The EWC Statement Series

Third Issue

2013

THE EUROPEAN
WERGELAND
CENTRE

COUNCIL CONSEIL
OF EUROPE DE L'EUROPE

Authors: Beate Küpper, Andreas Zick, Pascale Mompoint-Gaillard, Erik Amnå, Michael Byram, Anne B. Reinertsen

Contents

The 3rd issue of the EWC Statement Series

Highlighting current trends, research and scholarly debates

About this publication

Welcome to the 3rd issue of the EWC Statement Series, a presentation of the statements published on the EWC website in 2012, written by recognized scholars and practitioners. With the statement series, The European Wergeland Centre aims to bridge theory and educational practice by highlighting current research trends and theoretical debates related to Education for Democratic Citizenship, Human Rights Education and Intercultural Education.

2012 has been an interesting and challenging year, also seen from the perspective of Education for democratic citizenship, human rights and intercultural understanding. The continuing economic crisis in Europe, leading to rising unemployment – especially among young people – and poverty, and also to cuts in public budgets, has severe consequences for social cohesion and civic culture.

Prejudice and hatred against minorities is rising in many countries. This illustrates that racism and anti-Semitism can easily be mobilized in times of crisis, offering easy explanations and scape goats.

The statement '**Prejudice and Group Focused Enmity',** by Beate Küpper and Andreas Zick, addresses this challenge. Based on theories of social psychology, they describe the mechanisms and functions of prejudice, making it clear why stereotypes against vulnerable and "out" groups are so long lasting.

The authors identify the destructive potential of open and covert prejudices, especially as they form a part of a broader syndrome of "Group Focused Enmity" based on an assumption of inequality and hierarchy among human groups. According to Küpper and Zick, building learning arenas based on principles of equality and openness can make an important contribution to counteract Group Focused Enmity.

But the crisis has also resulted in protest movements, mobilizing large parts of the population, especially young people, in some European countries. Are new forms of engagement emerging among the younger generation?

The statement '**Active, Passive and Standby Citizens'**, by Erik Amnå addresses this issue. Amnå focuses on different patterns of adolescents' and young adults' orientations towards civic engagement and political participation and asks *how their civic engagement is manifested and how their political participation is developed.* He states:

"... what young people particularly may bring to democratic life in its various forms is an electrifying spirit and a developmental perspective, that things in fact can be changed, peacefully, by the people. The maybe greatest idea behind youth civic engagement is a conviction that change is possible".

This insight tells educators a lot about the need to make the experience of democratic school and class room culture, and active participation a part of "learning democracy".

New forms of political mobilization and participation, as well as new ways of expressing and escalating group related hate, take place online. This represents a challenge for educators; How to understand, how to meet the changes and challenges of new media? How to provide what is necessary for "digital natives" to develop "digital literacy"?

In her statement '**New media and education: how will educators take up the challenge?'**, Pascale Mompoint-Gaillard offers a range of important insights starting from suggesting to leave the focus on the harmful effects of new media to adopting

"… a more optimistic stance, to look for opportunity and to accept the act of doubt: we don't know what the near, let alone the far away, future will bring in digital media, and one is forced to accept that by the time a publication on the topic is out, it becomes instantaneously obsolete. The rapid development in terms of technology forces us to be tolerant of ambiguity and to be flexible thinkers and educators when we tackle the topic of media literacy. We have to move toward a humanistic and creative perspective."

As in all educational fields, in education for sustainable, democratic and diverse societies we need to be interested in the impact of the educational activities. Education for Democratic Citizenship, Human Rights Education and Education for Intercultural Understanding have the common goal to develop attitudes and skills in learners that are necessary for becoming active citizens. But these achievements are more difficult to "trace" than mere factual knowledge or skills. How do we know if learners develop the capacities they need to become active citizens? And how do we teach them to reflect on their own learning development, to become real "lifelong learners"? What kind of strategies and methods and which language should be used in order to include evaluation and assessment in the learning process?

Two statements deal with these issues:

- **Evaluation and Assessment** by Michael Byram
- **Poetry in language and democracy** by Anne Beate Reinertsen

Byram, after clarifying some of the often confusing concepts involved, focuses on the assessment but also self-reflection of Intercultural Competence supported by the 'Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters' [1].

Reinertsen focuses on the feasible language in formative evaluation. She pleads for the use of poetic language:

"The goal is to become subject in and for your own learning processes. We should therefore avoid a constative and too positivistic language in our pedagogies, our feedback and criteria and in the subsequent assessment and/or evaluation methods/activities. We should offer feedback not only on how to do a task, but also on meta-cognitive learning processes: Thinking about learning and/or learning to learn."

For us at the EWC, the statements have served as valuable resources in our educational activities. We hope that they will be inspiring and useful for you, too.

And, last but not least: we invite all educational stakeholders to come up with suggestions for further statement topics, potential authors – or to offer us a statement of your own!

Please contact: c.lenz@theewc.org

Best regards, on behalf of the whole EWC team,

Claudia Lenz

Head of Research & Development

The European Wergeland Centre

---

[1] The "Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters" is an educational tool, developed by the Council of Europe, to support and encourage the development of the intercultural competences which are necessary for engaging in effective intercultural dialogue in learners (http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/autobiography/default_EN.asp)

Prejudice and Group-Focused Enmity

Beate Küpper and Andreas Zick

Prejudice from the perspective of social psychology

Racism, sexism, anti-immigrant attitudes, anti-Semitism and many other prejudices are not personal traits, but social attitudes that must be understood through the context of the person who holds them. As attitudes they are learnable – and unlearnable – even if this is often a long and difficult process in cases where attitudes are deep-seated.

Classical prejudice research understands prejudices as negative attitudes towards groups and individuals based solely on their group membership (Allport 1964). Individuals are looked down upon not on the basis of their personal characteristics but through nothing other than their categorization as a member of an out-group. It is utterly irrelevant whether they see themselves as a member of this group or whether their group membership can be determined objectively. What matters is solely the categorization by the person holding or expressing the prejudice. Taken the example of xenophobic prejudices it is generally irrelevant whether targets in fact possess the country's citizenship, were born there, or have ever lived anywhere else.

Three Steps to Prejudice

The first step to prejudice is categorization. Categorization is a fundamental cognitive process that occurs almost automatically and helps individuals to understand and make sense of the complex information they receive from their environment. We differentiate people by whether they belong to our own in-group or to an out-group. Whether a person applies categorizing labels such as "foreigner", "Muslim" or "Jew", "woman", "homosexual" or "disabled" depends largely on their environment, on the debates conducted in their immediate life world and in the public sphere. In political discourse, too, we can observe how categories are continuously discussed and assessed.

