

University of Southampton Research Repository

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis and, where applicable, any accompanying data are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis and the accompanying data cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content of the thesis and accompanying research data (where applicable) must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder/s.

When referring to this thesis and any accompanying data, full bibliographic details must be given, e.g.

Thesis: Jinyu Yang (2017) " Young People's Citizenship in Higher Education in the UK", University of Southampton, Faculty of Social and Human and Mathematical Sciences, PhD Thesis, 1-149.

Data: Whiteley, P. F., A. Keating, Kerr, D. & National Foundation for Educational Research. (2013). Citizens in Transition: Civic Engagement among Young People, 2011. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 7230, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-7230-1>.

Keating, A., Green, A., Janmaat, G., Franceschelli, M. & Hoskins, B.(2014). Citizenship Education Longitudinal Survey (CELS), 2014. Unpublished dataset.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

FACULTY OF SOCIAL, HUMAN AND MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Southampton Educational School

Young People's Citizenship in Higher Education in the UK

by

Jinyu Yang

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

July 2016

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF SOCIAL, HUMAN AND MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Education

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

YOUNG PEOPLE'S CITIZENSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UK

by Jinyu Yang

Increasingly, higher education's importance role in preparing students to be active citizens in civil society has been realised, yet there is limited understanding of the citizenship learning in higher education in the UK. Although there is a good deal of research about the political or civic engagement at universities in general, this study represents the first comprehensive exploration of the active citizenship learning in higher education in the UK.

This thesis takes a three-paper format, accompanied with an introduction, literature review, contextual information on higher education system, methodology and conclusion chapters. The thesis focuses on understanding citizenship learning in higher education in the UK using the community of practice theory. It uses quantitative method. First, a descriptive analysis is carried out to understand young people's civic behaviour and attitudes and a comparison is made between university students and their peers not attending universities. After that, in order to understand the relationship between HE and active citizenship, the thesis uses ordinal logistic regression on Citizenship Educational Longitudinal Study data to test if HE has an independent impact on active citizenship in the UK. Later, the thesis explores the citizenship learning at universities with community of practice theory. Then ordinal logistic regression is used on Citizenship in Transition dataset.

The result shows that HE has an independent impact on voting and volunteering, but not protesting. The descriptive results indicate that young people at university follow a liberal model approach to Citizenship. These results provide evidences that HE is moving towards marketization, and students tend to care more about representation and rights than social justice. The results also support that community of practice theory can be applied in citizenship learning in HE. The

thesis shows that belongingness is a very important part in learning citizenship at universities. The sense of belongingness can be formed in the learning process, and can facilitate learning. More importantly, it tends to promote future participation in society as it becomes an identity of active participants which is likely to appear in the similar contexts. Also, quantitative analyses show that university students can learn citizenship from their participation in activities and organizations on campus. The learning process takes place when students participate, share information and communicate. These findings support that it is imperative for HE to take its social role to promote citizenship and democracy. The findings from the study indicate that citizenship learning in HE should be a priority in future research and policymaking.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
List of Tables	v
List of Figures	vii
List of Accompanying Materials	ix
DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP	xi
Acknowledgements	xiii
Abbreviations	xv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Citizenship models	5
2.2.1 The liberal model	6
2.2.2 Republicanism	7
2.2.3 Participatory model.....	9
2.2.4 The communitarian model.....	9
2.3 Citizenship	11
2.3.1 Active Citizenship	12
2.3.2 Education and active citizenship	18
2.3.3 How can higher education influence active citizenship?	20
2.4 Learning theory	22
2.4.1 Community of Practice.....	26
2.5 How do we promote citizenship in HE?	30
2.5.1 Civic and political knowledge, skills and values	30
2.5.2 Motivation.....	32
2.5.3 Student participation at university	33
2.6 Empirical literature review	35
2.6.1 US research	35
2.6.2 Literature on UK research	37

Chapter 3:	Context of Higher Education in the UK	43
3.1	The role of higher education	43
3.1.1	Traditional role	43
3.1.2	Economics	44
3.1.3	Democracy	44
3.2	Demography	45
3.3	History of higher education	46
3.4	Higher education autonomy	46
3.5	Student organisation	47
3.6	Student voice	47
3.7	Globalisation	49
Chapter 4:	Methodology	51
4.1	Introduction	51
4.2	Research paradigm and research design	51
4.3	Data collection	52
4.3.1	Quantitative data	52
4.4	Data analysis	54
4.4.1	Quantitative analysis	54
4.5	Introduction to Analytical Content	57
4.6	Conclusion	58
Chapter 5:	Descriptive Analysis of Civic Behaviour of Young People in England Based on the CELS Dataset	59
5.1	Introduction	59
5.2	Dataset and limitations	59
5.3	Results	59
5.3.1	Overall basic description	59
5.3.2	Comparison with non-university participants	65
5.4	Themes	66
5.4.1	Voting	66

5.4.2	Political engagement.....	66
5.4.3	Volunteering.....	67
5.4.4	Concepts of citizenship/ citizenship model.....	67
5.5	Key questions and implication for future research	68
5.5.1	Key questions/findings.....	68
5.5.2	Implications and plan for qualitative research and quantitative analysis.....	68
Chapter 6: University's Effect on Young People's Active Citizenship in England ...		70
6.1	Introduction	70
6.2	Active citizenship.....	72
6.3	How can higher education influence active citizenship?	74
6.3.1	Education as a proxy	75
6.4	Data and method	76
6.4.1	Dependent variables	78
6.4.2	Predictor variables	78
6.4.3	Control variables	78
6.5	Results.....	79
6.6	Discussion and conclusion.....	85
Chapter 7: Young People's Citizenship Learning at University in the UK: Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis on the Citizenship in Transition		88
7.1	Introduction	88
7.2	The concept of citizenship.....	91
7.2.2	Citizenship and higher education.....	96
7.2.3	Learning citizenship at university.....	97
7.3	Data	101
7.3.1	Variables.....	102
7.4	Methods.....	104
7.5	Results.....	104
7.5.1	Voting.....	104
7.5.2	Protest.....	105

7.5.3	Volunteering.....	105
7.6	Discussion and conclusion.....	109
Chapter 8:	Conclusion	113
8.1.1	Qualitative study	115
8.2	The important effect of HE on active citizenship	118
8.2.1	Marketisation of HE	119
8.3	Citizenship learning in university	120
8.3.1	Belongingness	121
8.3.2	The process of learning	122
8.4	Implications.....	125
8.5	Conclusions	127
List of References		129
Bibliography		151
Appendix A	Table Likelihood of Future Citizenship in Ordinal Logistic Regression	153
Appendix B	Interviewing Questions	155
Appendix C	Participant Information Sheet.....	158
Appendix D	CONSENT FORM.....	162

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Principles and limitations of different citizenship models.....	10
Table 5.1. Groups of young people in CELS dataset	59
Table 5.2. Civic attitude and behaviour of university students and non-university young people.....	61
Table 5.3. Binary questions relating to voting and participation	63
Table 5.4 Binary questions for university students and non-university young people	64
Table 6.1. Hybrid logistic models predicting young people’s active citizenship	81
Table 7.1. Full list of predictor variables	103
Table 7.2. Likelihood of future citizenship in ordinal logistic regression	107

List of Figures

List of Accompanying Materials

DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

I, Jinyu Yang

declare that this thesis and the work presented in it are my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

Yong People's Citizenship in higher education in the UK.

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;
7. None of this work has been published before submission, but parts of it have been submitted for publish and they are now under review:

Yang, J. and Hoskins, B. (forthcoming) Young people's citizenship learning at university in the UK: Ordinal logistic regression analysis on Citizenship in Transition dataset, *British Journal of Educational Studies*.

Yang, J. and Hoskins, B. (forthcoming) University's effect on young people's active citizenship in England, *Oxford Review of Education*.

Signed:

Date:

Acknowledgements

I would like to offer my sincere appreciation to my supervisors, Professor Bryony Hoskins and Dr. Gary Kinchin who have tirelessly helped me to complete this Doctoral degree. They have been very patient and most helpful in their guidance and supervision. Professor Hoskins has led me into the field of citizenship and the quantitative study. Dr. Kinchin has offered me insights in higher education and showed me the essence of qualitative method.

My great gratitude is also to my family, who have supported and encouraged me to start and continue Ph.D programme. For my parents, who have always believed in me and supported me both financially and mentally. For my boyfriend, who now is my husband, he encouraged me to start my Ph.D in England, and has always been there to help and has inspired me with love and patience.

I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues, Becca, Yuan, Li Hao, Shumaila, Rosie, Hamis, Angie, Kun, Yi, Elizabeth, Xiaotong, Ange, Steph, Eva, Hao Xu and so on, who always offered me assistance both in my work and life.

Finally, my thanks are for those staff and friends who have ever helped me, Dr. Christian Bokhove and so on. I am very grateful for the kind permission of using CiT data to National Foundation for Educational Research, Economic and Social Research Council, the UK Data Archive and UK Data Service. Also, my sincere gratitude is to researchers in LLAKES centre of UCL, IOE who shared the CELS data with me and permitted me to use it for my PhD research.

Also, I would thank two examiners, Dr. James Sloam and Prof. Daniel Muijs, who kindly offered their helpful comments and support to improve my thesis.

With the oversight of my supervisors, proofreading advice has been sought. No changes of intellectual content were made as a result of this advice. Thanks to Dr. Tess Milar for this proofreading work.

Abbreviations

HE- Higher Education

CELS- Citizenship Educational Longitudinal Study

CIT- Citizenship in Education

Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce my research and frame my thesis. I begin by providing the background and rationale for my research. Then, I introduce how I began to think about citizenship in higher education (HE). After that, I discuss the research questions and methodology, as well as the limitations. The last section outlines the structure of my thesis.

Democracy has been described by people as ‘unfinished work’, which remains ‘the task before us’ in the ‘critical and complex conditions of today’ (Dewey, 1998, p.225). Democracy involves various kinds of responsible participation of citizens that could bring about and maintain accountable political institutions, as well as being a culture of ideal practices which underpins citizens’ engagement in and control over social choices and directions (Colby et al., 2007). Thus, democracy is always in progress through cultivating citizenship and civil society. Among all the factors facilitating citizenship, education has played an important and powerful role in boosting citizenship, including political participation, voter turnout, civic engagement, citizenship knowledge and democratic values, as well as the attitudes in civil society (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Nie et al., 1996; Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005; Hillygus, 2005). Education can be described as having three distinct functions – personal development, preparing for the labour market, and preparing for living in a society (Veugelers et al., 2014). Traditionally, HE is regarded as a place to intellectually cultivate individuals in a space separate from society (Veugelers et al., 2014). From this viewpoint, intellectual development means the study of great traditions and books (Veugelers et al., 2014), which neglects the societal and political life (Aloni, 2003, cited in Veugelers et al., 2014). Another modern view considers HE not only as a tool in contributing to knowledge, but also aiming towards technical and economic development (Veugelers et al., 2014). From this perspective, technological and economic advancement is the driving force of society and is more important than human development (Veugelers et al., 2014). However, some views on HE concentrate on equity, social cohesion and democracy, which emphasise the importance of social change and justice, as well as empowering people (Englund, 2002; Barnett, 2007; Arthur and Bohlin, 2005; Veugelers et al., 2014). In this view, HE is also aiming to help students to prepare for civil life in society. As there are multiple perspectives of HE, especially regarding the view focusing on equity, social cohesion and democracy, it is imperative to understand how HE influences future citizenship in society.

The rationale for civic education are multidimensional and complex, reflecting the range of competing needs of contemporary higher education. Teaching and learning strategies with a civic dimension are frequently related to the moral aims of higher education and the role of public

Chapter 1

education in democracy. However, with the liberal globalisation, there is a particular trend for university to demonstrate effectiveness and value for money. Therefore, it is imperative to shed some more lights on the citizenship education at higher education level and balance different roles of higher education.

The need for higher education, especially in the UK, to do more to promote greater participation of youth in the political process is especially compelling today. In the 2015 UK general election, young people voted at nearly half the rate compared with older age groups, which means this cohort of young people are not represented within the democratic system. This also means they tend to be ignored by policymakers and their voices are less likely to be heard, consequently, their needs are less likely to be taken into consideration in policy-making process, which leads to more disappointment and disillusionment among young people. This is a vicious circle of political disengagement (Sloam, 2016). After the global financial crisis, the situation worsened with high youth unemployment and government efforts to control public spending (Sloam, 2016). Meanwhile, some researchers suggest that young people are not really disinterested in politics, instead, many of them are standby citizens who 'given the relevant circumstances will become' active participants (Amna and Ekman, 2013). Education can be a means to promote these young people to be more politically and civic engaged. In terms of studies in different levels of education, citizenship education in secondary schools has been the focus, for example, the IEA international civic and citizenship education study (ICCS). However, the role of HE in preparing students to become responsible citizens has not gained as much attention as that of secondary school education in the UK. In this context, the civic mission of higher education needs renewed attention as universities need to seek ways of strengthening and diversifying the ways in which they engage with and serve the needs of society and community. In the meantime, there is a large proportion of young people (involving upwards of 40 per cent of young adults, though the figures vary) studying at university in the UK, thus university could be a very important place to facilitate young people's active citizenship.

Many researchers in the United States have endeavoured to promote students' civic engagement in universities and colleges. For instance, Colby's work focused on American colleges' political engagement course (Colby et al., 2007), which helped US college students to gain more motivation, interest and civic knowledge and skills. However, researchers in the UK have done less than their US counterparts. Many studies in the UK have been theoretical and as such provide an outline for future work, for example, Englund (2002), Zgaga (2008), Plantan (2002) and Goddard (2009). These studies generally discuss the societal role of university, and claim that university should contribute to citizenship development (Veugelers et al., 2014). However, they do not explore how to specifically promote students' citizenship in HE. Another theme among studies on

citizenship in HE is around students' civic engagement, which often focuses on voluntary service-type activities, for example, Annette (2005). Additionally, there is very limited research on exploring citizenship learning with constructive learning theory, community of practice in particular. A constructivist approach can provide insights into the development of a more student-centred learning approach, to the benefit of both pedagogical and participatory goals (Sloam, 2011). Therefore, there is a research gap, so the thesis is very important to explore citizenship learning within the context of youth and student participation in democracy.

My own experience of being a student leader in a student council in a university has inspired me to think about the following questions. What does citizenship mean to young people? What can students' participation at universities bring about? What might students gain from their participation at universities? How can you motivate them to participate in universities in order to gain more civic competences? The need for this research is further highlighted when examining voter turnout in the UK. In the 2015 UK general election, young people voted at nearly half the rate compared with older age groups, which means this cohort of young people are not represented within the democratic system. There is a large proportion of young people (involving upwards of 40 per cent of young adults, though the figures vary) studying at university in the UK, thus university could be a very important place to facilitate young people's active citizenship. All these experiences and practices have afforded me the opportunity to initiate the research on citizenship in higher education in the UK.

In my thesis, I will seek to understand the relationship between HE and active citizenship, as well as how HE affects active citizenship. Furthermore, I will elaborate on how to help students, through their institutions, promote their participation in universities in order to promote their political and civic participation in society. I will use a mixed qualitative and quantitative method to address my research questions. The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) dataset will be used to understand the civic behaviour of young people in the UK and to test the hypothesis in quantitative analysis. The CELS data is the biggest longitudinal study about the impact of citizenship education on young people in the UK, and investigated how young people's citizenship practice was changing and the role of statutory citizenship in shaping young people's citizenship. In 2010 the CELS data continued and was extended as part of Citizenships in Transition (CiT) research. In 2014, it was funded by ESRC and conducted by the LLAKES Centre at the Institute of Education, UCL. I will use ordinal logistic regression with between and within effects on CELS data to test the relationship between higher education and citizenship. For the quantitative research, the attrition of the data presents the main challenge.

My research questions for this thesis are:

Chapter 1

1. How does higher education influence students' active citizenship?
2. How is it possible to improve students' active citizenship through universities in the UK?

This thesis takes the 'Three-Paper' format, which means it is based on three articles accompanied by introduction, literature review, context, methodology and conclusion chapters. Following the introduction, Chapter Two provides the development of a theoretical account of citizenship in HE, reviews the relevant literature and research, and highlights future areas for investigation. Chapter Three provides the context for understanding HE in the UK, outlining the background and development of HE. Chapter Four outlines the quantitative method and paradigm adopted in the thesis and explains specific analysis strategies for understanding and addressing the research questions. Chapter Five offers an introduction to the following contents and explains that three chapters (Seven, Eight and Nine) are three related articles on citizenship learning in the university rather than conventional thesis chapters. Chapter Five gives an overview of the civic behaviour and attitudes of young people in the England and makes a comparison between university students and young people not attending universities, based on the CELS database information. Taking this data, Chapter Six, in the format of an article, uses ordered logistic regression with between and within effects on three waves of CELS data to explain the influence of HE on young people's active citizenship in England. The overall aim of the chapter is to examine whether the theoretical account provides an explanation of the influence of HE on citizenship. In Chapter Seven, the third article, I explore how HE promotes young people's citizenship in the UK with the aid of ordinal logistic regression based on the CiT dataset. In the final chapter, Chapter Nine, includes an additional qualitative exploratory analysis to understand the quantitative findings. This investigates students' views of university as a site to learn representative democracy. The additional qualitative analysis is based on interviews of students from a case study university, including both student leaders and students without any roles. This chapter concludes the studies and brings together connections between findings from these papers and addresses potential implications for universities and students, as well as for policymakers. It also discusses the limitations of the thesis and makes recommendation for further research within the field.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the relevant theories about citizenship and learning as well as theory and evidence about citizenship and education. It considers the implications of existing theoretical and empirical work in these areas for an understanding of the relationship between citizenship and higher education. In this chapter, I review some theoretical literature concerning citizenship models, citizenship concepts, the relationship between education and political and civic participation, and how to promote students' citizenship in HE. Citizenship has been a contested concept, so I describe its different models and theoretical development, and then develop my theoretical model for measurement purposes. I begin by exploring theoretical concepts of liberal participatory, republican, communitarian models, and discuss concepts of participation in these models. In the second section, I review the development of citizenship concepts, as well as active citizenship. Education has been an important factor influencing citizenship. Whilst there is a broad discussion about citizenship learning, there is less agreement about the relationship between citizenship and higher education, in terms of the relative importance of academic, social and institutional factors. I discuss the positive effect of education, in particular higher education, on citizenship. I also review four theories of how HE influences civic and political participation. In order to understand the philosophical positions and promote citizenship learning in HE, I explore different learning theories including cognitive learning, behaviourism and constructivist learning. After that, I explore specific ways of promoting students' civic competence (civic and political knowledge, skills, values and motivations) in HE. The last section reviews the empirical literature, which shows the current research on citizenship in HE and where the research gaps are. Even though there is some existing research on citizenship learning in HE, those existing works focus more on voluntary-type engagement. This chapter forms the theoretical framework for my research and shows its importance.

2.2 Citizenship models

Citizenship has become a major theme on the agenda of politicians, policy makers and civic organisations around the world for the past decades. In democratic countries, citizenship is extraordinarily important for legitimating democratic governance, as 'this is considered to depend crucially on the extent to which democratic structures and practices are supported and "owned" by citizens' (Biesta, 2009, p.146). In different countries, citizenship entails different

understandings and foci because of differing political systems. There are, therefore, different sorts of citizenship models, including liberal, civic republican, participatory, communitarian and communist models. In order to have a full picture of citizenship models and help to conceptualise citizenship, I review theoretical literature about all these models in this section. However, as my research lies in the context of the UK, I mainly elaborate four distinctive models of citizenship: the liberal, the republican, the communitarian and the participatory models. I analyse each model along three dimensions: values and principles of society, decision-making process and corruption prevention. The limitations of each model are also discussed. This sets a theoretical citizenship background for the research and helps contextualise the concept of citizenship in the UK.

2.2.1 The liberal model

The liberal model of democracy strives to develop a political culture where individuals are members of, and committed to, a society that implicitly promotes the values of freedom and tolerance towards individual diversity (Bell, 2012). One of the main justifications for this approach is to secure the conditions for individuals to live autonomous lives through self-determination, and the freedom to make their own choices including deciding which values and beliefs they should hold (Doppelt, 1989). In order to secure autonomy and freedom, the liberal model has focused on establishing and upholding individual rights. According to Hoskins et al. (2012c), liberal democracy is typically considered 'thin' democracy (p.17). This means that the involvement of citizens in public life is relatively minimal compared to a civic republican or participatory citizenship model, and is realised predominantly through voting in elections, though even this act of voting is encouraged rather than an obligation for the citizen (Hoskins, 2012b). The system of parliamentary democracy developed within the liberal model of citizenship usually only consists of two dominant parties, which minimizes choice and voter turnout is rarely as high as in countries that follow more of a civic republican system. Low voter turnout is associated with inequality in the groups of people who participate in elections, as it is the educated and wealthy who vote more and as a consequence it is the elite who tend to have a greater say (Held, 2006). Thus the extent to which the liberal democratic system is truly representative of the people could be questioned (Held, 2006).

Liberal market economies

Liberal democracy can only be fully understood in the context of liberal market economy. The emphasis of the liberal market economy is on competition between individuals, companies and countries. A wide consensus has been reached that neoliberal developments have involved a 'marketization of citizenship' (Freedland, 2001) or what Rose(1999) has termed 'fragmenting the

social into a multitude of markets' (p.146; c.f. Ahier et al., 2003). With the reduction of the complex and empowering vision of citizenship, neoliberalism has sought to convert the citizen into a consumer (Munck, 2005). The new democracy is thin and anaemic, and is restricted and delegative at best (Munck, 2005). Market relationships are characterised by the arm's-length exchange of goods or services in a context of competition and formal contracting (Hall and Soskice, 2009). Thus, Munck claims, 'money became the key to political influence as never before, and politics became packaged and marketed like any other commodity' (2005, p.66). Consequently, many citizens lost interest and participated less in politics, and their disappointment in the political process became common (Munck, 2005). A new form of 'citizen' identity has been structured with a twin focus (Ahier, Beck, and Moore 2003). On the one hand, 'efforts have been made to position and "interpellate" citizens as consumers, whose main concern vis-à-vis the state is to individualistically obtain value-for-money and quality of service delivery for themselves and their dependants, and to seek remedies and compensation if services are inadequate' (Ahier et al., 2003, p.17-18). The second focus of the new 'citizenship' identity is around 'the idea of individual enterprise, which is also (and significantly) constructed primarily in marketised terms' (Ahier et al., 2003, p.18). According to Munck (2005), neoliberalism also introduces new conservative concepts such as 'social capital' into the democratic lexicon, and it also promotes less government, but this does not mean the governance is any less important. In higher education, it is presented as the notion of regarding the student as client, which focuses on the relationship of contract and service. One of the difficulties is that students would consequently be interested in a service only for as long as they consume it – they would have no long-term interest in its quality for future 'consumers' (Bergan, 2003).

2.2.2 Republicanism

According to Held (2006), the term 'republicanism' is commonly used in two different yet closely related senses. The first is the traditional sense, sometimes referred to as the classical republican or neo-roman (Held, 2006). The republicans in this sense focus on many common ideas and concerns, such as the importance of civic virtue and political participation, the dangers of corruption, the benefits of a mixed constitution and the rule of law (Held, 2006).

The classical democracy model stemmed from Athens, whose political ideals – equality among citizens, liberty, respect for the law and justice – have exerted influence on political thinking in the west (Held, 2006). Held believes that Athenian democracy emphasised involvement in public/political issues. As Pericles says: 'We do not say that a man who takes no interest in politics is a man who minds his own business; we say that he has no business here at all.' (Pericles' Funeral Oration, in Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War*, p.147 cited in Held, 2006). The key point

Chapter 2

of Athenian democracy is a general commitment to the principle of civic virtue: dedication to the republican city-state and the subordination of private life to public affairs and the common good (Held, 2006). In Athens, the government is self-government, in which citizens meet to debate, decide and enact the law. This is a form of direct participation (Held, 2006).

For the republicanism model, political participation is an essential condition of personal liberty (Held, 2006). If citizens do not govern themselves, they will be dominated by others instead (Held, 2006). Lovett (2010) holds a similar view that civic republicanism requires citizens to maintain the democratic processes and institutions in order to assure greater freedoms. According to Held (2006), this model also demonstrates the balance of power after the rise of Christianity between 'the people', aristocracy and the monarchy, linked to a mixed constitution or mixed government, with provision for all leading political forces to play an active role in public life. Citizens could participate via different sorts of feasible mechanisms, such as the election of consuls and representatives to serve on ruling councils (Held, 2006).

In the republicanism model, citizens must enjoy political and economic equality so that all can enjoy equal freedom and development in the process of self-determination for the common good (Held, 2006). However, the legislative and executive functions were divided in this model.

The history of the republicanism model emphasises the general equality and freedom of domestic citizens with a large degree of exclusion. For example, it pays more attention to man. As Phillips (1991) criticises, the history of republicanism is 'ominously dismissive of femininity and women' (p.46). The salient themes in the classical republican tradition are the importance of civic virtue and the dangers of corruption (Lovett, 2010). Civic virtue emphasises the individual should do his or her best to pursue public good (Lovett, 2010). However, Goodin (2003) criticises this, maintaining that it indicates extensive self-sacrifice and frugality, a renunciation of individuality and self-identification with the community.

The most defensible and attractive form of democracy is one in which citizens can, in principle, extend their participation in and deliberation about decision-making to a wide array of spheres (political, economic and social) (Held, 2006, p.7). Civic republicanism stresses that citizens need to act politically in public affairs, and to actively participate in the political community as equal and free citizens (Hoskins et al., 2012c). Civic republicans advocate a general model of democratic participation that requires a wide range of public participation in the decision-making process, arriving at a 'common good' (Poisner, 1996). Participation or involvement in the public sphere seems to be an obligation and a very important role for citizens in republicanism. Compared to the liberal model, the republican model pays attention to the general broad participation in public rather than being focused on a limited number of citizens. However, it mainly aims for the

common good, which is in itself a point for debate. For example, some feel the government may do things that are detrimental to some citizens in the name of the common good (Held, 2006).

2.2.3 Participatory model

Participatory democracy is understood as self-government by citizens instead of a representative government in the name of citizens (Barber, 1984). Barber defines strong democracy in the participatory model as:

It resolves conflict in the absence of an independent ground through a participatory process of ongoing, proximate self-legislation and the creation of a political community capable of transforming dependent private individuals into free citizens and partial and private interests into public goods (Barber, 1984, p.151).

The participatory model emphasises participation in politics. This participation is for every citizen rather than an unrepresentative group. Furthermore, participation could help people become real citizens and be more competent to act as a citizen. People will become and be transformed into citizens who will pursue the public good instead of private interest through participating in the process of self-government. In the process of participation, a community grows and further makes participation possible and sensible; civic life educates individuals about how to think publicly as citizens (Barber, 1984). The democratic values of liberty, equality and social justice take on richer and fuller meanings in the participatory model (Barber, 1984). However, there is some criticism of this, suggesting that enlarged public participation would produce no great result, and the empowered mass would pursue private interests and selfish ambitions. However, Barber (1984) argues that democracy in participatory mode is not governed by 'the people' or 'the masses' because people are not yet citizens and the masses are only nominal freemen who do not actually govern themselves. Only the citizen could participate in a certain fashion that presumes awareness of and engagement in activity with others (Barber, 1984). The participation model also emphasises the intimate bind between community and participation. Barber (1984) thinks 'participation without community breeds mindless enterprise and undirected, competitive interest-mongering, while participation without community merely rationalizes individualism, giving it the aura of democracy' (p.155).

2.2.4 The communitarian model

The communitarian model, focusing more on communities rather than nation or state, emphasises how social groups impact on values and behaviours (Hoskins et al., 2012c). These researchers also claim the communitarian model is associated more with 'more hierarchical and

top-down decision making' in comparison with liberal and civic republican models (Hoskins et al., 2012c, p.11).

Communitarians primarily posit a need to experience our lives as bound up with the good of the communities out of which our identity has been constituted (Bell, 2012). Unlike the liberal and republican models, the communitarian model stresses the narrow community, e.g., family, instead of countries (Hoskins et al., 2012c). According to Bell (2012), the communitarian model has a strong link with specific culture and context. Therefore, there is a difference in the communitarian model between East Asia and the West as East Asian countries are, more or less, influenced by Confucianism.

Table 2.1. Principles and limitations of different citizenship models

Model	Values and principles of society	Decision process	Corruption prevented	Limitations
Liberal model	Self-interest Freedom Autonomy Tolerance Rights	Voting for elected representatives	Voting out representatives	Inequality of representatives
Civic republicanism	Common good Civic virtue Importance of engagement	Voting for representatives Citizen participation	Active citizens	Common good misused (Harm individual rights)
Participatory model	Involvement of all citizens in decision-making Common good	All citizens through deliberative process	Active citizens	Time consuming The right not to participate
Communitarian model	Respect for hierarchy Good of community Collectivism	Local representative or elite	Judgments and virtues of leaders	Inequality in decisions

No agreement has been reached on which model is most appropriate. Each model has its unique value as well as limitations. Therefore, it is important and sensible to find out the

complementarity and limitations in every model. In reality, these models are conceptual frameworks for discussing citizenship instead of theories of the origins, characteristics and determinants of contemporary citizenship (Pattie et al., 2004). There are different emphases that could be taken into consideration from these citizenship models in defining and measuring citizenship in my research. To better understand the situation in the universities in the UK where the students are located, I draw more on the liberal model, civic republicanism and the participatory model. These models, to some degree, help in trying to conceptualise citizenship (Pattie et al., 2004). Even though the 'framework has been eclipsed by new challenges to traditional theories of citizenship' (Pattie et al., 2004, p.13), the discussion of these models can help us understand the following sections and how the concept of citizenship is formed.

2.3 Citizenship

Citizenship has been a contested and developing concept, from minimalist conception to maximal expansionist conceptions in which participation at all levels of political life are included. In the section, I review the development of citizenship concepts, as well as active citizenship, in order to propose a conceptual model for measurement. I also describe the criticism on active citizenship.

In the past, citizenship research has paid much attention to the responsibility and rights of people related to the state. Marshal (1950), one of the most popularly acknowledged researchers, defines citizenship as 'a status bestowed on all those who are full members of a community', and argues that 'all those who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed' (Marshall, 1950, p.28-29). He focuses on the civil rights of equal justice and freedom, political rights to influence the decision-making process, and social rights such as the opportunity to access education and welfare, etc. The critical view of Marshal's citizenship is that citizenship is seen exclusively as a matter of extending or creating rights (Pattie et al., 2004). Rights theorists suppose 'a disembodied state provides the resources needed to extend social benefits and rights', but it is actually 'other citizens who provide these rights by paying their taxes and by supporting such things as legislation outlawing discrimination on the grounds of race and sex' (Pattie et al., 2004, p. 16). Empirically, as it ignores this crucial dimension of citizenship, the rights-based concept of citizenship is at risk of becoming separated from any political reality (Pattie et al., 2004). Later, citizenship research shifted its focus to citizens' participation in political processes and individual involvement with intention to influence (Verba and Nie, 1972). The focus then moved to individual involvement in participatory democracy, where people are encouraged to participate in the decision-making process of politics (Barber, 2003).

Dalton (2015) refers to citizenship as 'a shared set of expectations about the citizen's role in politics'. The term is about 'what people feel is expected of them as good citizens.' The social transformation of America, for example, changing social status of women, the expansion of civil and human rights to people such as homosexuals as well as the growth of mass media, and generational change have changed the meaning of citizenship, from duty based citizenship focusing more on voting, obeying the law and paying taxes to engaged citizenship focusing on keeping watch on government, being active in association and helping others. In response to the claims that democracy is eroding, he argues that it is the trend of citizenship has moved forward to engaged citizenship among young people in America. In Britain, Pattie et. al. (2004) define citizenship from the perspective of 'solving collective action problems which involve the recognition by individuals that they have rights and obligations to each other if they wish to solve such problems' (p.22). This refers to a set of norms, values and in particular behaviour. This important aspect of citizenship, civic norms, is related to political participation. Such participation involves political activities 'such as voting, joining interest groups, contacting public officials and campaigning', as well as protesting, taking part in demonstrations and being involved in political strikes, and talking about politics with other people and taking an interest in political matters (p.24). Importantly, based on Putnam's social capital theory, citizenship is much broader than just political involvement as it also involves voluntary activities of all kinds, including 'informal activities with friends, relatives and neighbours and formal membership in various organisations' (p.24). Dalton (2015) and Pattie et al. (2004), from two perspectives, analysed and summarised the fundamental idea of citizenship: fulfilling needs of the society from individual citizens and from the relationship binding the citizens together. Based on the theory, the fundamental idea of citizenship is to meet the needs of the society. What does a society need? A group of people are willing to cooperate with each other to solve common problems, which is the core problem to be explained by a theory of citizenship. A democratic system supports the effective political system of the society in which people can cooperate to solve common problems, while social cohesion supports the community through bringing citizens together and developing a relationship between them. Therefore, in the thesis, citizenship refers to the needs of the society, which includes a democratic system and social cohesion.

2.3.1 Active Citizenship

In reality, there is a long-term decline in electorate voter-turnout and membership of civic and political organisations observed across the West, many researchers suggest people's engagement (or not) with politics may have changed (Dalton, 2015; Pattie et al., 2004; Bennett and Segerberg,

2012). Pattie et al. (2004) have tested different theories about citizenship, and found that cognitive engagement theory plays an important role in explaining collective participation, and the general incentives model is very important in explaining both individual and collective participation. These two models are examples of choice-based theories. Therefore, choice-based theories are more important than structural-based theories, which suggests that citizenship is the product of choices by individuals rather than being the product of macro level social forces. This means citizenship is malleable and can be much broader than traditional concept. The core idea of cognitive engagement theory is that participation relies on the individual's access to information and resources and on their ability and willingness to utilize them to make informed choices. So education and access of information is important to explain participation. The general incentives theory is a synthesis of rational choice and social psychological accounts of participation, and the core idea behind it is that actors need incentives if they are to participate and have positive civic values. This means people need incentives to be more involved in political and civic activities. Also, Amna and Ekman (2013) argue that some seemingly 'passive' standby citizens who have not been involved yet may in fact be an asset to democracy, due to their particular combination of political interest, trust, and inclination to participate. Also, young people participate in politics on an individual basis, considering reasons or issues with a personal meaning (Amna and Ekman, 2013). This indicates the current trend of youth participation and the ways to promote active citizenship by involving the asset of democracy—standby citizens. When education and incentives are given, standby citizens tend to be involved in political and civic engagement. Bennett and Segerberg (2012) have realized that new ways of communications, especially digitally networked action helps in an era of increasingly personalised political participation, protesting in particular. Meanwhile, several researchers, e.g. Putnam and Oliver, argue that a healthy civic life stimulates participation in conventional politics. They suggest that communities in which individuals tend to be active citizens are areas where people take part in elections. After testing different models, Pattie et al. found social capital(Putnam) theory help to explain the variations across communities. The average number of political activities, defined in the wide sense, carried out by the citizens of each local authority is positively related to one aspect of social capital: associational activity. This means the more groups local individuals joined, the more political activities they participated. This shows the importance of community activities for a society and active citizenship. From these discussions, we are aware of the importance of the active citizenship and the ways to promote active citizens.

The notion of active citizenship, mostly used in the field of education, further focuses on the involvement of citizens (Hoskins and Mascherini, 2009). Most active citizenship research is related to the social outcome of learning (Preston and Green, 2003), dealing with the possible

relationship between active citizenship with learning (Hoskins and Mascherini, 2009). Within European policy, the idea of active citizenship first came from the Lisbon European Council in 2000 (Biesta 2009). The strategic goal for the European Community was to become 'the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion' (Lisbon European Council, 2000). The European Commission put forward 'learning for active citizenship' as one of three major pillars in the communication *Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality* (see Commission of European Communities, 2001). In the *Detailed Work Programme on the Follow-up of the Objectives of Education and Training Systems in Europe* (Council of the European Union, 2002), the European Council promoted 13 objectives following the Lisbon conference, one of which was 'supporting active citizenship, equal opportunities and social cohesion' (de Weerd et al., 2005, p.1). To respond to this, many researchers have made efforts around active citizenship, for example, Hoskins and Mascherini (2009), and accordingly, active citizenship become a central part in the European Union's push to develop citizenship (Biesta 2009).

