal growth and social progress, or overall excellence in the field of personhood. Instruction and learning in schools should therefore have the following qualities:

(a) Substituting an educational development program for the discipline-based school curriculum as the school’s main content basis.

(b) Meaningful teaching in touch with the students’ actual world and with current affairs.
(c) Creating a ‘pedagogic Eros’ and an ‘academic drama’ by teachers who evidence enthusiasm for manifestations of truth, justice and beauty.
(d) Translating knowledge into life literacies that allow learners to identify the value-laden messages of issues discussed in class and to plan their actions with greater reason and responsibility.
(e) A holistic approach relying on multiple, and interpersonal, intelligences.
(f) Diverse assessment approaches related to the whole gamut of student’s abilities, functions and contributions, avoiding any reduction of their personality to extraneous standards.

7. A Safe, aesthetic, and Hospitable Physical Infrastructure
The school’s physical layout should facilitate the achievement of personal and cultural goals as well as communicate respect for humanistic and environmental values:
(a) Safety of buildings, teaching aids and playgrounds.
(b) Hospitable and aesthetic architecture as well as investment in design, facilities, artwork and vegetation.
(c) Open and roomy spaces that optimise options for independents study, social interaction, and small group dialogue.

Let me conclude now by stating again the challenge that stood at the centre of this article: to utilize, translate, adapt, and integrate the widely agreed upon tenets of Humanism and Humanistic Educational Theory into pedagogical elements capable of constructing the lived reality of humanistic schools. As we have seen, humanism has its roots in ancient traditions in both the West and the East, and out of these traditions evolved various humanistic educational philosophies – classical, romantic, existentialist and critical. It is a pity, however, that the popularity of the values and tenets of humanistic education has failed to be translated and put to work in the real life of educational practice and schools characteristics. It is my hope that the detailed portrayal of the practical aspects of humanistic education I have offered above would contribute to overcome the so familiar challenge familiar to us from so many spheres of life – moving from a worthy and promising theory to a desirable and rewarding practice.
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