In the second step we attribute particular characteristics to people on the basis of their group membership. These stereotypes can be understood as little pictures we make in our heads (Lippmann 1922, cited in Aronson, Wilson and Akert 2004, 485). Stereotyping involves generalizing about a group of people, attributing identical characteristics to all of them even though they may in reality be very different. But the step of stereotyping does not occur automatically. We also have the option of stopping to think and consciously reconsidering or revising our stereotypes (Devine 1989).

Finally, groups are evaluated positively or negatively. As a rule, members of society tend to assess members of their ingroup positively and members of identified outgroups negatively to gain a positive social identity and preserve or enhance self-esteem (Tajfel and Turner 1979). All prejudices share an implicit assumption that all members of the outgroup are the same, and that they are different from and worse than the ingroup.

There are of course also positive prejudices towards groups, however, they cause no disadvantage to those affected. More problematic are prejudices that at first glance appear positive but actually have

negative consequences for those they address. Examples of such benevolent prejudices are the idea that women are especially emotional and men more rational. This idea serves to legitimize social discrimination, for example in the appointment of senior managers.

Overt and Covert Prejudices

Prejudices may be expressed openly and directly or in subtle, indirect and hidden ways. Nevertheless, they consist of a series of arguments that on closer examination turn out to be similar regardless of which target group they are directed against. The negative characteristics of overt and covert prejudices are always the same: stupidity, laziness and indolence, uncleanliness, physical weakness and psychological instability, criminality, deviousness and slyness. Prejudices often involve double standards, where something that is criticized in the outgroup, is ignored or dismissed as unimportant in the ingroup. One example of this would be where Muslims are criticized for favoring gender inequality while support for traditional gender roles in the majority population is ignored. Furthermore, all prejudices share the aspect of holding all members of a group responsible for the deeds of an individual, for example blaming all Muslims for terrorist attacks conducted by radical minorities or individuals.

In recent decades in Europe, strong social norms of tolerance and anti-racism have become established, and increasingly inhibit open expression of prejudice. Nevertheless, negative emotions towards particular groups often remain extant, deeply rooted in cultural memory and individual socialization. Then, traditional, overt prejudice turns into modern prejudices. Modern prejudices express stereotypes more subtle or hidden, e.g. also in a polite manner, for example through statements that a particular group is less high-achieving. Another example is the rejection or refusal of sympathy for a particular outgroup, or the exaggeration of alleged cultural differences (Pettigrew and Meertens 1995); i.e. assuming that the other group holds completely different and incompatible values with respect to education or gender equality. There is no open hostility here, but no affection either, making it difficult for members of this outgroup to feel personally liked as individuals.

Functions of Prejudices

Prejudices are especially persistent when they fulfill social-psychological functions, meaning they have social and individual utility for groups and individuals. There are five main social functions of prejudice.

Prejudices bond. The most important function of prejudice (and of extremist attitudes and ideologies) is probably bonding, where differentiation from the other creates social identity and a sense of belonging within the ingroup. This is why political propaganda so often plays the prejudice and racism cards, because devaluing minorities heightens the importance of the ingroup (Mendelberg, 2001).

Prejudices serve to preserve and enhance self-esteem. This function is directly connected with the first. The more inferior the other in comparison to the ingroup, the more positive the self-esteem gained through group identification.

Prejudices offer control and legitimize hierarchies. Prejudices serve as justifications for an existing social order. By explaining why certain groups possess greater wealth and power (e.g. whites, men) than others (e.g. blacks, women) they defend a hierarchical status quo or even help to establish it in the first place (Sidanius and Pratto 1999). As traded myths they are widely disseminated and socially shared even sometimes by subordinate groups.

Prejudices supply "knowledge" and "orientation". Prejudices provide a handy frame of reference for understanding the world. They are especially potent where complex social realities have become incomprehensible, e.g. in situations of crisis, such as economic recession, natural disaster or famine. Where little real factual knowledge about a group is available, deeply rooted stereotypes, old wives' tales and anecdotes serve as a substitute.

Prejudices show who can be trusted and who cannot. The "knowledge" imparted by prejudices also tells its recipients which individuals and groups can be trusted and which cannot. Social prejudice thus fulfills a confidence-building function and at the same time sows mistrust.

Consequences of prejudices

Prejudice on the grounds of a person's attributed membership of a group defined as "foreign", "strange" or "other" is not simply one possible personal opinion among many. Prejudices have far-reaching negative consequences for those targeted and for the social climate as a whole.

Prejudices can supply the basis and above all the justification for discrimination and even violence as we know from the field of hate crime. A less drastic but still relevant example is the way middle-class children are favored by teachers who treat them from the very start as cleverer and more ambitious. Prejudice can lead to direct, individual discrimination. Examples are biased decisions concerning job appointments and housing, rejecting a member of a specific out-group as neighbor, parents who avoid sending their children to a school attended by significant numbers of migrants' children or physical distance in the public sphere. Prejudice give also base for structural discrimination by institutions, organizations and businesses, where the rules, regulations, laws and procedures favor certain groups and disadvantage others. For example, schools that demand parental participation and support with homework automatically disadvantage those pupils whose parents are unable to provide this, whether because they have poor command of the language or because their own education is inadequate. Thirdly, discrimination can also take the form of harassment. This involves denigrating individuals on the basis of their group membership or creating an environment in which people are humiliated, intimidated or insulted on the basis of particular group characteristics.

Prejudices also create social norms. They have the power to define what is proper and customary – what is "normal". In the political context prejudices can even influence the rules, regulations and legislation that encourage or discourage individual discriminatory behavior.

Prejudices also have consequences for their targets, their physical and emotional well-being as well as on their achievements and success in life. Research has found that experiencing prejudice and discrimination destroys self-respect and can lead to self-stigmatization. E.g. studies show that black school students in the United States have a worse opinion of their own marks than white students with the same level of achievement (Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000). Getting exhausted by the

permanent fight against prejudice, targets sometimes alter their behavior to conform to the popular stereotype. Then prejudices can even become self-fulfilling.

So prejudices are used to justify existing discrimination through ideas of unequal status and contribute to the establishment and maintenance of discriminatory structures and thought patterns (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Prejudices shape people's understanding of their world and create reality. Prejudices are thus ultimately reflected in the distribution of power, influence and money, in access to education and housing, in health, and much more besides.

Group-focused Enmity

Back in the 1950s the founder of modern prejudice research, Gordon Allport, stated (1954, 68):

One of the facts of which we are most certain is that people who reject one out-group will tend to reject other out-groups. If a person is anti-Jewish, he is likely to be anti-Catholic, anti-Negro, anti any out-group.