Many literature has worked on the concept of active citizenship. Some include a political element in active citizenship. De Weerd et al. (2005, p.ii) propose that active citizenship is 'political participation and participation in associational life characterized by tolerance and non-violence and the acknowledgement of the rule of law and human rights'. They describe active citizenship as an eclectic collection of participatory activities including political participation (de Weerd et al., 2005) in a deliberative manner (Ivancic et al., 2003). Researchers using the concept of political participation which is close to active citizenship place more weight on conventional forms of politics such as voting (Liset, 1959). Even though the traditional form of politics is still very important, it is not enough for the active citizenship today. As there emerges new technologies, a trend of globalisation and other contemporary phenomenon, the nature of active citizenship have changed and expanded. Dalton (2015) argues that other forms of political action have increased over time, and young people in the US tend to engage in more voluntary activities. Meanwhile, some scholars focus more on community and voluntary action (Irish Government Taskforce, 2007; de Weerd et al., 2005). Also, scholars using concepts similar to active citizenship such as social capital have tended to pay more attention on the volunteering, community participation and actions that support community cohesion (e.g., Putnam, 2000). However, the concept, to some extent, is depoliticising, focusing too much on associational life. Furthermore, there are scholars defining active citizenship as a combination of participation in political life and community with values. For example, Hoskins (2009) argues active citizenship consists of several important themes, including civil society, community and political life and democratic values (Hoskins, 2009). It emphasises participation in civil society which is the 'sum of institutions, organisations, and

individuals located between the family, the state and the market in which people associated voluntarily to advance common interests' (Anheier, 2004, p.20, cited in Hoskins, 2009). According to theories of active citizenship, civic behaviour is regarded as a set of participatory activities, including political participation (Ivancic et al., 2003) and community and voluntary activities (de Weerd et al., 2005; Irish Taskforce on Active Citizenship, 2007; cited in Hoskins et al., 2008). In the context of defining active citizenship, participation is argued to be characterised by mutual respect and non-violence according to human rights and democracy (Hoskins, 2006). Based on these concepts, the core of active citizenship is participation which is also the central element in EU policy goals (de Weerd et al., 2005). It legitimates decision-making, which therefore makes it a key requirement of active citizenship (Pattie et al., 2004). Also, 'participation is a prime criterion for defining the democratic citizen and his or her role within the political process' (Dalton, 2015). Therefore, participation is central in our definition of active citizenship. It refers to behaviour, not to attitudes or knowledge (de Weerd et al., 2005). The emphasis of participation in political and community activities in active citizenship contributes to the maintenance of democracy, good governance and social cohesion rather than specific benefits for the individual (Hoskins, 2006). Supporting democracy and social cohesion are also the needs of a good society. Therefore, in the thesis, I conceptualise active citizenship as political participation-voting and protesting- and civic engagement-volunteering- with non-violence value. This concept is defined as a mixture of citizens' rights and responsibilities, as suggested by Dalton and Pattie, to form a good society.

2.3.1.1 Voting

Voting is a very important aspect of political participation, and one of the most frequently studied forms of engagement (Campbell, 2006). Voting is also an important mode of citizen involvement in political life (Verba et al., 1995). A national election enables people to have a say in who will lead the country. It is an important part of active citizenship, and is also participation in representative democracy (Hoskins and Mascherini, 2009). A long line of research illustrates that voting should be analysed on its own for analytical purposes (Campbell, 2006). According to Verba et al. (1995), voting is unique in all forms of participation as the configuration of the mix of resources and motivations, and consists of a varied 'mix of gratifications and a different bundle of issue concerns' (p.23). Elections are important as "they select political elites, provide a source of democratic legitimacy, and engage the mass public in the democratic process" (Dalton, 2015). If a large amount of young people do not vote, this weakens their representation in the political process and may change election results. It is not healthy for democracy for large proportions of the public to stay away from electing government officials. This would be a serious problem when the elected government does not represent all groups of people and makes decisions that a full majority of people do not support (Dalton, 2015).

2.3.1.2 Protest

Political participation means the activities of citizens intended to influence state structures, authorities, and the making of collectively binding decisions and allocation of public goods by means of voting or protesting (Verba et al., 1978). Therefore, the boundaries of political action are much broader today than just electoral politics. According to a 2013 LSE Enterprise study, when European 16- to 26-year olds reflect on voting and institutional politics, they find “the political ‘offer’ does not match their concerns, ideas, and ideal of democratic politics” (EACEA, 2010). Meanwhile, there are high levels of youth participation in issue-oriented activism, boycotting and buycotting, and protest activities. (Bennett, 2008). The new generation of young people are seen as ‘actualizing citizens’, ‘who favour loosely networked activism to address issues that reflect personal values’, in contrast with “dutiful citizens”, who keep a more collective and government-centred set of practices (Bennett, 2007, p.61). The economic crisis has also given the ideal conditions for accelerating youth protests, which has enhanced the political participation (through digital participation) among highly educated youth looking for a mouthpiece for their ‘indignation’ (Bennett and Segerberg, 2012). Protest could be a kind of ‘action orientated participation’ which is an ‘established’ and necessary voice of influence within modern democracies, and includes demonstrations, boycotts and political strikes (Ogris and Westphal, 2006). The central purpose of protest is to try to act or express a voice to influence decision-making. Protest is more participatory democracy, and less formal. It is a critical voice of democracy process, and keeps the government accountable. Protest can focus on specific issues or policy goals—from protecting environment to protesting the local policies—and ‘can convey a high level of political information with real political force’ (Dalton, 2015, p.55). Sustained and effective protest is demanding, which requires initiative, political skills, and cooperation with others. Therefore, the advocates of protest stress that citizens can increase their political influence by taking a strategy of direct action (Dalton, 2015). The protest item in the 2002 European Social Survey includes participating in a lawful demonstration, signing a petition, boycotting products and deliberately buying certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons. Protest also includes signing a petition, contacting officials to influence and so on. Bennett and Segerberg (2012) have realized that new ways of communications, especially digitally networked action helps in an era of increasingly personalised political participation, protesting in particular.

2.3.1.3 Volunteering

As Dalton and Pattie argue, patterns of citizenship are changing, and an increasing number of young people prefer to participate in voluntary activities. Volunteering is therefore the third

dimension that is included in the concept. Volunteering is organised by a group of people spontaneously for political or non-political issues. It is one of many citizen participation acts (Verba et al., 1995), and important for active citizenship (de Tocqueville, 1988). Voluntary association is argued to 'provide opportunities for social participation, for democratic involvement at the local level, and thus for active citizenship' (Turner, 2001, p. 200). According to Hoskins and Mascherini (2009), participation in community and/ or political life is also a part of active citizenship. Community activities come from community life, and are one form of active citizenship, referring to those activities supporting a community including cultural or religious, business, social, sport and parent-teacher organisations. These involve membership, participation activities, donating money and voluntary work. Also, volunteering is one of the popular activities among young people (Dalton, 2015).

After testing different models, Pattie et al. (2004) found social capital (Putnam) theory help to explain the variations across communities. The average number of political activities, defined in the wide sense, carried out by the citizens of each local authority is positively related to one aspect of social capital: associational activity which refers to the number of types of groups joined, voluntary work and percentage of respondents in informal networks. This means the more groups local individuals joined, the more political activities they participated. Therefore, volunteering is helpful for active citizenship.

Young people's active citizenship is used in later analysis, including political and civic activities as indicators: voting, protest and volunteering.

Now the concept of citizenship has been discussed, the task of the next section is to explore the determinants of citizenship. Among all factors influencing citizenship, education has been argued to be an important one. Much attention has been paid to secondary education in terms of citizenship education, for example, the IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS). Additionally, citizenship has become a central concern to policy-makers confronted with difficult social and economic problems brought about by social and political changes. Governments have worked to propose a civic renewal agenda as a way to stimulate participation, reduce crime and promote voluntary activity (Blunkett, 2001, 2003). England incorporated citizenship education in the national curriculum and later, in 2002, made it compulsory in schools for the first time. The curriculum centres on topics including developing political knowledge, promoting the skills of enquiry and communication and stimulating participation (Department for Education and Employment, 1999; Crick, 2002). Recently, the attention of citizenship studies has been extended to the area of higher education. HE is advocated to shoulder its responsibility to contribute to democracy and citizenship.

2.3.2 Education and active citizenship

As I discussed in the last section, HE is going to take centre stage in citizenship studies. How is HE related to citizenship? In this section, I discuss the positive effect of education, particularly higher education, on citizenship. This offers a justification for my research, and is also a theoretical support for the hypothesis I will test in later chapters. There is a considerable amount of literature (both theoretical and empirical) that shows the connections between education and active citizenship or democracy (e.g. Torney-Purta et al., 2001; Milligan et al., 2004; Dee, 2004). Education has been a tool for the creation of social outcomes, for example, social cohesion and democracy (Dewey, 1961). Specifically, Almond and Verba (1989; 1963) claim that educational attainment, in most studies of political attitudes, seems to have the most important statistical effect on political attitudes, compared with other variables including gender, place of residence, occupation, income, age, and so on. Verba et al. (2005) observe that 'educational attainment is, in fact, the single most potent predictor of an adult's political activity' (p.110). Putnam (2000) also reiterates the relationship between education and citizenship by claiming that education is a very important and powerful predictor of civic engagement. All the literature illustrates the positive effect of education on all forms of engagement (Campbell, 2006).

Researchers have also used different concepts of citizenship and democracy in higher education. Plantan (2002) provides shared concepts of citizenship and civic responsibility – democracy and democratic values that facilitate a stronger European identity and prosperity while protecting and maintaining the rich intellectual and cultural traditions of each nation. For higher education, it would be more sensible and appropriate to mention the notions of 'political democracy' and 'academic democracy' (Molander, 2002) as it includes student participation in academic (learning) and governance aspects of universities, which in concept is more complete. Molander (2002) claims that the primary task of higher education is to cultivate 'academic democracy', i.e. the practice of democratic knowledge-making methods, which is a prerequisite to 'political democracy', that is the practice of public, democratic decision-making method. Similarly, Boland (2005) claims that a civic role for HE presupposes a curriculum through which critical thinking, collaboration, argumentation and tolerance of different views are encouraged and actively fostered.

Additionally, some research (Beaumont et al. 2006; Longo and Meyer, 2006) has demonstrated that educational interventions at the HE level with a focus on political engagement can promote many dimensions of democratic participation, including expectations for future political activity.

According to Sloam (2013), the big participation gap between college students and other young people indicates the great importance of universities and colleges in enhancing civic and political engagement. Through participation in university, students will acquire knowledge about citizenship and democracy (Bleiklie, 2002, cited in Plantan, 2002). Then, they can also practice citizenship in university in order to acquire the necessary skills for future participation. Lastly, the experience of participation in university will improve their self-efficacy if they perceive they can exert influence on a university (Bleiklie, 2002 cited in Plantan, 2002). Many US researchers, using both quantitative and qualitative research, have found the importance of HE in boosting citizenship (Colby, 2007). In the UK, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) also recognised the role of universities in promoting citizenship in its Strategic Plan for the period 2006 to 2011 by pointing out that ‘graduates, on average, are more likely to vote in elections, more tolerant to other ethnicities, and more likely to be involved in their local communities through voluntary activities’ (HEFCE, 2006, p.42). Some researchers have also realised the importance of higher education in democracy and citizenship (Plantan, 2002; Boland 2005; Bergan, 2003). For example, the study of universities as sites of citizenship and civic responsibility postulates the notion that ‘universities can become key institutions for the transmission of democratic values through direct engagement in democratic activities and democratic education on campus’ (Plantan, 2002). Similarly, Boland (2005) argues that higher education has an important role to play in the democratic socialisation process, and participation in shared governance demonstrates a significant opportunity to address democratic fatigue and to contribute to the preparation of students for their future role as democratic citizens and as members of civil society. Meanwhile, their research has demonstrated the important relationship between student participation in university governance, higher education and civic and democracy and citizenship. Bergan (2003) also has paid attention to the relationship between higher education and wider society and claimed that higher education institutions are not only an important part of society, but also play an important role in society.

In addition, a vast amount of literature has attempted to identify the determinants of citizenship. During citizenship formation, HE is a very important factor, but other factors also influence the civic behaviour of young people, such as socio-economic background, parents, and their citizenship education in school (Colby et al., 2007). Gender and ethnicity have been found to be related to different patterns of civic and political engagement (Vromen, 2003; McFarland and Thomas, 2006).

2.3.3 How can higher education influence active citizenship?

The previous section discusses the general relationship between education and citizenship; now I begin to have a closer investigation of the relationship between higher education and citizenship. A starting point is therefore to explore how higher education influences citizenship. This section provides a theoretical overview that spells out the concepts underpinning the hypothesis specified and tested in Chapters Seven and Eight. There are four main theories regarding how higher education is related to citizenship. The first and widely accepted hypothesis is that university could help to develop knowledge to understand politics and skills for political participation. Well-educated individuals tend to participate more as their education has equipped them with:

The skills people need to understand the abstract subject of politics, to follow the political campaign, and to research and evaluate the issues and candidates. In addition, because of their schooling, the well-educated are better able to handle the bureaucratic requirements of registration and voting (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993, p. 136).

Based on the theory of development and skills, Campbell (2006) proposes that more education affects many dimensions of civic and social engagement. HE is important for political participation is because it could provide more knowledge, skills and political familiarity for individuals to participate in more complex political activities (Hillygus, 2005). It does not only prepare a citizen to vote, but also helps them to have 'a reasoned and deliberative decision-making' process (Hillygus, 2005, p.27). A substantial body of literature suggests that HE could promote the cognitive skills which are necessary to gain, process, and analyse political information, and meanwhile, it helps improve motivation and provide the opportunity to practice citizenship (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Nie et al., 1996). The development of cognitive skills is also regarded as the 'direct effect' of education on citizenship (Colby et al., 2007, p.50). Education also has other 'indirect effects' (Colby et al., 2007, p.50), which are discussed in the following paragraph.

The second theory of HE's influence is its sorting function. More education for a specific individual leads to more participation for that individual because educational attainments could promote their position in social hierarchy (Campbell, 2006). Nie et al. (1996) argue that education plays a very important role in political engagement as it sorts citizens into positions in the social and political hierarchy, which will enhance political engagement to a higher or lower degree. The sorting model is also the social network hypothesis (Hillygus, 2005). HE influences political participation because it predicts the social network position of individuals rather than having a skill-cultivating function (Nie et al., 1996). Higher levels of education help people stay closer to the politically important social networks, which will facilitate easy involvement in political participation with more sources of political information and opportunities. Colby et al. (2007) also

claim that one of the indirect effects of HE is that HE is positively related to income and social status, which predict political participation. Furthermore, Nie et al. (1996) argue that it is not an individual's education level, but their relative education level (education level compared to other peers) that determines their social status. However, many empirical studies show that the sorting model or network model do not suitably explain civic and social engagement (Helliwell and Putnam, 1999; Hillygus, 2005; Campbell, 2006). Furthermore, some suggest that students who are most likely to be civically and politically engaged have a higher tendency to attend college or university (Colby et al, 2007). In addition, colleges or universities attract or select applicants who participate more in civic and political activities than their peers do.

The third theory concerns innate intelligence, which claims that intelligence leads to both higher education and more political engagement. This hypothesis suggests that individuals with higher innate intelligence will be more likely to go to higher educational institutions and they will tend to participate more in politics engagement as well. Herrnstein and Murray (1994) argue that 'education predicts political involvement in America because it is primarily a proxy for cognitive ability' (p.235). However, Hillygus's (2005) empirical study shows no relationship between general intelligence and political engagement.

The fourth theory proposes learning citizenship through the practice of civic skills. This is based on a constructive learning theory, which is discussed in the next section. According to the notion of community of practice, citizenship can be learned through practice in the community. A community of practice is a group of individuals sharing a concern, a series of issues or an interest in a topic, and gaining their knowledge by practising and interacting with each other in the community (Wenger 1998). Through the process of exchanging information and experiences with the group, the members could learn from each other, and could promote themselves personally and professionally (Lave and Wenger, 1991). In community of practice theory, people can learn through engagement and constructing their identity in the community. Similarly, the important indirect effect proposed by Verba et al. (1995) is the workplace experience offered by university. This workplace, university, provides the most opportunities to learn and practice civic skills. Through a learning experience such as education, civic competence (civic knowledge, skills, attitudes and values) is cultivated, which in turn makes individuals into active citizens (Hoskins, 2006). Therefore, education plays a very important role in the learning experience of citizenship, as through it an individual is able to develop the learning outcome of civic competence, particularly 'participatory attitudes, social justice values, citizenship values and cognition about democratic institutions' (Hoskins et al., 2008). In addition, the democratic ethos of educational institutions such as schools, universities and colleges is very important for possible future democratic engagement (Kerr et al., 2007).

Chapter 2

Even though most of the research agrees that education has an impact on the individual and society, Desjardins (2008) doubts how and to what extent this has worked. Some researchers also argue that education has no effect on citizenship. Egerton (2002) suggests the very small effect of HE on the probability of engagement might only be a reflection of family influence. Fish (2003) argues moral and civic education in colleges and university is unworkable for it consists of 'too many intervening variables and too many uncontrolled factors that mediate the relationship between what goes on in a classroom and the shape of what is finally a life' (p.24). Botstein proposes that liberal learning has very little empirical justification as 'the presumed civic and cultural benefits of going to college continue to elude us' (2005, p.211).

This section has mainly discussed four theories on how HE can influence civic and political participation: university can improve civic and political knowledge and skills; university has a sorting function, university is a proxy for higher innate intelligence; and university can be a place to practice citizenship. Which theory is helpful to explain the relationship between higher education and citizenship in the UK? In this thesis, the theory of university as a proxy and as a cause for active citizenship will be examined using quantitative data in Chapter Six. The hypothesis tested in Chapter Six is that university can promote young people's active citizenship rather than as a proxy. For me, university may influence civic and political participation of students by promoting their citizenship through the classroom, campus culture and opportunities for citizenship practice. As there is no suitable data for classroom and campus culture, the thesis will test whether citizenship practice and identity can promote citizenship learning in later quantitative analysis in Chapter Seven. The thesis will suggest some ways to improve young people's citizenship within university and build active learning into the campus life. The last question is around how students view their university as a site of citizenship learning, so the thesis will discuss this with qualitative analysis. As the thesis focuses on students' citizenship learning in university, it is very important to investigate different learning theories that provide insights into exploring how to learn citizenship in HE.

2.4 Learning theory

A range of teaching and learning theories offered by pedagogical studies are helpful for analysing citizenship learning in HE. This study can be combined with pedagogical research and studies to form new approaches to learn citizenship in universities. In this section, I investigate which of these learning theories gives the most plausible account of citizenship learning. While these different theories obviously overlap in teaching and learning, they can offer some insights to understand the philosophical positions that underpin different learning methods, and to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of practice. This helps guide a more effective way of learning

citizenship on campus. Therefore, this section describes different learning theories and then explores how these theories can be applied in the thesis.

Cognitive theory is a very important part in learning and teaching in education. Cognitive theory is 'based on an investigation of human thought processes' (Carlile and Jordan, 2005, p.17), which regards learning as a process taking place within the head or the mind. The cognitivist approach aims to advance the 'long-term memory' and 'deep learning' (Marton and Saljo, 1976; Ramsden 2003, cited in Sloam, 2008). Cognitive theory involves a 'mentalistic' learning, which is in line with mind-body duality culture in Europe and America (Fox, 1997). During the learning process, mind plays an irreplaceable role. Cognitive theory is more about the individual learning with professionals' assistance, for example, teachers. The learning takes place in formal education institutions such as schools and the classroom, in which professionals provide help. Much research has been done to improve citizenship learning according to cognitive theory, focusing on teaching, curriculum and other formal learning methods to improve cognitive skills (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Nie et al., 1996). Cognitive theory emphasises learning in the formal institution, and sees learning as an individual issue. In cognitive learning, more effective teaching methods can be developed through exploring the process of learning and learning experiences (Sloam 2008). However, it ignores the social dimension of learning, treating learning as a process of knowledge acquisition. Knowledge is seen to be produced professionally and distributed according to standard set by professional organisations. The process is that students memorise, understand, and then reproduce the knowledge they were taught by writing or speaking. Cognitive theory also considers knowledge as 'free standing and decontextualised', which students can gain and approach. 'Knowledge is taken to be unproblematically and appropriately preclassified by the existing academic disciplines, taxonomies, and library classifications and to constitute the bodies of knowledge which learners should consume, internalise, and inwardly digest' (Fox, 1997, p.730).

Behaviourism is another learning theory that has influence on the learning process in HE today. According to behaviourists, behaviour is explained in terms of a stimulus, a response and accordingly operation. The expected outcome of the learning, 'the sequence of events or "stimuli" to bring about this change, and the importance of rewards and penalties for motivating the learner' are key component in behaviourism (Carlile and Jordan 2005, p.14). According to the view of behaviourists, an individual gains knowledge through repeated actions towards stimuli and the learning process is directed by the instructor who controls the sequence of stimuli and the reward system (Roopnarine and Johnson, 2012). The most important aims of behaviourism are to gain basic academic knowledge and skills. It focuses on learning of facts and contents. Many elements of behaviourism are very obvious in educational institutions, and it is also a fact that 'some of the

key developments in modern curriculum planning are Behaviourist' (Carlile and Jordan, 2005, p.15). According to Sloam (2008, p.514), behaviourism is commonly integrated into the design of the first year political science curriculum as well as in a 'progression' in teaching methods in the second and third years, in particular relating to the teaching of knowledge. This is because civic knowledge is argued to be very important in citizenship learning, which could promote political participation (Galston, 2001). Behaviourism can also be understood as learning by doing – learning through actions – which is relevant to political engagement. However, behaviourism ignores social and emotional development, while citizenship learning, especially political engagement, is deemed as a social process. Behaviourists think that social and emotional development will come after academic achievements. Many believe students will have more positive self-esteem if they feel they are successful in learning. There are also some other disadvantages. The behaviourist approach tends to encourage student passivity and separates teaching structures from student input, as it neglects the learners' action and teachers' response (Sloam, 2008). Behaviourism offers a top-down approach, focusing on knowing rather than understanding, on learning outcomes rather than the relationship between teachers and learners (Sloam, 2008).

Recently, there has been an increased focus on the impact of constructionism to learn citizenship (eg. Lave's situated learning, Lave and Wenger's communities of practice theory), which sees researchers' interest in education transferring from considering educational attainment to process, as well as from the curriculum and the way of teaching to learning from practicing. Constructivism is also a student-centred approach, emphasising the teacher's role as a 'facilitator' or 'mediator' (Sloam, 2008, p.514). Furthermore, it connects the learning process and the learner's wider social context (Sloam, 2008). It is a key idea in constructivist and social constructivist perspectives that students can learn more unaided or through interaction with one another than they can directly from the teacher. Situated learning theory is a relatively new theory in the field of education. It does not simply expand cognitive theory by adding the component of social relations within the formal education context – 'It is not enough to say that some designated cognitive theory of learning could be amended by adding a theory of "situation" for this raises crucial questions about the compatibility of particular theories.' (Lave, 1993, p.7) – situated theory seeks to see learning from a new perspective and endeavours 'to construct a theory that encompasses mind and lived-in-world, treating relations among person, activity, and situation, as they are given in social practice, itself viewed as a "single encompassing theoretical entity"' (Lave, 1993, p. 7). The theory attempts to relate knowledge with the material in the world and regards learning as a process of producing knowledge that is inseparable from the situated, contextual, social engagement with the material world people live in. Some research on active

citizenship has managed to employ this theory, especially community of practice, to explain informal education in school or the local community. Hoskins et al. (2008) show the usefulness of situated learning theory in civic education. Moreover, they find that learning through social participation, both inside and outside school, and especially through meaning-making activities, demonstrates a strong positive relationship with citizenship knowledge, skills and dispositions across a wide range of countries. Therefore, we rely on the constructivist learning in the thesis, using 'community of practice' to explore active citizenship in HE in the UK. Situated learning theoretically supports the fact that young people are able to learn active citizenship through their participation in communities and practice in their daily lives. Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that learning is a situated activity. The community of practice theory focuses on learning from practising and interacting with others in the 'community'; meanwhile the identity is constructed. However, most studies in this field have mainly focused on using constructivist learning theory to explore certain types of young people's civic competence in secondary school – for example, voting, participatory attitudes and cognition about democracy. Research that explores how the communities of practice (CoP) theory affects the learning of active citizenship, such as voting, volunteering and protesting, is lacking, especially at HE level. A constructivist approach can provide insights into the development of a more student-centred learning approach, to the benefit of both pedagogical and participatory goals (Sloam, 2011).

The differing approaches to learning aim to improve the learning of active citizenship for young people at HE institutions. These pedagogical theories can also be combined with theories of citizenship to create positive synergies relating to the value of education and its role in increasing active citizenship: learning about active citizenship is necessary for understanding the nature of civic and political engagement in society; learning as practice of citizenship can help students relate their learning with their identity and experiences. Education is seen as a means for strengthening democracy and citizenship, which has been described in section 2.3.2 and 2.3.3.

The constructivist approaches to learning focus on the importance of participation, identity and human interactions, which are also the key to active citizenship. As I mentioned in section 2.3.1, the core of active citizenship concept is the participation in political and civic activities. It legitimates decision-making, which therefore makes it a key requirement of active citizenship (Pattie et al., 2004). Also, 'participation is a prime criterion for defining the democratic citizen and his or her role within the political process' (Dalton, 2015). Colby et al. (2007) argue that sustained political participation could lead to more stable habits, attitudes and dispositions. The focus on participation can provide a bridge between active citizenship and theories of constructivist learning. Also, what connects political theory with constructivist approaches to learning is their common focus on the importance of human interaction (especially communication and discourse)

as the key to politics and democracy. Hannah Arendt's (1969) emphasis on interaction for the human condition (Biesta, 2007, cited in Sloam, 2008) also has some implications for learning citizenship in HE.

Also, youth citizenship is particularly related to the theory. Even though young people feel disillusioned with electoral politics, they are interested in politics in the broader sense such as political activities in the street or on the internet (Sloam, 2016). Also, Amna and Ekman (2013) argue that some seemingly 'passive' standby citizens who have not been involved yet may in fact be an asset to democracy, due to their particular combination of political interest, trust, and inclination to participate. These standby citizens are, in community of practice, people in peripheral position, who can be active participants and full members of the community during the process of participation and gaining identity. This shows the necessity to promote active citizenship by involving the asset of democracy—standby citizens through community of practice approach. After learning through participation and interaction, standby young citizens tend to be involved in political and civic engagement.

Therefore, this view of citizenship education focusing on human interaction and engagement can be well related to the CoP theory: learn citizenship through participation and social interaction. It is, therefore, important to discuss promoting citizenship with the constructivist learning method, community of practice. The following section attempts to provide theoretical supports to form the hypothesis in Chapter Seven, which is based around the question 'how does university promote students' citizenship?'. This has also laid a theoretical foundation for my further qualitative research on learning citizenship in HE.

2.4.1 Community of Practice

2.4.1.1 Community

A university can be a community of practice to learn citizenship, which will be discussed in this section. Practice as a community includes three dimensions: 'mutual engagement', 'a joint enterprise' and 'a shared repertoire' (Wenger, 1998, p.73). Practice exists in a community of people and the relations of mutual engagement (Wenger, 1998). A community is not just a group of people staying together; instead, people form a community of practice because they maintain frequent relations of mutual engagement around them (Wenger, 1998). Students in university are able to work together to experience representative democracy and meanwhile build relationships with their peers and staff within university. Membership in a community of practice is a matter of mutual engagement (Wenger, 1998). The second characteristic of practice as a source of community is the negotiation of a joint enterprise, which keeps a community of practice together

(Wenger, 1998). It involves the negotiation between individual instrumental, personal and interpersonal aspects and the demand of the community. When experiencing voting or volunteering, students can negotiate with their peers and staff. Furthermore, the negotiation takes place between their ability and ambitions and the university's requirements. The negotiation leads to relations of mutual accountability, which is a very important part of a community of practice. Accountability includes not only engagement, but also being personable, sharing information and resources, and being responsible to others. The third characteristic is shared repertoire. The repertoire includes concrete concepts, for example, rules. To be specific, the representative democracy on campus follows clear and specific guidance and regulations created and improved by students and staff in the university community. It is a dynamic process including both reificative aspects and participation to create them.

2.4.1.2 Learning as social participation

The main focus of communities of practice (CoP) in the thesis is learning citizenship through practice in the university community. A community of practice is a group of individuals sharing a concern, a series of issues or an interest in a topic, and gaining their knowledge by practicing and interacting with each other in the community (Wenger, 1998). Through the process of exchanging information and experiences with the group, the members can learn from each other, and can promote themselves personally and professionally (Wenger, 1998). Learning as social participation means the individual as an active participant can learn in the practices of social communities, and construct his/her identity through these communities (Wenger, 1998). Thus, a community of practice could be understood as a context where people participate in communal activities, and gradually create their shared identity and gain knowledge through this participation. In this context, students practise citizenship by voting, engaging and volunteering, creating their identity or belongingness to the university, through which they learn citizenship.

Participation in CoP is defined as the 'social experience of living in the world in terms of membership in social communities and active involvement in social enterprises.' (Wenger, 1998, p.55). Participation includes both action and feelings of belongingness, which entail 'all kinds of relations, conflictual as well as harmonious, intimate as well as political, competitive as well as cooperative.' (Wenger, 1988, p.56). In this section, two important characteristics of CoP, namely the engagement and the identity, are discussed in detail.

2.4.1.2.1 Engagement

First of all, engagement in activities and communities is one part of participation. Through mutual engagement in communities, people are able to experience and also 'shape these communities'

(Wenger, 1998, p.56). Through combining participation and reification, the capability to have an experience of meaning is gained. Members through their own engagement in practice can experience the competence to mutually engage, to be accountable to the community and to make use of the repertoire of the practice (Wenger, 1998). The realignment of experience of meaning and competences are the characteristics of learning, which produces knowledge, information and skills (Wenger, 1998). When young people engage in organisations and activities at university, learning of active citizenship takes place. Meanwhile, young people gain knowledge and skills of active citizenship from the engagement.

2.4.1.2.2 Identity

Importantly, participation is more than mere engagement in practice. Its effects are not confined to the actual context of people's engagement (Wenger, 1998). Even if individuals leave the context, participation will not be turned off. This is explained by Wenger (1998), who states that participation becomes a part of individuals; they will always carry it with them and it will appear if they are confronted by similar situations in other communities. Therefore, 'participation places the negotiation of meaning in the context of the forms of membership in various communities. It is a constituent of our identities' (Wenger, 1998). In this sense, participation in the university community helps students form the identity of active participants and full members of the community, which will be carried and will surface in the larger community of society. Therefore, young people with the identity gained from engagement in universities are always at the forefront of participation in society.

Theoretically, from practice, people are able to form an identity, which facilitates future practice. During that process, learning takes place. Learning changes identity by changing the ability to participate, and the ability is gained socially in terms of practices and communities where it shapes identity (Wenger, 1998). During learning process, the identity of active participants or full members of the community are formed; meanwhile their skills and knowledge on active citizenship are developed, which facilitates their active citizenship in the future. Therefore, encouraging students in HE to participate in all kinds of political activities or groups as well as extra-curricular activities is very important to cultivate active citizens.

However, there are some critics concerning the theory, for instance, the neglect of power (Contu and Willmott, 2003; Fox, 2000), its failure to take into account pre-existing conditions such as habitus and social codes (Mutch, 2003), as well as its widespread application within organisational studies beyond its original focus on situated learning (Handley et al. 2006), and the term 'community' itself, which is problematic, embodies positive connotations and is open to multiple interpretations (Lindkvist, 2005, Roberts, 2006). A common line of critique is that the concept of

of community of practice fail to consider the issue of power, therefore, it contains unbalanced power relations which enable and constrain access to positions of peripherality and potential mastery (Contu and Willmott, 2003). The characteristics attributed to the communities of practice appear to obscure the extent to which they are influenced and shaped by their institutional, political or cultural context. For example, factors such as the class, gender and ethnicity render a proportion of people unable or disinclined to participate in certain communities; therefore, it reduces their chances to learn from participation. By contrast, for others, as they have privileged access to these practices and resources, they have high level of propensity to learn. This may be mentioned by Lave and Wenger (1991) when they consider that learning embodies 'the structural characteristics of communities of practice' (1991, p.55), which indicates that social divisions including class and gender, are structured into 'communities' through organizing social space and hindering or promoting access to certain resources, forms of activity, technology, etc. However, when it comes to demonstrating their idea by reference to the practices of midwives, tailors, quartermasters, butchers, and non-drinking alcoholics, the link between the practice of 'community' members and the 'structural characteristics' of these communities remains largely unexplored (Contu and Willmott, 2003). Also, the formation of identity in practice may seem to pay insufficient attention to broader discourses of identity, such as class, gender, and race. The identity formation of individuals may also be influenced by their gender, race and other factors. This is especially the case for learning citizenship. It is reported that there are many factor influencing young people's political and civic engagement, such as social economic background (Colby et al., 2007), gender and ethnicity (Vromen, 2003, McFarland and Thomas, 2006). This means people from certain class, in certain gender or race are more likely to be involved in political and civic activities, consequently, they can learn more and form an active identity from their participation. Therefore, in my concept of community of practice, these factors will be taken into consideration. Young people will learn citizenship from participation in universities and the identity can be formed during their participation, but their participation and identity will also be influenced by their gender, race and social economic status. To the best of our knowledge, there has not any attempt to test this theory in the HE in the UK. Therefore, we examine CiT data on learning citizenship in the university in the UK. Based on the theoretical analysis, I propose two hypotheses, which are to be tested in Chapter 6 and 7, respectively. The education effect hypothesis in Chapter 6: the university can promote young people's active citizenship, that is the university has a significantly positive impact on young people's behaviours of active citizenship. The citizenship learning hypothesis in Chapter 7: students' citizenship learning depends on their participation and identity gained at universities; If students participate in groups or activities and construct their identity at universities, they are more likely to participate in future voting, protesting and volunteering. Also, their participation and identity may be influenced by their

gender, race and social economic status, so their social economic status, gender and ethnicity are taken into control in analysis. The hypothesis is likely to be true if the participation in groups or activities and students' belongingness are positively correlated with young people's future civic behaviour.

2.5 How do we promote citizenship in HE?

After discussing different learning theories in the previous section, I now explore specific ways of promoting students' citizenship. Much research focuses on promoting civic competence, including civic and political knowledge, skills, values and motivations in HE.

2.5.1 Civic and political knowledge, skills and values

Civic and political participation require a broad range of skills, for example, voting requires knowing how to obtain and analyse the information needed to vote. Thus, civic and political skills play a vital role in civic and political participation as studies illustrate that these skills are strong predictors of political involvement (Colby et al., 2007). Young people's political skills motivate them to participate, and in turn, political participation brings greater skills (Colby et al., 2007). Many studies indicate that a great number of people first start to gain skills important for civic participation in adolescence, particularly through extracurricular experiences (Glanville, 1999; Verba et al., 1995 cited in Colby et al., 2007). Then, they develop these skills into adulthood through work and involvement in civic and political organisations (Glanville, 1999; Verba et al., 1995, cited in Colby et al., 2007). Yates and Youniss (1998) find that participating in organised groups is extraordinarily important for predicting further civic participation, which is probably because these early experiences help young people to learn and practice civic skills, for instance, communication and organisation skills, which enhance their future involvement in community and political issues (Colby et al., 2007). Furthermore, some suggest that involvement in organisations that require working together towards group goals such as a student council, political clubs, student newspapers, or youth groups, could lead to better political skills and participation than other organisations (Glanville, 1999). The practice of participation, in particular participation in school councils, demonstrates a positive relationship with cognition (Hoskins et al., 2012a). Thus, participation in a university community may help impart some of the basic related skills necessary to function in the political and civic realm (Galston, 2001). It will also help socialise individuals to take part in political communities (Galston, 2001). The norms and skills of community and civic involvement continue to influence political involvement as well (de Tocqueville, 1998). Based on the discussion above, participation takes central stage in promoting civic skills.

Though participation in an educational community such as a classroom, department or university is an important connective mechanism between higher education and citizenship, the specific content of education is also a key factor (Hillygus, 2005). The curriculum in university is also important for increasing civic and political knowledge and skills. Sloam (2008) argues that political science education can be important in rejuvenating politics by adopting a constructivist approach – constructively aligned curricula, teaching methods and assessment, establishing synergies between pedagogical and participatory goals. Hillygus (2005) claims that HE impacts on political participation in the future because of what students learned in the curriculum that was relevant to politics. Similarly, Campbell (2006) summarises that the curriculum has an effect on civic cognitive capacities – that is, classroom instruction with the specific objective of preparing students for active citizenship. Boland (2006, 2008) posits a fundamental transformation of the curriculum through a notion of ‘pedagogy for civic engagement’, which emphasises bringing the civic dimension into disciplinary study and learning and teaching citizenship through interaction and engagement with others.