Follow Allport's assumptions, we understand a spectrum of prejudices, including anti-immigrant attitudes, racism, anti-Semitism, anti-Muslim attitudes, sexism, homophobia, and the devaluation of homeless, unemployed, disabled people (recently also the devaluation of asylum seeker and Sinti and Roma was included) as elements of a syndrome of group-focused enmity (Heitmeyer, 2002). We speak of a syndrome of group-focused enmity in order to make it clear that prejudices directed towards different target groups are linked to one another and share the common core of an ideology of unequal status. Individuals who share this ideology look down upon out-groups regardless of these groups' specific identity. The German survey project on group-focused enmity (2002-2011) has been able to confirm this empirically (Zick et al. 2008; see also http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/en/ikg/projekte/GMF). In 2008 we conducted an empirical study on group-focused Enmity in eight European countries that validated the close link of different types of prejudice in various cultural contexts but also highlighted differences between countries (Zick, Küpper & Hövermann, 2011).

Implications for Education

Taken the concept and empirical findings of a syndrome of group-focused enmity seriously, the combat against prejudice needs to take into account parallels and similarities of devaluation of several target groups despite their uniqueness. The central core of different types of prejudice is the acceptance of group-based inequality. This insight may seem to be too vague and general at first glance, but it is not at second: In its consequence, it should inform the basic principles of any educational setting:

- Realizing equality between individuals regardless their real or perceived group-membership,
- Valuing diversity by giving chance for equal participation,
- Uncovering propagandistic blaming of easy scapegoats, supposed threats by marked out-group and

- Deconstructing prejudicial myths that serve for privileges of dominant groups and cement disadvantages for subordinate groups.

References

Allport, G. (1954). The Nature of Prejudice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and Prejudice: Their Automatic and Controlled Components. Journal of Personality and Social Pschology 56:5–18.

Aronson, E., T. D. Wilson and R. M. Akert (2004). Sozialpsychologie, 4th ed. Munich: Pearson Studium.

Mendelberg, T. (2001). The Race Card: Campaign Strategy, Implicit Messages, and the Norm of Equality. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pettigrew, T. F., and R. W. Meertens (1995). Subtle and Blatant Prejudice in Western Europe. European Journal of Social Psychology 25:57–75.

Sidanius, J., and F. Pratto (1999). Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., and J. C. Turner (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations, ed. W. G. Austin and S. Worchel, 33–47. Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole.

Williams, D. R., and R. Williams-Morris (2000). Racism and Mental Health: The African-American Experience. Ethnicity and Health 5:243–68.

Zick, A., C. Wolf, B. Küpper, E. Davidov, P. Schmidt and W. Heitmeyer. (2008). The Syndrome of Group-focused Enmity. The Interrelation of Prejudices Tested with Multiple Cross-sectional and Panel Data. Journal of Social Issues 64 (2): 363–83.

Zick, A., Küpper, B. & Hövermann, A. (2011). Intolerance, prejudice and discrimination. A European report. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert Foundation. Free download: http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/do/07908-20110311.pdf

New media and education: how will educators take up the challenge?

Pascale Mompoint-Gaillard

What is the role of the educators in the field of developing digital literacies and what is really at stake in the field? How can teacher education help the profession take up the challenge? These are a few questions that we will attempt to discuss in this article.

Introduction

We have gone from a time when citizens of the world were consumers of media to a time when we are becoming producers of content; a time when information is controlled by many more than just a few, as it has been in the past. In the past 10 years, the Council of Europe has issued close to a dozen recommendations concerning new media and human rights. Upon re-visiting them, it's clear that, whereas new media is at the forefront of the education agenda, most concerns are placed at the level of protection: protecting privacy, protecting children from harmful content, protecting human dignity….

Here, we would like to engage the reader to shift from this somewhat negative perspective and to adopt a more optimistic stance, to look for opportunity and to accept the act of doubt: we don't know what the near, let alone the far way, future will bring in digital media, and one is forced to accept that by the time a publication on the topic is out, it becomes instantaneously obsolete. The rapid development in terms of technology forces us to be tolerant of ambiguity and to be flexible thinkers and educators when we tackle the topic of media literacy. We have to move toward a humanistic and creative perspective.

What is at stake in the field?

We will center the question of new media, and the new literacies that go with it, around 3 issues: language, democracy, and learning.

In terms of language the new media and its configuration of ideas is changing humans' relationship to reading. Our human brain was never created to read as points out Maryanne Wolf (2008). It took humanity approximately 60 000 years to develop its oral traditions; 6000 years towards a tradition of writing and reading and 2000 years to develop alphabets… Now we are faced with a brand new way of transmitting ideas, it came 30 years ago and it is here to stay. A classic text on paper presents ideas in a linear, 2-dimensional way whereas new media content presents ideas in multidimensional way, with pages within pages, hyperlinks and imbedded texts, moving structures, boxes, fonts, colors, images and sound... Also, new languages are being created around new media: 'texting', 'tweeting' and 'posting' follow new rules of expression. Young people are engaging in language in creative ways, altering literacies. Many learners who present difficulties with reading/writing and learning (dyslexia, ADHD …) in our traditional contexts do much better with digital media because it

puts to use other neuronal structures in our brains. New media can represent an opportunity for better equity in access to education in some parts of our societies.

In terms of learning and cognitive development, the new media environment constitutes a quantum leap from our traditional books, libraries and education institutions (Higher education institutions as well as schools). Studies of youth's digital practices (MacArthur Foundation, USA Reports on Digital Media and Learning, 2008; Mediappro/European Commission 2006) point to young people's extending friendships and interests and the development of self-directed and peer-based learning. Our learners today are in networks of learners in a society of networks. This has many repercussions on our education systems and educators will have to think about this: maintaining student interest in schools systems, re-thinking our expectations toward attention spans (long sessions of sitting and listening), dealing with the generation gap between teachers from a 'TV world' to students in a 'web world' (this gap will phase out organically!). 'Technical media are not only tools of transmission but also instruments of understanding' (Jökulson, 2010). The cyber-citizen encounters material, internalizes it and then externalizes it as stories. Because imagination helps us define our world together and make sense of our experiences, students should not be asked to internalize their teachers' stories (with greater chances of misunderstanding them!), but they should make their own stories and meanings out of old and new elements. A 'paradigmal' change is awaiting educators here.

In terms of democracy, the media environment has a social effect: it is 'designed' (interfaces, platforms …) and therefore it elicits certain types of social interaction. The value laden designs of the web2.0 spaces of interaction points us towards new definitions of how we live together and this is where the issues on democracy and human rights come through. Certain research shows that the greater interconnectedness can actually increase our human experience of empathy (Rifkin, 2009). Recent news ('the Arab spring', 2011, Occupy Wall Street movement) has demonstrated how digital media can help citizens to organize, protest and attempt to defend their human rights. The cyber-subject has passed from a culture of consumerism to a culture of participation (Frau-Megs, 2011). On the flip side, the greater freedom of expression by way of anonymity of speech on the internet is increasing the visibility and aura of intolerant, violent and hateful speech. Obviously, governments and authoritative institutions will not be able to control the limitless human interaction on the net, and therefore the focus should be on educating the young, and reflecting on how the digital processes can be made friendly to human destiny.

What is the role of the educator in the field of developing digital literacies?

Right now, young people are doing, and making, on the internet with very little guidance on these matters. Cogito ergo sum. On the web, we 'co-agitate'; our ideas are shared and mixed online to construct new knowledge. However, in order for young people to act, and interact consciously, knowingly, within their online activities, educators will have to support their values, attitudes, skills and knowledge for using web2.0 tools, a transversal approach.

Values and attitudes:

- Respect
- Tolerance
- Diversity
- Equity
- Responsibility
- Autonomy
- Participation
- Cooperation
- Open-mindedness and flexibility
- Curiosity
- Privacy

Skills:

- Using the appropriate media for diverse types of content
- Negotiating
- Giving respectful feedback
- Learning from peers
- Searching, verifying, interpreting and evaluating sources of information
- Deconstructing perceived realities (others' and own)
- Learning autonomously
- Distinguishing the 'public me' and the 'private me'
- Technical skills

Knowledge and understanding:

- Reflecting on and analysing the difference between data, information, and knowledge.
- Knowing about how the internet works and what types of media are intended or appropriate for different types of communication.
- Balancing/articulating the local and the global dimensions of encountered elements: (data, opinion, relations, competition …)
- Knowing the ethical and legal aspects surrounding issues of authorship and intellectual rights, human rights…
- Understanding relevant terms

Our role as educators is on the table. We need to put this on our agenda. What strategies we choose will depend on what answer we give to this question: should education have a mission of awakening capacities in people or should it stand to set the boundaries of what should or not be learned?

How can teacher education and teacher learning help educators take up the challenge?

The key to teacher education, at the dawn of the 3rd age of language (Bell, 2009), is access to quality lifelong learning. Continued support and education seen over the continuum of a teacher's career are essential.

The generation gap will have to be bridged: today we have two generations of people that are visibly divergent in how they learn and think about learning. In conferences about new media, there is most often the moment where the elders of the group are told that they are thinking as 'the television generation'… All teachers will have to learn and accept to take the risk of not being 'the one who knows best', or knows more. Accepting to relinquish some of our power, empathizing with young people and, for some of us, accepting our 'illectronacy' is a first step.

If schools and education systems can shift from content to process, part of the path will be cleared for the development of new literacies. Such a shift includes letting go of our subject based curricula to open orientations: inquiry based learning, learning about cognition, thinking about thinking, learning the value of cooperation … Teachers as facilitators of learning on an interconnected world have to develop specific transversal competences in themselves: experimentation, systemic thinking and collaborative knowledge construction, problem-solving, critical thinking, capacity to face new developments quickly, cooperative spirit and skills, navigating in knowledge networks... Certain soft skills, such as respect for diversity and intercultural communication, will come to the forefront in teacher development because these are the issues that 'pop up' when dealing with new and constantly changing environments.

With the growing number of competences teachers need to acquire, one has to consider that teacher competences no longer be seen as individual and finite. Whole school approaches and supporting teachers acquiring collaborative skills, team teaching approaches, and cooperative techniques are in need. A number of practices can help support change:

- Implementing peer-training and team work to face the new competences needed for digital learning.
- Belonging to a community of practice, working on innovative learning structures.
- organizing teacher mobility, helping teachers integrate local, regional and international networks;
- Developing 2nd and 3rd language skills: teachers need language awareness to build on language diversity in the classroom and engage in regional and international networking.

If educators had more time planned in their schedules for these activities, much more could be done to help young people thrive and learn in digital contexts. Continuous professional development policies, as well as policies to enhance collective strategies for teaching and learning, effectively support those who are willing and able to try innovative actions in their school and classrooms. Ultimately our goal as educators is to fully integrate our young students' 'world of digital learning', supporting 'slow', reflected construction of knowledge within the 'fast' exchanges of our environment.

References:

Barab, S. & Kling R. & Gray J. H., (2004), Designing for Virtual Communities in the Service of Learning, Cambridge University Press

Bell, R.P. (2009). 'You are what you read'. Online Lecture, University of New England (Creative commons licensing)

Frau-Megs, D. (2011). Lecture notes. Living together in a connected world. 15-16 December 2011, CoE Think-Tank European Youth Centre, Strasbourg, France

Gee, James Situated Language and Learning: A Critique of Traditional Schooling. New York: Routledge, 2004

Jökulson, S. (2010). Creativity in Media Education. Merging Different Mindsets in. Media literacy Education, Nordic perspectives, 121-132. NORDICOM, University of Gothenburg.

Kimble, C. & Hildreth, P. & Bourdon, I. (2008). Communities of practice: creating learning environments for educators, vol. 1 &2. IAP-Information Age Publishing, Charlotte, NC, USA

Mediappro / European Commission (2006). The Appropriation of New Media by Youth. Available at http://www.mediappro.org/publications/finalreport.pdf

Rifkin, J. (2009). The Empathic Civilization: The Race to Global Consciousness in a World in Crisis. Tarcher

Wolf, M. (2008). Proust and the Squid. The Story and Science of the reading brain. Harper Collins.

Active, passive and standby citizens

Erik Amnå

Introduction

What shall we do with our youths? This seems to be a most frequent asked question by adults throughout history.

What shall we do with the youths and our democracies? This is the more specific topic of this statement. Feelings of distrust in the youth recently have been shown in association with a series of protests in many European cities during the last years, where youths – and adults – often peacefully, sometimes violently are demonstrating their disrespect for the democratic leadership. The parents are confused, worried, and, indeed, even disappointed about their offspring regarding their civic and political involvement. The youths are even blamed for the weaknesses of our democracies.

But before we answer what 'we' shall do with our daughters and sons, let us see what they actually do: How is their civic engagement manifested? Where and how is their political participation developed? In our collaborative research group of psychologists, media researchers and political scientists we follow 10.000 13-30 year olds plus two of their best friends and their parents over six years (www.oru.se/yes). Four diverse patterns of adolescents' and young adults' orientations towards civic engagement and political participation have been revealed.

1. ACTIVISTS

They are active in various everyday life settings in family, among peers, in school, in clubs and community groups, they participate at the Internet, generate, download and forward political cartoons, buy fair trade products, etcetera. They eat food, listen to music and dress themselves in line with their political and ethical ideas. Politics is seldom a hobby, but often a life style. In several ways, individually as well collectively, they let the world know who they are, what they believe in, and what they dislike. They live wholly in line with the ideal of the active citizens.