Besides the content of the curriculum, the open climate of a classroom is irreplaceable for promoting civic political participation skills and values. Classroom learning may play a very important role for university students. Even though it is not yet proved at university level, at school, an open classroom climate plays an important role in classroom democracy as the ‘climate is a real factor in the lives of learners’ (Freiberg and Stein 1999, p.17). Most conferences on the subject of preparing citizens mentioned that ‘democracy needs to be taught in a democratic atmosphere’ (Torney-Purta and Carolyn, 2005). Many researchers have noted that student democratic competencies are related to open classroom climates (Torney-Purta and Carolyn, 2005; Hahn, 1998). In a Detroit High School, Ehman (1969) concludes that greater exposure to an open climate and controversial issues correlated positively with a sense of citizen duty, participation and efficacy. He also found in a three-year longitudinal study of 339 students in 1977 that an open classroom climate related positively to more political interest and political confidence. Torney-Purta et al. (2001) also find in the study based on CIVED data that an open climate for discussion on social and political issues in the classroom has positive relationship with civic knowledge and intention to vote. Using the IEA CIVED study, Hoskins et al. (2012b) conclude that cognition and participatory attitudes have the highest association with learning, including an open classroom climate for discussion for young people.

Furthermore, all participants including students and teachers in the dialogue of an open classroom are willing to change or amend their opinions with increased new information and/or better and more convincing arguments (Wilmer, 2006). Baughman and Eberle’s (1965) research finds that students in more participatory classrooms tend to show higher levels of support for

rights guaranteed by the United States Bill of Rights. Grossman (1975) concludes that the number of controversial issues courses was connected with support for 'civic tolerance' in the survey of around 1000 students in the San Francisco Bay area high schools. Furthermore, he has also found that the more students perceive they can freely express opinions in class, the higher the civic tolerance they have. In addition, Goldenson's (1978) study of the impact of a three-week course on students' attitudes and opinions notes that the relationship between support for civil liberties and the process of open inquiry is important, rather than the time spent studying controversial issues. An open classroom climate includes the extent to which students perceive that they can disagree with each other and with the teacher and that controversial issues can be considered (Hahn et al., 1990). Based on several studies, students' political attitude and value can only be influenced under particular conditions (Hahn et al., 1990). The key variable of this is likely to be that to what extent students perceive an open classroom climate in which they can express different views on controversial issues (Hahn and Cynthia, 1990). A study (Hahn, 1998) in five countries also finds that issues-related discussion in a supportive classroom positively related to political interest and trust.

2.5.2 Motivation

Political motivation is influenced by many situational or contextual factors, which belong to the changing cultural, social and political environment rather than an individual's characteristics (Colby et al., 2007). Among them, the most powerful situational influences are peer or family encouragement in political participation (Huckfeldt and Sprague, 1992; Leighley, 1996; McAdam and Paulsen, 1993). However, these situational factors cannot lead to long-term political motivation (Colby et al., 2007). Sustained political participation could lead to more stable habits, attitudes and dispositions (Colby et al., 2007). For instance, students who are involved in political activities for a period may develop habits of long-term political participation (Colby et al., 2007). A considerable amount of research indicates that habit information has a powerful influence on political engagement, especially at a young age (Gerber et al., 2003; Miller and Shanks, 1996; Plutzer, 2002). Therefore, encouraging students in HE to participate in all kinds of political activities or groups as well as extra-curricular activities is very important for cultivating active citizens. In the next section, we are going to explore ways to raise student participation at university in order to promote active citizenship.

From the discussion on promoting civic competencies, it is clear that participation, curriculum, and an open classroom climate are very important factors. These sections provide theoretical supports to form the hypothesis in later chapters. The next part reviews studies of student participation at universities in order to know more about student participation in university.

2.5.3 Student participation at university

In their studies, researchers have paid much attention to the formal or statutory provisions for student participation in the governance of universities. Plantan (2002) states that 'the formal and statutory provisions for shared governance, transparency of decision-making and protection of faculty and students has been made in universities, but they tend to be at odds with reality and actual practices' (p.12). Most respondents in the survey for the Council of Europe indicated that student representation and participation is ensured by legal mechanisms at the institutional level (institutional, faculty or department levels) (Persson, 2003). Persson (2003) also mentions that in the majority of countries surveyed, there are regular contacts between government and student representatives and national rectors' conferences. These provisions are vital as they underpin student participation in governance, and guarantee its legality in universities. In addition, the reform of student participation in university governance has been a major theme in university reconstruction in Europe (Bergan, 2003). For Bergan, 'student participation is an aspect of the broader area of higher education governance, so it may be useful to recall that higher education governance is at the heart of the Bologna Process and will be a key feature of the European Higher Education Area to be set up by 2010' (p.2).

At the same time, researchers reveal the status quo of student participation in Higher Education in Europe. Plantan (2002) presents the findings of an empirical study related to student participation in several universities in Europe based on nine aspects: characteristics of campuses, the political environment of universities, prohibition of political parties and their activities, administrative practices and university leadership, formal provisions with actual practice, government role in university administration, community relations, students and civil responsibility and democratic pedagogy, and promotion of civic engagement. His research offers a wide-reaching and relatively complete discussion of student participation. However, he has failed to give a deeper analysis because of the wide coverage of regions. Overall, student participation in the governance of universities needed to be stronger and implemented in more countries, and needed to be extended beyond baseline rights such as the right to vote on matters about which they had not been consulted (Bergan, 2003).

However, other research has revealed different aspects and difficulties in the actual practice of student participation. Passivity among some students in participation in universities is very common, because some are reluctant to spend time on work that is considered 'irrelevant' work and largely because of the overwhelming need to help students meet vocational needs and guarantee employment and relevant work (Plantan, 2002). This is really the main barrier in student participation in Europe. Another specific finding is that student influence varies according

to the issue. Persson (2003) finds that the strongest influence from students seems to be on social and environmental issues at institutions and on pedagogical and educational content issues, while the weakest influence is on budget matters and the criteria for the appointment of teaching staff and the admission of students. Furthermore, student representation and participation, both formal and informal, at national level and at department level, are not as strong as at the institutional level (Persson, 2003). Little et al. (2009) provide some reflections on the effectiveness of current student representation systems in the UK. They focus more on existing student representative engagement in universities rather than participation in the governance of universities. In Boland's (2005) research, there is evidence to indicate that the real influence of student participation in the decision-making process is positive but limited – evidence that is not confined to Ireland. According to the literature, these findings are very common in actual practice. However, this literature has not paid much attention to feasible methods that motivate students to participate in the governance of universities and accept more democratic responsibility and civic engagement, which, the researchers believe, would be an important topic in the future. Persson (2003) believes the relationship between formal provisions for participation and actual practices at different levels needs closer examination, as well as role of the student organisations, internal division of power and organisation, the support from other stakeholders in higher education and the often low participation in the election of student representatives. He also proposes that the governance of HE in general and the participation of all stakeholders should be an important topic in future (Persson, 2003). This suggests the need for further research on how to effectively enhance the participation and influence of the whole student body in the governance of universities, as well as feasible mechanisms to help students participate more in the governance of universities.

Western researchers have also focused on the perception of student influence on the governance of universities, as well as the perception of staff. Boland's (2005) central argument is that the way a student views their role and how they are viewed by their partners has significant implications for the nature, effectiveness and influence of their participation in shared governance. He also claims that an academic's perception of their role of HE is fundamentally significant. Therefore, Little et al. (2009) study the perception of influence and find that the majority of higher education institutions rated their student engagement process, student feedback and student representation system as effective, while student unions were less likely to do so. In addition, staff and students across a diverse range of HE providers thought their effectiveness could be improved. However, researchers have mainly investigated students or representatives in student organisations such as student councils, with less attention given to the whole student body.

These sections have reviewed the literature on HE and citizenship that has enlightened our further research, in particular quantitative analysis on whether HE influences citizenship. The learning theory section discusses different characteristics and limitations of learning approaches, and mainly focuses on applying the constructive learning theory in the thesis. Also, theories on citizenship in HE have been explored. The following section will review the current research on citizenship in HE.

2.6 Empirical literature review

The section presents an up-to-date empirical investigation of studies of citizenship learning in HE. There are many studies on learning citizenship; I am, therefore, going to review related works on citizenship in HE in order to understand the current situation of the research, as well as identify any gaps in the research.

2.6.1 US research

Educational thinkers in the US have made the link between democracy and HE – from of John Dewey's democratic education philosophy, to Ernest Boyer's idea of the engaged campus and to the recent consideration of the civic responsibility of higher education (cf. Ehrlich, 2000). The American pragmatists and particularly John Dewey have had an important influence on developing this linkage between higher education and citizenship through experiential learning (Benson et al., 2007; Saltmarsh, 1996). More importantly, this pragmatic tradition of thought has encouraged HE researchers periodically to think about how to promote the moral and civic education of students through active, problem-based and service learning (Benson and Harkavay, 2002; Orrill, 1995, 1998). Universities and colleges in the US have elaborated more extensively and explicitly on preparing their students to be citizens than their counterparts in the UK (Annette 2010). According to Boyte and Kari, 'Recasting civic education as the public work of higher education holds potential to move the collective efforts in civic renewal to a new stage' (Boyte and Kari, 2000, p. 51).

US researchers have conducted a number of studies on citizenship in higher education. The political discipline has elaborated on revitalising democracy by enhancing the political skills, interests, and efficacy of college students. This has often been accomplished due to the individual efforts of political science faculties to offer courses that provide students with opportunities in service-learning and civic and political engagement. Topics include simulations (Malone and Julian, 2005; McQuaid, 1992; Smith and Boyer, 1996), deliberative discussion (Gastil and Dillard 1999; Strachan, 2006), internships, service-learning (Dicklitch, 2003; Hepburn, Niemi, and Chapman

2000; Walker 2000), and voting and campaigning projects (Blumberg, Sweitzer, and Helldobler 2005). Faculties at a wide range of institutions have also used classrooms for applied knowledge, encouraging students to think about political and social questions not only as theoretical concerns but also as practical problems. Efforts have been made to enhance student participation in the democratic process, which included developing new curricular and extracurricular programs (Lindstrom and Haeg, 2010; Owen, Chalif, and Soule, 2011; Smith, 2012; Townes, 2012), improving existing courses and syllabi (Iwanek, 2012), promoting service-learning (Annette, 2005; Butin 2010; Cipolle 2010; McHugh and Mayer 2012; Saltmarsh and Hartley 2011; Teune and Vish 2010), and introducing new instructional methods (Dense, 2012; McCartney, Bennion, and Simpson 2014; Spiezio, Baker, and Boland, 2005, cited in Yanus et al., 2015).

Colleges make great efforts to build new centres that attempt to design programmes including internships, service learning, and participation in community action projects, which allows HE teachers to easily integrate political participation into academic courses and programmes (Colby et al., 2007). This also enables colleges to incorporate a civic mission into their core institutional objectives. Campus Compact, founded in 1985 by three university presidents, has expanded considerably, and now includes over 950 institutional members dedicated to service learning, community engagement, and democratic development.

2.6.1.1 Developing civic engagement in higher education

Many US studies have emphasised that learning is not only important for academic knowledge but also for key skills and capabilities, including student leadership and civic engagement in HE (Colby et al., 2003, 2007; Ehrlich et al., 2000). At the core of service-learning is the pedagogy of experiential learning, which is based on the thoughts of John Dewey, David Kolb, David Boud, Jennifer Moon, and others. In the US the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) has since 1971 been engaged in the development of and research into experience education, and the American Association of Higher Education (no longer in existence), in partnership with the Corporation for National Service, commissioned volumes by leading academic figures to examine the importance of service-learning in higher education. What is impressive about the work of the International Association for Research on Service Learning is that it promotes research on not only pedagogic practices but also goes beyond anecdotal evidence, researching into the measurement of the learning outcomes of service learning (Annette, 2010).

The Carnegie Foundation's Political Engagement Project is a study of twenty-one courses and co-curricular programmes in US higher education institutions that prepare students for 'democratic participation' (Colby et al., 2007). This study highlights the challenges of establishing 'political participation' as a formal learning outcome. We also need to better understand how young

people frame the 'political' in terms of their everyday lives and how they see themselves as engaged in political participation (Colby et al., 2007; Levine, 2007; Marsh et al., 2007).

2.6.2 Literature on UK research

Unlike the US, most of the mission statements of UK HEIs hardly use civic republicanism and rarely mention promoting citizenship or civic responsibility (Annette, 2010). Universities UK, the main organisation of university heads, published a study of 'Universities and Communities' (CVCP, 1994) and in 2001 commissioned research into the regional roles of higher education institutions. There is no discussion of the broader civic role of HEIs in these documents, nor any proposals to think about the role of the undergraduate curriculum in developing students' moral and civic capacity for active citizenship (Annette 2010). Recently, the Beacons for Public Engagement Programme was established by the major research councils and the 'national' higher education funding councils. This is not only to think about the importance of 'co-production' in the public engagement of research in HEIs, but also to advance student volunteering and both service-learning and community-based research in the curriculum (Annette 2010). In addition, Goddard (2009) has argued for the 're-invention of the civic university', where universities work with local and regional communities as well as link these communities and global communities and markets.

2.6.2.1 Academic citizenship

Some studies focus on the citizenship of academics in university. The work by Bolden et al. (2013) explores the preoccupations of academics as citizens rather than as employees, managers or individuals from a societal perspective on academic leadership. It uses the listening posts methodology, comprising 26 participants from 15 higher education institutions, and finds 'a sense of ambiguity and ambivalence about one's relationship with the employing institution and a concern about the fragmentation of academic identities' (p.754). The study challenges dominant individual and organisational perspectives on leadership by exposing an alternative discourse, based on citizenship, which may offer new opportunities for engagement in the civic life of universities. Paterson and Bond (2005) investigate the views of academics in Scotland and England regarding whether higher education has a special role to play in educating citizens, and what that role might be.

2.6.2.2 Teaching democracy

One way of developing citizenship is through dedicated teaching (McCowan 2012). There are long traditions of teaching citizenship within the politics discipline, and some universities (e.g. University of East London, South Bank University) now have degree courses in Citizenship (McCowan 2012). In HE, with the increasing size and heterogeneity of the student body, researchers have become increasingly interested in using student-centred teaching. Teaching reflection through peer assessment (and student evaluation) and the standard use of teaching training courses have gained much attention. This therefore has provided a stimulus for embracing teaching methods steering towards the needs of a changing student body. Sloam (2008) argues that political science education can be important in rejuvenating politics by adopting a constructivist approach – constructively aligned curricula, teaching methods and assessment, establishing synergies between pedagogical and participatory goals. However, the teaching is confined to political science students or students who have chosen political courses in universities (McCowan 2012).

Some argue that citizenship needs to be promoted through the whole university experience, and integrated into the curriculum (Essomba et al., 2008; Munck, 2010). Boland (2006, 2008) proposes a fundamental transformation of the curriculum through a notion of ‘pedagogy for civic engagement’, which emphasises bringing the civic dimension into disciplinary study and learning and teaching citizenship through interaction and engagement with others. Essomba et al. (2008) also argue that forms of pedagogy play an important role as curricular content in the development of democratic citizenship. McCowan (2012) assesses three initiatives for teaching citizenship in English universities, including both discrete modules and embedded approaches. He suggests that university is a place for citizenship education, and lecturer involvement is a key factor. In terms of the curriculum, both taught courses and whole university approaches are faced with challenges and opportunities.

2.6.2.3 Civic engagement

Another research theme is to develop students’ civic knowledge, capacities and dispositions through work outside the university (McCowan 2012). It is increasingly recognised that students can acquire key skills through work experience, and education for citizenship can be achieved through volunteering as well as community-based learning and research in the UK (Annette, 2005). Student volunteering has played an important part in UK higher education since the 1960s, and today this work is supported by several organisations, for example, Student Volunteer, England and the WiSCV (Annette, 2010). Community Service Volunteers has worked to promote

citizenship education and community-based learning in higher education by working with universities (Annette, 2010). Importantly, professional education (business, engineering, teaching, etc.) in the UK has also paid attention to ethical issues and also civic professionalism through giving community-based learning and research opportunities for its students to deal with poverty, social justice and global citizenship issues (Dzur, 2008; Sullivan, 2004). In the UK there has been a significant development of the service-learning programme. Service-learning involves students working in partnership with local communities and learning through a structured programme that includes reflection (Annette, 2010). The service-learning programme includes not only academic learning but also service experience, which is argued to promote civic engagement. Throughout the UK, many universities have realised the challenge of building partnership-working with local and regional communities; as a result, they have gradually developed community-based learning and research programmes. To support the development, HEFCE funded Development of Teaching and Learning programmes. More importantly, service-learning can be integrated into a wide range of academic disciplines and learning opportunities (Annette, 2010). A number of universities have been part of the Active Learning for Active Citizenship (ALAC) programme for adult learning in the community, which was supported by the Community Empowerment Unit of what is now the Department for Communities and Local Government (Annette and Mayo, 2010; Mayo and Rooke, 2006). However, service-learning is faced with some challenges. There is evidence that in service-learning students are mostly interested in volunteer and community work rather than in political engagement (cf. Annette, 2003; Levine, 2007; Marsh et al., 2007). It is recognised that community service efforts disconnect direct political engagement of college students, which facilitates some educators to think about other strategies for advancing political learning, motivation, and involvement (Dalton and Crosby, 2008). Therefore, service-learning can hardly contribute to political engagement, which is one of the important learning outcomes of active citizenship (Colby et al., 2007). McCowan (2012) suggests that ‘a component of service-learning (of a political rather than a charity-based nature) is necessary in conjunction with the campus-based activities’ (p.65).

2.6.2.4 Student participation and citizenship

Student participation in shared governance of higher education institutions is considered in the context of a civic role for higher education in a democracy (Boland, 2005). Europe and Ireland have studies on student participation in the governance of higher education, and Boland (2005) finds that student participation in shared governance is very necessary to promote citizenship and democracy in HE, but other strategies still need to be adopted. In particular, Boland argues that academics have a critical role to play in this endeavour to promote democracy. Luescher-Mamashela (2013) proposes four theoretical typologies in terms of understanding student

representation. One of them is the 'democratic (and consequentialist) case', which understands student representation as a means to further citizenship education through inculcating democratic values and exercising democratic practice. In the UK, Ahier et al. (2003) find that university education can promote sociality and mutuality among students, supported by values of fairness, respect, responsibility and altruism. Furthermore, both informal and formal spaces in universities help the formation of these citizenship values; however, this has not necessarily resulted in civic action on or beyond university campuses. They also suggest that it is an important part of students' university lives that 'they found themselves engaged in a significant process of mutual social learning that included 'political' learning' (Ahier et al., 2003). It indicates that the learning often took place through interaction with their fellow students, but also through more complex routes where ideas encountered in their courses entered into peer discussion and contributed both to the widening of their political horizons and also to a greater self-confidence in their capacity to reflect about broadly political issues in more informed ways. Brooks et al. (2015) study on the changing role of student unions at universities in the UK offers support to the suggested university tendency to head towards a politically realist and consumerist typology (Luescher-Mamashela 2013). This qualitative study suggests that student representation in UK universities has led to a positioning of the students as consumers (Brooks et al., 2015, p.178).

While a lot of attention has been paid to citizenship education in secondary schools, surprisingly little emphasis has been placed upon the role of the tertiary section in teaching democracy (Sloam, 2008). These efforts to promote good and active citizenship in HEIs often focus on voluntary service-type activities (Kisby and Sloam, 2009). However, few studies, and especially not those using mixed methods, have investigated students' learning of citizenship on campus through their participation in activities and organisations.

In Europe, research has examined student citizenship and participation in the governance of higher education. The project looking at universities as sites of citizenship and civic responsibility summarised the findings of twelve monographs constituting the site reports of European universities, including Queen's University Belfast in the UK (Plantan, 2002). Bergan (2003) analysed students' participation in higher education governance in preparation for the Bologna Seminar held in Oslo, 12–14 June 2003, regarding higher education governance. For a report to HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council for England) (Little et al., 2009), 80 English institutions and 39 student unions in the UK took part in an online survey about student representation in their institutions, and supplementary interviews were conducted with students and staff. Little et al. (2009) mapped student opportunities for representation at all levels of institutional governance and illustrated a similar level of student involvement in committees for governance across the sector. A Council of Europe survey conducted by Persson (2003) received responses

from 28 countries without respondents from UK. Boland (2005) researched student participation in shared governance in the Republic of Ireland. However, research on the UK is quite sparse, with studies tending to focus on giving a brief overview of student participation in several European countries instead of a deep and specific research. Researchers have mainly investigated the students or representatives in student organisations such as student councils, while few studies have attempted to pay attention to the whole body of students.

The empirical literature review provides the current situation of students' civic participation in universities in the UK. There has been research that explores citizenship education in HE, including studies focusing on the citizenship of academics in the university (Bolden et al., 2013); teaching democracy (McCowan, 2012; Sloam, 2008), especially within the politics discipline; developing students' civic knowledge, capacities and dispositions through community volunteering, community-based learning and research (Annette, 2005; McCowan, 2012); and student participation in shared governance of higher education (Boland, 2005). This shows the gap in existing knowledge, which informs me about what needs to be done in further research. The literature on citizenship learning in HE, as well as on how to promote students' citizenship learning with different learning theories on campus, is limited. Thus, I explore student citizenship learning in HE further in this thesis using the constructivist learning approach and look at how university could improve students' active citizenship in the UK. Drawing on quantitative data and qualitative interview data of university students in HE in the UK, this work performs some exploratory research to identify the effect of HE on citizenship and citizenship learning in universities using community of practice theory, and contributes to the research on citizenship education in higher education. It examines how citizenship practice and identity promote citizenship learning in HE, and explores student's views on representative democracy learning in university. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that the issue of citizenship learning in HE has been addressed using mixed research methods in the UK. The research is also significant as it helps provide an understanding of learning citizenship in HE using community of practice theory. Thus, the results have the potential to provide substantial evidence for illustrating changes in policy and practice for citizenship education in the UK, with the goal of enhancing citizenship. Additionally, the quantitative data used in the study is the latest nationally representative longitudinal data on young people's citizenship in the UK. The qualitative interview sample also includes students holding positions and students without positions in university.

Chapter 3: Context of Higher Education in the UK

This chapter traces the development of the roles of HE, from its origins in ancient times to an outline of its contemporary roles. Does HE have the responsibility to promote democracy and citizenship? I try to answer this by showing the different roles of HE, one of which is to contribute to democracy and prepare young people for living in a civic society. Next, the chapter provides a context and necessary factual detail about HE in the UK to inform the chapters which follow. To begin with, it introduces the demography of HE in the UK, followed by a history of universities. This section gives a brief overview of the emergence of universities and their development in these years, which was closely associated with broader social changes. The final sections include outlines of autonomy, the student experience at universities and the globalisation of HE.

Higher Education aims to enrich and inspire students by delivering a quality educational experience that enhances social mobility, economy and international standing (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2011). However, the role of HE is still in debate, especially with market-based reforms within higher education sector, and many have doubted HE's function to promote democracy. Universities are faced with pressures to meet students' demands for skills and qualifications for the job market; the requirement to achieve measurable targets as the civic outcome is difficult to measure, and there is a strongly disciplinary focus to higher education studies (Arthur & Bohlin, 2005; Essomba et al., 2008). As a result, all these things discourage universities to include citizenship education (Arthur and Bohlin 2005; Essomba et al. 2008). Therefore, the following section will discuss the role of HE.

3.1 The role of higher education

Nowadays, higher education can be described as having three roles – advancing the production of knowledge, preparing students for the labour market and boosting economic development, and preparing students for living in a society and contributing to social equity and democracy (Veugelers et al. 2014; Boland 2005).

3.1.1 Traditional role

From a historical perspective, the university has been an institution for educating an elite (Englund, 2002). Higher Education is traditionally regarded as a place that is separated from wider society, to intellectually cultivate individuals through the study of great traditions and books (Veugelers et al. 2014). Newman claimed education is for 'pursuit of knowledge for the sake of knowledge and not for the value of any of the fruits or applications, however important', compared to the utilitarian views. (Hutton, 1890, p.127).

3.1.2 Economics

The university has greatly expanded in size and importance during the last century. Perkin (1983, p.218) suggests that universities have been transformed from 'a finishing school for young gentlemen' prior to the 20th century to 'the central power house of modern industry and society' after the First World War. Many factors led to this change, 'although as expansion proceeds some identify endogenous factors such as institutions' desire to achieve financial sustainability through growth and the need to create careers for graduates in new subjects' (Wakeling, 2009, p.37). Some indicate that the labour market requiring mental instead of physical labour created the need for more skilled intellectual workers (e.g. Lowe, 1983); higher education (in particular science) contributes to potential military and economic advantage (e.g. Simpson, 1983); and people try to have an advantage in the labour market through the possession of HE qualifications, (e.g. Collins, 1979; Wolf, 2002; Wakeling, 2009). Therefore, HE is considered as a tool to contribute to technical and economic development (Sullivan, 2000). HE meets individual needs with regard to career pursuit and supports the economy within the public sector (Wynne, 2014).

3.1.3 Democracy

It is widely acknowledged that democratic society 'cannot be taken for granted – they need to be cherished, nurtured and protected' (Boland 2005, p.199). Even though agreement is almost reached on the role of compulsory education in preparing citizens for effectively participating in democratic society, the same role and responsibility of higher education is not very clear (Boland, 2010; Englund, 2002). University/higher education tends to be necessary for entering the labour market (i.e. as a place for vocational education), 'but it is also a way of creating human conditions which will allow adult life to be endowed with meaningful content' (Englund 2002, p. 282). According to Englund, even though the dominant tradition of universities implies marginal groups and a traditional view of knowledge, the situation has changed for all university students today (Englund 2002). During the 20th century, Dewey's philosophy about education and democracy was revived, and there were recurrent thoughts about universities as potential sites for democracy and citizenship (Englund 2002). Recently, the civic role of higher education in

democracy has gained renewed interest and critical comment, especially in the context of an expanding European Union (McGinn and Epstein 1999; Englund, 2002; Kelly, 2002; Nussbaum, 2002). Universities now cannot reasonably avoid the question of their role regarding citizenship and democracy as they are 'increasingly becoming institutions for mass education, supplementing the role of the schools' (Englund, 2002, p.282). Therefore, HE has taken on its responsibility to promote equity and democracy (Colby et al., 2000; Veugelers et al., 2014; UNESCO, 1998). In this way, HE is argued to prepare young people for living in civic society.

To sum up, these roles characterise higher education today – 'advancing the frontiers of knowledge and serving the needs of the economy, while contributing to achievement of broader social goals such as equity and inclusion' (Boland, 2010).

3.2 Demography

Higher education in England is provided by a number of different institutions, which are independent, self-governing bodies in teaching, researching and scholarship. These are established by Royal Charter or legislation. The UK's HEIs are not owned or run by government. HE institution councils or governing bodies take responsibility for determining the strategic aims of the institutions, monitoring their financial condition and ensuring they are effectively managed (Baskerville et al., 2011). The universities vary in size, mission, subject and history. While almost all UK HEIs receive some public funding as a percentage of their total income, the government works through a series of funding councils to provide both financial support and general guidance to institutions instead of managing this money directly (Baskerville et al., 2011).

According to recent statistics from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA, 2016), there were 2,266,075 students, including 1,727,895 undergraduates and 538,180 postgraduates, in the UK universities in 2014/2015. UK universities are international. Undergraduate students account for 76.3 per cent of the total student body while postgraduate students account for 23.7 per cent. Among them, 80.7 per cent come from the UK, 5 per cent from EU countries and 14 per cent from non-EU countries.

Both teaching and researching in UK HEIs are important for enhancing the economy in the UK. UK HEIs make a strong contribution to regional and national economic development. According to HEFCE (2012b), analysis of the Business and Community Interaction survey demonstrates that the total value of the services which UK universities provide to the economy and society was 3.3 billion in 2010–11, an increase of 7 per cent on 2009–10.

3.3 History of higher education

Higher education in England has a long history. Teaching in the city of Oxford is documented as far back as 1096, which marks the University of Oxford as the oldest university in the English-speaking area (Baskerville et al., 2011; HEFCE, 2012a). More than one hundred years later, the University of Cambridge was established with the association of scholars gathering in the town of Cambridge.

Since their establishment, there were three significant expansions in HE in the UK. In the 19th century, a major expansion UK took place through the awarding of royal charters to St David's College, Lampeter (subsequently part of the University of Wales), Durham University, King's College London, and University College (Baskerville et al., 2011). In the latter part of that century, many medical, science, and engineering colleges were founded in major industrial cities. Among them, some combined to form the 'red brick' universities of Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield (Baskerville et al., 2011). Another expansion occurred during the 1950s to 1960s. The UK government began to expand the HE sector in response to the demands of an increasing population and the rapidly developing technological economy (Baskerville et al., 2011). From 1956, many new colleges of advanced technology were founded, and they gained university status in 1966 (Baskerville et al., 2011; HEFCE, 2012). For example, Aston, Bath, Bradford, Brunel, City, Loughborough, Salford and Surrey all became universities in this way. A further 13 UK institutions were awarded university status over the next 20 years (Baskerville et al., 2011). Another seven new universities – East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Lancaster, Sussex, Warwick and York – were also created during that period (Baskerville et al., 2011). In 1992, a further expansion followed. In that year, the UK government granted university status to 35 former polytechnics and many other institutions, mainly colleges of higher and further education, through the Further and Higher Education Act (Baskerville et al., 2011; HEFCE, 2012a). Generally, these universities are referred to as 'post-92' or 'modern' universities (Baskerville et al., 2011).

3.4 Higher education autonomy

UK universities are autonomous and independent institutions, with both intellectual and academic freedom. Indeed, their autonomy is considered a key factor in their international success in research, scholarship and education (Baskerville et al., 2011). According to the European University Association (EUA) report, the UK (England) universities rank among the top three countries and are part of the 'high' group of higher education systems in the organisational, financial, staffing and academic areas of institutional autonomy (Estermann and Nokkala, 2009).

UK universities could freely decide their academic structures. Decision-making processes can vary across HEIs throughout the UK. The decision-making structures are defined in the Higher Education Acts for post-1992 universities, while these provisions are included in the Charters and statutes of universities (Estermann and Nokkala, 2009). There are dual governance structures in universities, including external members in governing bodies; the executive rector is appointed or selected by a board, which could be outside academia and universities can determine the rector's term of office (Estermann and Nokkala, 2009). UK universities receive their basic funding from the Ministry, and can allocate their internal activities autonomously (Estermann and Nokkala, 2009). Universities also have the ability to freely recruit staff. However, in terms of individual salary level, a university may decide within certain limits (Estermann and Nokkala, 2009).

3.5 Student organisation

UK HEIs have a statutory obligation to help and support their students to establish student organisations, such as the student union, or a student representative council (Baskerville et al., 2011). These organisations, on behalf of all students, engage in discussion with institutional managers and try to provide a wide range of appropriate social, sporting and community activities for students (Baskerville et al., 2011).

Most student unions focus on lobbying, campaigning, debating, carrying out other representative activities, enhancing student experience, sharing peer-led support, and providing social venues to bring their members together. The student union represents students in the university governing body for student interests, e.g. university council, and provides social support and activities.

The National Union of Students (NUS) is a voluntary membership organisation that aims to improve the lives of students and its member student unions. It is a confederation of 600 student unions, comprising more than 95 per cent of all higher education and further education student unions in the UK. It represents the interests of more than 7 million students through member unions, by promoting, defending and extending the rights of students, and developing and championing strong student unions in the UK.

3.6 Student voice

Since 2005, Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) has commissioned Ipsos MORI to run the National Student Survey (NSS) annually, on behalf of Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW), the Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland (DELNI) and Health Education England. The survey collects feedback from final-year students in universities on

the quality of their courses. Undergraduates are also asked to provide their opinions about their study in institutions. HEIs in the UK have achieved high levels of student satisfaction. According to the National Student Survey in 2013, 86 per cent of students were satisfied with their course (HEFCE, 2013b).

Students have the opportunity to attend official meetings with staff to discuss issues they are concerned with in the module or course level. For example, at the University of Southampton, the student–staff liaison committee is a forum for student representatives to participate in discussion about the quality of the degree courses and to meet staff to share their views or concerns at a course or module level. Their opinions are typically minuted with copies submitted.

A central part of student academic experience is assessment (Thomas, 2002). Individual students express their voice through student evaluation of courses/modules in the middle year or at the end of modules. They also have a placement evaluation if they have taken placements in schools or other institutions. They are also key participants during university-wide external audits. A QAA report on a university will include the content of discussions with students. The QAA uses the Institutional Review (England and Northern Ireland) method to evaluate HEIs in England and Northern Ireland for educational provision and has published a report on academic standards and quality from 2011 onwards. The regular review team consists of students, and a lead student representative, an institutional facilitator who communicates between the review team and the institution. Students are also required to submit a statement called a student written submission on their student experience in advance. All students are encouraged to take part in the review process through meetings, providing feedback and representing in committees.

As the student union is a democratic organisation, student can take part in its election process. The union elects students as representatives into a wide range of committees, positions and activities. Students are entitled to vote for their course representatives, Junior Common Room (JCR) halls committees, sabbatical, student leader and academic presidents each year in SUSU.

Students' views and experiences have played a more and more important role in universities with the introduction of tuition fees. Tuition fees were first introduced across the UK in 1998 as a way of funding tuition to undergraduate and postgraduate in universities (Alley & Smith, 2004). At that time, they were required to pay up to £1,000 a year for tuition fees (Alley & Smith, 2004). In England, the UK government raised the level of tuition fees that universities were allowed to charge to £3,000 each year, which preceded developments in the funding of HE in 2004. By 2010/2011, the cost of tuition fees increased to £3,290 a year (Lewis et al., 2010). In 2010, the Browne Review (Browne, 2010) proposed to remove the cap on tuition fees. Even though students conducted protests to oppose any increase in tuition fees (Lewis et al., 2010), the

government voted in the House of Commons to increase the maximum cost of tuition fees to £9,000 a year (BBC, 2011). After that, 64 universities announced their intention to charge £9,000 from 2012 (Shepherd and Sedghi, 2011). This made universities tend towards marketisation and regarding students as consumers. Universities need to pay more attention to the student experience and their expectations of their chosen university – the increase in tuition fees allows students to have greater expectations. They expect to gain more in their time at university, from their degree to campus life. Thus, many universities introduced a major-minor degree for students. Students are offered a free choice option. At the University of Southampton, if students take degrees in Humanities or Single Honours in Social Sciences, Education or Geography, they can choose a minor subject with their main degree. When they graduate, they will have a 'with' subject added to their degree certificate. In terms of pedagogy, The Kings Warwick Project placed importance on the co-curriculum, from which students may gain a wide range of experience through participation in, for instance, voluntary or service activities (HEFCE, 2012b). Students also expect that universities will provide advanced technology in campus, e.g. free WIFI. That is why most universities invest a large amount of money on facilities, for instance, accommodation and gym, to attract as many students as possible.

3.7 Globalisation

The UK has consistently been one of the top destinations for international students. It also has one of the largest percentages of enrolled international students, accounting for around 12 per cent of the international student market (Cemmel and Bekhradnia, 2008). Meanwhile, the UK is quite rightly encouraging Britain's universities to establish relationships and corporations with other countries through exchange programmes and setting up campuses overseas. For example, Southampton University has a campus in Malaysia and has strong relationships with many overseas universities, e.g., Xiamen University in China. HEFCE's objectives for transition in 2011 further promote international partnership in education, research and knowledge exchange.

Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the methodology used for my thesis and how it has guided data collection, analysis and development of theory. At the beginning, I discuss the quantitative method and pragmatic approach to Chapters Six, Seven and Eight that I have adopted. Chapters Six, Seven and Eight are based on quantitative analysis. The advantages and necessity of using quantitative methods in the research are also illustrated. Section 4.3 section elaborates on the dataset and data collection of the research. It explains the quantitative dataset in detail and demonstrates the specific quantitative methods. Ordered logistic regression is used in the quantitative analysis. Section 4.4 explains the specific analysis methods, their advantages and their limitations for the research. More detail into the analysis will be discussed in each article in Chapter Five, Six and Seven. The chapter concludes by explicating the analytical approach for the empirical data.

4.2 Research paradigm and research design

The paradigm is the theoretical framework of researchers (Mertens, 2005; Bogdan & Biklen, 1998), which guides the way knowledge is studied and interpreted as well as the way researchers think (Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006). The paradigm of research determines the purpose, motivation and expectations for the research (Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006; Cohen & Manion, 1994). Paradigms serve as a belief system and basis for assumptions made by research.

In this section, I begin with a brief overview of the mixed methods and pragmatic approach. Later, I describe the implementation of quantitative method in the research of student participation in university. Hillygus (2005) used quantitative method to test the relationship between HE and political behaviour.