The opposite of being active is to be passive. However, you can be passive in more than one way. Therefore you shall be cautious when you are categorizing, maybe even demonizing, people who obviously show no civic or political activity as passive ones. We can distinguish between three different groups of youths, who at least at the surface all appear to be non-active:

First we have those who simply are:

2. DISENGAGED

Many young people, like most adults, are disengaged. They do not care about public affairs. For various reasons they are not interested. They are in the midst of very demanding biological, psychological and social development processes during adolescence and early adulthood. They may

think that politics is unsexy and boring. Others associate politics, not always surprisingly, with dirty, corrupted business. Some simply claim they have other, more important things to do.

And as democrats we are not to blame them. The very idea of democracy allows people to be passive, if they prefer to be so. If we start to consider taking actions, to instruct and order people to become active, we have started to remove ourselves from the ideals of democracy. The tracks from our European modern history are horrifying.

Another group of inactive youths can be described as:

3. DISILLUSIONED

They represent a stronger, more avoiding and hostile attitude towards politics. In comparison with the disengaged, the disillusioned not only have chosen to stay away from politics, they additionally have taken a deliberate stand against politics. If the disengaged are apolitical, the disillusioned can be described as anti-political. They are alienated, disappointed over politics in general and politicians in particular. They have lost their trust in their governmental institutions, the media and the political parties, perhaps just because these institutions are not trustworthy because they have failed to obtain facilities for their daily life such as job, housing, or a valuable education.

A totally different, but seemingly passive group of youths is the:

4. STANDBY CITIZENS

These youths are engaged but they do not manifest and show openly their engagement. It is in a way hidden and potential. Nevertheless, they stay alert, keep themselves informed, in order to be prepared and be ready if something would happen that should deserve their active participation. Not active at the moment but you can count on them in case…In other words, they simply stand by. Interested but not participating for the moment.

All of a sudden there is a window of opportunities that is opened for them to climb in trough and take part in protests that are formed, such as demonstrations that were organized into an Arabic spring or a riot in suburban London, or as an immediate reaction of protest against the decision by migrant authorities to send a school mate back to her origin country. The standbyers do, in other words, exploit not primarily the dutifulness part but the freedom and autonomy part of a democracy ideal.

When then, one may wonder, would a young person intervene, leave his or her spectator position and get involved? It seems to be six main motives for standbyers not to stay still but step in:

I. Duty – "I ought to!"

Particularly when it comes to voting, there are many countries all over the world that has a widespread strong feeling of obligation to vote. It is a civic culture which almost is blaming the

passive voter. It is seen as a minimum contribution and confession to a system you maybe not love, but still believe can be changed to the better, perhaps by replacing the leadership peacefully. The duty is basically about dignity; to be responsible for the actions you take (or not take), to be able to look in the mirror and feel proud.

II. Importance – "I have to"

The issue at stake is the one I really care for. The way it is handled frightens me, and makes me so angry and upset that I have to raise my voice. If I do not intervene now, I will never forgive myself.

III. Recruitment – I am wanted!

To be asked to join a group, to come to a meeting, to sign a protest, seems to be a sadly underestimated factor to take into consideration when we try to get more young people involved. Thousands of young activists focus on a single event to explain when it all started. Someone showed them a brochure at a stall in the school. Someone told them to come to a political meeting or to a civic festival. One single, apparently coincidence can make a big change of lifelong consequences.

IV. Efficacy – Yes, I can!

Very crucial for your willingness to get involved with others into a political or civic project, is whether you feel you are efficacious and capable of making a difference, to add something. A basic prerequisite of this kind is about understanding the rules of the game as well as the issue you deal with and how to approach it. In sum, efficacy is about personal self-reliance as well as about knowledge and skills.

V. Effectiveness – It works!

Before a smart young person decides to get involved in anything, she or he critically asks if it will work or not. A democratic schooling and empowering upbringing make them allergic, not to say hostile, towards empty gestures and symbols. They simply refuse to uphold traditions that since long have lost their power and stopped to function effectively. Therefore new forms of civic engagement are constantly under construction in order to utilize new techniques, experiences and needs both by citizens from below or by power holders from above.

VI. Meaningfulness – It gives something back!

It can be about quite many and quite different things ranging from enjoying membership discounts, to gaining more knowledge, beginning a healthier life style, getting friends, having fun, maybe even to be filled by a good feeling of having been part of something bigger than myself. It has to do with life satisfaction and self-realization.

To conclude, if we want to engage with youth, their various orientations have to be understood and approached. The structural background of disillusion has to be anticipated and combated with reforms and policies improving the social, educational, labor market and housing conditions. The involuntary passivity of the disillusioned deserves much more attention than the self-selected political inactivity by the disengaged.

Regarding the activists, and also the standbyers, other lessons may be learned from the many experiences of efforts to involve youths. Some of them has obviously not only failed, but been contra-productive, because smart young people hate to be fooled and promised something they soon discover was nothing but plain lip service - their active participation was really not wanted. The organizers apparently foreshadowed power and influence when the only thing that was realized was some sharing of information.

The treacherously promising word 'democracy' should not be launched as a high way to power, since it at best can be about letting everyone having a say. From the beginning you never can know who will win the debates and the votes. But democracy is the only system we know which is able to create good losers – they may be upset about the result but they accept it because the procedure was fair and gave them a chance to make influence. And in general our democracies are robust enough to manage interesting experiments of new modes of engagement and participation.

In other words, adults have to stop looking upon youths as they were the citizens of tomorrow. They are actually citizens of today. Therefore, adults, politicians and political institutions, and political parties must be ready to share power, to leave some share of it to others – if they want youth to become co-owners of 'their' democracies. Giving them a say with a promise to be listened to and offer them seats at their, often gerontocratic, decision making boards. So, if we support (or, if we ourselves become) politicians who are taking these very important steps, our democracies can be more equal, meaningful and trustworthy.

Important to bear in mind is also that the youths – luckily – are not easy targets of others' often good hearted efforts to socialize, discipline and tame them. Youths do in fact drive their own socialization processes in various everyday life contexts. In fact, some of the youths are already are transforming our democracies, not least by creating new ways of political communication and by developing new ways of loyalties towards authorities – partly due to the very successes of democratic development and educational reforms. The shared challenge across generations now seems to be to reap these rewards.

Finally, I think, besides everything else they do contribute with, what young people particularly may bring to democratic life in its various forms is an electrifying spirit and a developmental perspective, that things in fact can be changed, peacefully, by the people. The maybe greatest idea behind youth civic engagement is a conviction that change is possible.

One of the young women who survived the political mass murdering at a youth camp in Norway, July 22nd, 2011, Stine Renate Håheim, has so bravely expressed this vital democratic spirit: *"If one man can show so much hate, think how much love we could show together."*

Further reading

Amnå, E., Ekström M., Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2009). Political socialization and human agency. The development of civic engagement from adolescence to adulthood. Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift, vol. 111, no. 1, s. 27-40.

Amnå, E. (2010). Active, Passive, or Standby Citizens?: Latent and manifest political participation , in New Forms of Citizen Participation: Normative Implications, ed. E. Amnå. Baden- Baden: Nomos Verlag, pp. 191-203. http://www.nomos-shop.de/Amn%C3%A5-New-Forms-of-Citizen-Participation/productview.aspx?product=12116

Amnå, E. (2012). How is civic engagement developed over time? Emerging answers from a multidisciplinary field. Journal of Adolescence, vol. 35, no. 4, pp 611-627. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140197112000607

Ekman, J. & Amnå, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: towards a new typology. Human Affairs, vol. 22, no 3, pp. 283-300. http://link.springer.com/article/10.2478/s13374-012-0024-1

PIDOP – a multinational research project funded by the European Commission under the Seventh Framework Programme 2010 – 2012. The project examined the processes which influence democratic ownership and participation in eight European states – Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey and the UK. http://www.fahs.surrey.ac.uk/pidop/

Evaluation and Assessment

- With particular reference to 'The Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters' -

Michael Byram

Terminology and its difficulties

The distinction between 'evaluation' and 'assessment' is not easily made in some European languages and bilingual dictionaries often translate these two English words with one single word, with the same etymological roots as 'evaluation'. This happens for example between the two official languages of the Council of Europe, where the French 'évaluation' is often used as the translation for both English words, unless a conscious effort is made to maintain the same distinction.[2]

Within English too the ordinary, everyday use of the two terms can overlap. One main purpose of this text is to begin to clarify the distinctions in English when the terms are used for technical, educational purposes. The translation of technical usages into other languages is beyond the scope of the text at this stage.

In the second part of the text, some of the issues are illustrated by reference to the 'Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters' in which the concept of 'Intercultural Competence' – one of the topics of this series of papers written by Martyn Barrett – is crucial.

Assessment

'The measurement of a learner's potential for attainment, or of their actual attainment' (Oxford Dictionary of Education)

This term is generally used to cover all methods of establishing an individual's capacity in some aspect of what they have learnt, irrespective of whether they have learnt as a result of being taught in an educational setting or as a consequence of learning through experience.

Assessment is often used synonymously with 'testing', but it is more useful and accurate to consider testing and tests as one type of assessment, for there are 'alternatives' as we shall see below.

Tests have various purposes and their purposes determine the form and content. Some purposes for tests are:

---

[2] The French term 'évaluation' is in fact generic covering both evaluation and assessment, but can be used in opposition to 'certification' where the institutional dimension of assessment is emphasized (as is also the case with English 'certification'). It is also possible to distinguish between 'contrôle', which is associated with objective and quantitative measurement, and 'évaluation', which is associated with holistic, hermeneutic assessment. (My thanks to Jean-Claude Beacco for this clarification).

- aptitude: to establish whether an individual is likely to be successful in learning X
- progress: to measure what the individual has learnt of X since the previous assessment, whether it was a test or other form of assessment
- placement: to determine where an individual should be placed in a course of study of X, at the beginning or at a later point
- achievement: to ascertain what and how much the individual has learnt of X from what has been taught
- proficiency: to establish an individual's capacity in X irrespective of the source of their learning.

There is often confusion of 'achievement' and 'proficiency' and this confusion may appear especially when tests are used as examinations i.e. tests which lead to certification and access to further learning of some kind. Examinations ought to be achievement tests so that everyone is assessed on what they have been taught, but they are often at least in part proficiency tests which may advantage individuals who have been favored with more opportunities for learning.

Tests can be used for either 'formative' or 'summative' purposes, to tell learners what they have learned (summative) and also what they have not yet learned and can plan to learn (formative). Current phrases refer to 'assessment for learning' and 'assessment of learning'.

There are many types of tests, including multiple choice, production of a text or essay or contribution to an oral discussion/interview, but many others both written and oral. The choice of test types depends on what exactly is to be tested but also on pragmatic factors of cost, time, opportunity etc. Multiple choice tests on the one hand, and written essays or oral discussions on the other hand, are near the two extremes of a continuum of types of test and of the procedures for giving a mark or other type of result. On the one hand a multiple choice test can be marked objectively, and even by a machine, whereas an essay or discussion has to be marked by human beings who may differ in their understanding of what is being written or said, and the degree to which this demonstrates achievement or proficiency.

In both cases, the assessment can be norm-referenced or criterion-referenced. In the first case an individual's capacity is assessed and placed on a spectrum of what is considered to be poor average or good for someone of their age/learning experience/exposure to teaching. They are implicitly compared with other individuals and the test is constructed to ensure that there will be a spread of individuals across the spectrum, meaning some will inevitably fail. In the second case the individual's capacity is compared with pre-established descriptions of different levels of what is 'unsatisfactory', 'satisfactory' or 'good', and no comparison is made with other individuals. In the first case there will inevitably be some individuals who are 'below average' and deemed to fail. In the second case everyone may meet the criteria for 'satisfactory' or 'good' and all may pass.

Tests are however just one kind of assessment and there are other kinds of assessment which need to be mentioned. That these other kinds of assessment are often referred to as 'alternative' reveals the dominance of testing in assessment – and accounts for the assumption that assessment and testing are synonymous. 'Alternatives' include portfolios and learner-diaries which may be self-assessed or peer-assessed, as well as being assessed by teachers or testers/examiners. Later we shall

return to the concept of portfolio and self-assessment in connection with the Council of Europe's 'Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters'.

Whether 'alternative' or not, all kinds of assessment must be scrutinized for their reliability and validity.

The former refers to the accuracy, consistency and fairness of an assessment instrument, from multiple choice to essay. An instrument is reliable if it measures consistently over time, so that for example an individual would have the same results if they were assessed at two different points in time. It is also reliable if, when used by different assessors, the results would be the same. A multiple choice test would be very reliable in the second sense.

Validity refers to the extent to which an instrument is assessing what it is claimed to assess. When what is being assessed is a complex capacity, such as intercultural competence – as we shall see below – rather than a mechanical skill, the validity of a reliable instrument such as a multiple choice test is low. In general with complex capacities, reliability and validity have to be balanced against each other; highly reliable assessment is unlikely to be highly valid, and vice versa.

(Finally we should note that assessment has educational purposes such as those listed above, but measurement is also crucial in scientific investigation, and instruments used for collecting and analyzing data in an investigation may be identical with but have a different purpose from instruments used in educational assessment.)

Evaluation

'The measuring of the effectiveness of a lesson, course, or programme of study' (Oxford Dictionary of education)

Evaluation is the study and reporting of a phenomenon – in our case an aspect of education – to assist an audience to determine its merit and value. The first is matter of professional standards and the second a matter of societal or individual need. For example we may wish to know whether the teaching of a specific subject such as astrology is being carried out efficiently and effectively, and the evaluation may show this is the case. On the other hand we may wish to know if it is important to teach astrology in our society and the evaluation may show that this is not the case.