My research uses a quantitative method approach, which uses quantitative to better understand the research questions. In the design, the quantitative data can provide holistic and basic information, and help to avoid objective bias in the data collection (Sieber, 1973). Also, the results can be generalised. This research utilises quantitative analysis on a longitudinal survey dataset. The purpose of the design is to find the relationship between student participation in university and student civic participation, and understand how to promote student civic participation through participation at university level.

Recently, I link my research methods to pragmatism, which provides the underlying philosophical framework. The research question is the central issue in the pragmatism paradigm. The pragmatist researchers pay much attention to the 'what' and 'how' of the research questions and this is applied to all methods to understand and figure out the question (Creswell et al., 2003, p.11). Therefore, all data collection and analysis methods can be chosen if they can provide insights into the question (Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006). The research in this thesis uses quantitative method design. In the first step, a descriptive analysis is conducted on the CELS data in Chapter Five, which offers a picture on young people's civic behaviour and attitudes in England. Then, the quantitative data – the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Survey (CELS) dataset – is analysed in Chapter Six using ordinal logistic regression. The Citizenship in Transition data is used in Chapter Seven. The purpose of these chapters is to justify the research topic, identify the potential predictive power of selected variables on the civic participation of university students, and provide more basic information for the second phase. Specifically, the quantitative data and results in Chapter Six provide a justification for the research topic and give a general picture of the research topic; for example, the ordered logistic regression indicates that university is an important factor in learning active citizenship in England. Furthermore, the quantitative analysis in Chapter Seven shows the relationship between student participation in university and students' active citizenship in society in the UK.

Nonetheless, the quantitative method approach also has some practical limitations. Firstly, it takes a long time to collect reasonable data, especially when collecting quantitative data for the research. The representative data collection is very time-consuming, making it an almost impossible choice for doctoral research. Therefore, I have to use a secondary data, which may limit some of the researcher questions as we cannot find suitable variables in the data.

4.3 Data collection

In this section, I explain the longitudinal dataset, along with its strengths and weakness. The qualitative data collection process is also discussed.

4.3.1 Quantitative data

The dataset for quantitative analysis is the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) dataset. The CELS data is the biggest longitudinal study about the impact of citizenship education on young people. It was continued and extended as part of Citizenships in Transition (CiT) research, which investigated how young people's citizenship practices were changing, and the role of statutory citizenship in shaping young people's citizenship. The first phase, CELS, was funded by the

Department of Education and run only by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER), while the second phase, CiT, was paid for by the ESRC and run by NFER and the University of Essex. The 2011 survey study was conducted by CiT to follow into early adulthood the young people at age 20 who took part in CELS longitudinal survey. The dataset we used extends CELS' on-going biannual survey of a cohort of young people. TNS-BMRB was commissioned to conduct the fieldwork, which consisted of 3,520 interviews with young people from three sample groups, using both face-to-face and online methodologies.

The majority of face-to-face respondents were young people aged 19–20 who had participated in a previous wave of CELS at school or in their sixth-form college. In fact, 1,232 interviews were conducted, out of 2,165 issued records. Additionally, there was a small top-up sample of young people who had not taken part in previous CELS waves. The sample was designed to correct regional and gender imbalance in the longitudinal sample. The same face-to-face method was used for the top-up sample. The completed interviews numbered 279 from a selected sample of 526 records.

A cross-sectional web survey was also used to capture the views of respondents aged between 18 and 25 in England, Scotland and Wales. However, I only have the English data from the CELS data, so the samples in the analysis are from England. Participants who had not taken part in any previous wave of CELS participated through an online panel. 2,010 interviews were conducted through the cross-sectional survey.

The CELS dataset is the only large-scale and reliable dataset that is available on higher education students and citizenship in the UK. It had a very broad range of questions. There is the potential to learn useful information from this dataset about the active citizenship of university students and how they compare to non-university students in the UK. This dataset also provides us with an overview of the general situation of university students in the UK. The limitation of this dataset, in terms of the research questions, is that it does not allow me to perform comparisons with other countries. The attrition of longitudinal data has also posed a potential threat of bias, as some participants in the earlier round dropped out of the study and some new participants joined in round five. Furthermore, in some analyses, the rate of missing cases is very high.

The dataset will be described in detail in Chapter Five, Six and Seven.

4.4 Data analysis

This section describes the quantitative analysis of CELS data in detail with its sample size, attrition and analytical procedures, as well as the qualitative analysis. It explains the ordinal logistic regression method and its implementation in the research. The interview analysis process is also discussed explicitly.

4.4.1 Quantitative analysis

This section briefly introduces the quantitative analysis, and more detailed information about analysis procedure will be discussed in each article chapter, that is, chapter Five, chapter Six and Chapter Seven.

Before the statistical analysis of the CELS data, I performed an overview of the dataset including the descriptive statistics for related variables, information about the cases, the missing data, normality, and frequency. Descriptive statistics for this dataset was summarized in the text and reported in Chapter Five. Frequencies analysis was conducted to identify a valid percentage for responses to interested questions and provide overview information on the civic behaviour of young people in the UK. It also included a comparison of civic behaviour between university students and non-university youngsters. The total number of young people aged 19–20 in the dataset was 1,510, including 642 university students and 868 young people not in university.

First of all, I provided a justification for the research topic of university influence on young people's active citizenship in the UK through quantitative analysis on the last three waves of CELS data. The research question 'Does university exert influence on young people's active citizenship in England?' in Chapter Six has determined the statistical test and analysis method in the study. The purpose of the chapter is to correctly predict the influence of university on young people's active citizenship in England. The outcome variables (dependent variables) – intentions for future active citizenship – were ordinal, that is, definitely to do, likely to do, not likely to do and definitely not to do. Therefore, ordinal logistic regression was appropriate for the study. In statistics, logistic regression is a type of probabilistic statistical classification model (Bishop, 2006). It estimates the probability of an event occurring (e.g. the probability of young people voting in general elections) compared to not occurring (e.g. the probability of young people not voting in general elections) (Field, 2013). What we want to predict from the relevant predictor variables is not the exact numerical value of a dependent variable, but rather the probability (p) that it is 1 (event occurring) compared to 0 (event not occurring) (Field, 2013). It is used to predict the relationship between an outcome variable and one or more predictor variables, where the

outcome variable is categorical and predictor variables are categorical or continuous (Field, 2013). When the outcome variable is ordinal, the analysis is ordinal logistic regression (Field, 2013).

In this study, the latest three waves of CELS data were used. However, the missing data rate is high in the dataset. The total number of cases was 1,494, including 232 cases in analysis. The missing rate in the analysis was high as it involved variables from three waves, which led to the attrition. It is common that some participants withdraw in later rounds of longitudinal surveys and attrition in longitudinal studies is a common problem (Deng et al., 2013). However, this is simply ignored in most research, where the analysis is based on those who completed all waves of study (Deng et al., 2013). However, attrition may reduce the effective sample size, or even worse, result in substantial biases in the statistical inferences (Deng et al., 2013). It is, therefore, important to handle attrition in the research, although it is not possible to determine how much the attrition degrades the analysis relying on the collected data alone, and external information is required. One of the possible sources of external information is refreshment samples, which collect information from new and randomly chosen respondents who are interviewed or answer questionnaires at the second or subsequent waves of longitudinal studies (Deng et al., 2013).

In the longitudinal sample there was a small top-up sample of young people who had not previously taken part in CELS but who were selected to participate in the face-to-face survey. The top-up sample was designed to correct for bias in the longitudinal sample caused by attrition across waves and was handled in the same way as the longitudinal sample, with both groups completing the same face to face questionnaire.

In this way, the refreshment samples are used to handle the attrition for my study. Multiple imputation is a very common method to deal with attrition, but it is not suitable for this study. This is because the missing data rate is too high, thus the imputed data would not be reliable. For this reason, we use weighting to make the sample representative of the target population, as weighting data can help correct sample non-representativeness (Peck, 2001). The weighting methods appropriate for my study based on the CELS data are discussed below.

In order to represent the whole population, rim weighting (Sharot, 1986) is used in the data. Rim weighting is designed to 'minimise the weighting adjustments needed to make sample marginal distributions similar to target population marginal distributions' according to a mathematical algorithm (Kalton and Flores-Cervantes, 2003, p.87). It helps provide an even distribution of results from the whole dataset, while balancing certain categories such as gender to a pre-determined proportion (Snap Survey). It can weigh the specified characteristics simultaneously. In the study, the weight variable is created based on the proportion of gender, region and ethnicity of young people in England. As these proportions may change over time, the weight variable was

created according to the data from national statistics in the year 2009 (the fourth wave of CELS data), 2010 (the fifth wave of CELS data) and 2014 (the sixth wave of CELS data). The weight helps the data match the target population, which allows some cases to have more 'weights' in the analyses because sometimes they were under- or over-sampled from a group, as well as removing some of the effect of attrition. Therefore, I ran the analysis with weights for each case so that the groups would more closely resemble the proportions we had hoped to sample. The ordered logistic regression with between and within effects is used in the analysis to try to draw a causal relationship based on the longitudinal data. With between and within effects, it is possible to remove the time-invariant factors of individuals, for example, intelligence. The before and after university intentions are also taken into consideration.

After the analysis on university influence on young people's active citizenship in the England, I investigated the CELS data further. Based on the literature, the community of practice theory is used to help explain active citizenship learning in university. Researchers believe that university could promote active citizenship because students could acquire knowledge and skills through participating in organisations and groups and interacting with others at university. The university experience also helps to develop a student's identity, which encourages them to learn active citizenship. Thus, I used the quantitative method to examine community of practice theory and investigate the research question 'Does citizenship practice at university influence future active citizenship of young people in the England?' Similarly, ordinal logistic regression was also used in the study, following the same procedure as the previous analysis. The total number of cases is 1,520, including around 1,337 cases in analysis. The results of this analysis are reported in text and tables in Chapter Six. I measured active citizenship in voting, voluntary and protest activities in the Citizenship in Transition data, which is the fifth wave of the CELS dataset. These variables were measured based on the literature and dataset. Young people's backgrounds were taken into consideration. Gender, parents' educational level, number of books owned at home, and previous citizenship education were control variables. The cases summary provided the information of cases in analysis and missing cases. The -2 log likelihood and R^2 showed the significance of the model and how well the model fitted to the data. The change of classification rate and -2 log likelihood indicated whether or not the model had improved compared to the previous model. The significance of variables indicated whether or not variables have a statistical effect. In the analysis, I used 10% significance as the criterion; that is, a significance rate below 10% means it is significant. The odds ratio demonstrated the actual effect of variables compared to reference variables when other variables were controlled.

All statistical analyses of the quantitative results were conducted with the IBM Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Statistical software, version 22.0, or Stata SE 13. The results of the quantitative analysis were discussed and then further explored in the qualitative phase.

4.5 Introduction to Analytical Content

The following chapters form the analysis of the thesis, beginning with a chapter (Chapter Five) that provides an overview of the data using descriptive statistics of the CELS data. This chapter provides a brief picture of young people's political and civic engagement and their civic attitude by comparing university students and non-university young people. After this, there will be two articles rather than conventional thesis chapters, forming Chapter Six and Chapter Seven. The first of these is the justification for the research on higher education and active citizenship, answering the question 'Does HE influence young people's active citizenship in England?'. The core issue to be addressed in Chapter Six is whether or not citizenship is promoted by education. This clearly has important implications for academia and public policy, as if civic behaviours cannot significantly be influenced by education, then the prospects for improving citizenship education in HE are limited. On the other hand, if education influences citizenship then it is possible that it might be improved by appropriate education. Educational attainment measured by years of education has been widely reported as leading to higher levels of political participation. The theory is that education plays an important role in a person's civic skills and cognitive capacity, helping them understand and connect with the world of politics and be able to defend their interests (Nie et al 1996). However, a number of studies argue that education has no effect on political engagement as educational attainment has been identified as a proxy for socioeconomic background and intelligence. In particular, some research has identified that going to university has no effect on political engagement (Kam and Palmer 2008). The hypothesis tested in Chapter Six is that university can promote young people's active citizenship. If the university has a significantly positive impact on young people's active citizenship, the hypothesis is likely to be true. In order to test these hypotheses and to examine whether university has an effect on active citizenship, ordered logit models are used on waves four to six of the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study with between and within effects. We include control measures of previous citizenship education. The results suggest that university has a positive independent effect on voting and volunteering, but not on protest, in the future.

After confirming the positive effect of university on active citizenship, the second article further explores the following question: how does university promote young people's active citizenship learning in the UK based on Citizenship in Transition dataset? University can be understood as a

key site for the transmission of democratic values by providing the opportunity for young people to participate directly in democratic activities and education. In this regard, it is important for those involved in HE in the UK to understand whether or not and how learning citizenship is taking place. This article uses the 2011 Citizenship in Transition (CiT) data to examine how the university experience might influence student citizenship. Previous research on youth engagement has indicated that prior experience of participation could facilitate active citizenship. In community of practice theory, people can learn through engagement and constructing their identity in the community. Thus, I propose the hypothesis that experience at university, including the practice of citizenship and self-identity gained at university, promotes students to be active citizens who participate more in civic and political activities in the future. If the participation in groups or activities and students' belongingness are positively correlated with young people's future civic behaviour, the hypothesis is likely to be true. To test this hypothesis, ordinal logistic regression is used to explore whether voting, participation in and volunteering in organisations, and identity gained at university facilitate student citizenship in the future. In the analysis, control variables are also included. The results show that students' sense of belonging to their universities, as well as participation in activities and organisations, promote their active citizenship, such as voting, engaging in a protest and undertaking voluntary activities.

With the information in these papers, I can conduct a detailed investigation on the informal learning of active citizenship in HE in the UK. I use constructivist learning theory, community of practice, to help explore and understand how active citizenship learning takes place in universities.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has introduced and discussed the choice of quantitative methods as a suitable research methodology for the research. The quantitative method approach will therefore be used to provide holistic pictures of student citizenship in universities in the UK, the relationship between student participation in university and future participation, and to identify ways to encourage students to participate more in university. This chapter has explained in detail the specific data collection and analysis. The quantitative analyses on CiT and CELS data have been conducted to provide an overview of civic behaviour of young people in the UK, and explore the relationship between university and active citizenship as well as the relationship between university citizenship practice active citizenship in the UK.

Chapter 5: Descriptive Analysis of Civic Behaviour of Young People in England Based on the CELS Dataset

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the descriptive analysis on civic behaviour of young people in the UK, particularly university students. It presents data from the CELS (Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study) and Citizenship in Transition (CiT) datasets of 2011, which surveyed young people aged 18–25 in the England. The descriptive analysis enables us to know the civic attitudes and behaviour of young people in the England, including voting and participation. It also explores differences in civic attitude and behaviour between university students and non-university students in England. In the last section, the implications and proposal for further research are discussed.

5.2 Dataset and limitations

The information and limitations about the dataset is provided in detail in section 4.3.1 in Chapter Four.

5.3 Results

5.3.1 Overall basic description

The total number of young people aged 19–20 in this study was 1,510. The number of university students was 642. Those who were not in university numbered 868. These latter participants included people on a course at college/sixth-form college, on a course at a training provider, in an apprenticeship, in another job with training, in a job without training, looking after the home, taking a break from work/study, looking for a school or college, looking for a training course, looking for a job, and something else (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1. Groups of young people in CELS dataset

Category		Number	%
University students	Total	642	100

Category		Number	%
Non-university students	Total	868	100
	On a course at college/sixth form college	149	17.2
	On a course at a training provider	19	2.2
	In an Apprenticeship/ Advanced Apprenticeship	50	5.8
	In another job with training	234	27
	In a job without training	265	30.5
	Looking after home/family	32	3.7
	Taking a break from work/study	28	3.2
	Looking for a school/college course	11	1.3
	Looking for a training course	7	0.8
	Something else	37	4.3
	Don't know	1	0.1

The questionnaire contained a variety of different closed responses. For the binary questions, the answer will only be YES or NO. For most other questions, the scale had five options ranging from 'disagree strongly' to 'agree strongly'. For a few questions, the scale was composed of four items, ranging from 'not at all' to 'completely'.

Only around half of the students agree that it is every adult's duty to vote in elections (Table 5.2) and less than 20 per cent of students agree or strongly agree that taking part in clubs or groups is every young person's duty (Table 5.2). In addition, students showed their low interest in politics, as only around two thirds of students showed much interest in what is going on in politics (Table 5.2). However, in practice, most of students in university have voted in elections, mostly in a general election, a local election for the local council and a school/college election. About three quarters of students voted in the general election in May 2012 (Table 5.3). University students have also taken part in activities, some clubs or groups, and political or social issues. A majority of students have done volunteering for some groups, clubs or organisations and the motivation for volunteering was that they thought volunteering would benefit them, e.g. getting a better job or get into university in the future (Table 5.2). About 70 per cent of university students have given help to various groups and organisations (Table 5.3), for example, helped to organise or run an

event (Table 5.4). However, they are less likely to help political organisations, e.g. by donating money to a political party or cause (Table 5.4).

Table 5.2. Civic attitude and behaviour of university students and non-university young people

	Questions		Mean	Agree and Agree strongly	N	Std. Deviation
Attitude to vote and participate	It is every adult's duty to vote in elections	students	3.44	57.30%	641	1.04
		non-students	3.04	34.20%	868	1.02
	Taking part in clubs or groups is every young person's duty	students	2.67	17.70%	642	0.88
		non-students	2.64	16.3%	862	0.88
Politics	Interest in politics*	students	2.83	37.00%	642	1.00
		non-students	3.47	16.7%	866	1.04
	Politics has an impact on everything we do	students	4.03	83.60%	642	0.75
		non-students	3.77	71.8%	849	0.88
Politics and social activities	Use the Internet#	students	3.95	99.20%	642	0.27
		non-students	3.79	95.7	868	0.55
	Watch the news on television#	students	3.28	80.70%	642	0.86
		non-students	3.17	78.4	868	0.94
	Use the Internet to read news sites#	students	3.22	79.00%	641	0.9
		non-students	2.43	47.6	854	1.14
	Use the internet to write a blog about politics or current affairs#	students	1.19	4.40%	641	0.52
		non-students	1.15	2.6	856	0.45
A good citizen:	should obey the law	students	4.35	93.90%	642	0.68
		non-students	4.16	89.2	822	0.7

	Questions		Mean	Agree and Agree strongly	N	Std. Deviation
	should take an interest in local and community issues	students	3.72	74.30%	641	0.68
		non-students	3.61	64.5	859	0.69
	should participate in activities to benefit people in the community	students	3.72	71.20%	640	0.67
		non-students	3.61	63.1	859	0.73
	should join a political party	students	2.56	12.10%	639	0.68
		non-students	2.71	15.6	844	0.8
Volunteering	Taking part in optional activities is a good way to meet interesting people	students	4.24	95.30%	641	0.56
		non-students	4.01	86.5	863	0.59
	Doing voluntary work may help me to get a better job in the future	students	4.17	90.00%	642	0.69
		non-students	3.89	77.9	862	0.77
	Doing lots of activities may help me to get ahead in life	students	4.16	90.50%	642	0.65
		non-students	3.78	73.3	863	0.76
Feeling	Feel part of University	students	3.11	84.30%	641	0.66
	Feel part of work place	non-students	3.17	87.7	484	0.66
	Feel part of Europe	students	2.2	29.30%	614	0.78
		non-students	1.94	18.2	813	0.77
	Influence the way my university is run	students	3.23	49.40%	637	0.98

	Questions		Mean	Agree and Agree strongly	N	Std. Deviation
	Influence the way my work place is run	non-students	3.43	58.5	486	1.03

Normally, a high score means a higher degree of agreement and participation.

* In the interest in politics category, a higher score reflects lower interest.

means that the range of the mean is 4, while for the others it is 5.

Table 5.3. Binary questions relating to voting and participation

Questions		%	N
Voted in the general election in May 2010	students	76.50	642
	non-students	48.2	868
Have ever taken part in activities	students	74	642
	non-students	38.9	868
Have ever taken part in some clubs or groups	students	73.2	642
	non-students	44	868
Have ever taken part in political or social issues	students	81.8	642
	non-students	59.1	868
Signed a petition or email/online petition	students	65.1	642
	non-students	37.8	868
Joined a Facebook group about a political or social issue	students	53.7	642
	non-students	33.2	868
Started a Twitter campaign about a political or social issue	students	1.4	642
	non-students	0.3	868
Have ever given any help to any groups, clubs or organisations	students	70.1	642
	non-students	49.3	868

Chapter 5

In university, what students learned most in everyday life related to rights and responsibilities, different cultures and ethnic groups, the media, voting and elections (see Table 6.4). The students understood citizenship to mean people's rights, working together to make things better, people's responsibilities and obeying the law. They felt much more a part of their universities than they did of their neighbourhood and country. Most of them, to a large extent, agreed that a good citizen should obey the law, take interest in issues in the local community and participate in activities that benefit people in the community. Students in universities are likely to read news in newspapers (national), and see it on television and online news sites, but they rarely look for social or political information, discuss or write about social and political issues (Table 5.2).

Table 5.4 Binary questions for university students and non-university young people

Questions	students	%	N	non-students	%	N
In the last year, have taken part in these activities	Electing student union or council representatives	51.4	642	Raising money for a good cause or charity	27.8	868
	Electing staff council member or trade union representatives	0.8	642	Electing staff council member or trade union representatives	1.8	868
Taken part in these clubs or groups	Sports clubs/teams	41.9	642	Sports clubs/teams	29.4	868
	Student union or student council	23.8	642	Staff council	0.8	868
Given help to groups, clubs or organisations	Helped to organise or run an event	37.6	642	Helped to organise or run an event	22.6	868
	Donated money to a political party or cause	16.7	642	Been part of committee for a group or club	7.5	868
Learned in university or work place	Media	62.6	642	Rights and responsibility	53.6	868
	Different cultures and ethnic groups	62.3	642	Crime and punishment	44.9	868
	Voting and elections	60.6	642	The environment	41.7	868
	Rights and responsibilities	57.6	642	Different cultures and ethnic groups	41.2	868

Questions	students	%	N	non-students	%	N
	Resolving conflict*	33.6	642	The global community and international organisation*	16.2	868
Meaning of citizenship	People's rights (e.g. health, education, jobs, housing)	45.6	642	People's rights (e.g. health, education, jobs, housing)	41.7	868
	Working together to make things better	41.4	642	Making sure everyone is treated fairly	38.7	868
	People's responsibilities and obeying the law	36.6	642	Working together to make things better	36.8	868
Civic knowledge	Min voting age is 18	98.8	335	Min voting age is 18	95.3	214
	Only vote in elections for Euro Parliament if already voted in British election	35.7	333	Countries that join EU must be democracies	29.7	212

*This group was the least chosen option for university students and non-university young people.

5.3.2 Comparison with non-university participants

Generally, participants who were not at university in England showed a lower degree of civic behaviour than university students, based on the CELS dataset.

According to Table 5.2, people not in university are less inclined to participate in all kinds of groups and activities than people in universities. Fewer non-university participants have ever taken part in any clubs and groups and activities. Although some of them participated in groups or clubs, most of them did this in their spare time rather than as a part of work. More young people in universities have done volunteering than people not in university. The participation in political activities has the same trend. Non-university participants also thought volunteering was good for their future job or life, but the degree of agreement is less than students in universities and colleges.

In terms of voting, only half of them agreed voting was every adult's duty to vote in elections. About half of non-university participants have voted in any elections, in comparison to 86.6 per cent of students in universities. There are only a few people not in universities who have voted in

club or group elections, or work or staff elections. In the general election on 6 May 2010, under half of non-university young people managed to vote, compared to much more than half of people in universities. Those not in universities also showed less interest in politics. Non-university people are not very interested in politics even though they also agree that politics has an influence on everything they do, including work or training. They also felt that they were part of their work or training institution. Around half of them thought they could have a real influence on governance if they got involved, and felt they had influence on the way their work place is run.

What non-university young people learned most in work or training concerned crime and punishment, environment, although the percentage is smaller than for people in universities. They learned most of those topics as a part of work. Similar to university students, most of them agreed that a good citizen should obey the law, while just over half of them agreed a good citizen should take an interest in local and community issues, and participate in activities to benefit people in the community. The three things that can best describe citizenship for non-university young people are people's rights, fair treatment everyone and working together to make things better (Table 5.4).

5.4 Themes

5.4.1 Voting

Young people in the England are likely to be more liberal in their democratic norms as they did not regard voting in elections and participation in groups or clubs as a duty for individuals. They do not have a very positive attitude towards voting and election, as only a few of them thought voting and participation was a duty (Table 5.2). However, their actual voting and participation seemed to be better. Students at university, in contrast to non-students, tend to be involved in elections. Three quarters of students in university voted in the general election in May 2010 (Table 5.3). University students had more knowledge of their right to vote rather than of specific election processes, particularly in European Union elections (Table 5.4). Comparatively, non-university participants showed a lower voting rate in elections and civic participation (Table 5.3), and a less positive attitude towards voting and participation (Table 5.4).

5.4.2 Political engagement

In the liberal model, people care more about individual interest and freedom than politics. Young people in England showed a relatively low interest in politics even though they thought politics had an impact on everything they did. This result indicates that young people in England tend to

be liberal in terms of democratic norms. Only a minority of university students supported a political party and would like to join a political party or take part in local politics in the future. Nine per cent of them intended to write to a Member of Parliament (MP) if they were confronted by something they thought was wrong. However, most university students had taken part in political or social issues. In particular, they tend to get involved in political or social issues online. According to the dataset, young people were inclined to care more about what was going on rather than try to initiate a political or social activity. Non-university young people showed much lower levels of participation in political or social activities. Young people are likely to read news in newspapers, see it on television and on online news sites, but they rarely try to look for information on, discuss or write about social and political issues.

5.4.3 Volunteering

Most university students had taken part in volunteering. However, few of them had given help to political organisations, for example, donated money to a political party or cause. In addition, the reason they participated in volunteering was for the sake of their own interest rather than the common good. They thought volunteering would benefit them, e.g. get into a university or get promotion in work. This relates to the liberal model in democracy, where people focus more on their own interest rather than common good. Therefore, they would probably volunteer if they thought voluntary activities could bring them benefits.

5.4.4 Concepts of citizenship/ citizenship model

In the liberal model of democracy, people focus on individual interests, rights and freedom. They also pay more attention to their local community than the whole nation. Young people in England thought a good citizen should obey the law, take an interest in local and community issues, and participate in activities to benefit people in the community. And they do not agree a good citizen should join a political party. This tends to be a more liberal outlook. Citizenship means people's rights, working together to make things better, and people's responsibilities and obeying the law. This relates to individual's rights, the common good and responsibilities respectively, two of which are related to the civic republican model in democracy. Therefore, students in England tend to be a mix of liberal and civic republican in terms of citizenship. In comparison, non-university participants paid more attention to rights, social justice and the common good. Additionally, even though they felt part of university, not many university students felt they had any influence on how the university was run.

In university, students learned most about media, different cultures and ethnic groups, voting and elections, and rights and responsibilities. The liberal model in democracy emphasises individual rights and tolerance. The civic republican model focuses on duty and the common good. Thus, the university environment tends to be a combination of liberal and civic republican as well and it also paid attention to giving students knowledge about voting and elections. In comparison, non-university participants learned much less in the work place (see Table 5.4); nor could they learn much about voting and elections in their work place. Thus, university tends to be a better environment to impart more civic knowledge to young people, both in the classroom and on campus. University is a place to transmit democratic value and knowledge.

5.5 Key questions and implication for future research

5.5.1 Key questions/findings

The descriptive analysis indicates that young people in England tend to be liberal in democracy, especially non-university young people. They do not have a strongly positive attitude towards civic behaviour, particularly politics. However, university students showed a higher degree of participation and voting than non-university young people. Even though they showed low interest in politics, university students participated more in political and volunteering activities than non-university young people did.

Even though the findings from the CELS dataset concerning young people in England are interesting, we cannot ignore the limitations of the datasets. The findings may be not very generalisable as the sample of the datasets is not very large. We also cannot compare results with other countries as the dataset is only for England. However, the datasets could be a beginning for research on student participation in universities.

The findings showed a difference in civic behaviour between university students and non-university young people. Among other reasons, university could be one of the important factors leading to the differences, by providing opportunities for young people to learn and practice citizenship. Thus, further research on factors at university that motivate students and enable them to perceive their influence would be of considerable importance.

5.5.2 Implications and plan for qualitative research and quantitative analysis

Based on the descriptive analysis of the CELS dataset, we can conduct qualitative research such as interviews to understand the reason why students in university participate in all kinds of activities,

the difference between university students' attitude towards participation and actual participation behaviour, how students perceive their influence, and how university motivates students to participate more.

As for quantitative analysis, we can conduct logistic regression to identify factors in university leading to more engagement. Before that, I may create a scale to indicate the level of participation by university students.

Chapter 6: University's Effect on Young People's Active Citizenship in England

6.1 Introduction

There is a considerable amount of literature (both theoretical and empirical) that shows the connections between education and active citizenship or democracy (e.g. Torney-Purta et al., 2001; Milligan et al., 2004; Dee, 2004, Pattie et al., 2004). Specifically, Almond and Verba (1963) claim that educational attainment, in most studies of political attitudes, seems to have the most important statistical effect on political attitudes, compared with other variables including gender, place of residence, occupation, income, age, and so on. Putnam (2000) also claims the relationship between education and citizenship by stating that education is a very important and powerful predictor of political engagement. Even though scholars suggest that education is important and powerful in boosting citizenship, there is limited research on citizenship education in higher education (Veugelers et al., 2014). While higher education is widely regarded as a tool for economic development, it is also advocated to be strongly related to social cohesion, equity and democracy, as well as the empowerment of individuals (Dewey, 2004; Colby et al., 2000; Veugelers et al., 2014; UNESCO, 1998). Higher education institutions are not only an important part of society; they also play an important role in it (Bergan, 2003). However, in the United Kingdom, the role of HE in citizenship has been historically neglected (Annette, 2010), similar to Englund's (2002) view that education for citizenship and democracy has been seen to be more associated with the compulsory school system than with HE.

In the United States, many HE institutions have engaged extensively in preparing their students to be citizens of society. In 1999, the 'President's Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education' was established by the national organisation Campus Compact, and was written for the Advancement of Teaching in citizenship. Later on in 2004, about 528 presidents of universities and colleges in the United States signed the declaration. Furthermore, many researchers in United States have identified the importance of HE in active citizenship from various perspectives (Colby et al., 2007). After quantitative analysis of 481 college students participating in a survey before and after their courses and programmes in the United States, Beaumont et al. (2006) have demonstrated that at the HE level particular educational interventions with a focus on political engagement can promote many dimensions of democratic participation, including expectations for future political activity. In Europe, some researchers have also realised the importance of higher education in democracy and citizenship (Plantan, 2002; Boland 2005; Bergan, 2003). In the

study of universities as sites of citizenship and civic responsibility, Plantan (2002) proposes that 'universities can become key institutions for the transmission of democratic values through direct engagement in democratic activities and democratic education on campus' (p.6). Similarly, Boland (2005) argues that higher education has an important role to play in the democratic socialisation process, and participation in shared governance demonstrates a significant opportunity to address democratic fatigue and to contribute to the preparation of students for their future role as democratic citizens and as members of civil society. Through participation in university, it is argued that students acquire knowledge about citizenship and democracy (Bleiklie, 2001). Meanwhile, they are able to practice citizenship in university in order to acquire the necessary skills for future participation. Lastly, the experience of participation in university will improve their self-efficacy if they perceive they can exert influence on a university (Bleiklie, 2001).

In the UK, according to Sloam (2013), the large participation gap between college students and other young people indicates the great importance of universities and colleges in enhancing civic and political engagement. A study comparing between cohorts (1958 cohort and 1970 cohort) and across ages (1958 cohorts) finds that graduates show a higher probability of voting in general elections, and higher rates of participation in voluntary organisations (Bynner et al. 2003). The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) has also recognised the role of universities in promoting citizenship in its Strategic Plan for the period 2006 to 2011 by pointing out that 'graduates, on average, are more likely to vote in elections, more tolerant to other ethnicities, and more likely to be involved in their local communities through voluntary activities' (HEFCE, 2006, p.42). Meanwhile, some studies have also used different methods to examine whether education has a causal effect on political participation; however, most of them mainly focus on voting and protesting – see literature in Persson (2014). Our study has extended the scope of political participation to active citizenship in the UK. Also, few studies employ longitudinal data including measurements of the dependent variable before the educational episode or intervention of interest to investigate the effects of education on political engagement (Hoskins and Janmaat, 2016). These studies can better draw causal relationships than those relying on cross-sectional data or on longitudinal data without prior measures of the outcome (Persson, 2012). Although experimental designed studies do generally entail such prior measurements (e.g. Sondheimer and Green, 2010), the sample in such experiments is usually very small (Hoskins and Janmaat, 2016). This can limit the scope of the findings of these studies. Therefore, it is imperative to study effects of higher education on citizenship with larger and preferably nationally representative longitudinal data. This would provide a better and broader, even though still not conclusive, assessment of the net effect of a phase of education and of the durability of this effect (Paterson, 2009; Janmaat et al., 2014). This article explores the effects of HE on young people's active

citizenship in England with the latest data of the nationally representative Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS). Furthermore, it includes variables of young people's intention to engage in voting, protesting and volunteering before entering, during and after HE. In this article, the ordered logit regression hybrid model that can help remove the innate and time-invariant factors in the analysis is used to find out whether going to university leads to voting, protesting and volunteering of young people when background variables were controlled for with the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) dataset.

This article brings the following contributions to the debates. It extends the research on political participation to active citizenship including political and civic participation, and uses hybrid models to get a causal relationship between education and citizenship. Also, the study uses the latest national representative longitudinal data in England and test different theories about education and citizenship. The data includes three waves data and variables measuring young people's intention before entering, during and after HE that are not included in the previous studies. It helps to draw a causal relationship. The results show significant relationship between higher education and voting and volunteering i.e., the education as a cause view is supported. However, the relationship between university and protesting is insignificant, which is the new finding in the field.

In the article, we first review theories concerning active citizenship as well as the relationship between higher education and active citizenship. Then, we explain the method used in the study, introduce the dataset and outline the variables used. After that, we present the results of the test, and conclude with a discussion.

6.2 Active citizenship

The concept of active citizenship is a key focus of the article, thus it is important to discuss it first. Citizenship is a contested and developing concept, and active citizenship is mainly used in the education field. Many researchers have used this term when discussing citizenship education (Kerr and Nelson, 2006; Kennedy, 2007, Jansen et. al., 2006). Active citizenship puts emphasis on the active process according to policy development in England (Kerr and Nelson, 2006). Participation is a central part of active citizenship in the EU policy goals (de Weerd et al., 2005). Active citizenship is found to focus on 'a more participatory form of citizenship that involves the development of citizenship education as an active process' in many countries (Kerr and Nelson, 2006, p.6). It is fundamentally about engagement and participation in society and focuses on participation in both civil and civic society (Kerr and Nelson, 2006). Haahr (1997) defines active

citizens as having civic, political and social rights through participatory practices at various levels. Active citizenship thus includes engagement in political and social contexts and production of common demand in daily life. Citizenship is defined in terms of attitudes, norms, values and, in particular, behaviour (Pattie et al., 2004). The behaviour is related to political participation, which involves political activities 'such as voting, joining interest groups, contacting public officials and campaigning', as well as 'protesting, taking part in demonstrations and being involved in political strikes, and talking about politics with other people and taking an interest in political matters' (p.24). Furthermore, citizenship means much more than political involvement as it also involves a wide range of voluntary activities, including 'informal activities with friends, relatives and neighbours and formal membership in various organisations' (p.24). The definition of citizenship consists of several important themes, including civil society, community and political life and democratic values (Hoskins et al., 2012b). In the concept, participation in civil society is an important focus, which means the 'sum of institutions, organisations, and individuals located between the family, the state and the market in which people associated voluntarily to advance common interests' (Anheier, 2004, p.20). Hoskins (2006) defines active citizenship as 'Participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterised by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy.' (p.6). There are also critical reviews of the concept of active citizenship. Biesta and Lawy (2009) argue that active citizenship is depoliticising with a strong focus on consensus in the underlying conception of democracy. Also, it regards civic learning as a form of socialisation which reproduces the current socio-political order. Hence, they think 'the citizenship is more political than social, more concerned about collective than individual learning, that acknowledges the role of conflict and contestation, and that is less aimed at integration and reproduction of the existing order but also allows for forms of political agency that question the particular construction of the political order' (p.154). In this context, citizenship should be seen as a public identity rather than an individual one. Even so, active citizenship is still the focus of the article since active citizenship allow us to act on and realise our understandings of the world (Jackson, 2012). Moreover, active citizenship as a part of lifelong learning is broadly recognised in education field. (DGEC of the European Commission, 2007).

Based on this definition, this article describes active citizenship as action in political life – voting and protest, and activities in civil society or community volunteering (Yang and Hoskins, forthcoming). Voting is a form of representative democracy, which is generally seen as one of the most important manifestations of democracy where citizens are able to influence the government and political decision-making (de Weerd et al., 2005). Elections are important as 'they select political elites, provide a source of democratic legitimacy, and engage the mass public in the democratic process' (Dalton, 2015).

Furthermore, many researchers have found that the scope of political participation has extended, and include protest as an important form (Barnes and Kaase, 1979; Jennings and van Deth, 1989; Meyer and Tarrow, 1998; Roefs, 2003, cited in de Weerd et al., 2005). Protest activities, a more intensive form of participation, aim to act or express a voice to influence decision-making. It serves as a critical voice of democracy process, and makes the government accountable. The 2013 LSE Enterprise study shows that European 16- to 26-year old young people find 'the political offer does not match their concerns, ideas, and ideal of democratic politics' when they reflect on voting and institutional politics. Meanwhile, there are high levels of youth participation in protest activities and issue-oriented activism (Bennett, 2008). The new generation of young people are seen as 'actualizing citizens who favour loosely networked activism to address issues that reflect personal values', in contrast with 'dutiful citizens', who keep a more collective and government-centred set of practices (Bennett, 2007, p.61). The economic crisis has also given the ideal conditions for accelerating youth protests (Amna and Ekman, 2013), which has enhanced the political participation (through digital participation) among highly educated youth looking for a mouthpiece for their 'indignation' (Bennett and Segerberg, 2012). Protest can focus on specific issues or policy goals—from protecting environment to protesting the local policies—and 'can convey a high level of political information with real political force' (Dalton, 2015, p.55). Therefore, those who advocate protest stress that citizens can promote their political influence by taking a strategy of direct action (Dalton, 2015). New ways of communications, especially digitally networked action helps in an era of increasingly personalised political participation, especially protesting (Bennett and Segerberg, 2012).

As Dalton and Pattie argue, patterns of citizenship are changing, and an increasing number of young people prefer to participate in voluntary activities. Therefore, volunteering is also regarded as a key part of civil society (Dekker & Halman, 2003), which is conducted to make a contribution to the community (de Weerd et al., 2005). It is one of many forms of citizen participation (Verba et al., 1995) and is important for active citizenship (de Tocqueville, 1988). Therefore, the article uses these three dimensions to measure active citizenship.

From previous literature, we can be aware of the importance of HE in promoting active citizenship, and then comes the question: how can higher education influence active citizenship? This is discussed in the following section.

6.3 How can higher education influence active citizenship?

There are theories regarding how higher education is related to active citizenship. The widely accepted hypothesis is that university could help to develop knowledge to understand politics and

skills for active citizenship. HE can be argued to be important for political participation because it can provide more knowledge, skills, attitude and political familiarity for individuals to participate in more complex political activities (Verba et al., 1995; Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Hillygus, 2005; Campbell, 2006). This means people who accept HE are more likely to have gained these competences and to be politically engaged. HE does not only prepare a citizen to vote, but also helps them to have 'a reasoned and deliberative decision making' process (Hillygus, 2005, p.27). Research suggests that HE could promote the cognitive skills that are necessary to gain, process, and analyse political information; meanwhile, it helps improve motivation and provides the opportunity to practice citizenship (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Nie et al., 1996). Campbell (2006) refers to the cognitive development through education as the factor promoting civic engagement (absolute model). He employs the European Social Survey (ESS) to test the absolute education model in multiple European nations, and finds strong evidence for it in voting, expressive political activity (protesting) and voluntary association.

6.3.1 Education as a proxy

Even though it seems that most researchers have reached an agreement that education has influenced civic and political engagement, there are some scholars that argue that education has no effect on active citizenship (Desjardins, 2008). Botstein argues that there is very little empirical justification for liberal learning as 'the presumed civic and cultural benefits of going to college continue to elude us' (2005, p.211). Recently, political scientists have argued that education has no effect on political engagement as educational attainment has been identified as a proxy for socioeconomic background (Persson, 2014). Persson uses quantitative analysis with British Cohort 1970 data, and concludes that educational attainment serves only as a proxy for people's socioeconomic background rather than a cause of political participation. He also claims cognitive ability, cultural activities and parents' education are strong predictors for both educational attainment and political participation from the analysis.

An alternative theory exists, examining the influence of intelligence, which suggests that education increases active citizenship because intelligence decides their political participation rather than education itself (Jencks et al., 1972; Olneck and Crouse, 1979). People with higher intelligence tend to get more education and participate more.

Additionally, it is acknowledged that many other factors have influenced citizenship of young people, such as socioeconomic background, parents and their citizenship education in school (Colby et al., 2007). Gender and ethnicity have also been found to be related to different patterns of civic and political engagement (Vromen, 2003; McFarland and Thomas, 2006).

In this study, we control people's socioeconomic status, parents' education, individual's innate ability and other variables by two methods:

- (1) Using longitudinal data
- (2) Using fixed effects on Citizenship Educational Longitudinal data.

Educational studies supporting educational attainment as a factor in political engagement mainly rely on cross-sectional data, which is hardly appropriate for drawing a conclusion on a causal relationship (Persson, 2012). Also, most studies focus mainly on secondary education. Thus, our study brings a contribution by using the latest national representative longitudinal data to test whether higher education has an impact on active citizenship in England with young people's intentions prior to HE and during HE. Importantly, we use a hybrid model with within effects and between effects to take time-invariant variables into account. Meanwhile, in order to isolate the influence of HE, we take background and other possible factors into consideration, and regard them as control variables. Based on the theoretical discussion, the hypothesis tested in this article is that the university can promote young people's active citizenship, including voting, protesting and volunteering. If the university has a significantly positive impact on young people's active citizenship, the hypothesis is likely to be true.

6.4 Data and method

Our analysis is based on data drawn from last three waves of the Citizenship Educational Longitudinal Study. The longitudinal data are from 2009 to 2014, and cover England, Scotland, Wales and North of Ireland. The initial aim of the CELS data focused on citizenship education, and then it moved to examine young people's active citizenship and to investigate the factors contributing to different types and levels of engagement (TNS BMRB, 2015). The longitudinal data include a wide range of variables measuring factors through school and adulthood, which have not been used by previous studies in the field. Therefore, this provides the opportunity to better investigate HE's effect on active citizenship.

The citizenship items are taken from the three waves. The citizenship is measured by young people's intention to vote, protest and volunteer in the future in waves 4, 5 and 6. Some studies use instrumental variables to predict education attainment (Dee, 2004; Milligan et al., 2004); however, this article is in a better position by using higher education as the predictor variable. The higher education variable is measured by the following question: 'Did you get a degree or above, or are you doing a degree at university or not?' Citizenship education before university is also

taken into account. Other observed background variables such as gender, ethnicity, books at home, parents' education level and parents' socioeconomic classification (occupation) are used as control variables. By adding fixed effects in longitudinal data analysis, the effect of unobserved individual background can also be omitted.

As with other longitudinal datasets, the CELS dataset is also experiencing attrition. The first wave was in 2002–2003 and comprised 18,582 respondents. In wave 4, there were 1388 respondents, while just 322 of this original cohort took part in wave 6. We get only 322 individuals for the three waves. A large proportion of participants dropped out in wave 5, when many students went to university or left education. The data have already included a top-up sample in the fifth and sixth wave to reduce the effect of attrition. Also, data from each survey are weighted to the same specifications so as to be nationally representative. However, these weights are not appropriate for the sample in our study. For the sample used in the study, rim weighting is applied on gender, ethnicity and region in order to make the data nationally representative. The weight created is used in the later analysis. Even with the attrition, this dataset is the only longitudinal data available that could still provide insights on the effects of university on citizenship. With repeated observations for the same individual over time, the longitudinal data enable us to address the issue of causality and to control for unobserved individual characteristics that are time invariant, but correlated with civic engagement (Winkelmann and Winkelmann, 1998).

For our study, hybrid ordinal logit models (Allison, 2009) are created to explore whether university has an impact on young people's future active citizenship. The model is applied 'with robust standard errors that correct for dependence in the repeated observations' (Allison, 2009, p.43). The ordinal logistic regression could help predict the relationship between the ordered category dependent variable and continuous or categorical variables. In order to get a precise result, we add between and within effects on the model. The hybrid models allow us to have two coefficients estimated for each variable: a within-individual effect and a between-individual effect.

The between-individual effect (equal to fixed effect) estimators are equivalent to the individual-specific mean of each variable across time and estimating a logistic regression on the dataset of means. With the between effects model, we are able to examine the impact of HE through difference between individuals. However, the covariate and the error term are regarded to be exogenous in the between-individual effect. Correlation of independent variables and the error terms might lead to biased estimates. Therefore, between-individual effects estimators are probably biased by unobserved heterogeneity.

The within effects only employ within-individual variation to estimate coefficients, which enables us to analyse changes across time. With within effects added on, it allows us to counter omitted

variable bias. Specifically, within-individuals' differences are also included in the model. For example, some research thought that an individual's intelligence or other unobserved variables also influenced political engagement. With within individual effects, the time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity is eliminated as fixed effects control all these differences by removing the idiosyncratic error term (Halaby, 2004). Therefore, by comparing these two effects estimators, we can better understand how university influences young people's active citizenship.

6.4.1 Dependent variables

As the analysis method requires variables to exist in each time point, the variables of actual action, for example, voter turnout, cannot be used as indicators for political engagement because young people cannot vote before 18 and national elections happen about every 5 years. Therefore, to measure young people's active citizenship, we will depend on their intention on political and civic activities: voting, protest and volunteering. The three items, repeated in each wave, were asked as the following questions, respectively: 'In the future will you - Vote in general elections?'; 'If you were confronted by something you thought was wrong would you - Take part in a non-violent protest march or rally?'; 'In the future will you - Volunteer time to help other people?'. The answer categories were: 'definitely not do' = 1, 'probably not do' = 2, 'probably do' = 3, 'definitely do' = 4.

6.4.2 Predictor variables

In this study, we would like to know the effect of university on active citizenship. In the dataset, respondents were asked what the highest qualification they achieved in each wave was. In wave 5, they were also asked if they were doing a university degree. For the analysis, we constructed a dichotomous variable as predictor variable in each wave: 'Do you have a university degree (or above) or are you doing a university degree?' (1 = Yes, 0 = No).

6.4.3 Control variables

Some other factors are reported to influence young people's political and civic engagement, such as social economic background (Colby et al., 2007), gender and ethnicity (Vromen, 2003, McFarland and Thomas, 2006). In order to separate the effect of university from young people's background factors, we include controls for gender, ethnicity, parental education level and occupation, as well as the amount of books in the home. Young people's citizenship education at school is also a factor (Colby et al., 2007). To remove the influence of previous citizenship education, their citizenship education before university (1 = Yes, 0 = No) is also controlled.

Additionally, the longitudinal data enable us to separate differences between groups that were developed by previous differences unrelated to the influence of university. With fixed effects, the time-invariant variables like innate characteristics – for example, intelligence – can also be controlled.

6.5 Results

Table 7.1 shows the results of ordered logit hybrid models. It presents the effects of university on voting, protesting and volunteering in the future. The table shows both between effects and within effects estimators and standard errors. The upper part shows the within effects, while the middle part demonstrates the between effects estimators. The coefficients for the models stand for the change in the log-odds of being in a higher category of the dependent variable. The upper part lists the within-effect, which only includes variance within individuals. The university has a statistically significant effect on voting and volunteering. An individual is more than twice as likely to vote after HE when other variables are controlled. For volunteering, the trend is the same when other variables are controlled.

Young people are nearly twice as likely to volunteer after HE. These results are consistent with educational attainment theory. The study shows that even if we rely solely on within-person variance, the educational effect is very obvious.

For the between individual effects, all variables are insignificant except on voting. As the test of the equality of fixed effect and random effects shows the random effect is significant in the analysis of voting, the coefficient for the centre variable is the same as the coefficient for the between effects (Allison, 2005). Therefore, university has a very strong positive influence on young people's voting intention. This indicates the important impact of HE on voting, which is in line with previous research. Young people tend to vote in the future over three times more than their peers without HE. All the findings are robust with observed and unobserved control variables within two models. This suggests HE exerts an independent impact on active citizenship.

The major limitation of our study is the attrition of the longitudinal data; this is, however, a common problem in other longitudinal data. And this is the only longitudinal dataset in the UK that includes HE factors and is able to take into account the effects of prior intentions towards active citizenship before going to university. Additionally, even though the sample size is small, it can still be analysed. However, due to the attrition and the small sample size, we should be more cautious about the results. Also, even though we are aware that there may be differences between full time and part time students as well as of different disciplines, the data don't provide

Chapter 6

any information about these differences. Therefore, the study examines university students as a whole including students both full time and part-time across all disciplines.

Table 6.1. Hybrid logistic models predicting young people's active citizenship

	Vote intention			Protest intention			Volunteer intention		
	Coefficient	Robust SE	P	Coefficient	Robust SE	P	Coefficient	Robust SE	P
Within-effects									
University	0.83	0.27	<0.01	0.26	0.22	0.24	0.54	0.29	0.06
Citizenship	0.46	0.31	0.14	-0.28	0.29	0.32	-0.02	0.59	0.98
Between-effects									
University	1.69	0.48	<0.01	0.58	0.38	0.13	0.53	0.39	0.18
Citizenship	0.71	0.98	0.47	1.33	0.75	0.078	1.62	0.57	<0.01
Male	0.23	0.26	0.38	0.39	0.23	0.09	-0.97	0.23	<0.01
Ethnicity: White	-0.21	0.16	0.19	-0.13	0.16	0.40	0.10	0.17	0.56
Ref: Books (None)									
Books (1-10)	1.59	1.75	0.36	0.75	0.43	0.09	0.91	2.11	0.77
Books (11-50)	2.04	1.74	0.24	1.59	0.40	<0.01	0.93	3.10	0.77
Books (11-100)	1.79	1.77	0.31	1.15	0.40	0.004	0.92	3.10	0.77
Books (101-200)	1.51	1.78	0.40	0.85	0.43	0.05	0.92	3.09	0.77
Books (more than 200)	2.21	1.78	0.21	1.53	0.35	0.00	1.66	3.11	0.59

Chapter 6

Mother's education level (left full-time education before 16)	Ref.								
Mother's education level (left full-time education after school)	0.08	0.32	0.81	-0.06	0.30	0.85	0.09	0.26	0.73
Mother's education level (Studied at university/got a degree)	2.16	0.49	<0.001	-0.03	0.45	0.95	-0.11	0.34	0.75
Father's education level (left full-time education before 16)	Ref.								
Father's education (level left full-time education after school)	-0.56	0.34	0.10	-0.14	0.27	0.61	-0.16	0.29	0.58
Father's education level (Studied at university/got a degree)	-0.56	0.49	0.21	-0.10	0.43	0.82	-0.72	0.37	0.05
Mother's occupation (Professional or higher technical work)	Ref.								
Mother's occupation (Manager or Senior Administrator)	0.22	0.67	0.74	-0.24	0.43	0.57	-1.12	0.43	0.01
Mother's occupation (Clerical)	0.57	0.46	0.21	-0.53	0.47	0.25	-0/28	0.33	0.40
Mother's occupation (Sales or Services)	-0.31	0.54	0.57	-0.97	0.60	0.11	-0.72	0.43	0.10
Mother's occupation (Semi-Skilled or Unskilled Manual Work)	0.67	0.56	0.23	-0.10	0.51	0.85	-0.34	0.49	0.48
Mother's occupation (Homemaker/carers in the home/other)	0.45	0.46	0.33	-0.66	0.46	0.15	-0.23	0.32	0.34

Father's occupation (Professional or higher technical work)	Ref.								
Father's occupation (Manager or Senior Administrator)	-0.40	0.47	0.40	-1.02	0.40	0.01	-0.14	0.29	0.64
Father's occupation (Sales or Services)	0.20	0.62	0.75	0.31	0.77	0.69	-0.31	0.32	0.34
Father's occupation (Skilled Manual Work)	-1.01	0.52	0.05	-0.81	0.44	0.07	-0.49	0.40	0.22
Father's occupation (Semi-Skilled or Unskilled Manual Work or other)	-0.63	0.44	0.15	-0.75	0.42	0.07	-0.25	0.30	0.41
Intercept 1	-1.52	1.91		-1.03	1.00		-2.22	3.27	
Intercept 2	-0.32	1.95		1.00	1.02		-0.033	3.20	
Intercept 3	1.74	1.96		3.36	1.04		2.94	3.22	
Log likelihood	-554.18			-772.1			-621.69		
N observations	644			644			644		

6.6 Discussion and conclusion

The study examined the effect of university on active citizenship in England, and partly support the hypothesis that the university can promote young people's active citizenship, including voting and volunteering. Our results indicate that university could improve young people's future voting and volunteering rates. This is in line with previous research (Campbell, 2006) that education attainment could promote political engagement and the findings of Bynner et al. (2003) that university graduates have a higher rate of participation in voluntary organisations and are more likely to vote in general elections. Our study provides evidence of HE's impact on active citizenship, in particular volunteering. The longitudinal data we use also helps study dynamic relationships as well as model the differences and heterogeneity among individuals (Frees, 2004). Additionally, the longitudinal data allows us to determine a causal direction of the relationship. Most importantly, with between and within effects, we can better remove the time-invariant factors. Also, we take control for respondents' previous citizenship education in schools. This means that the early citizenship education influence has been taken into account. Therefore, our results suggest that HE has an independent positive effect on young people's active citizenship, especially for voting and volunteering. This provides strong support to the theory that educational attainment leads to a high level of active citizenship.

In contrast, Persson (2014) argues that HE has no independent influence on political engagement. Meanwhile, HE is seen to only serve as a proxy for early socialisation influence instead of having a direct effect on political engagement. Using within individual effect, our study is able to remove the influence of innate time-invariable factors including the individual's intelligence and social economic status. This is in contrast to Luskin's (1990) conclusion that education has no impact on political sophistication once intelligence and other variables are taken into consideration.

However, we find no significance for protest. This finding is a unique contribution of the study. Even though there are traditionally low levels of protest in Britain across all groups, an explanation for the finding might be that university is an environment less given to protesting (Brooks et al., 2015). This leads us to surmise that university in the UK is now a conservative environment promoting more about voting, representation and quality assurance activities than being an environment for social change and justice. Students are more likely to participate based on value for money and less for the social justice and critical thinking that are very important for society. The skills for employment are possibly viewed as more important than those that are

particularly conducive to protesting such as critical thinking, political efficacy and the capacity to argue and propagate one's case. Also, demand for satisfaction introduced in universities implies that 'teaching should confirm what the student believes, rather than challenging students' assumptions in an intellectual process of transformation requiring sustained commitment' (William, 2013, p100). This would also influence the way engaging students in challenging social, political and ethical questions (Burke, 2014). Similarly, Giroux (2011) argues that weak forms of political protest and a conservative political climate on US campus relate to the commodification of all forms of social life. Additionally, the marketisation trend of universities is also a reflection of the liberal model in universities in the UK. The descriptive study in Chapter Five indicates young people in universities in England tend to mostly reflect the liberal model of political engagement, with a tiny proportion of civic republicans. Students care more about their rights and interests than responsibility or social justice. It is even more so with the continuing increase in tuition fees in universities in England and there is a possibility that the continuing increase in tuition fees brings about a consumer mindset among students in HE and also strengthens the perception of value for money in HE. Also, it is possible that the recent removal of student number controls will have considerable impact on the demands from students as they have more choices of universities. It is reported the student intake greatly rises in some university, especially from Russell group while falls significantly in other universities, for example, some post-92 universities. All these marketization actions may affect students' judgment about the education they receive and will also influence their way of viewing university: should university be more about social equity or the liberal aspects? In order to attract more students, universities will do their best to meet students' demands. The rise of student consumer model changes both students and universities (Williams, 2013). Students will view HE as a private investment for employment and a place to gain vocational skills, while the university seeks to focus more on its individualised economic function and pursues private rather than public good (Williams, 2013). This raises a question to the balance of different roles of HE in the UK in the future: Is HE taking more responsibility for promoting social equity and democracy or more for pursuing financial purposes?

One important question to ask is why HE has an important effect on voting and volunteering. HE is argued to be important for active citizenship as it can provide more knowledge, skills and political familiarity for individuals to participate in more complex political activities (Hillygus, 2005). It does not only prepare a citizen to vote, but also helps them with 'reasoned and deliberative decision making' (Hillygus, 2005, p.27). Our previous research has also provided evidence that citizenship can be learned in a university community through participation in activities or groups, plus gaining a sense of belonging to the community (Yang and Hoskins, forthcoming a). Therefore, we may conclude that HE can promote civic engagement by providing knowledge and skills, as well as a

great number of opportunities to participate in all kinds of activities and helping create an individual's self-identity.

Awareness of the positive relationship between HE and active citizenship can help unearth important implications for policymaking. Young people's active citizenship has been a problem in recent times; we could, therefore, raise educational levels in society to help deal with this issue. More importantly, this article also contributes to the philosophical thinking of universities. For university, there has been a relative neglect of citizenship in HE as education for democracy and citizenship has been historically regarded as the responsibility of schooling and as 'not relevant' to HE (Englund, 2002, p.282). The article has endeavoured to bring some central issues relating to this role into clearer focus: the role of HE to promote citizenship and democracy and prepare students for living in a civil society, which has an effect on young people's citizenship and is significant to them as young adults. This can help rethink the role of HE, especially in the global marketisation of HE. Additionally, with findings on how HE promotes active citizenship, we could apply this knowledge in other contexts with individuals who have not undertaken HE. This will help address the unequal levels of active citizenship seen.

Chapter 7: Young People's Citizenship Learning at University in the UK: Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis on the Citizenship in Transition

7.1 Introduction

Democracy has been described by people as 'unfinished work', remaining as 'the task before us' in the 'critical and complex conditions of today' (Dewey, 1998, p. 225). Democracy involves various kinds of responsible participation of citizens, which can bring about and maintain accountable political institutions, as well as a culture of ideals and practices that underpin citizens' engagement in and control over social choices and directions. Thus, democracy is always in progress through cultivating citizenship and civil society (Colby et al., 2007). Among all the factors facilitating citizenship, education has played an important and powerful role in boosting citizenship, including political participation, voting turnout, civic engagement, citizenship knowledge and democratic values as well as the attitudes in civil society (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Nie et al., 1996; Hillygus, 2005).

Higher education can be described as having three functions – personal development, preparing for the labour market, and preparing for living in society (Zgaga, 2008; Veugelers et al., 2014). Traditionally, higher education is regarded as a place to intellectually cultivate individuals (Veugelers et al., 2014). Intellectual development means the study of great traditions and books (Veugelers et al., 2014) and neglects societal and political life (Aloni, 2002). Newman claims education is for 'pursuit of knowledge for the sake of knowledge and not for the value of any of the fruits or applications, however important it is' compared to utilitarian views (Hutton, 1890, p.127). Another modern view considers HE as a tool to contribute to knowledge, as well as technical and economic development (Sullivan, 2000). HE is required to meet individual needs with regard to career pursuit and supports the economy within the public sector (Wynne, 2014). However, some scholars argue that HE also needs to equally concentrate on equity, social cohesion and democracy, including the importance of social change and justice, as well as empowering people (e.g. Dewey, 2004; UNESCO, 1998). From this point of view, HE is also about seeking to help students prepare for life in civil society. As there are multiple perspectives of HE, especially regarding the view focusing on equity, social cohesion and democracy, it is imperative to understand how HE influences future citizenship in society.

The rationale for civic education is multidimensional and complex, reflecting the range of competing needs of contemporary higher education. Teaching and learning strategies with a civic dimension are frequently related to the moral aims of higher education and the role of public education in democracy. However, with the liberal globalisation, there is a particular trend for university to demonstrate effectiveness and value for money. Nowadays, it must be acknowledged that universities in the UK have been heading in a more marketised, neo-liberal direction and the alternative position is currently not the mainstream perspective (Brooks et al., 2015). Therefore, it is imperative to shed some more lights on the citizenship education at higher education level and balance different roles of higher education.

The need for higher education, especially in the UK, to do more to promote greater participation of youth in the political process is especially compelling today. In the 2015 UK general election, nearly half the amount of young people (43%) voted while more than 70% of older age groups participated (Ipsos MORI, 2015), which means the cohort of young people is not well represented within the democratic system. In addition, the voter turnout of young people has dropped 1 per cent since last general election in 2010. This also means young people tend to be ignored by policymakers and their voices are less likely to be heard, consequently, their needs are less likely to be taken into consideration in and policy-making process, which leads to more disappointment and disillusionment among young people. This is a vicious circle of political disengagement (Sloam, 2016). After the global financial crisis, the situation worsened with high youth unemployment and government efforts to control public spending (Sloam, 2016). Meanwhile, some researchers suggest that young people are not really disinterested in politics, instead, many of them are standby citizens who 'given the relevant circumstances will become' active participants (Amna and Ekman, 2013). Education can be a means to promote these young people to be more politically and civic engaged. In terms of studies in different levels of education, citizenship education in secondary schools has been the focus, for example, the IEA international civic and citizenship education study (ICCS). However, the role of HE in preparing students to become responsible citizens has not gained as much attention as that of secondary school education in the UK. In this context, the civic mission of higher education needs renewed attention as universities need to seek ways of strengthening and diversifying the ways in which they engage with and serve the needs of society and community. Meanwhile, there is a large proportion of young people (involving upwards of 40 per cent of young adults, though the figures vary) studying at university in the UK, thus university could be a very important place to facilitate young people's active citizenship. Therefore, it is especially imperative for universities to shoulder their civic responsibility to promote citizenship.

Much of the literature on citizenship in higher education has been theoretical and tended to offer an outline for future work (Veugelers et al., 2014). It generally discusses the societal role of university, and claims university should contribute to citizenship development. For example, the study of universities as sites of citizenship and civic responsibility postulates the notion that 'universities can become key institutions for the transmission of democratic values through direct engagement in democratic activities and democratic education on campus' (Plantan, 2002, p.6). Other studies mainly focus on civic engagement, such as volunteering in HE. For example, a substantial body of studies has focused on the service-learning programme in HE. Williams and Cochrane's (2009) study of the social and cultural role of four HEIs in the UK suggests student volunteering is a means to support active citizenship. Recognising this, McCowan (2012) focuses on three initiatives that theoretically seek to promote democratic citizenship in different ways through taught courses and the broader experience of university study. More research has been undertaken in the United States exploring how to promote students' civic engagement in HE (Beaumont et al., 2006; Colby et al., 2007). Altogether these researchers have analysed the effectiveness of some of the strategies on civic engagement, which are mostly related to local community or civil society; however, they have not analysed citizenship practice on campus, for example, voting practice in student organisations. Another theme around citizenship in HE is institutionalising values of citizenship, immersing them in campus life and the management of universities (Bourn et al., 2006). Many of these whole-institution initiatives have a 'global dimension', which is partly because of the financial interests of globalisation, and seek to provide students with the knowledge, skills and values necessary to adapt to a globalised economy and culture (Bourn and Shiel, 2009). Even though these studies have worked on various themes of citizenship in HE, few of them have investigated students' learning of citizenship on campus through their participation in activities and organisations from a constructivist learning perspective, especially using quantitative method.

In order to address the gaps in the current research and to better understand how students learn citizenship in the university setting, this article analyses the CiT data employing ordinal logistic regression to explore the association of citizenship and the student citizenship learning experience at university. The article is organised into seven sections. It commences with the development of a theoretical account of citizenship in HE. Then, it discusses the positive effect of education, particularly higher education, on citizenship, and it seeks to explain how HE influences citizenship. The fourth section describes the dataset used in the study, the CiT dataset, and it outlines the variables for the quantitative analysis. The fifth section describes the quantitative analysis method for the study, and the specific procedures, followed by a discussion on the results

of the ordinal logistic regression. The final section concludes the analysis and makes recommendations for future research.

7.2 The concept of citizenship

In this section, we briefly review the development of citizenship concepts, as well as active citizenship, in order to propose a conceptual framework for measurement.

In the past, citizenship research has paid much attention to rights of people related to the state. Marshall (1950), one of the most popularly acknowledged researchers, defines citizenship as ‘a status bestowed on all those who are full members of a community’, and argues that ‘all those who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed’ (Marshall, 1950, p.28-29). He focuses on the civil rights of equal justice and freedom, political rights to influence the decision-making process, and social rights such as the opportunity to access education and welfare, etc. The critical view of Marshall’s citizenship is that citizenship is seen exclusively as a matter of extending or creating rights (Pattie et al., 2004). Rights theorists suppose the resources needed to extend social rights is provided by a disembodied state, but it is actually ‘other citizens who provide these rights by paying their taxes and by supporting such things as legislation outlawing discrimination on the grounds of race and sex’ (Pattie et al., 2004, p. 16). Empirically, as it ignores this crucial dimension of citizenship, the rights-based concept of citizenship is at risk of becoming separated from any political reality (Pattie et al., 2004). Later, citizenship research shifted its focus to citizens’ participation in political processes and individual involvement with intention to influence (Verba and Nie, 1972). The focus then moved to individual involvement in participatory democracy, where people are encouraged to participate in the decision-making process of politics (Barber, 2003).

In Britain, Pattie et. al. (2004) define citizenship from the perspective of ‘solving collective action problems which involve the recognition by individuals that they have rights and obligations to each other if they wish to solve such problems’ (p.22). This refers to a set of norms, values and in particular behaviour. This important aspect of citizenship, civic norms, is related to political participation. Such participation involves political activities ‘such as voting, joining interest groups, contacting public officials and campaigning’, as well as protesting, taking part in demonstrations and being involved in political strikes, and talking about politics with other people and taking an interest in political matters (p.24). Importantly, based on Putnam’s social capital theory, citizenship is much broader than just political involvement as it also involves voluntary activities of

all kinds, including 'informal activities with friends, relatives and neighbours and formal membership in various organisations' (p.24). Pattie et al. analyse and summarise the fundamental idea of citizenship: fulfilling needs of the society from individual citizens and from the relationship binding the citizens together. Based on the theory, the fundamental idea of citizenship is to meet the needs of the society. What does a society need? A group of people are willing to cooperate with each other to solve common problems, which is the core problem to be explained by a theory of citizenship. A democratic system supports the effective political system of the society in which people can cooperate to solve common problems, while social cohesion supports the community through bringing citizens together and developing a relationship between them. Therefore, in the thesis, citizenship refers to the needs of the society, which includes a democratic system and social cohesion.

7.2.1 Active Citizenship

In reality, there is a long-term decline in electorate voter-turnout and membership of civic and political organisations observed across the West, many researchers suggest people's engagement (or not) with politics may have changed (Dalton, 2015; Pattie et al., 2004; Bennett and Segerberg, 2012). Amna and Ekman (2013) argue that some seemingly 'passive' standby citizens who have not been involved yet may in fact be an asset to democracy, due to their particular combination of political interest, trust, and inclination to participate. Also, young people participate in politics on an individual basis, considering reasons or issues with a personal meaning (Amna and Ekman, 2013). This indicates the current trend of youth participation and the ways to promote active citizenship by involving the asset of democracy—standby citizens. When education and incentives are given, standby citizens tend to be involved in political and civic engagement. Bennett and Segerberg (2012) have realized that new ways of communications, especially digitally networked action helps in an era of increasingly personalised political participation, protesting in particular.

The notion of active citizenship, mostly used in the field of education, further focuses on the involvement of citizens (Hoskins and Mascherini, 2009). Most active citizenship research is related to the social outcome of learning (Preston and Green, 2003), dealing with the possible relationship between active citizenship with learning (Hoskins and Mascherini, 2009). Within European policy, the idea of active citizenship first came from the Lisbon European Council in 2000 (Biesta 2009). The strategic goal for the European Community was to become 'the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion' (Lisbon European Council, 2000). The European Commission put forward 'learning for active citizenship' as one of three major pillars in the communication *Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality* (see Commission of European Communities, 2001).

In the *Detailed Work Programme on the Follow-up of the Objectives of Education and Training Systems in Europe* (Council of the European Union, 2002), the European Council promoted 13 objectives following the Lisbon conference, one of which was ‘supporting active citizenship, equal opportunities and social cohesion’ (de Weerd et al., 2005, p.1). To respond to this, many researchers have made efforts around active citizenship, for example, Hoskins and Mascherini (2009), and accordingly, active citizenship become a central part in the European Union’s push to develop citizenship (Biesta 2009).

Considerable literature has examined the concept literature has worked on the concept of active citizenship. Some include a political element in active citizenship. De Weerd et al. (2005, p.ii) propose that active citizenship is ‘political participation and participation in associational life characterized by tolerance and non-violence and the acknowledgement of the rule of law and human rights’. They describe active citizenship as an eclectic collection of participatory activities including political participation (de Weerd et al., 2005) in a deliberative manner (Ivancic et al., 2003). Researchers using the concept of political participation, which is close to active citizenship place more weight on conventional forms of politics such as voting (Liset, 1959). Even though the traditional form of politics is still very important, it is not enough for the active citizenship today. As new technologies emerge a trend of globalisation and other contemporary phenomenon, the nature of active citizenship have changed and expanded. Dalton (2015) argues that other forms of political action have increased over time, and young people in the US tend to engage in more voluntary activities. Meanwhile, some scholars focus more on community and voluntary action (Irish Government Taskforce, 2007; de Weerd et al., 2005). Also, scholars using concepts similar to active citizenship such as social capital have tended to pay more attention to volunteering, community participation and actions that support community cohesion (e.g., Putnam, 2000). However, the concept, to some extent, is depoliticising, focusing too much on associational life. Furthermore, there are scholars defining active citizenship as a combination of participation in political life and community with values. For example, Hoskins (2009) argues active citizenship consists of several important themes, including civil society, community and political life and democratic values. It emphasises participation in civil society which is the ‘sum of institutions, organisations, and individuals located between the family, the state and the market in which people associated voluntarily to advance common interests’ (Anheier, 2004, p.20, cited in Hoskins, 2009). According to theories of active citizenship, civic behaviour is regarded as a set of participatory activities, including political participation (Ivancic et al., 2003) and community and voluntary activities (de Weerd et al., 2005; Irish Taskforce on Active Citizenship, 2007; cited in Hoskins et al., 2008). In the context of defining active citizenship, participation is characterised by

mutual respect and non-violence according to human rights and democracy (Hoskins, 2006). Based on these concepts, the core of active citizenship is participation which is also the central element in EU policy goals (de Weerd et al., 2005). It legitimates decision-making, which therefore makes it a key requirement of active citizenship (Pattie et al., 2004). Also, 'participation is a prime criterion for defining the democratic citizen and his or her role within the political process' (Dalton, 2015). Therefore, participation is central in our definition of active citizenship. It refers to behaviour, not to attitudes or knowledge (de Weerd et al., 2005). The emphasis of participation in political and community activities in active citizenship contributes to the maintenance of democracy, good governance and social cohesion rather than specific benefits for the individual (Hoskins, 2006). Supporting democracy and social cohesion are also the needs of a good society. Therefore, in the thesis, I conceptualise active citizenship as political participation-voting and protesting- and civic engagement-volunteering- with non-violence value. This concept is defined as a mixture of citizens' rights and responsibilities, as suggested by Dalton and Pattie, to form a good society.

7.2.1.1 Voting

Voting is a very important aspect of political participation, and one of the most frequently studied forms of engagement (Campbell, 2006). Voting is also an important mode of citizen involvement in political life (Verba et al., 1995). A national election enables people to have a say in who will lead the country. It is an important part of active citizenship, and is also participation in representative democracy (Hoskins and Mascherini, 2009). A long line of research illustrates that voting should be analysed on its own for analytical purposes (Campbell, 2006). According to Verba et al. (1995), voting is unique in all forms of participation as the configuration of the mix of resources and motivations, and consists of a varied 'mix of gratifications and a different bundle of issue concerns' (p.23). Elections are important as 'they select political elites, provide a source of democratic legitimacy, and engage the mass public in the democratic process' (Dalton, 2015). If a large amount of young people do not vote, this weakens their representation in the political process and may change election results. It is not healthy for democracy for large proportions of the public to stay away from electing government officials. This would be a serious problem when the elected government does not represent all groups of people and makes decisions that a full majority of people do not support (Dalton, 2015).