Evaluation may be 'summative' or 'formative', the former being carried out during the process of teaching and feedback being supplied so that improvements can be made as the process develops. The latter produces a judgment which takes place at the end of the process and may be used in future iterations of the teaching to make improvements. Both kinds of evaluation consider the explicitly or implicitly stated purpose and expected outcomes from the process – of teaching astrology to continue the example – and whether the purpose and outcomes have been realized, whether the intentions have been implemented. This is usually a matter of professional judgment about how the teacher interprets the purposes and expected outcomes, whether learners are expected to be able to read the stars and make predictions and to what level of proficiency. In parallel, both kinds of evaluation may question the value of learning astrology and may argue that it is not scientific nor of historical interest.

In both approaches to evaluation, one, but only one, of the sources of evidence for efficiency and effectiveness of the teaching will be the assessment of learners. An achievement test will provide evidence whether the teaching has been successful. Where a norm-referenced assessment is used, success will be judged according to whether the results reveal that learners in a group are spread across the different levels of proficiency in astrology. In a criterion-referenced assessment, evaluators may expect that all learners should reach at least the level 'satisfactory'.

The Assessment of Intercultural Competence and the 'Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters

The Council of Europe's 'European Language Portfolio' is an example of an instrument of 'alternative' assessment, which can be self-assessment, peer-assessment or teacher assessment, and a combination of these. It is criterion-referenced, the criteria being taken from the Common European Framework of Reference. It is also formative because it helps users to know both what they have learned and what they can plan to learn.

The 'Autobiography of Intercultural Competence' also has a portfolio format and is intended to be used for self-analysis of the individual's responses to intercultural encounters. There are however no statements or descriptions of either norm- or criterion-referenced levels of proficiency, and it is therefore not an instrument of assessment. It is however 'formative' because it asks users to reflect on their responses to intercultural encounters, to analyze what they have learnt, and to decide what they will 'do next'; this process is iterative.

On the other hand the AIE may act as an instrument of self-evaluation. It is clearly an instrument which fosters 'valued' learning and behavior; it is derived from the values of the Council of Europe, particularly human rights and democratic citizenship. Although this remains implicit, users of the AIE are asked to judge their own behavior and think about how they could change.

As Barrett explains in the Statement on Intercultural Competence, the AIE is an instrument which teachers and other educators can use to foster intercultural competence. Used in an educational setting (formal, informal or non-formal), it is an instrument for teaching or facilitating learning. As Barrett also points out this instrument needs to be evaluated and from the above discussion this would include:

- analysis and judgment about the value of the purposes of the instrument
- analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness with which it is used
- analysis of its validity and reliability as an instrument for recording and analysis by the user themselves of their intercultural encounters.

Reference:

Oxford Dictionary of Education edited by S. Wallace. Oxford University Press2008

Bibliography

Assessment

Andrade, H. L. and Cizek, G. J. 2010, Handbook of Formative Assessment. New York: Routledge.

Gipps, C. 1994, Beyond Testing: towards a theory of educational assessment. London: Falmer.

Wyatt-Smith, C. and Cumming, J. (eds.) Educational Assessment in the 21st Century. Dordrecht: Springer.

Evaluation

Hamilton, D. 1977, Beyond the Numbers Game. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Norris, N. 1990, Understanding Educational Evaluation. London: Kogan Page.

Kellaghan, T. and Stufflebeam, D. L. 2002, International Handbook of Educational Evaluation. Dordrecht: Kluwer

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R. and Worthen, B. R. (2010) Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines, 4th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Poetry in language and democracy

Anne B. Reinertsen

Introduction

There is a general interest in- and focus on improving our quality evaluation and assessment practices in learning and development processes today. We speak of summative assessment practices; assessment of learning. We speak of formative assessment practices; assessment for learning. Ultimately we speak of assessment as learning, therefore assessment practices intimately related to our identities- and subjectivity processes; e.g. creating personal and/or situated models for self- assessment and peer evaluation. Evaluation for democracy becoming the ultimate task.

Language and wordings, or the words we use and how we use them, are of great importance. In discussions about learning ultimately democracy and human rights issues, language might become the quality we look for and both condition and tool for change. It implies the creation and use of a language that directs attention to the subject and is open, process oriented, inclusive and dynamic thus a language that envisages complexity and multiplicity. It implies improving our quality evaluation through language sensitive approaches and/or human needs melting together with an understanding of the general importance of language.

Both logic argumentative and poetic registers work in our languages/words always: Poetics securing openness, inclusion, dialogue and action; poetics containing dreams and open ended investigations thus experimentation. Developing a language therefore that is not just constative and relating to statements that conveys information and is capable of being considered as true or false, but a language that performs; a language that acts and/or makes us act. We can open up or close down our understandings with language if we want to. We can investigate deeper and further through language or not. We can create ourselves and others through language. We can raise children's hopes and urge to learn or not through language.

To secure quality in our practices, the task is therefore to develop a language to describe constant change. This is to avoid confirmation traps, instrumentalism or tunnel view. In our goal oriented and criteria based systems and search for systematic knowledge this is easy to forget. All too often we slide into functionalist, objectivating language which doesn't leave room for difference, development, initiative ultimately autonomy. Or rather; it is easy to go at it (the goal that is) too directly or too strong so that important dimensions, nuances, decisive and/or real inequalities are overlooked, thus words and voices silenced. Sensitivity of and for the language used and the implications the uses of words, concepts and/or wording have for evaluation and/or assessment processes is thus of great importance. Words are as important as action. Words are action. That is why they are important.

But it is difficult. It is risky. And one must constantly rehearse and remind oneself specifically about this pivotal role of inclusive, open ended and poetic aspects of language. Below you'll find some examples and a little diagram which hopefully might trigger the process.

Poetry and reality in learning

Study the following examples: You are the mother or father of a child at the age of four attending kindergarten. One afternoon when you pick up your child after work, he/she presents you with a drawing which is given to you as a gift. You are of cause both pleased and happy about this. However, you have different response possibilities and you can choose words which might have different effects.

Consider the two options below in the first example:

Alternative 1:

Child: "I have made a drawing today. It is for you".

You: "Oh is it for me. Thank you. That is a really fine drawing"

Alternative 2:

Child: "I have made a drawing today. It is for you".

You: "Oh is it for me. Thank you. Now you made me happy".

The first alternative directs attention towards the drawing – a product - and the parent's own (quality) judgment: The drawing is fine therefore mother/father is pleased. The language objectifies the product, the child, the parent and the activity alike. The child learns that because the drawing is fine mother/father is pleased. The child can/must please mother/father to be important. Relations are linear, functional and singular.