7.2.1.2 Protest

Political participation means the activities of citizens intended to influence state structures, authorities, and the making of collectively binding decisions and allocation of public goods by means of voting or protesting (Verba et al., 1978). Therefore, the boundaries of political action

are much broader today than just electoral politics. According to a 2013 LSE Enterprise study, when European 16- to 26-year olds reflect on voting and institutional politics, they find 'the political 'offer' does not match their concerns, ideas, and ideal of democratic politics' (EACEA, 2010). Meanwhile, there are high levels of youth participation in issue-oriented activism, boycotting and buycotting, and protest activities. (Bennett, 2008). The new generation of young people are seen as 'actualizing citizens', 'who favour loosely networked activism to address issues that reflect personal values', in contrast with 'dutiful citizens', who keep a more collective and government-centred set of practices (Bennett, 2007, p.61). The economic crisis has also given the ideal conditions for accelerating youth protests, which has enhanced the political participation (through digital participation) among highly educated youth looking for a mouthpiece for their 'indignation' (Bennett and Segerberg, 2012). Protest could be a kind of 'action orientated participation' which is an 'established' and necessary voice of influence within modern democracies, and includes demonstrations, boycotts and political strikes (Ogris and Westphal, 2006). The central purpose of protest is to try to act or express a voice to influence decision-making. Protest is more participatory democracy, and less formal. It is a critical voice of the democracy process, and keeps the government accountable. Protest can focus on specific issues or policy goals—from protecting environment to protesting the local policies—and 'can convey a high level of political information with real political force' (Dalton, 2015, p.55). Sustained and effective protest is demanding, which requires initiative, political skills, and cooperation with others. Therefore, the advocates of protest stress that citizens can increase their political influence by taking a strategy of direct action (Dalton, 2015). The protest item in the 2002 European Social Survey includes participating in a lawful demonstration, signing a petition, boycotting products and deliberately buying certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons. Protest also includes signing a petition, contacting officials to influence and so on. Bennett and Segerberg (2012) have realized that new ways of communications, especially digitally networked action helps in an era of increasingly personalised political participation, protesting in particular.

7.2.1.3 Volunteering

As Dalton and Pattie argue, patterns of citizenship are changing, and an increasing number of young people prefer to participate in voluntary activities. Volunteering is therefore the third dimension that is included in the concept of citizenship. Volunteering is organised by a group of people spontaneously for political or non-political issues. It is one of many citizen participation acts (Verba et al., 1995), and important for active citizenship (de Tocqueville, 1988). Voluntary

association is argued to 'provide opportunities for social participation, for democratic involvement at the local level, and thus for active citizenship' (Turner, 2001, p. 200). According to Hoskins and Mascherini (2009), participation in community and/ or political life is also a part of active citizenship. Community activities come from community life, and are one form of active citizenship, referring to those activities supporting a community including cultural or religious, business, social, sport and parent-teacher organisations. These involve membership, participation activities, donating money and voluntary work. Also, volunteering is one of the popular activities among young people (Dalton, 2015). After testing different models, Pattie et al. (2004) found social capital(Putnam) theory help to explain the variations across communities. The average number of political activities, defined in the wide sense, carried out by the citizens of each local authority is positively related to one aspect of social capital: associational activity which refers to the number of types of groups joined, voluntary work and percentage of respondents in informal networks. This means the more groups local individuals joined, the more political activities they participated. Therefore, volunteering is helpful for active citizenship.

Young people's active citizenship is used in later analysis, including political and civic activities as indicators: voting, protest and volunteering.

7.2.2 Citizenship and higher education

In this section, the positive effect of education, particularly higher education, on civic and political participation is discussed. There is considerable literature that shows the connections between education and active citizenship or democracy (e.g. Torney-Purta et al., 2001; Dee, 2004). Specifically, Almond and Verba (1963) claim that educational attainment, in most studies of political attitudes, seems to have the most important statistical effect on political attitudes, compared with other variables including gender, place of residence, occupation, income, age, and so on. HE can provide more knowledge, skills and political familiarity for individuals to participate in more complex political activities (Hillygus, 2005). It does not only prepare a citizen to vote, but also helps them to have 'a reasoned and deliberative decision-making' process (p.27). Some research also suggests that HE can promote the cognitive skills which are necessary to gain, process, and analyse political information, and can improve motivation and provide the opportunity to practise citizenship (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Nie et al., 1996). Alternative theories exist, including intelligence (Hillygus, 2005) and education as providing a sorting function (Campbell, 2006), but the data available does not enable the testing of these theories. The theory tested in the study is discussed in the following section.

Based on the discussion above, HE is a very important factor in citizenship formation. Other factors have also influenced young people's citizenship, such as socioeconomic background, parents and their citizenship education in school (Colby et al., 2007). Gender and ethnicity have been found to be related to different patterns of civic and political engagement (Vromen, 2003; McFarland and Thomas, 2006). These background factors are therefore taken into consideration in this article.

7.2.3 Learning citizenship at university

The previous section describes different theories concerning the ways university influences on student citizenship; subsequently this section aims to explore how students might learn citizenship at university from a perspective of constructivist learning. The constructivist approaches to learning focus on the importance of participation, identity and human interactions, which are also the key to active citizenship. As I discussed earlier, the core of active citizenship concept is ~~the~~ participation in political and civic activities. It legitimates decision-making, which therefore makes it a key requirement of active citizenship (Pattie et al., 2004). Also, 'participation is a prime criterion for defining the democratic citizen and his or her role within the political process' (Dalton, 2015). Colby et al. (2007) argue that sustained political participation could lead to more stable habits, attitudes and dispositions. The focus on participation can provide a bridge between active citizenship and theories of constructivist learning. Also, what connects political theory with constructivist approaches to learning is their common focus on the importance of human interaction (especially communication and discourse) as the key to politics and democracy. Hannah Arendt's (1969) emphasis on interaction for the human condition (Biesta, 2007, cited in Sloam, 2008) also has some implications for learning citizenship in HE.

Also, youth citizenship is particularly related to the theory. Even though young people feel disillusioned with electoral politics, they are interested in politics in the broader sense such as political activities in the street or on the internet (Sloam, 2016). Also, Amna and Ekman (2013) argue that some seemingly 'passive' standby citizens who have not been involved yet may in fact be an asset to democracy, due to their particular combination of political interest, trust, and inclination to participate. These standby citizens are, in community of practice, people in peripheral position, who can be active participants and full members of the community during the process of participation and gaining identity. This shows the necessity to promote active citizenship by involving the asset of democracy—standby citizens through community of practice

approach. After learning through participation and interaction, standby young citizens tend to be involved in political and civic engagement.

Therefore, this view of citizenship education focusing on human interaction and engagement can be well related to the CoP theory: learn citizenship through social participation.

7.2.3.1 Community of practice

The main focus of communities of practice (CoP) in this article is learning citizenship through practice in the university community. A community of practice is a group of individuals sharing a concern, a series of issues or an interest in a topic, and gaining their knowledge by practicing and interacting with each other in the community (Wenger, 1998). The complexities of this concept is that communities of practice means not only a social grouping, but also the practice of the individual members, who have a sense of identity and feel belonging to the group (Jewson, 2007). A community of practice is not presuming the creating of a new informal grouping or social system within the organization, but rather a way of emphasizing that every practice relies on and is sustained and perpetuated through a social process, and that members learn through the engagement in that practice. (Gherardi et al., 1988, p. 279). What is particular to the concept of community of practice is that the individual as an active participant can learn in the participation in social communities, and construct his/her identity through these communities (Wenger, 1998). Thus, a community of practice could be understood as a context where people learn through participating in communal activities, and gradually create their shared identity through this participation. In this context, students practise citizenship by voting, engaging and volunteering, creating their identity or belongingness to the university, through which they learn citizenship.

Participation in CoP is defined as the 'social experience of living in the world in terms of membership in social communities and active involvement in social enterprises.' (Wenger, 1998, p.55). Participation includes both action and feelings of belongingness, which entail 'all kinds of relations, conflictual as well as harmonious, intimate as well as political, competitive as well as cooperative.' (Wenger, 1988, p.56). In this section, two important characteristics of CoP, namely the engagement and the identity, are discussed in detail.

7.2.3.1.1 Engagement

First of all, engagement in activities and communities is a very important part of participation. A community of practice emerges when there is sustained mutual engagement on an appropriated organisation (Vann and Bowker, 2001). Through mutual engagement in communities, people are able to experience and also 'shape these communities' (Wenger, 1998, p.56). Through their own

engagement in practice, members in the community of practice can experience the competence to mutually engage, to be accountable to the community and to make use of the repertoire of the practice (Wenger, 1998). The realignment of experience of meaning and competences are the characteristics of learning, which produces knowledge, information and skills (Wenger, 1998). When young people engage in organisations and activities at university, learning of active citizenship takes place. Meanwhile, young people gain knowledge and skills of active citizenship from the engagement.

7.2.3.1.2 Identity

Wenger's focus is on identity, and he particularly stresses the importance of trajectories through different levels of participation in a community. Importantly, participation is more than mere engagement in practice. Its effects are not confined to the actual context of people's engagement (Wenger, 1998). Even if individuals leave the context, participation will not be turned off. This is explained by Wenger (1998), who states that participation becomes a part of individuals; they will always carry it with them and it will appear if they are confronted by similar situations in other communities. Therefore, 'participation places the negotiation of meaning in the context of the forms of membership in various communities. It is a constituent of our identities' (Wenger, 1998). In this sense, participation in the university community helps students form the identity of active participants and full members of the community, which will be carried and will surface in the larger community of society. Therefore, young people with the identity gained from engagement in universities are always at the forefront of participation in society.

However, a common line of critique is that the concept of community of practice fails to consider the issue of power, therefore, it contains unbalanced power relations which enable and constrain access to positions of peripherality and potential mastery (Contu and Willmott, 2003). The characteristics attributed to the communities of practice appear to obscure the extent to which they are influenced and shaped by their institutional, political or cultural context. For example, factors such as the class, gender and ethnicity render a proportion of people unable or disinclined to participate in certain communities; therefore, it reduces their chances to learn from participation. By contrast, for others, as they have privileged access to these practices and resources, they have high level of propensity to learn. This may be mentioned by Lave and Wenger (1991) when they consider that learning embodies 'the structural characteristics of communities of practice' (1991, p.55), which indicates that social divisions including class and gender, are structured into 'communities' through organizing social space and hindering or promoting access to certain resources, forms of activity, technology, etc. However, when it comes

to demonstrating their idea by reference to the practices of midwives, tailors and quartermasters, the link between the practice of 'community' members and the 'structural characteristics' of these communities remains largely unexplored (Contu and Willmott, 2003). Hoskins et al. (2012b) also argue multiple membership of wider social groupings such as family and neighbourhood may play a role in learning. Additionally, the formation of identity in practice in original concept may seem to pay insufficient attention to broader discourses of identity, such as class, gender, and race. Within multiple and interlinked communities where there may be different or even contradictory identities, individual can develop identity of the active citizen (Hoskins et al., 2012c). The identity formation of individuals may also be influenced by their gender, race and other factors. This is especially the case for learning citizenship. It is reported that there are many factor influencing young people's political and civic engagement, such as social economic background (Colby et al., 2007), gender and ethnicity (Vromen, 2003, McFarland and Thomas, 2006). This means people from certain class, in certain gender or race are more likely to be involved in political and civic activities, consequently, they can learn more and form an active identity from their participation. Therefore, in my concept of community of practice, these factors will be taken into consideration. Young people will learn citizenship from participation in universities and the identity can be formed during their participation, but their participation and identity will also be influenced by their gender, race and social economic status.

Theoretically, from practice, people are able to form an identity, which facilitates future practice. During that process, learning takes place. Learning changes identity by changing the ability to participate, and the ability is gained socially in terms of practices and communities where it shapes identity (Wenger, 1998). During learning process, the identity of active participants or full members of the community are formed; meanwhile their skills and knowledge on active citizenship are developed, which facilitates their active citizenship in the future. Therefore, encouraging students in HE to participate in all kinds of political activities or groups as well as extra-curricular activities is very important to cultivate active citizens.

According to the theory of community of practice, students may learn citizenship in university through citizenship practice and the forming of their identities, and these can also be influenced by social economic status, gender and ethnicity. To the best of our knowledge, there has not any attempt to test this theory in the HE in the UK. Therefore, we examine CiT data on learning citizenship in the university in the UK. The hypothesis tested in this study is that experience at university, including the practice of citizenship and self-identity gained at university, promotes students to be active citizens who participate more in civic and political activities when their social economic status, gender and ethnicity are taken into control.

7.3 Data

To test the hypothesis above, the CiT 2011 dataset is used, which was funded by the European Social Research Council, and gathered for a study commissioned by the University of Essex and National Foundation for Educational Research (Whiteley et al., 2013). The CiT data is the 2011 cross-sectional dataset from the largest longitudinal study designed to find out how young people's citizenship practices were changing, and the role of statutory citizenship in shaping young people's citizenship (Whiteley et al., 2013). In the study, we do not use longitudinal data because of attrition issues. The CiT interviewed young people from three sample groups with both face-to-face and online methodologies.

The majority of face-to-face respondents are young people aged 19–20 who have participated in a previous wave at school or in their sixth form college. Additionally, there is a small top-up sample of young people, who have not taken part in previous waves. The sample is designed to correct region and gender imbalance in the longitudinal sample. The cross-sectional web survey is also used to capture the views of respondents aged between 18 and 25 in England, Scotland and Wales.

The analyses in our study are based on those participants who indicated that they were doing a university degree. Of the 3520 participants, 1337 (38%) reported that they were doing a university degree.

The data is generally representative of the larger university population in most respects, including participation rate in HE, socioeconomic class, and gender. In the whole population, the provisional higher education participation rates in the UK for domiciled people aged 17 to 30 in 2010–2011 is around 47% (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2012). In the CiT data, the proportion of young people aged 18 to 25 doing a degree at university is 38%. As in higher education as a whole, the CiT data includes considerably more women than men (64.1% vs 35.9%), similar to the UK-domiciled university students in 2010–2011 (56.4% vs 43.6%) (HESA, 2015). The percentage of university students from lower social-economic classes is 39.7% in the CiT data, while the percentage of UK-domiciled young entrants to full-time first degree courses in 2010/11 from lower social-economic classes is 30.6% (HESA, 2014).

The CiT data provides aspects of civic competence from active citizenship indicators (Hoskins and Mascherini, 2009); in this article, three domains from the CiT data form the central focus:

Democracy/citizenship attitude

Attitudes, values and background information were surveyed through items using Likert-type scales. In addition, the data on actions and attitudes are self-reported measures not looking at actual behaviour.

The CiT dataset is the only available large-scale and reliable dataset on higher education students and citizenship behaviour in the UK. It covers a very broad range of questions. From the dataset, useful information about citizenship of university students can be learned. The dataset also provides an overview of the general situation of UK university students. To the best of our knowledge, we are the only researchers to investigate the university factors using CiT data. The limitation of the dataset is that the aim of the data is to explore the effectiveness of compulsory citizenship at school rather than in HE. However, it is possible to use the data to explore universities because it includes a university variable and has a reasonable sample size after filtering out non-university participants. It is acknowledged that this possibly affects, to some extent, how representative the sample is for universities after we filter out non-university people. However, according to the basic demographics of the data detailed above, the sample data is generally representative.

7.3.1 Variables

7.3.1.1 Dependent variables

This article uses three indicators introduced earlier to measure young people's citizenship in the analysis. They are all surveyed using Likert-type scales (Definitely not do = 1, probably not do = 2, probably do = 3, definitely do = 4).

Vote: Voting in a general election in the future.

Protest: Taking part in a non-violent protest march or rally in the future.

Volunteer: Volunteer to help others in the future.

7.3.1.2 Predictor variables

In this article, we are interested in exploring the relationship between learning experience and citizenship practice at university and in citizenship. Thus, we select a number of behavioural, attitudinal variables (Table 8.1) that consistently figure as predictors. The experience of voting or

volunteering at university, participation in groups, clubs or organisations in the last year in the CiT data are measured as practice of citizenship in universities. Meanwhile, students' sense of identity with and belonging to their university is measured by an item asking students how much they feel they belong to the university.

Table 7.1. Full list of predictor variables

The practice of citizenship in university, as well as belongingness gained in universities
Citizenship practice in the last year
Electing student union or council representative (Yes = 1, No = 0)
Taking part in a club or group election (Yes = 1, No = 0)
Electing staff union or council representative (Yes = 1, No = 0)
Taking part in student union or council (Yes = 1, No = 0)
Being a committee member in a group or club (Yes = 1, No = 0)
Taking part in a sponsored activity for a group or club (Yes = 1, No = 0)
Giving help to groups, organisations and clubs (Yes = 1, No = 0)
Helping to run an event (Yes = 1, No = 0)
Identity
The belongingness of students: How much do they feel a part of their university? (Not at all = 1, A little = 2, A lot = 3, Completely = 4)

7.3.1.3 Control variables

In order to better explain the relationship between citizenship and citizenship learning experience at university, the background variables of students are utilised as control variables.

Gender (Male = 1, Female = 2)

Parents' education level (Left full-time education at 15–16 = 1, Left after college or sixth form = 2, Studied at university/got a degree = 3)

Number of books owned at home (No books = 1, Very few books (1–10) = 2, One shelf of books (11–50) = 3, One bookcase of books (51–100) = 4, Two bookcases of books (101–200) = 5, Three or more bookcases of books (more than 200) = 6)

Ethnicity (White = 1, Other = 2)

Citizenship education before 18 (None = 1, A little = 2, A lot = 3)

7.4 Methods

In order to predict the influence of university experience on the future citizenship of young people in the UK, ordinal logistic regression is performed on each of the three citizenship measures controlling for gender, ethnicity, parents' education level, number of books at home and previous citizenship education. The analysis is run using the SPSS statistics software. The logistic regression is used to predict the relationship between a dependent variable – in this case citizenship – and one or more predictor variables, where the dependent variable is categorical and predictor variables are categorical or continuous (Field, 2013). As the dependent variables – citizenship indicators – are ordinal variables, ordinal logistic regression models are very useful.

The R-squared values presented in Table 7.2 show the percentage of variance explained by the data. The tests of the assumption of parallel lines show the ordinal regression is appropriate for the data ($P > 0.01$). The coefficients indicate how much the logit changes based on the values of the predictor variables; that is, how predictor variables relate to the dependent variables. Odds ratios are also presented to show the association between predictor variables and dependent variables, which demonstrate the actual effect of variables compared to reference variables when other variables are controlled for. Collinearity tests were carried out, and showed no significant correlation between variables.

7.5 Results

In this section, ordinal logistic regression models are applied to test whether the practice of citizenship as well as the sense of belonging gained in universities lead to more future citizenship. Findings from the analysis are listed in Table 7.2. The first, middle and final three columns show the regression coefficients, standard errors, and odds ratios for voting in a general election in the future, intention of future volunteering, and non-violent protesting in the future respectively. The results of control variables are in the appendix A.

7.5.1 Voting

Table 7.2 presents the likelihood of voting in a future general election of university students with the predictor variables. According to Table 7.2, many variables fail to reach significance. However, there are interesting points. Three predictor variables are statistically significant, which are being a committee member, organising events and feeling part of the university. This indicates that those who were committee members are (1.37 times) more likely to vote in a future general election than students who were not, when taking control variables into consideration. Similarly,

students who have organised an event tend to vote in future general elections compared to those who have not, when other background variables were controlled. Interestingly, the more students felt part of their university, the more likely they are to vote in future general elections. This suggests university students who identify more strongly with their university are more likely to vote in the future.

7.5.2 Protest

We also use the ordinal logistic regression model to examine the relationship between practice of citizenship in universities as well as belongingness to universities and future protest. According to Table 7.2, variables of electing student union representative, taking part in clubs or groups and feeling part of university have a statistically significant effect on the probability to protest. Students who elected student union representatives and took part in clubs or groups within the past year are more likely to protest in the future than those who did not. In addition, students who felt more a part of university have a slightly greater tendency to protest in the future.

7.5.3 Volunteering

The final test of citizenship lies in respect of the likelihood of volunteering in the future. Turning to individual effects, variables of taking part in all groups and feeling part of the university have a partial statistical effect on future volunteering while keeping control variables constant. Specifically, university students who have taken part in all kinds of groups are more likely to want to volunteer in the future. Self-identity also remains significant, suggesting university students with a greater sense of belonging are more likely to volunteer in the future.

Limitations

The main limitation of the study may be that the cross-sectional data does not allow us to draw a causal result. However, we argue that it is the belongingness and engagement that lead to the active citizenship outcomes. The theoretical support lies in the theory of community of practice; that is, young people gain identity from their engagement in the university, which facilitates learning of active citizenship. Most importantly, their identity as active members will be retained by students even they leave university, and will continue to stimulate their future participation in society. Furthermore, the study manages to remove effects of previous citizenship education and socioeconomic status by controlling these variables, so it is the more likely to support the above argument rather than indicate that the relationship is causal in the other direction, and that those

Chapter 7

students most likely to participate in citizenship activities are also those that seek out such opportunities at university.

Table 7.2. Likelihood of future citizenship in ordinal logistic regression

Predictor variables	Vote in general election in the future			Take part in non-violent protest march or rally in the future			Volunteer to help others in the future		
	Coefficient	SE	Odds Ratio	Coefficient	SE	Odds Ratio	Coefficient	SE	Odds Ratio
In the last year, have you taken part in any of these activities?									
Electing student union or council representative (No)	-0.11	0.15	0.90	-0.40***	0.13	0.67	0.06	0.14	1.06
Electing staff union or council representative (No)	0.28	0.55	1.32	-0.58	0.50	1.79	0.03	0.54	1.03
Taken part in student union or council (No)	-0.10	0.19	0.90	-0.07	0.16	1.07	-0.06	0.17	0.94
In the last 12 months, have you given any help to any groups?									
Taken part in a sponsored activity for a group or club (No)	-0.10	0.17	0.90	-0.18	0.15	1.20	-0.45***	0.16	0.63
Been a committee member in the group or club (No)	-0.31*	0.19	0.73	0.01	0.16	2.72	-0.28*	0.16	0.76
Organised events (No)	-0.34**	0.17	0.71	-0.07	0.14	0.93	-0.36**	0.15	0.70
Given any other help to groups (No)	0.10	0.17	1.11	0.13	0.15	1.14	-0.56***	0.16	0.57
Taken part in groups or clubs (No)	-0.16	0.16	0.85	-0.31**	0.15	0.73	-0.25	0.16	0.78
How much do you feel part of your university?									
Not at all	-1.32***	0.43	0.27	-0.51	0.42	0.60	-0.90*	0.47	0.41
A little	-0.79***	0.21	0.45	-0.49***	0.18	0.61	-0.61***	0.20	0.54

Quite a lot	-0.42**	0.18	0.66	-0.10	0.15	0.90	-0.26*	0.16	0.77
Intercept 1 (Definitely not)	-5.43***	0.644		-3.88***	0.56		-5.82***	0.64	
Intercept 2 (Probably not)	-4.21***	0.619		-1.99***	0.54		-3.92***	0.60	
Intercept 3 (Probably do)	-2.11***	0.606		0.42	0.54		-0.766	0.14	
Pseudo R2	0.12			0.08			0.14		
Test of Parallel Line P-Value	0.39			0.08			0.02		

Note. Asterisks represent statistically significant differences at the following levels: * $p \leq .1$, ** $p \leq .05$, *** $p \leq .01$. N = 1337

7.6 Discussion and conclusion

Our results confirm the hypothesis that experience at university, including the practice of citizenship and self-identity gained at university, promotes students to be active citizens who participate more in civic and political activities.

For young people in the UK, the results of the analysis show that self-identity such as belongingness to a university is very important for student citizenship. It can be concluded that the process of gaining a sense of belonging to the institution or organisation would promote the learning of active citizenship. This is an innovative finding in young people's citizenship in HE. This also is in line with Sant et al.'s (2015) finding on English students' view of identity in schools that it is possible for these English students to construct a common identity in relation to activity and friendship groups. The interviews suggest that if a student is taking part in an activity with others then the likelihood of sharing a common identity with other participants is accepted. The community of practice theory can provide theoretical support by arguing that members of the community can create identity or belongingness through participation, which also facilitates their learning. (Wenger, 1998). Through a process of identification, 'modes of belonging become constitutive of our identities by creating bonds or distinctions in which we invested' (p.191). Engagement is a source of identification as we identity ourselves in what we do as well as in our relationship with other people in the community (Wenger, 1998). The belongingness comes from participation in activities, organisations and being members at university. For example, students actively participated in voting and organisations on campus, with their identity constructed during the process of reading manifestos, talking with candidates and peers, and then voting for the candidate they thought best. Also, as discussed in the community of practice, the identity of active members will be maintained by young people who actively participate in universities and it will facilitate them to continue participating in the society even when they leave university. This can help support our findings that the identity of active members gained at university helps stimulate future civic participation in the society. In other words, students who feel a part of university are more likely to vote, protest and volunteer in the future. Through practice and engagement, students create their identities as active members in the process of becoming full participants from peripheral participants in universities. Meanwhile, their membership of organisations in university forms their identity as active participants, which makes the individual an insider, a full participant/member. Even when individuals leave this context, participation will likely continue. Wenger (1998) states that the identity of active member becomes a part of

individuals in the community of practice; they will always carry it with them and it will appear if they are confronted by similar situations in other communities. It is the belongingness and engagement at universities that lead to the active citizenship outcomes in society – young people gain their identity through belonging to the university and their engagement in the institution, which in turn supports their learning of active citizenship. More importantly, they will carry that identity with them, and will be more likely to participate in similar activities such as national elections. Students who had been involved in the university might intend to carry on participating and always be involved in society later. They may be motivated to participate more in the future as they experience how elections are run and how people work together, and are satisfied with the process and the free choice to vote and participate on campus. Thus, universities have a key influence on the formation of identity and citizenship. As they provide a variety of opportunities to participate and interact, universities can make contributions to explore, create and strengthen identities. Thus, it is the university's responsibility to be more inclusive for young people in order to help them gain this sense of belonging. The university can encourage students to get involved in the decision-making process on campus. More interactions with other members in clubs or organisations should also be promoted in the university. However, as universities in the UK are moving towards marketization, many students now regard themselves as consumers in universities, which focuses on the relationship of contract and service. One of the difficulties is that students would consequently be interested in a service only for as long as they consume it (Bergan, 2003) – they would have no long-term interest for public good. Therefore, it is important for universities to help students create identity of active participants

In addition, the results of the study indicate that engagement in clubs or organisations in university generally leads to more future civic behaviour in society such as voting, undertaking voluntary activities and engaging in a protest. This indicates that practising opportunities of citizenship in universities play an important role in enhancing their citizenship in the future life. Our results suggest that representation activities on campus, for example, electing student union or council representatives, is very important for promoting future protesting. This has received little attention in previous research. Our research provides evidence to the community of practice theory that those students, as members of the university community, can learn active citizenship through practising representation activities. Our data also supports Bleiklie's (2001) argument that student participation in decision-making can make contributions to citizenship. More significantly, according to our results, giving different kinds of help to groups and clubs at university is very significant for citizenship. This is in line with a study of the social and cultural role of four HEIs in the UK that suggests student volunteering is a means to support active citizenship (Williams and Cochrane, 2010). Our results also find that participation and activities,

such as participation in clubs, can enhance student citizenship. Service learning programmes in the United States also indicate the important role of participation. Some researchers have found community service very helpful for civic education – for example, Campus Compact, the US university and college presidents' association, which promotes service learning and community service and civic engagement in HE (Campus Compact, 2008). However, they have yet to realise the importance of student organisations and activities on campus in active citizenship. According to the theory of community of practice, university is a community of practice, in which students as members can learn citizenship from sharing, practicing and participation. The results in this article offer significant implications for citizenship practice in universities, and our data suggest that offering students multiple participation opportunities in various organisations promotes their citizenship. Universities can also try to create mechanisms or channels to encourage and attract students to participate, and the incentive system can be developed to attract students.

From my perspective, it seems that universities in England have not paid sufficient attention to students' citizenship learning. Recent years has seen profound changes to the higher education sector in the UK, which have tended to emphasise on the role of prospective students as active choosers within a marketplace and on student engagement and representation as a means of improving the quality of the learning experience (Brooks et al., 2015). Currently, the students' satisfaction is the key driver of activities in universities, which plays a role in transforming students into consumers (Williams, 2013). The rise of student consumer model leads to that students focus on their employment prospects and earning potential while universities have emphasised on its individualised economic function and pursuing more about private rather than public goods (Williams, 2013). However, as university has its mission to promote democracy, more activities focusing on promoting students' citizenship should be promoted. In the literature, student union is seen as a major body to promote political engagement (Crossley and Ibrahim, 2012), but our results suggest that there is room for universities to create additional activities and organisations for young people to learn citizenship and form their identity. Activities or programs that can bring students together to communicate, negotiate and actively engage should be encouraged and developed on campus. ICT and social medias can also be used to form community of practices as young people are more likely to be involved in politics online. Also, these activities or programmes can be incorporated with curriculum in universities, which can engage more students.

Chapter 7

As our results suggest the importance of participation in university to citizenship, how we can attract students to participate in organisations and activities and how we take the most advantage of current activities and organisations in university for citizenship should provide a basis for a new research agenda in citizenship education and HE more broadly. In addition, our research could provide some insights to young people 's citizenship learning in other settings such as schools and workplaces.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

Education for active citizenship in HE has been neglected by educational researchers. Most attention has been paid to the secondary education level and there is a strong case for extending the reach of research and theory beyond this and on to the HE level. This is not least because of the staggering growth in the population and size of HE, and the importance of its role in preparing students to be active citizens in civil society. The need for this research is further highlighted when examining voter turnout in the UK. In the 2015 UK general election nearly half the amount of young people voted compared with the older age groups, which means this cohort of young people are not represented within the democratic system. It is, therefore, imperative for us to address the research gap in order to identify how to support young people's political and civic engagement. This thesis takes a three-paper format, which makes several distinctive contributions to citizenship education in HE. Firstly, it compares civic behaviour and attitude between university students and young people not attending universities. Then, it examines the relationship between higher education and citizenship education with the latest longitudinal data in England. Secondly, the research endeavours to understand students' citizenship learning in universities with constructive learning theory and explores whether the community of practice theory can be applied in citizenship learning in HE. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study on this topic. Thirdly, the thesis is significant in terms of the research design, which manages to use mixed methods in the data collection and analysis, and explains citizenship learning with both perspectives. Lastly, the design of the qualitative study also makes an important contribution. The views on representation democracy on campus are more profound and complete as the sample includes both participants holding roles and those without roles. In the thesis, initially, I discussed different citizenship models: the liberal model, republican model, participatory model and the communitarian model. In the liberal model of democracy, there is a political culture where individuals are members of, and committed to, a society that implicitly promotes the values of freedom and tolerance towards individual diversity (Bell, 2012). People pay more attention to individual interest and freedom. The republicans focus on civic virtue, common good and political participation. Civic republicans advocate a general model of democratic participation that requires a wide range of public participation in the decision-making process, arriving at a 'common good' (Poisner, 1996). The participatory model emphasises participation in politics for every citizen rather than for an unequal group. Furthermore, participation could help people become real citizens and be more competent to act as a citizen.

The communitarian model, focusing more on communities rather than on nation or state, emphasises how social groups impact on values and behaviours (Hoskins et al., 2012a). Each model has its unique value as well as limitations. There are different emphases that were taken into consideration in defining and measuring active citizenship in the thesis. I then provided an overview of the context of HE in the UK by introducing the demography of HE, the history of universities, the autonomy and the student experience of universities as well as the globalisation of HE. Then, I reviewed the literature of citizenship in HE and learning theory. The definition of active citizenship consists of several important themes, including civil society, community and political life and democratic values (Hoskins and Mascherini, 2009). It emphasises participation in civil society which is the 'sum of institutions, organisations, and individuals located between the family, the state and the market in which people associated voluntarily to advance common interests' (Anheier, 2004, p.20, cited in Hoskins and Mascherini, 2009). Based on the definition, I measured active citizenship as voting, protesting and volunteering and examined the influence of HE in active citizenship using citizenship education longitudinal data. After this, the way HE promotes active citizenship was explored. Finally, I attempted to understand the students' views of university as a site to learn representative democracy. My findings thus have implications both for education and for policy in the area of active citizenship education in higher education.

In this concluding chapter, I introduce a qualitative study I have conducted as an exploration for understand university as a site to learn citizenship from students' perspective. The finding of the qualitative study will help us to understand more about the thesis. Then, I review the main findings of the research, demonstrating how these successfully address the research questions of the thesis. I begin reviewing the studies in Chapters Six to Nine and the substantive findings of the research. Firstly, I review the comparison of civic behaviour and attitudes between university students and young people not attending universities in Chapter Five and reflect the results on different citizenship models. Then, discussion of the findings in relation to the theories of education as a cause of political engagement or as a proxy lead on to consideration of the influence of HE on active citizenship. This proceeds to a comparison of my results to the theories for the explanation of education's effect on active citizenship. The hypothesis tested in Chapter Six is that university can promote young people's active citizenship. The results show that HE has a positive effect on voting and volunteering, and support the education as a cause theory. The marketisation of HE is also a very important finding in these studies. After confirming HE has a positive effect on active citizenship, I also explored the data to see how citizenship learning takes place in university. Many theories have contributed to the explanation of citizenship learning, but that they are not sufficient to entirely clarify it. I have drawn on community of practice theory and explained the informal learning of citizenship in university. In order to understand these

quantitative findings, I also sought views from university students to elucidate to what extent university was a site for them to learn representative democracy. Belongingness and the process of learning are two significant findings from these studies. After this review, I will also show the implications of my research for policy-making, citizenship learning and universities, and make some recommendations for potential areas for further research.

8.1.1 Qualitative study

In order to understand the quantitative results, I have conducted an additional qualitative study to explore student views on learning citizenship at university. Section 8.1.1.1 describes the data collection and analysis, and the results will be discussed in the following sections. Interviews are conducted to seek students' views on university as a site to learn representative democracy. To date, there has been limited research on students' view of university as a site to learn representative democracy. This study can help understand the thesis, so it is included in the conclusion. From analysing interview data, the study found that student leaders regarded their role as mainly representing students and all students in the study have realised the importance of such democratic representation through participation. Importantly, through participation in representative democracy, students, and especially the student leaders, have gained knowledge and skills about voting and election. Interestingly, students' belongingness was a result of participation in all activities and organisations, which very likely included voting and engagement with the election activity. This learning and belongingness are likely to make them participate more in future democratic representation activities. Even though students gave credit to the university's performance in promoting representative democracy, they identified some challenges. The university is supposed to promote more participation in voting and election for the first-year students. Another concern expressed was that the short-term nature of positions in student union may not allow real changes to be made. The data collection and analysis are described in the following subsections.

8.1.1.1 Qualitative data collection

In order to better understand the research question and 'represent the complexity of our world' (Creswell, 2002, p.194), I selected different kinds of participants. Student representatives, student union or council representatives, students in clubs or organisations, students not holding any position in university from a case university in England were selected for the case study analysis.

The case university in the UK is a university in the Russell Group located in the South of England. Eight interviews were conducted for qualitative data collection. The interview method is appropriate where the researcher needs to focus on gaining insights and understanding the important depth of meaning (Gillham, 2000; Ritchie and Lewis, 2003). Interviews are also very helpful for gaining explanations and information on abstract things such as perceptions, attitudes and values (Partington, 2001). The snowball sampling method was used, which asks participants to identify one or more participants who meet required characteristics and who are willing to be involved in the study (Johnson and Christensen, 2004). In the beginning, only a few student leaders were approached and asked to participate in research; however, they were asked to help to recommend more participants with certain characteristics (Johnson and Christensen, 2004). For my research, I used snowball sampling to find three students who participated in university through student unions or student representatives. They also recommended one student who did not participate in university and who was potentially willing to be involved in the interviews. The participants in each group came from different backgrounds and academic subjects. The analysis took place after data collection. In this way, the interview was developed during data collection. Interview questions gave considerable guidance to participants in order to make sure interviewees answered the questions from the quantitative results as best they could. These questions were built on the quantitative results and relevant literature. In the last part of the interview, interviewees were also allowed to talk about what was significant to them in a given context, in order to understand what kind of university characteristics could lead to more participation. I extracted the important experiences by giving them a label, known as a code. These codes were brought together, and became categories that could then be compared in the analysis.