The second alternative directs the attention more towards the child - a process between parent/child - and thus also the child's judgment: The child makes mother/father happy not the drawing. The language subjectifies the process, the child, the parent and the activity. The child learns that he/she is important for someone else irrespective of the drawing being fine or not. Still the act of drawing has had the effect of pleasing someone leaving initiative with the child. Relations are more open to other registers than strictly functional effects. They are multiple and complex. The way I see this then, the second alternative has a greater potential for empowering the child and directed towards action both present and future: A language that is performative therefore not just constative.

Second example: Your daughter has climbed up a high tree:

Alternative 1:

You: "Come down. It is dangerous!"

Alternative 2:

You: "Oh that is high up! Are you OK? Do you manage or do you want any help?"

Alternative one leaves judgment of danger in the situation to you. The second alternative leaves judgment to the child. She gets the chance to think, feel and assess the situation herself and also decide what to do next.

Example three: The pupil has done an exercise in English or in your history class. Three out of five questions are answered correctly.

Alternative 1:

Teacher: "Answers three, four and five are correct. One and two are false, take a closer look at them and read chapter x in your book again."

Alternative 2:

Teacher: "Answers three, four and five are correct. How did you find the answers? How can you think, and what can you do to find the correct answers to the first two questions also?"

In alternative one judgment is done by the teacher. The language and wording is constative; singular, objectifying and product oriented. The teacher knows the criteria, the quality standard and method both before and after judgment. The pupil is left to act accordingly without gaining- or at least being encouraged to gain a clearer notion him/herself of what constitutes quality and/or what it might consist of as a more generalized attribute. In alternative two, language is opened up towards the pupil's own learning and assessment processes leaving him/her with the initiative to learn and how to go about it. The pupil is induced into evaluating quality, without necessarily being bound to tightly specific criteria. Criteria might thus envisage doubts and difficulties and also the possibilities that "I do not know but accept working more and harder."

With these examples in mind: In our evaluation and/or assessment endeavors, we must work hard to avoid positivistic wording or a too positivistic tone in the criteria or components and in the subsequent evaluation activities. If too positivistic the components become too obvious, or too easy just to say yes to – or simply no for that matter - and then lead us to believe that after having said yes one has become what one has said yes to. Further; developing evaluation methods, "criteria" and "observable behaviors" might also become too positivistic and straight forward per se. However we should be careful and not think this is so. It is far more difficult and subtle. As stated above, both argumentative (cognitive and logic) and poetic registers are constantly and simultaneously at work in our minds and our languages. This might make it difficult both to notice and of course evaluate any behavior. It requires us both to systematize but simultaneously also open up for issues that possibly cannot be systematized but still requires us to be aware about.

The sensitivity of the language used and the implications the uses of concepts/wordings have for our processes is therefore of great importance. All too often we forget; logics so easy to comply with. But this is what evaluation in democratic and human rights oriented learning processes should be all about.

Practice makes practice

The goal is to become subject in and for your own learning processes. We should therefore avoid a constative and too positivistic language in our pedagogies, our feedback and criteria and in the subsequent assessment and/or evaluation methods/activities. We should offer feedback not only on how to do a task, but also on meta-cognitive learning processes: Thinking about learning and/or learning to learn that is.

Polarizing different language possibilities might thus help:

Logic argumentative or language one:	Poetic or language two:
Constative	Performative
Singular and linear	Pluralistic and complex
Objectivating	Subjectivating
Product oriented	Process oriented

We can practice or rehearse "poetic language two" approaches. It is important because this "approach would mirror the way multi-criterion judgments are typically made by experienced teachers. It is also an authentic representation of the ways many appraisals are made in a host of everyday contexts by experts and non-experts alike" (Sadler, 2008:19).

Here, and again, poetics or a poetic mode of investigation might serve as both means and goals in our learning processes, and always in search of quality.

References:

Sadler, D.R. (2008). Indeterminacy in the use of preset criteria for assessment and grading. In Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 1-20. Routledge, Taylor & Francis, USA.

About the Contributors

Beate Küpper, Dr., Dipl.-Psych., born in 1968, is Professor for Social Work in group and conflict situations at the University of Applied Science Niederrhein. She supervised the survey of Group-focused Enmity in Europe conducted in 2008 in eight countries. Her research focuses on intergroup conflict, the link between social status and prejudice, integration, diversity, the role of religiosity, Social Dominance Orientation, and gender aspects.

e-mail: beate.kuepper@uni-bielefeld.de

Andreas Zick, Dr. rer.-nat., phil. habil., Dipl.-Psych., born in 1962, is Professor of Socialization and Conflict Research at the Faculty of Educational Science at the University of Bielefeld and a member of the Institute for Interdisciplinary Research on Conflict and Violence. He invented the study of Group-focused Enmity in Europe and is cooperating in the German long-term study on Group-focused Enmity (2002-2011). His research interest in the issue of prejudice dates back to the 1980s (www.uni-bielefeld.de/ikg/zick).

e-mail: zick@uni-bielefeld.de

Pascale Mompoint-Gaillard, social psychologist, has worked in the area of intercultural communication, education and leadership training for the past 20 years. Her professional activities in Paris (France) and Seattle (U.S.A.) for 15 years have been in accord with her militant engagement: giving voice to those who are disenfranchised; giving tools helping marginalized communities to organize and have their dignity restored by their active participation.

Since 2006, she has been coordinating international teacher education programmes, facilitating a pan-European community of practice geared toward educational issues related to living together in mutual understanding and promoting education for democracy. Her partners are the Council of Europe, the European Wergeland Center (Norway), the Anna Lindh Foundation (Egypt), and French training institutions for teachers and social workers.

e-mail: pascalemompoint@hotmail.com

Erik Amnå is professor in Political Science at Örebro University in Sweden. Since 2009, he has been the coordinator of the multidisciplinary research group 'Youth & Society' (YeS; www.oru.se/yes), Örebro University, and from 2010-2012 he was the Team Leader of the EU FP7 Research Project on Processes for processes which influence democratic ownership and participation in eight European states.

One of his recent publications is the book "New Forms of Citizen Participation: Normative Implications" Baden-Baden: Nomos 2010

e-mail: erik.amna@oru.se

Michael Byram 'read' languages at Cambridge, taught French and German in secondary and adult education. At Durham University since 1980, now Professor Emeritus, he has trained teachers and researched linguistic minorities and foreign language education.

His most recent book is "From Foreign Language Education to Education for Intercultural Citizenship".

e-mail: m.s.byram@durham.ac.uk

Anne Beate Reinertsen is Associate Professor in the Department of Education at Nord-Trøndelag University College, Levanger, Norway. She holds a PhD from the University of Trondheim, NTNU.

She has been working several years as a high school lecturer and administrator prior to her academic career. She writes about School Reform and Philosophy of Education issues, and is currently preoccupied with quality issues, assessment and action research.

e-mail: anne.b.reinertsen@hint.no