8.1.1.2 Qualitative analysis

The qualitative phase in the research focuses on explaining why factors tested earlier may be significant in promoting student citizenship, and how best to promote increased student participation in university. A case study has been used in this research. The case study is an in-depth piece of research, focusing on figuring out the particularity and complexity of the case, and perceiving emotional reflections of the researched from different, holistic perspectives in the specific and complicated context (Stake, 1995; Sturman, 1994; Yin, 1994). This indicates that the case study is useful for understanding the complexity of issues, situations and problems in a certain context. Here, the case study helps to explain why factors tested earlier may be significant in promoting student civic participation, and how best to encourage students to participate more

in university. I conducted in-depth 'semi-structured interviews' (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1989, p.83; Bernard, 1988) with student representatives, student club members, student union or council representatives, students not in any organisations, and staff or teachers. The interviews provided insights and are appropriate when looking for rich data illuminating individuals' experiences and feelings. The semi-structured interviews not only enabled me to control the process of obtaining information from the participants, but also helped me to follow new issues raised by interviewees (Bernard, 1988). I recorded interviews by phone with the participants' permission. The data collection and analysis were conducted sequentially.

The interview included around fifteen open-ended questions, and was pilot tested. The questions were based on the literature and results of the statistical analysis of the relationship between university practice and active citizenship as presented in Chapter Six and Seven. The interviews focused on aspects of university practice such as activities, knowledge, feeling and civic participation, as well as how to better involve students in more activities, organisations, and student elections in university. The interview questions were piloted on two students from the same target population in the UK two weeks before the main study, but they were then excluded from the full study. The pilot interviews also contained fifteen open-ended questions, which were designed to understand the quantitative results and student participation in universities. In addition, the participants in the pilot study were encouraged to talk about their perceptions of the study and provide feedback on the interview. After initial analysis of the pilot data and feedback from participants, some changes were undertaken to improve the interview questions and the interview method. The pilot interviews provided valuable guidance for later, more in-depth interviews. The participants received the interview schedule before the interview, and were informed the interview would be recorded and transcribed. The interviews took place in a quiet office in the School of Education at the University of Southampton, England. They lasted about 50 minutes each. After that, participants had the opportunity to review the contents of the interview transcripts as a member check and they did not make any changes to the transcripts.

The qualitative analysis included the following steps: (1) creating an overview of the data by reading the transcripts and writing memos; (2) coding the data by labelling relevant words, phrases, sentences; (3) choosing important codes and create categories by combining several codes; (4) labelling categories and connect relevant categories; (5) constructing a framework of categories; (6) writing up the results and discuss them.

The data analysis included a brief description of each case with their age, subject, grade and other basic information. Methods of case study analysis can vary; in a series of cases studies in the UK,

analysis was performed within each case and across cases (Stake, 1995). The analysis of the data can be a holistic analysis of the whole case or a specific perspective of the cases (Yin, 1994). For this study, each participant case was analysed for categories. Then, all cases were analysed for categories that were either common or different. This reveals the factors that encourage students to participate in university (or not) in the specific context. After this, a comparison of two groups was made based on interview data. Lastly, the research provides an interpretation of the cases and discusses the results. For this study, qualitative analysis software, Nvivo, was used to support the analysis and to help to manage interview and observation data.

The results of the additional qualitative study will be combined with the quantitative findings and be discussed in following sections.

8.2 The important effect of HE on active citizenship

Chapter Five is a descriptive analysis of CELS data, which compares general civic attitude and behaviour between university students and non-university young people. It provides much understanding on political attitude and participation among university students and their peers outside university. It also reflects the citizenship models discussed in section 2.2 of Chapter 2. The liberal model in democracy emphasises rights and tolerance of individuals while the civic republican model focuses on duty and the common good. According to the results, university students in England tend to be a mix of liberal and civic republican in terms of citizenship. In comparison, non-university students pay more attention to rights, social justice and the common good. This shows that the university environment tends to be a combination of liberal and civic republican as well. Universities also pay attention to giving students knowledge about voting and elections. Comparably, non-university young people learn much less about this in the work place. This forms a brief picture of young people's citizenship in England, and a background of the liberal model of universities.

Chapter Six sets out the evidence for the positive influence of higher education on young people's active citizenship, especially for voting and volunteering. Campbell (2006) regards the cognitive development resulting from education as the absolute model, whilst Colby et al. (2007) refer to this as the 'direct effect'. Campbell (2006) employs the European Social Survey (ESS) to test educational attainment against political and civic engagement in multiple European nations, and finds strong evidence for the positive effect of educational attainment in voting, expressive political activity (protesting) and voluntary association. However, there are some scholars who argue that education has no effect on political participation (Desjardins, 2008). Recently, political scientists have argued that education has no effect on political engagement as educational

attainment has been identified as a proxy for socioeconomic background (Persson, 2013). Some researchers argue that education increases political engagement because the people with higher intelligence tend to get more education and participate more. (Jencks et al., 1972; Olneck and Crouse, 1979). **Based on the theoretical review, I propose the hypothesis tested in Chapter 6 that university can promote young people's active citizenship including voting, protesting and volunteering.** I expand the conception of civic or political engagement to active citizenship including voting, protesting and volunteering. I have also used nationally representative longitudinal data to test these theories with variables of citizenship intention prior to **higher education** phrase, which helps to draw a better relationship between citizenship and HE. Some research argues that other background factors such as family socio-economic status, gender and ethnicity influence citizenship. In order to remove the bias of these factors and intelligence factors, the between and within effects have been employed to remove the influence of innate factors and time-invariant variables. Controlling for these, the results support the absolute education theory that education attainment could promote political engagement. The finding shows the importance of citizenship learning in HE, and thus underpins the whole research of the thesis.

8.2.1 Marketisation of HE

My analysis in Chapter Six suggests that people who have a university degree are more likely to vote and volunteer than those without a degree. This is explained and further explored in the quantitative and qualitative analysis. As there are more opportunities in universities for young people to learn and practise citizenship, young people with university degrees tend to vote and volunteer in the future.

However, I have not found evidence for HE's effect on protesting. This is probably because university is now a conserving and marketised environment promoting voting, representation and more quality assurance activities rather than an environment for social change. This is in line with the qualitative results showing that student leaders regarded their roles as mainly representing students, and that representation was the heart of their roles. Voting and election were the most frequently referred to in the interviews. All these results indicate universities are becoming increasingly marketised and a place for representation and volunteering rather than for social justice. University now tends to encourage students to participate based on value for money instead of for the social justice and critical thinking that are very important for society and students. The descriptive analysis also shows young people in universities tend to mostly reflect

the liberal model of political engagement, with a tiny proportion of civic republicans. The marketisation effect on voting and volunteering is also a reflection of the liberal model in universities. Students care more about their rights and interests than responsibility or social justice. There is a possibility that the continuing increase in tuition fees brings about a consumer mindset among students in HE and also strengthens the perception of value for money in HE. The financial burden will mean students make a judgment about the education they receive and will also influence their way of viewing university: should university be more about social equity or the liberal aspects?

I have demonstrated that HE has an impact on active citizenship, which is generally in accordance with some of the previous research on active citizenship and educational attainment. HE is argued to be important for active citizenship as it can provide more knowledge, skills and political familiarity for individuals to participate in more complex political activities (Hillygus, 2005). It does not only prepare a citizen to vote, but also helps them to have 'a reasoned and deliberative decision making' process (Hillygus, 2005, p.27). A key concern of the thesis is to understand further the ways that young people learn citizenship in university. The next section addresses this question.

8.3 Citizenship learning in university

Chapter Seven introduces another key question of the thesis, namely 'How do young people learn citizenship in university in the UK?' In Chapter Seven, I have proposed one plausible hypothesis for the influence of HE on young people's active citizenship. Based on the political engagement project, Colby and her colleagues articulate ideas that help college students in United States to learn citizenship through classroom discussion and deliberation, involving political speakers and mentors in colleges, activities in internships, placements and service-learning as well as structured reflection (Colby et al., 2007). Beaumont et al. (2006) demonstrate at the college level that educational interventions with a focus on political engagement can promote many dimensions of democratic participation, including expectations for future political activity. In the UK, some research has paid attention to the learning of citizenship in HE, but most focuses on voluntary-type activities. This thesis provides the first cross-university quantitative analysis to explore how students learn citizenship in HE in the UK. In addition, we manage to understand citizenship learning from a relatively new pedagogic perspective – constructivist learning. We attempt to examine community of practice theory in learning citizenship in HE. Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that through the process of exchanging information and experiences within the group, the

members could learn from each other, and could promote themselves personally and professionally. The individual as an active participant could learn in the practices of social communities, and construct his/her identity through these communities (Wenger, 1998). However, Wenger's concept failed to take background factors such as class, gender and race in to consideration. I, therefore, move forward from their concept, and conceptualize the community of practice as young people will learn citizenship from participation in universities and their identity can be formed during their participation, but their participation and identity will also be influenced by their gender, race and social economic status. The hypothesis tested in Chapter Seven is that experience at university, including the practice of citizenship and self-identity gained at university, promotes students to be active citizens who participate more in civic and political activities in the future when their social economic status, gender and ethnicity are taken into control. To test the hypothesis, we employed ordered logistic regression on the Citizenship in Transition data in Chapter Seven.

A very important question is to what extent university is a site for students to learn representative democracy. Plantan (2002) has argued that 'universities can become key institutions for the transmission of democratic values through direct engagement in democratic activities and democratic education on campus' (p.6). The qualitative study seeks to understand this question from the students' perspective. The views are not only from those students who held elected positions, but also from those who didn't hold any position in university. Using this data, I was able to distinguish opinions about representative democracy between two groups, whether you are in the role or not. Admittedly, the qualitative sample is very small. However, within the sample, I was able to investigate similarity and difference in terms of future voting intention. The qualitative study not only provides an explanation of the quantitative results, but also further explores the subject from the students' perspective.

Based on the quantitative and qualitative analyses, I have obtained the following findings.

8.3.1 Belongingness

One of the findings is very new in the field of young people's citizenship learning in the HE. For young people in the UK, the quantitative analysis shows that self-identity, such as belongingness to a university, is very important for student citizenship. It can be concluded that the process of gaining a sense of belonging to the institution or organisation would promote the learning of active citizenship. According to CoP theory, identity is formed during engagement, and it also facilitates learning (Wenger, 1998). The theme of 'belongingness' is also a very interesting finding

from the qualitative analysis. All students described their sense of belonging to the university community from a broad perspective. Their belongingness was claimed as a result of participation in all activities and organisations, which very likely included voting and engagement with election activity. This finding is in line with CoP theory that students actively participated in voting and organisations, with their identity constructed during the process of reading manifestos, talking with candidates and peers, and then voting for the candidate they thought best. These qualitative results describe in detail how students' sense of belonging was formed. From the students' descriptions, their belongingness comes from participation in activities, organisations and being members at university. Meanwhile, their membership of organisations in university forms their identity as active participants, which makes the individual an insider, a full participant/member. Along with belongingness, there were feelings of attachment to and ownership of the university. For students this typically came as a result of giving freely of their time through volunteering. Even when individuals leave this context, participation will likely continue. Wenger (1998) states that the participation part of the identity becomes a part of individuals in the community of practice; they will always carry it with them and it will appear if they are confronted by similar situations in other communities. This supports the quantitative results about future engagement in **Chapter Seven**, in that students who feel a part of university are more likely to vote, protest and volunteer in the future. It is the belongingness and engagement at universities that lead to the active citizenship outcomes in society – young people gain their identity through belonging to the university and their engagement in the institution, which in turn supports their learning of active citizenship. Their identity as a political actor is then likely to be continued into their future participation in society. This is further explained in the qualitative data. During this process of forming the sense of belongingness, students learn representation democracy, and more importantly they will carry that identity with them, and will be more likely to participate in similar activities such as national elections. From the students' perspectives, those who had been involved in the university expressed their intention to carry on participating and always be involved in society later. By contrast, students without any positions admitted that their role in university life was 'small' but that their participation in a 'few things' did generate a sense of attachment to their university. They were motivated to participate more in the future as they saw how elections were run and how people put themselves forward, and were satisfied with the process and the free choice to vote on campus.

8.3.2 The process of learning

Studies on learning citizenship in HE are limited, especially those relating to constructive learning theory. The process of learning citizenship is explored on the basis of the theory, specifically

community of practice theory. My analysis in Chapter Six suggests that people who have a university degree are more likely to vote and volunteer than those without a degree. This is explained and further explored in the quantitative analysis in Chapter Seven and qualitative study. The result in Chapter Seven demonstrates that engagement in clubs or organisations in universities generally leads to more future civic behaviour in society such as voting, undertaking voluntary activities and engaging in a protest. This indicates university students learn citizenship from their participation in organisations and clubs on campus. It also means that practising opportunities of citizenship in universities plays an important role in enhancing their citizenship in the future life. This supports the community of practice theory that students as members of the university community can learn active citizenship through participation in activities and organisations. The results offer significant implications for citizenship practice in universities, and they suggest that offering students multiple participation opportunities in various organisations will promote their citizenship. Even though the qualitative sample is small, it still can illuminate the learning process of representative democracy in university. Participation as learning is an important finding from the qualitative analysis. Students thought that they had learned voting, representation democracy and volunteering through their practices and experience in university. Therefore, participation in university life was deemed to be a learning process by participants and that this led to a range of claimed benefits for them. Through participation in representative democracy, students gained knowledge and skills about voting and election, especially the student leaders. Wenger (1998) argues participation in social communities shapes both people's experience and the communities they are in. The process of realignment of meaningful experience and competence is an obvious part of learning that produces knowledge and skills. In the qualitative study, students actively engaging in voting and election and taking the process seriously learn knowledge of and skills about representative democracy from the process. In addition, a range of skills including leadership, communication, organisational skills and the ability to manage time well can be acquired through participation in representation and volunteering activities. Furthermore, participating in university life gives people confidence to participate in the wider world later. From the perspective of the qualitative analysis, therefore, it is apparent that 'university is the best place to start participating'. According to the theory of community of practice, university is a community of practice in which students as members can learn citizenship from sharing, practising and participation.

Students also have opportunities to learn the principle of representation democracy from voting on a university campus, even though the difference between voting in the national election and in a student union election is recognised. The qualitative data further explains why students

participate and how they consider their roles during the learning process. The student leaders' role of representing students was of considerable importance for them to learn and participate. All participants saw themselves as change agents with regards to voting, volunteering or other forms of engagement, and their motivation to participate as a way to exert 'influence'. This indicates universities can encourage students' participation on campus by offering them more opportunities to change things and exert influence, and by making them see their contributions to the university.

The qualitative study also shows that representative democracy is very important for both student leaders and those not holding any positions. By taking part in voting and elections at university, they realise the importance and meaning of representative democracy. This finding is in line with the results in Chapter Seven, and supports the theory that mutual recognition can be built during mutual engagement and interaction (Wenger, 1998). Students shared information, communicated with candidates and participated in voting and elections, which made them understand the importance of representative democracy. Students, especially leaders in this study, also believed that democracy worked, and other students claimed that the election process – including sharing information, communicating with candidates and then choosing the right candidates to represent them – was democratic. This could be argued to be a social learning process, including interacting and sharing, through which they get to learn more about voting and elections.

Another important finding is that all participants regarded themselves as change agents with regards to voting, while student leaders also mentioned change with being elected. Moreover, participants with positions also saw their motivation to participate as a way to exert 'influence'. This can be explained by CoP, in that the community is built by both the participants and the community's requirement, which includes the negotiation of a 'joint enterprise' (Wenger, 1998). The negotiation between active member or full member and the demand of the community leads to relations of mutual accountability, which makes full participants accountable and always seeking to make the community better. This is why students, especially leaders, seek to make university a better place.

Additionally, the case university was evaluated favourably by students in terms of encouraging them to participate in voting and elections. Students' participation in university shapes both students' experience and the university itself. Interviewees reported that the university made efforts to build repertoire by running campaigns to promote voting in national elections. According to interviewees, however, there were also challenges. The university is expected to promote more participation in voting and election among the first-year students. The newcomers

need more interaction and help to become members of the community, and to learn from it. Some participants also expressed their concern that the short-term positions in the student union did not allow real changes to be made.

8.4 Implications

The voter turnout of young people in the 2015 general election in the UK was almost half that of older citizens, which means young people are not properly represented, so the need to encourage young people to participate in representation democracy is especially compelling today. HE has a vital function in promoting democracy and preparing students for living in civil society. The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) has recognised the role of universities in promoting citizenship in its Strategic Plan for the period 2006 to 2011 by pointing out that 'graduates, on average, are more likely to vote in elections, more tolerant to other ethnicities, and more likely to be involved in their local communities through voluntary activities' (HEFCE, 2006, p.42). Without undertaking such responsibility, university is not a place contributing enough to society. The research presented here has implications for academic research as well as policy.

First of all, the policy-maker might ask, does HE have any influence on active citizenship? And how does it influence it? Chapter Six revealed that HE has a positive effect on young people's active citizenship, especially voting and volunteering. This can help policy-makers to raise their awareness of including HE as a part of citizenship education programmes. Universities can include citizenship education as one of their strategies to fulfil their responsibility. A further question might be whether citizenship education in HE should be similar to that in secondary school, focusing on formal learning and teaching in classroom. Or should citizenship education in HE pay more attention to informal learning? Chapter Seven demonstrates that informal learning based on constructive learning theory, such as participation in organisations and identity construction, are useful for active citizenship education in HE. HE can provide opportunities for students to participate and practise citizenship. Meanwhile, universities could try to create mechanisms or channels to encourage and attract students to participate. University can also be more inclusive for young people in order to help them gain this sense of belonging; it can make efforts to encourage students to be involved in the decision-making process on campus. Increased interaction with other members in clubs or organisations should also be promoted in university. Even though some research shows current student unions in HE tend to be moving towards a consumerist model, it is still vital to make efforts to link student organisations to citizenship education. This research has implications for policy-makers, but it is also evident that further

research is needed to more fully understand the situation. I will now give suggestions for further research.

There are some areas which can be explored in future research. As explained in Chapter Seven, there are some limitations in my study that can be addressed in future research. The interview sample sizes were small, so future research may consider expanding the sample size. As three out of four student leaders in the qualitative study were from the social sciences, and as data from interviews suggests different majors may influence students' participation, I could also find out whether students in a particular major are more likely to get involved. Different types of institutions can be included in the research, for example, non-Russell Group institutions. Furthermore, as my research suggests the importance of participation in university to citizenship, looking at ways to attract students to participate in organisations and activities as well as make the most of existing activities and organisations in university for citizenship should provide a basis for a new research agenda in citizenship education and HE more broadly. Importantly, universities also can make spaces for citizenship education in the curriculum, for example through promoting a formal curriculum about citizenship education. As Nussbaum (2002) sees the curriculum implications of citizenship in wide-ranging terms, it could involve a mixture of basic required courses that are compulsory for all students, and the ideas of world-citizenship perspectives in advanced courses in the different disciplines. Furthermore, it would be helpful if we could track particular students in our study after university in employment, to see their interest and action in representation democracy in private and public life. Additionally, my research could provide some insights to young people 's citizenship learning in other settings such as schools and workplaces.

Apart from the practical implications, the research also contributes to the philosophical thinking of universities. There has been a relative neglect of citizenship by universities in the United Kingdom, according to Englund's (2002) view that Western democracies have historically regarded education for democracy and citizenship as the responsibility of schooling and as 'not relevant' to HE (p.282). This thesis has endeavoured to bring some central issues relating to this role into clearer focus. There is both an internal and an external conception of HE: the former refers to epistemic and individual growth while the latter moves outwards to social and especially economic changes (Barnett, 2014). Therefore, higher education can be understood as the outcome of the changes that it as a social institution has undergone (Barnett, 2014). As a matter of public policy, HE has expanded from a small place on the edge of society giving social and cultural capital to elites to a massive institution, involving over 40 per cent of young adults (there are now between 150 and 200 million students worldwide) (Barnett, 2014). This expansion shows the trajectory of HE over the past decades across the world – from a medieval activity barely in society to a major institution of society (Barnett, 2014). 'A university has its possibilities; *and* they

are infinite' (Barnett, 2011, p.13). Each university has multiple options. However, Barnett (2011) states that:

The term 'university' has its place amid a horizon of ideas of university being. These ideas would include knowledge, truth, discussion, inquiry, authenticity, care, understanding, veracity, application, persons, critique, development and action. Newer understandings of the university are caught by new clusters of sentiments, as to money, wealth, society, growth, control, problem nets, property, and power. Yet other understandings have formed of late around a sense of rules, regulations, audit, risk, procedures, systems and processes. And yet other understandings can be seen emerging, variously implied by life chances, the digital revolution, public engagement and citizenship (p.13).

Nussbaum (1997; 2002) has extended the agenda for universities more in the direction of 'making of citizens' with a broad conception of citizenship; specifically, political forms of understanding are from some points of view underemphasised. This thesis has managed to shed light on the social role of HE in that it has an effect on young people's citizenship and that it has significance to young adults. Therefore, universities should be a place to promote citizenship and democracy and prepare students for living in civil society.

8.5 Conclusions

Learning citizenship in secondary school has been proven to be effective, while HE is a field that can be explored as a site for young people's citizenship learning. In this thesis, I have shown the importance of learning citizenship in HE. I have extended the debate on citizenship in HE by generating substantial new evidence about the positive relationship between higher education and young people's active citizenship in the UK, namely that HE has a positive impact on young people's citizenship. Thus my research generally confirms that the positive relationship between educational attainment and citizenship observed in large-scale cross-national research extends to young people in the UK with longitudinal data. The research also finds that HE is moving towards increased marketisation, where students care more about representation and value for money than social justice. In order to understand how HE can help to improve citizenship, we have also relied on statistical analysis. The evidence for learning citizenship in HE has been demonstrated in this thesis – that is, young people can learn active citizenship from participation and constructing an identity within university. It also supports the use of community of practice theory in learning

citizenship in the HE field. Furthermore, I have explored learning representative democracy from the perspective of students, which provides several important insights; belongingness and the process of citizenship learning on campus are two important findings for understanding citizenship learning in the context of HE.

The recent trend of increasing marketisation of HE continues. However, these changes do not obscure the intrinsic value of the university's role as custodian of knowledge and culture and its centrality to democracy and the civil society. I still believe HE needs to take responsibility for helping to prepare students for living in civil society and democracy, especially in the context of globalisation and marketisation. That is why citizenship learning at university matters: young people should be given opportunities to learn and practice citizenship in universities so that they can be active citizens when they live in civil society.

List of References

- Arendt, H. (1969) *The Human Condition*, Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Alley, S. and Smith, M. (2004) 'Timeline: Tuition fees', *The Guardian*, 27 January.
- Almond, G. and S. Verba. (1963) *Civic Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1989) *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Aloni, N. (2002) *Enhancing Humanity: The Philosophical Foundations of Humanistic Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Allison, P. D. (2005) *Fixed Effects Regression Methods for Longitudinal Data Using SAS*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.
- Allison, P. D. (2009) *Fixed Effects Regression Models*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ahier, J. Beck, J. and Moore, R. (2003) *Graduate Citizens? Issue of Citizenship and Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Amnå, E. and Ekman, J. (2013) 'Standby citizens: diverse faces of political passivity', *European Political Science Review*, 6(2), pp.261–281. Available at: http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S175577391300009X (Accessed: May 28, 2014).
- Anheier, H. (2004) *Civil society: Measurement, Evaluation and Policy*. London: Civicus.
- Annette, J. (2010). 'The Challenge of Developing Civic Engagement in Higher Education in England'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 58(4), pp.451–463.
- Annette, J. (2003) 'Community, Politics and Citizenship Education', in Lockyer, A. Crick, B. and Annette, J. (Eds) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Annette, J. (2005). 'Character, Civic Renewal and Service Learning for Democratic Citizenship in Higher Education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(3), pp.326–340.
- Annette, J. and Mayo, M. (2010) *Taking Part? Active Learning for Active Citizenship and Beyond*. Leicester: NIACE.

Chapter 7

Annette, J. and McLaughlin, T. (2005) 'Citizenship and Higher Education in the UK', In Arthur, J. and Bohlin, K. E. (Eds) *Citizenship and Higher Education: The Role of Universities in Communities and Society*. London: Routledge, pp. 56-72.

Arthur, J. and Bohlin, K. E. (2005). *Citizenship and Higher Education. Citizenship and Higher Education: The Role of Universities in Communities and Society*. London: Routledge.

Barnes, S. H. and Kaase, M. (1979). *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*. Beverly Hills CA.: Sage.

Barnett, R. (2007). 'Recovering the Civic University'. In McIlrath, L. and MacLabhrainn, I. (Eds), *Higher Education and Civic Engagement: International Perspectives*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 25-35.

Barnett, R. (2011). *Being a University*. London: Routledge.

Barnett, R. (2014). 'Thinking about higher education'. In Gibbs, P. and Barnett, R. (Eds.) *Thinking About Higher Education*. Switzerland: Springer, pp. 9-22.

Barber, B. (2003). *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Baskerville, S., MacLeod, F. and Saunders, N. (2011). 'A Guide to UK Higher Education and Partnerships for Overseas Universities', *UK: Higher Education International and Europe Unit*, Research Series 9, pp.27-32.

Baughman, M.D. and Eberle, R.E. (1965). The Open Classroom: Guidelines for the Creative Teacher, *Clearing House*, pp. 387-392.

Beaumont, E. Colby, A. Ehrlich, T. and Torney-Purta, J. (2006). 'Promoting Political Competence and Engagement in College Students: An Empirical Study'. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 2(3), pp. 249-70.

Bennett, L. (2007) 'Civic Learning in Changing Democracies: Challenges for Citizenship and Civic Education' in Dahlgren, P. (ed.) *Young Citizens and New Media: Learning and Democratic Engagement*. New York: Routledge, pp. 59-77.

Bennett, W.L. (2008) 'Changing citizenship in the digital age', in Bennett, W.L. (ed.) *Civic life online*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 1-24.

Bennett, W.L. and Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), pp.739-768.

Bernard, H. R. (1988). *Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

BBC (2011) *Q&A University funding*. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-11483638> (Accessed: 17 November 2013).

Bell, D. (2012) *Communitarianism*, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (Spring 2012 Edn), Zalta, E. N. (Ed.). Available at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2012/entries/communitarianism/> (download: 7 December 2012) .

Benson, L. and Harkavy, I. (2002) 'Democratization over commodification! An action orientated strategy to overcome the contradictory legacy of American higher education', *The Journal of Public Affairs*, VI (Supplemental Issue 1: Civic Engagement and Higher Education).

Benson, L., Harkavy, I. and Puckett, J. (2007). *Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform: Civil Society, Public Schools, and Democratic Citizenship*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bergan, S. (2003). *Student Participation in Higher Education Governance*. Available at: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/Governance/SB_student_participation_EN.pdf (Accessed: 17 December 2012).

Biesta, G. (2007) Foundations of Democratic Education: Kant, Dewey and Arendt, in Van Der Veen, R. Wildemeersch, D. Youngblood, J. and Marsick, V. (Eds), *Democratic Practices as Learning Opportunities*. Rotterdam: Sense. pp. 7–18.

Biesta, G. (2009). 'What Kind of Citizenship for European Higher Education? Beyond the Competent Active Citizen', *European Educational Research Journal*, 8(2), pp.146-158.

Biesta, G. and Lawy, R. (2006). From Teaching Citizenship to Learning Democracy: Overcoming Individualism in Research, Policy and Practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(1), pp.63–79.

Bishop, C. M. (2006). *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. New York: Springer.

Bleiklie, I. (2001). Towards European Convergence of Higher Education Policy? *Journal of the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education*, 13(3), pp. 9–29.

Blumberg M., Sweitzer, E. and Helldobler, R. (2005). *Professionalizing Campus Campaigns: A Lesson in Civic Engagement*. Paper presented at the 2005 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Blunkett, D. (2001). *Politics and Progress*. London: Politicos.

Blunkett, D. (2003). *Civic Renewal: A New Agenda*. CSV Edith Kahn Memorial Lecture. Home Office

Bogdan, R.C. and Biklin, S.K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. 3rd edn. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Chapter 7

Boland, J. A. (2005). 'Student Participation in Shared Governance: A Means of Advancing Democratic Values?' *Tertiary Education and Management*, 11(3), pp. 199–217.

Boland, J. A. (2006). 'Pedagogies for civic engagement in Irish higher education: Principles and practices in context', in Sandén, M. and Zdanevicius, A. (Eds) *Democracy, citizenship and higher education: Dialogue between universities and community*, Kaunas, Lithuania: Vytautas Magnus University, pp.72-87.

Boland, J. A. (2008). *Embedding a civic engagement dimension within the higher education curriculum: A study of policy, process and practice in Ireland*. EdD thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Bolden, R. Gosling, J. and O'Brien, A. (2013). 'Citizens of the Academic Community? A Societal Perspective on Leadership in UK Higher Education'. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(5), pp. 754–770.

Borgonovi, F. Beatrice, d' H. and Hoskins, B. (2010) Voter Turnout, Information Acquisition and Education: Evidence from 15 European Countries. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 10 (1), pp. 1-32.

Botstein, L. (2005). 'The curriculum and college life: confronting unfulfilled promises', in Hersh, R. H. and Merrow, J. (Eds.) *Declining by Degrees: Higher Education at Risk*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 209–227.

Bourn, D. and Shiel, C. (2009). 'Global Perspectives: Aligning agendas?' *Environmental Education Research*, 15(6), pp. 661–677.

Bourn, D., McKenzie, A. and Shiel, C. (2006). *The Global University: The Role of the Curriculum*. London: Development Education Association.

Boyte, H. and Kari, N. (2000) 'Renewing the Democratic Spirit in American Colleges and Universities: Higher Education as Public Work', in Ehrlich, T. (Ed.) *Civic Responsibility of Higher Education*. American Council on Education: Oryx Press, pp.37-60.

Brooks, R., Byford, K. and Sela, K. (2015). 'The Changing Role of Students' Unions Within Contemporary Higher Education', *Journal of Education Policy*, 30(2), pp. 165–181.

Browne, J. (2010) *Securing a Sustainable Future for Higher Education: An Independent Review of Higher Education Funding & Student Finance*. Available at: <http://www.independent.gov.uk/browne-report> (Accessed 18 November 2013).

Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service-Learning in Theory and Practice: The Future of Community Engagement in Higher Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bynner, J., Dolton, P., Feinstein, L., Makepeace, G., Malmberg, L. and Woods, L. (2003). *Revisiting the Benefits of Higher education. Report to the Higher Education Funding Council of England*, (April). Available at: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Pubs/RDreports/2003/rd05_03/ (Accessed 18 November 2013).

Campbell, D. E. (2006). 'What is Education's Impact on Civic and Social Engagement?' in Desjardins, R. and Schuller, T. (Eds) *Measuring the Effects of Education on Health and Civic/social Engagement*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, pp. 25–126.

Campus Compact (2008) *Educating Citizens: Building Communities*. Available at: <http://www.compact.org/> (Accessed 1 February 2014).

Carlile, O. and Jordan, A. (2005) 'It Works in Practice but Will it Work in Theory? The Theoretical Underpinnings of Pedagogy', in O'Neill, G. Moore, S. and McMullin, B. (Eds) *Emerging Issues in the Practice of University Learning and Teaching*. Dublin: AISHE, pp. 11–26.

Cemmel, J. and Bekhradnia, B. (2008). *The Bologna Process and the UK's International Student Market*. Oxford: Higher Education Policy Institute.

Cipolle, S. B. (2010). *Service-Learning and Social Justice: Engaging Students in Social Change*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). Educational research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Research. *Upper Saddle River*. NJ: Merrill/Pearson Education.

Creswell, J. W. Plano Clark, V. L. Guttman, M. and Hanson, W. (2003). 'Advanced Mixed Methods Research Designs', in Tashakkori, A. and Teddlie, C. (Eds.) *Handbook on Mixed Methods in the Behavioural and Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp.209-240.

Crick, B. (2002). 'Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 55(3), pp. 488–504.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994). *Research Methods in Education*. 4th edn. London: Routledge.

Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T. and Corngold, J. (2007). *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Responsible Political Engagement* (Vol. 19). Jossey-Bass

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T. Beaumont, E. and Stephens, J. (2000) 'Higher Education and the Development of Civic Responsibility', in Ehrlich, T. (Ed.) *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*. Phoenix: The Oryx Press, pp. xxi-xiii.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E. and Stephens, J. (2003) *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chapter 7

Collins, R. (1979). *The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*. New York: Academic Press.

Commission of the European Communities (2001) *European Governance: A White Paper* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (1994) *Universities and Community*. London, CVCP.

Contu, A. and Willmott, H. (2003) 'Re-embedding situatedness: the importance of power relations in learning theory', *Organization Science*, 14(3), pp. 283-296.

Council of the European Union (2002). *Detailed Work Programme on the Follow-up of Education and Training Systems in Europe*. Brussels, February 2002.

Dalton, J. and Crosby, P. (2008). 'Student Voting and Political Engagement in College: Should Higher Education Be Doing More to Promote Civic Agency?' *Journal of College and Character*, 10(1), pp. 1–8.

Dalton, R. J. (2015). *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation Is Reshaping American Politics*. 2nd edn. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Deng, Y., Hillygus, D. S., Reiter, J. P., Si, Y. and Zheng, S. (2013) 'Handling Attrition in Longitudinal Studies: The Case for Refreshment Samples', *Statistical Science*, 28(2), pp.238-256.

Dee, T.S. (2004) 'Are There Civic Returns to Education?' *Journal of Public Economics*, 88 (9), pp. 1697-1720.

Dense, J. (2012). *Civic Engagement and Distance Learning*. Presented at the American Political Science Association Teaching & Learning Conference, Washington, DC.

Dekker, P. and Halman, L. (2003). 'Volunteering and values', in Dekker, P. and Halman, L. (Eds.) *The Values of Volunteering. Cross-cultural Perspectives*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, pp.1-18.

Delli Carpini, M. X. and Keeter, S. (1996) *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. (2012). *Participation Rates in Higher Education: Academic Years 2006/2007–2010/2011*. Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/16203/12-p140-participation-rates-in-he-2010-11.pdf. (Accessed 02 May 2014).

Department for Education and Employment. (1999). *Citizenship: The National Curriculum for England*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

Desjardins, R. (2008). 'Researching the Links between Education and Wellbeing', *European Journal of Education*, 43(1), pp. 23–36.

Dewey, J. (1961) *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: Macmillan. (Originally published 1916)

Dewey, J. (1998) 'Creative Democracy: The Task before Us', in Boydston, J. A. (ed.), *The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925-1953 (Vol.14)*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. (Originally published 1939), pp. 224-230.

Dewey, J. (2004). *Democracy and education*. New York: Dover Publications.

Doppelt, G. D. (1989) 'Is Rawls' Kantian Liberalism Coherent and Defensible?' *Ethics*, 99 (4), pp. 815-85.

Dicklitch, S. (2003). 'Real Service Real Learning: Making Political Science Relevant through Service-Learning,' *Political Science & Politics*, 36(4), pp. 773–776.

Dzur, A. (2008) *Democratic Professionalism: Citizen Participation and the Reconstruction of Professional Ethics, Identity, and Practice*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Egerton, M. (2002). 'Higher Education and Civic Engagement', *British Journal of Sociology*, 53(4), pp. 603-620.

Ehman, L. H. (1969). 'An Analysis of the Relationships of Selected Educational Variables with the Political Socialization of High School Students', *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(4), pp. 559-580.

Ehrlich, T. (ed). (2000) *Civic Responsibility of Higher Education*, American Council on Education: Oryx Press.

Englund, T. (2002). 'Higher education, Democracy and Citizenship – the Democratic Potential of the University?' *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, (21), pp. 281–287.

Estermann T. and Nokkala T. (2009). *University Autonomy in Europe I*, European University Association

Essomba, M. A. Karatzia-Stavlioti, E. Maitles, H., and Zaltieskiene, I. (2008). *Developing the Conditions for Education for Citizenship in Higher Education (CiCe Guidelines on the Design of Higher Education Courses)*. London: Children's Identity & Citizenship in Europe Thematic Network.

European Commission, Directorate General for Education and Culture. (2007). *Study on Active Citizenship Education*. Available at: http://www.pedz.uni-mannheim.de/daten/edz-b/gdbk/07/study_active_citizenship.pdf. (Accessed 2 February 2014).

Eurydice. (2012). *Citizen Education in Europe*. Brussels: Education, Audio Visual and Culture Executive Agency. Available at: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/139EN.pdf (Accessed 6 September 2014).

Chapter 7

- Field, A. P. (2013). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. 4th edn. London: SAGE.
- Fish, S. E. (2003). 'Aim low', *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(36), C5, May 16.
- Frees E. W. (2004). *Longitudinal and Panel Data: Analysis and Applications in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freedland, M. (2001) 'The Marketization of Public Services', in Crouch, C. Eder, K. and Tambini, (Eds), *Citizenship, Markets and the State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.90-110.
- Freiberg, H. J. and Stein, T.A. (1999). *School Climate: Measuring, Improving and Sustaining Healthy Learning Environments*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Fox, S. (1997). 'Situated Learning Theory versus Traditional Cognitive Learning Theory: Why Management Education Should not Ignore Management Learning', *Systems Practice*, 10(6), pp. 727–747.
- Galston, W. A. (2001). 'Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, pp. 217-234.
- Gastil, J. and Dillard, J. P. (1999). 'The Aims, Methods, and Effects of Deliberative Civic Education through the National Issues Forum'. *Communication Education*, (48), pp. 179–192.
- Gerber, A. S., Green, D. P. and Shachar, R. (2003) 'Voting May Be Habit Forming: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment', *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(3), pp. 540-550.
- Gherardi, S. Nicolini, D. and Odella, F. (1998) 'Toward a social understanding of how people learn in organizations', *Management Learning*, 29(3), pp. 273–97.
- Gillhman, B. (2000). *The research interview*. London: Continuum
- Giroux, H. (2011). 'Fighting for the Future: American Youth and the Global Struggle for Democracy', *Cultural Studies – Critical Methodologies*, 11 (4), pp. 328–340.
- Glanville, J. L. (1999). 'Political Socialization or Selection? Adolescent Extracurricular Participation and Political Activity in Early Adulthood', *Social Science Quarterly*, 80(2), pp. 279-290.
- Goldenson, D. R. (1978). 'An Alternative View About the Role of the Secondary School in Political Socialization: A Field-Experimental Study of the Development of Civil Liberties Attitudes', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 6, pp. 44-72.
- Goodin, R. (2003) Folie Republicaine, *Annual Review of Political Science*, (6), pp. 55-76.
- Goddard, J. (2009) Re-inventing the Civic University, Provocation 12, NESTA.
- Grossman, D. L. (1975) 'Educational Climates and Attitudes toward Dissent: A Study of Political Socialization of Conflict Norms in Adolescents,' *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 36, pp. 1950-1980.
- Haahr, J. (1997) *Nordic Area Citizenship Study-Final Report*. Available at: www.europa.eu.int/comm/education/archive/citizen/copenhagen.pdf. (Accessed 6 September 2014).
- Halaby, C. N. (2004). 'Panel Models in Sociological Research: Theory into Practice,' *Annual Review of Sociology*, (30), pp. 507–544.

- Hahn, C. L. and Cynthia, M. T. (1990) 'Classroom Climate and Controversial Issues Discussions: A Five Nation Study,' *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 18(4), pp. 344-362.
- Hahn, C.L. (1998) *Becoming political: Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education*. Albany, NY: Suny Press
- Hall, P. and Soskice, D. (eds) (2009). An Introduction to Varieties of Capitalism, *Debating Varieties of Capitalism*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Handley, K. Sturdy, A. Fincham, R. and Clark, T. (2006) 'Within and Beyond Communities of Practice: Making Sense of Learning through Participation, Identity and Practice', *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(3), p. 641-653.
- Held D. (2006). *Models of Democracy*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Helliwell, J. and Putnam, R.D. (1999). *Education and Social Capital*, NBER Working Paper (W7121), No. 7121.
- Hepburn, M. A., Niemi, R. G. and Chapman, C. (2000) 'Service Learning in College Political Science: Queries and Commentary,' *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 33(3), pp. 617–622.
- Herrnstein, R. J. and Murray, C. (1994). *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (2006). *Strategic Plan, 2006-2011*, Bristol: HEFCE, available at [http:// www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2006/06_13/](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2006/06_13/) (Accessed 3 January, 2014)
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (2011). *Opportunity, Choice and Excellence in Higher Education*, available at www.hefce.ac.uk/about/howweoperate/strategystatement/ (Accessed 20 May, 2013)
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (2012a). *About the Higher Education*, available at www.hefce.ac.uk/about/intro/abouthighereducationinengland/ (Accessed 20 May, 2013)
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (2012b). *The report 'Higher Education – Business and Community Interaction survey 2010-11'*, available at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2012/201218/> (Accessed 20 May, 2013)
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (2013a). *National Student Survey*, available at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/whatwedo/lt/publicinfo/nss/> (Accessed 20 May, 2013)
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (2013b). *Student satisfaction at a nine-year high*. available at: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/news/newsarchive/2013/news82928.html> (Accessed 20 May 2013)
- Higher Education Statistics Agency. (2014). *Table Bi – Percentage of UK Domiciled Young Full-time First Degree Entrants from NS-SEC Classes 4, 5, 6 or 7 by Location of Institution and Academic Year*. Higher Education Statistics Agency, available at: <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/pis/summary>. (Accessed 02 September 2014).

Chapter 7

Higher Education Statistics Agency. (2015). *Table 1 – HE Student Enrolments by Mode of Study, Sex, Level of Study and Domicile 2009/10 to 2013/14*, available at: <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/content/view/1973/239/> (Accessed 02 January 2015)

Higher Education Statistics Agency. (2016) *Headline Statistics: UK total 2014/15*, available at: <https://www.hesa.ac.uk> (Accessed 10 June 2016)

Hillygus, D. S. (2005). 'The Missing Link: Exploring the Relationship between Higher Education and Political Engagement', *Political Behaviour*, 27(1), pp. 25-47.

Hoskins, B. (2006). *A framework for the Creation of Indicators on Active Citizenship and on Education and Training for Active Citizenship*. Ispra: European Commission.

Hoskins, B. and M. Mascherini. (2009) 'Measuring Active Citizenship through the Development of a Composite Indicator', *Social Indicators Research*, 90, pp.459–488.

Hoskins, B. Abs, H., Han, C., Kerr, D. and Veugelers, W. (2012a). *Contextual Report: Participatory Citizenship in the European Union, Institute of Education report for EU*. Southampton: Southampton University.

Hoskins, B. Janmaat, J.G. and Villalba, E. (2012b) 'Learning citizenship through social participation outside and inside school: an international, multilevel study of young people's learning of citizenship', *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), pp. 419–446.

Hoskins, B., Villalba, C. and Saisana, M. (2012c). *The 2011 Civic Competence Composite Indicator (CCCI-2): Measuring Young People's Civic Competence across Europe based on the IEA International Citizenship and Civic Education Study*. Ispra, Italy, European Commission, 100pp.

Hoskins, B., d'Hombres, B. and Campbell, J. (2008) 'Does formal education have an impact on active citizenship behaviour', *European educational research journal*, 7(3), pp. 386-402.

Hoskins, B., and Janmaat, J. G. (2016) 'Educational trajectories and inequalities of political engagement among adolescents in England', *Social Science Research*, 56, pp. 73–89.

Hirano, K. Imbens, G. Ridder, G. and Rubin, D. (1998) *Combining panel data sets with attrition and refreshment samples*. NBER Working Paper, No.230.

Hillygus, D. S. (2005) 'The Missing link: Exploring the Relationship Between Higher Education and Political Engagement', *Political Behaviour*, 27(1), pp. 25-47.

Hitchcock, G. and Hughes, D. (1989). *Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School-based Research*. London: Routledge.

Huckfeldt, R. and Sprague J. (1992). 'Political Parties and Electoral Mobilization: Political Structure, Social Structure, and the Party Canvass', *American Political Science Review*, (March), pp. 70-86.

Hutton, R. H. (1890) *Cardinal Newman*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company

Ipsos MORI (2015) 'How Britain voted in 2015: The 2015 Election – Who Voted for Whom?' Ipsos MORI, available at: <https://www.ipsos-mori.com/researchpublications/researcharchive/3575/How-Britain-voted-in-2015.aspx?view=wide> (Accessed 10 September 2015)

Irish Taskforce on Active Citizenship (2007). *The Concept of Active Citizenship*. Dublin: Secretariat of the Taskforce on Active Citizenship.

Ivancic, A. Novak, D. Chioncel, N. and Jansen, T. (2003) *Active Citizenship and Governance in the Central and Eastern European Context Report on Critical Review of the National Literature and Policy Analysis*. Netherlands: University of Nijmegen (Reviewing Education and Training for Governance and Active Citizenship in Europe - A Central and Eastern European Perspective (RE-ETGACE).

Iwanek, S. (2012) *Innovative Professors and the Civic-Minded Student*. Presented at the American Political Science Association Teaching & Learning Conference, Washington, DC.

Jackson, N. (2012). *Lifewide Learning, Education and Personal Development E-book*, available at: <http://lifewideeducation.co.uk/page/lifewide-learning-education-personal-development-e-book> (Accessed 12 February 2014)

Janmaat, J.G. and Mons, N. (2011) 'Promoting Ethnic Tolerance and Patriotism: the Role of Education System Characteristics,' *Comparative Education Review*, 55 (1), pp. 56-81.

Janmaat, J.G., Mostafa, T. and Hoskins, B. (2014) 'Widening the Participation Gap: the Effect of Educational Track on Reported Voting in England', *Journal of Adolescence*, 37, pp. 473–482.

Jansen, T. Chioncel, N. and Dekkers, H. (2006). 'Social Cohesion and Integration: Learning Active Citizenship', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(2), pp. 189–205.

Jencks, C. Smith, M. Acland, H. Bane, M. Cohen, D. Gintis, H. Heyns, B. and Michelson, S. (1972). *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books

Jennings, M.K. and van Deth, J. W. (1989). *Continuities in political action: A longitudinal study of political orientations in three western democracies*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Jewson, N. (2007) 'Cultivating network analysis: rethinking the concept of "community" within "communities of practice"', in Hughes, J. Jewson, N. and Unwin, L. (Eds) *Communities of practice: critical perspectives*. London: Routledge, pp.68–82.

Johnson, R. B. and Christensen, L. B. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J. and Turner, L. A. (2007). 'Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), pp. 112-123.

Kalton, G. and Flores-Cervantes, I. (2003) 'Weighting methods', *Journal of Official Statistics*, 19, pp.81-97.

Kam, C. D. and Palmer, C. L. (2008). 'Reconsidering the Effects of Education on Political Participation', *The Journal of Politics*, 70(3), pp.612–631.

Chapter 7

- Kelly, A.V. (2002) 'The Idea of a University Revisited', *Irish Educational Studies*, 22(2), pp. 101-116.
- Kennedy, K. J. (2007). 'Student Constructions of "Active Citizenship": What Does Participation Mean to Students?' *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(3), pp. 304–324.
- Kerr, D. Lopes, J. Nelson, J. White, K. Cleaver, E. and Benton, T. (2007). 'Vision Versus Pragmatism: Citizenship in the Secondary School Curriculum in England', *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Fifth Annual Report*, Slough: NFER.
- Kerr, D. Sturman, L. Schulz, W. and Burge, B. (2010) *ICCS 2009 European Report: Civic Knowledge, Attitudes, and Engagement Among Lower-secondary Students in 24 European Countries*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Kisby, B. and Sloam, J. (2009) 'Revitalising Politics: the Role of Citizenship Education', *Representation*, 45(3), pp. 313–324.
- Lave, J. (1993) 'The practice of learning', in Chaiklin, S. and Lave, J. (eds) *Understanding Practice: Perspectives of Activity in Context*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-34.
- Lave, J. and E. Wenger. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leighley, J. E. (1996) 'Group membership and the mobilization of political participation', *Journal of Politics*, 58 (May), pp. 447-63.
- Levine, P. (2007). *The Future of democracy: Developing the next generation of American citizens*. Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England.
- Lewis, P. Vasagar, J. Williams, R. and Taylor, M. (2010) 'Student protests over fees turns violent', November 10, London: The Guardian.
- Lindkvist, L. (2005) 'Knowledge Communities and Knowledge Collectivities: A Typology of Knowledge Work in Groups', *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(6), pp. 1189– 1210.
- Lindstrom, M. and Haeg, G. C. (2010). *Getting Potomac Fever: Increasing Civic Engagement Through Experiential Learning Communities*. Presented at the American Political Science Association Teaching & Learning Conference, Philadelphia, PA.
- Lisbon European Council (2000) *Presidency Conclusions*, Lisbon, 23-24 March 2000.
- Lizzio, A. and Wilson, K. (2009) 'Student participation in university governance: the role conceptions and sense of efficacy of student representatives on departmental committees,' *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(1), pp.69–84.
- Little, B. Locke, W. Scesa, A. and Williams, R. (2009). *Report to HEFCE on engagement*. HEFCE, Bristol, UK. Available on http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/2009/rd03_09/ (accessed: 1 January 2013)

Longo, N. and Meyer, R. (2006). *College students and politics: A literature review*. College Park: Maryland: The Centre for Information and Research in Civic Learning and Engagement.

Lovett, F. (2010) *Republicanism*, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2010 Edition), in Zalta, E. N. (ed.) available at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2010/entries/republicanism> (assessed: 20 May 2012).

Lovett, F. (2010) *A General Theory of Domination and Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lowe, R. (1983) 'The Expansion of Higher Education in England', in Jarausch, K. H. (ed) *The Transformation of Higher Learning 1860 – 1930: Expansion, Diversification, Social Opening and Professionalization in England, Germany, Russia and the United States*, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, pp. 37-56.

Luescher-Mamashela, T. M. (2013) 'Student representation in university decision making: good reasons, a new lens?' *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(10), pp. 1442–1456.

Luskin, R. C. (1990) 'Explaining Political Sophistication', *Political Behavior*, 12(4), pp. 331–355.

Mackenzie, N. and Knipe, S. (2006). 'Research Dilemmas: Paradigms, Methods and Methodology', *Issues in Educational Research*, 16(2), pp. 193–205.

Malone, C. and Julian, G. (2005). 'Democratic Action Research (DARE) and Large-Scale Simulations: Teaching Political Literacy and Civic Engagement at Pace University's Presidential Convention, 2004' *Political Science and Politics*, 38(4), pp. 771–776.

Marsh, D. O'Toole, T. and Jones, S. (2007). *Young People and Politics in the UK: Apathy or Alienation?* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class: And Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marton, F. and Saljo, R. (1976). On Qualitative Difference in Learning I: Outcome and Process, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 46, pp. 4–11.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1848) 'Manifesto of the Communist Party', Marx/Engels Selected Works, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Mayo, M. and Rooke, A. (2006) *Active Learning for Active Citizenship: an Evaluation Report* (Crown Report).

McAdam, D. and Paulsen, R. (1993) 'Specifying the Relationship between Social Ties and Activism', *American Journal of Sociology*, 99, pp. 640-667.

McCartney, A. R. M. Bennion, E. A. and Simpson, D. (eds) (2014) *Teaching Civic Education: From Student to Active Citizen*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.

McCowan, T. (2012) 'Opening Spaces for Citizenship in Higher Education: Three Initiatives in English Universities', *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(1), pp.51–67.

McFarland, D. A. and Thomas, R. J. (2006) 'Bowling Young: How Youth Voluntary Associations Influence Adult Political Participation', *American Sociological Review*, 71(3), pp. 401-425.

Chapter 7

McGinn, N. and Epstein, H. (eds.) (1999) *Comparative Perspectives on the Role of Education in Démocratisation*. Frankfurt: Peter Land

McHugh, M. and Mayer, R. (2012) *Do Lazy Students Learn Less from Service?* Presented at the American Political Science Association Teaching & Learning Conference, Washington, DC.

McQuaid, K. K. (1992) 'Guided Design Simulations in Introductory Level American Politics and State and Local Politics Courses Guided Design Simulations in Introductory Level American Politics and State and Local Politics Courses', *Political Science and Politics*, 25(3), pp. 532–534.

Mertens, D.M. (2005). *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods*. Thousand Oaks; London: SAGE

Meyer, D. S. and Tarrow, S. (Eds.) (1998). *The Social Movement Society: Contentious Politics for A New Century*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers INC.

Miller, W. E., and Shanks, J. M. (1996) *The New American Voter*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Milligan, K. Moretti, E. and Oreopoulos, P. (2004) 'Does Education Improve Citizenship? Evidence from the United States and the United Kingdom', *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(910), pp. 1667–1695.

Molander, B. (2002) 'Politics for learning or learning for politics', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21(4-5), pp. 361-375.

Munck, R. (2005) *Globalization and Social Exclusion: A Transformationalist Perspective*, Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

Munck, R. (2010). 'Civic engagement and global citizenship in a university context', *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 9(1), pp. 31–41.

Mutch, A. (2003) 'Communities of Practice and Habitus: A Critique', *Organization Studies*, 24 (3), p. 383-401.

National Foundation for Educational Research, CELS-CiT (2012) *Civic Engagement among Young People 2001-2011*, available at <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research/projects/cels-cit/> (Accessed: 15 January 2014)

Nie, N. H. and Hillygus, D. S. (2001). 'Education and Democratic Citizenship: Explorations into the Effects of What Happens in Pursuit of the Baccalaureate', in Ravitch, D. and Viteritti, J. (eds.) *Education and Civil Society*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, pp.30-57.

Nie, N. H. Junn, J. and Stehlik-Berry, K. (1996). *Education and Democratic Citizenship in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nie, N.H. Junn, J. and Stehlik-Barry, K. (1996) *Education and Democratic Citizenship in America*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Niemi, R. and Junn, J. (1998) 'Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn', *Oxford, A brief history of the University*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997) *Cultivating Humanity, A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2002) 'Education for citizenship in an era of global connection', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21, (4–5), pp. 289–303.

Ogris, G. and Westphal, S. (2006) *Active Citizenship Indicators on the Political Domain*. Vienna: SORA Institute for Social Research and Analysis.

Olneck, M. & Crouse, J. (1979) 'The IQ meritocracy reconsidered', *American Journal of Education*, 88, pp. 1–31.

ORRILL, R. (Ed.) (1995) *The Condition of American Liberal Education*, New York: The College Board.

ORRILL, R. (Ed.) (1998) *Education and Democracy: Re-imagining Liberal Learning in America*, New York: The College Board.

Owen, D. Chalif, R. and Soule, S. (2011). *Civic Education and Knowledge of Government and Politics*. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Seattle, WA.

Paterson, L. (2009) 'Civic values and the subject matter of educational courses', *Oxford Review of Education*, 35 (1), pp. 81–98.

Paterson, L. and Bond, R. (2005). 'Higher Education and Critical Citizenship: a Survey of Academics' Views in Scotland and England', *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 13(2), pp. 205–232.

Pattie, P. Seyd, C. and Whiteley, P. (2004). *Citizenship in Britain: Values, Participation and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Partington, G. (2001) 'Qualitative research interviews: Identifying problems in technique', *Issues in Educational Research*, 11(2), pp. 32–44.

Pascarella, E. T. and Terenzini, R.T. (2005) *How College Affects Students, Volume 2, A Third Decade of Research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Peck, J. (2011) *Extension Commands and Rim Weighting with IBM SPSS Statistics: Theory and Practice*, IBM Corporation.

Perkin, H. (1983) 'The pattern of social transformation in England,' in Jarausch, K. H. (ed) *The Transformation of Higher Learning 1860 – 1930: Expansion, Diversification, Social Opening and Professionalization in England, Germany, Russia and the United States*, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, pp.207-218.

Persson, A. (2003) *Student participation in the governance of higher education in Europe. A Council of Europe survey*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Steering committee on higher education and research. Working party on the Bologna process

Persson, M. (2012) 'Does Type of Education Affect Political Participation? Results from a Panel Survey of Swedish Adolescents', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 35 (3), pp. 198–221.

Chapter 7

Persson, M. (2013) 'Testing the Relationship between Education and Political Participation Using the 1970 British Cohort Study', *Politic Behave*, 33, pp.455-478.

Phillips, A. (1991) *Engendering democracy*. PSU Press Co-published with Polity Press.

Poisner, J. (1996). 'Essays: A Civic Republican Perspective on the National Environmental Policy, Act's Process for Citizen Participation', *Environ. Law* 26, pp. 53–94.

Plantan, F. (2002) *Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Civic Responsibility: Final General Report*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Steering committee on higher education and research.

Plutzer, E. (2002) 'Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth in Young Adulthood', *American Political Science Review*, 96, pp. 41–56.

Preston, J. and Green, A. (2003) 'The Macro-Social Benefits of Education', *Training and Skills in Comparative Perspective*. London: Centre for the Wider Benefits of Learning.

Putnam R. D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ramsden, P. (2003) 'Learning to Teaching in Higher Education', 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Ritchie, J. and J. Lewis (2003). *Qualitative Research Practice: a Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. London: SAGE.

Roberts, J. (2006) 'Limits to Communities of Practice', *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(3), pp. 623-639.

Roefs, M. (2003). *Public Participation and Perceived (in) Justice in South Africa, 1995-2000*. PhD Thesis, Amsterdam Free University. Rosema

Rosenstone, S. and Hansen, J. M. (1993) *Mobilization, Participation and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan.

Rose, N. (1999) 'Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought', Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roopnarine, J.L. and Johnson, J. E. (2012) *Approaches to Early Childhood Education*, 6th edn, Pearson.

Saltmarsh, J. (1996) 'Education for critical citizenship: John Dewey's contribution to the pedagogy of community service learning', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 3, pp. 13–21.

Saltmarsh, J. and Hartley, M. (eds). (2011) *To Serve a Larger Purpose: Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Sant, E. Davies, I. and Santisteban, A. (2015) 'Citizenship and Identity: the self-image of secondary school students in England and Catalonia', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 64(2), pp.235-260.

Shepherd, J. and Sedghi, A. (2011) 'Tuition Fees 2012: What Are the Universities Charging?' London: *The Guardian*, 25 March. (Accessed: 5 May 2013)

Sharot, T. (1986) 'Weighting Survey Results', *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 28, pp. 269- 284.

- Simpson, R. (1983) *How the PhD Came to Britain: a Century of Struggle for Postgraduate Education*. Guildford: Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Sloam, J. (2008). 'Teaching Democracy: The Role of Political Science Education', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 10(3), pp. 509–524.
- Sloam, J. (2011) "'Rejuvenating Democracy?" Young People and the "Big Society" Project', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 65(1), pp. 90–114.
- Sloam, J. (2013) 'Voice and Equality: Young People's Politics in the European Union', *West European Politics*, 36(4), pp. 836-858.
- Sloam, J. (2016) 'Diversity and Voice: the Political Participation of Young People in the European Union', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 18(3), pp. 521-537.
- Spiezio, K. Baker, K. and Boland, K. (2005) 'General Education and Civic Engagement: An Empirical Analysis of Pedagogical Possibilities', *The Journal of General Education*, 54(4), pp. 273–292.
- Strachan, J. C. (2006) 'An Argument for Deliberative Civic Education in the Political Science Class Room', *Political Science and Politics*, 39(4), pp. 911–916.
- Sieber, S. D. (1973) 'The integration of fieldwork and survey methods', *American Journal of Sociology*, 73, pp. 1335-1359.
- Smith, E. T. and Boyer, M. A. (1996) 'Designing In-Class Simulations', *Political Science and Politics*, 29(4), pp. 690–694.
- Smith, R. (2012). *Going Back to School: A University-Middle School Civics Partnership*. Presented at the American Political Science Association Teaching & Learning Conference, Washington, DC
- Sondheimer, R. M. and Green, D. P. (2010). 'Using experiments to estimate the effects of education on voter turnout', *American Journal of Political Science*, 54, pp. 174–189.
- Stake, R. E. (1995) *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sturman, A. (1994) 'Case Study Methods', in Keeves, J. P. (Ed), *Educational Research, Methodology and Measurement: An International Handbook*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp.173-179
- Sullivan, W. M. (2000) 'Institutional Identity and Social Responsibility in Higher Education', in Ehrlich, T. (Ed.) *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, Phoenix: The Oryx Press, pp. 19-36.
- Sullivan, W. M. (2004) *Work and Integrity: the Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapter 7

Teune, H. and Vish, V. (2010). *The Penn Democracy Project: What Has Been Learned About Democratic and Civic Education from Surveys of Penn Undergraduates?* Presented at the American Political Science Association Teaching & Learning Conference, Philadelphia, PA.

Thomas, N. (2002) *Children, Family and the State: Decision-making and Child Participation*, Bristol: Policy Press.

TNS-BMRB (2015) *Citizenship education longitudinal Survey: Wave 6 Technical report*, unpublished report.

The Quality Assurance Agency (2012). *International students studying in the UK - Guidance for UK higher education providers*. Available at: www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/International-students-studying-in-the-UK.aspx/ (Accessed: 8 May, 2013)

de Tocqueville, A. (1988). *Democracy in America*. New York: Harper and Row.

Torney-Purta, J. Schwille, J. and Amadeo, J. (1999). *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-Four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Torney-Purta, J. and Carolyn B. (2005) 'Democratic School Engagement and Civic Participation among European Adolescents: Analysis of Data from the IEA Civic Education Study', *Journal of Social Science Education*, 4 (Special issue: The European Year of Citizenship through Education).

Torney-Purta, J. Bruno, L. and Heinrich, M. (2001) *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*. Amsterdam: IEA.

Townes, M. (2012). *Quantum Civics: Politics for Everyone*. Presented at the American Political Science Association Teaching & Learning Conference, Washington, DC

Turner, B. S. (2001) 'The Erosion of Citizenship', *British Journal of Sociology*, 52(2), pp. 189–210.

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) (1998). *World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-first Century: Vision and Action*. Paper presented at the World Conference on Higher Education, France, October 5–9.

Vann, K. and Bowker, G.C. (2001) 'Instrumentalizing the truth of practice', *Epistemology*, 15(3), pp. 247–62.

Verba, S. Schlozman, K. L. and Brady, H. (1995) *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Verba, S. and Nie, H. (1972) *Participation in America: Political democracy and social equality*. New York: Harper and Row.

Verba, S. N.H. Nie and J. Kim. (1978). *Participation and Political Equality: A Seven-nation Comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verba, S. Schlozman, K. L. and Burns, N. (2005) 'Family Ties. Understanding the Intergenerational Transmission of Political Participation', in Zuckerman, A. S. (Ed.) *The social logic of politics. Personal networks as contexts for political behaviour*. Philadelphia: Temple University, pp.95-114.

Veugelers, W. de Groot, L. and Nollet, F. (2014) 'Higher education and citizenship development', in Teodoro, A. and Guilherme, M. (Eds.) *European and Latin American higher education between mirrors*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp.179–196.

Vromen, A. (2003). 'People Try to Put Us Down...': Participatory Citizenship of 'Generation X'. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 38(1), pp. 79–99.

Wakeling, P. B. J. (2009). *Social Class and Access to Postgraduate Education in the UK: a Sociological Analysis*. PhD thesis. Available at: <http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~pbjw1/> (Accessed: 5 November 2014).

Walker, T. (2000). 'The Service/Politics Split: Rethinking Service to Teach Political Engagement', *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 33(September), pp. 647–662.

Weerd, M. de, Gemmeke, M. Rigter, J. and Van Rij, C. (2005) *Indicators for Monitoring Active Citizenship and Citizenship Education*. Amsterdam: Regioplan Beleidsonderzoek.

Winkelmann, L. and Winkelmann, R. (1998) 'Why are the unemployed so unhappy?' *Evidence from panel data. Economics*, 65, pp. 1–15.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whiteley, P. F. Keating, A. Kerr, D. and National Foundation for Educational Research. (2013). *Citizens in Transition: Civic Engagement among Young People, 2011*. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 7230, available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-7230-1> (download 3 September 2014)

Williams, J. (2013) *Consuming Higher Education. Why Learning Can't Be Bought*. London: Bloomsbury.

Williams, R. and Cochrane, A. (2010). *The Role of Higher Education in Social and Cultural Transformation*. Centre for Higher Education Research and Information. London: The Open University. Available at: http://oro.open.ac.uk/21285/2/Higher_Education_and_Society_Chapter_3__Social_and_cultural_transformation.pdf. (Accessed 17 March 2014)

Chapter 7

Wilmer, F. (2006). *Pedagogy and politics: Democracy in the classroom*. Available at: <http://www.montana.edu/teachlearn/Papers/ideologicalconf.html> (Accessed 8 August, 2013)

Wolf, A. (2002). *Does Education Matter? Myths About Education and Economic Growth*. London: Penguin Books.

Wynne, R. (2014) 'Higher Education Student Civic Engagement: Conceptualizations of Citizenship and Engagement Strategies', in Laker, J. Naval, C. and Mrnjaj, K. (Eds) *Citizenship, Democracy and Higher Education in Europe, Canada and the USA*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.60–85

Zgaga, P. (2008). 'Higher education and citizenship: "the full range of purposes"', *European Educational Research Journal*, 8(2), pp. 175–188.

- Yang, J. & Hoskins, B. (forthcoming a). Young People' s Citizenship Learning at University in the UK: Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis on Citizenship in Transition Dataset, *Educational Research*.
- Yang, J. & Hoskins, B. (forthcoming b). Young people's citizenship learning at university in the UK: ordinal logistic regression analysis on the Citizenship in Transition dataset, *Oxford Review of Education*.
- Yanus, A. B., Kifer, M. J., Namaste, P., Elder, S. L., & Blosser, J. (2015). Turning Civic Education into Engagement: Evaluating the Efficacy of the Democracy USA Project. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 11(3), 279–300. doi:10.1080/15512169.2015.1047105
- Yates, M. and Youniss, J. (1998) Community Service and Political Identity Development in Adolescence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 495-512
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bibliography

List of References

Appendix A Table Likelihood of Future Citizenship in Ordinal Logistic Regression

Control variables	Vote in general election in the future			Take part in a non-violent protest march or rally			Volunteer your time in the future		
	Coefficient	Std. Error	Odds Ratio	Coefficient	Std. Error	Odds Ratio	Coefficient	Std. Error	Odds Ratio
Gender (Male)	0.14	0.14	1.15	0.13	0.82	1.14	-0.90***	1.38	0.41
Ethnicity (White)	-0.88***	0.18	2.41	0.18	0.92	1.20	0.26	0.18	1.30
Mother education level (left full time education before 16)	0.13	0.19	1.14	-0.10	0.16	0.90	0.15	0.18	1.16
Mother education level (left full time education after school)	-0.10	0.18	0.90	-0.23	0.16	1.26	0.34	0.18	1.40
Ref: Father Education level (Studied at university/got a degree)									
Father education level (left full time education before 16)	0.26	0.18	1.30	0.29*	0.16	1.30	0.09	0.17	1.09
Father education level (left full time education after school)	-0.10	0.19	0.90	-0.10	0.17	0.90	-0.09	0.19	0.83
Ref: Father Education level (Studied at university/got a degree)									

List of References

Books (0)	-1.91**	0.86	0.15	-1.50*	0.85	0.15	-1.41	0.90	0.24
Books (1-10)	-0.85***	0.29	0.43	-0.14	0.28	0.43	-0.37	0.30	0.69
Books (11-50)	-0.67***	0.21	0.51	-0.27	0.19	0.51	0.11	0.20	1.12
Books (11-100)	-0.76***	0.19	2.14	-0.63***	0.17	0.53	-0.28	1.83	0.75
Books (101-200)	-0.24	0.20	0.79	-0.24	0.17	1.27	0.001	0.18	1.00
Ref: Books (more than 200)									
Previous citizenship education (None)	0.07	0.21	1.07	0.14	0.19	1.15	0.49**	0.20	1.63
Previous citizenship education (A little)	-0.18	0.18	0.84	0.66	0.17	1.93	0.27	0.17	1.31
Ref: Previous citizenship education (A lot)									

Note: Asterisks represent statistically significant differences at the following levels: * $p \leq .1$, ** $p \leq .05$, *** $p \leq .01$.

Appendix B Interviewing Questions

1. Could you please briefly introduce yourself?
2. Have you heard about 'citizenship'? What citizenship means to you as a university student?
3. Have you ever voted/ volunteered/ protested in the last one/two years? Please describe it?
4. Have you ever participated in student election, committee, student meetings, or organized any event in your university?
 - i. If yes, please can you explain this experience?
 - ii. Why did you get involved?
 - iii. Do you think it made any difference? How?
 - iv. Would you get involved again?
5. Did you get involved in student organization such student club, student union? What do you know about student organization in Southampton? Do you think it is an effective organization which promote student to participate in school issues?
6. Why do you think students are asked to get involved in these activities in Southampton?
7. Have you learned any civic knowledge in your university? Do you think it is helpful for your citizenship?

8. how would you describe your classroom climate in your university? Is it open to any different opinion and political discussion?

9. What different activities can students get involved in your University?

10. Have you ever been involved in any of them?

a. If yes, please can you explain this experience?

i. Why did you get involved?

ii. Do you think it made any difference?

iii. Would you get involved again?

11. What your university has done to make you participate in activities and organizations at University? /what kind of measures have been taken? What do you think is the best way to make you participate in your university so far?

12. Are there other forms of student engagement in your University? (Like online petition)

13. Are you a political party member? Could you please describe some student participation or activities outside campus?

14. Tell me what you know about student participation in universities?

15. According to your experience, what is the current situation regarding student participation in universities? How would you evaluate the influence of student participation in universities?

16. Do you think it is important to participate? / Do you think student should participate or not? Explain your answer. Do you think the experience of participation in university has something to do with your future voting, participation in society?
17. How might we further enhance student participation in universities? What can be done to motivate student to participate more? What university can do to make you participate more? (Mechanisms or organizations)
18. To what extent do you think through participating in universities might enhance citizenship of students?
19. Do you think there are disadvantages of students participating in activities and organization at university? If so what are they and why do you think so?
20. Anything else you would like to say about student participation in universities?

Appendix C Participant Information Sheet

Study Title: Student citizenship in Higher Education in the UK and China

Researcher: Jinyu Yang

Ethics number: 11512

Please read this information carefully before deciding to take part in this research. If you are happy to participate you will be asked to sign a consent form.

What is the research about?

The research is a Ph.D student project. The purpose of the research is to understand relationship of citizenship and HE in the UK and China. The democracy needs responsible citizens, while HE plays an important role in cultivating responsible citizens for the society. Therefore, I would like to research on citizenship in HE in China and the UK. The research is to understand the relationship between HE and political & civic participation, as well as how HE affects political and civic participation. Additionally, I will work on how to help students through their institutions promote their participation in universities in order to promote their political and civic participation in society in the UK and China. In the interview, I will ask your experience in universities in order to

understand citizenship practice in HE and how you will participate more in university to improve your civic competences. The research is funded by University of Southampton and the researcher.

Why have I been chosen?

I will select different kinds of participants. Student representatives, student union or council representatives, students in clubs or organizations, students not in any organizations, teachers and staff in university from the UK and China will be selected for the case study analysis. You may be chosen because you are one of them and recommended by student union.

What will happen to me if I take part?

The interview is face to face, only between the researcher (me) and the participant (you). You will be asked about 15 questions around your experience and thoughts about citizenship in your university. This interview will last about 50 minutes. After interviewing, you will have access to the summary of the report and give feedbacks to me.

Are there any benefits in my taking part?

There may be no direct benefit to you as an individual, but it will benefit to the public and contribute to current knowledge. From a Chinese perspective, the UK is a country with a long democratic history, and I could explore and draw on the UK's citizenship development in Higher Education to find an appropriate way to promote student citizenship in China. Meanwhile, Chinese student experience of citizenship in HE may bring some new ideas to the liberal citizenship in HE in the UK as well. Most importantly, the research in China could help to understand the citizenship and democracy of young people in HE in China, which may remove the public bias and prejudice on Chinese democracy.

Are there any risks involved?

No.

Will my participation be confidential?

Yes. The research is in compliance with the Data Protection Act and University policy. The data will be coded, and anonymity will be assured. Electronic data will be stored with password protection in a laptop and backed up on a secure online location for five years. The password will only be known by the researcher. The laptop will be either in the direct supervision of the researcher or locked up at all times during the study. Paper records will be kept to a minimum amount in a locked place. Personal information will only be included on printed information if it is essential (e.g. consent forms) and this will be scanned for secure electronic storage and destroyed after use.

After the study, only electronic records of personal data will be retained and stored securely.

What happens if I change my mind?

You can decide to withdraw the research at any time without any penalty.

What happens if something goes wrong?

Head of Research Governance (023 80595058, rgoinfo@soton.ac.uk)

Where can I get more information?

Jinyu Yang, a PhD student in university of Southampton. (07746313938, jy2g12@stoton.ac.uk)

Appendix D CONSENT FORM

Study title: Student citizenship in Higher Education the UK and China

Researcher name: Jinyu Yang

Ethics reference: 11512

itemised statement:

Information will be commensurate with the study.

The research data will be anonymised.

The interview will be audio-recorded.

Please initial the box(es) if you agree with the statement(s):

I have read and understood the information sheet (130109, Verson Number 041454)

☐

and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study.

I agree to take part in this research project and agree for my data to be recorded used.

☐

I understand that my responses will be anonymised in reports of the research.

☐

I agree to be audio-recorded in the interview by the researcher.

I understand my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without any punishment.

☐

Data Protection

I understand that information collected about me during my participation in this study will be stored on a password protected computer and that this information will only be used for the purpose of this study.

Name of participant (print name)

Signature of participant.....

Date.....