



Educational Research (ISSN: 2141-5161)
Vol. 9(5) pp. 137-144, December, 2018 Available
online@ <http://www.interestjournals.org/ER>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14303/er.2018.226>
Copyright © 2018 International Research Journals

Full Length Research Paper

Role of universities in developing citizenship among students: A case from Pakistan

¹Rehman ZU, ²Naz S and ^{3*}Majoka MI

¹PhD Scholar, Department of Education, Hazara University, Mansehra, Pakistan. ²PhD Scholar, Department of Islamic & Religious Studies, Hazara University, Mansehra, Pakistan. ³Associate Professor, Department of Education, Hazara University, Mansehra, Pakistan.

*Corresponding Author's Email: zajadoon555@hotmail.com

Abstract

Citizenship is associated with educational learning which facilitate to get ready our young graduates for the challenges and prospects of a changing World. Citizenship is becoming a corner stone subject in teaching learning process. However, still it is an entrance to a more comprehensive society. So, it was indispensable to explore the function of universities in developing citizenship among graduates. A survey research method was adopted, with a questionnaire and fifteen hundred Master level graduates were selected as sample of the study from fifteen public/private universities of Pakistan. The analysis of data exposed that a substantial number of the graduates having civic characteristics, were significantly in favor to develop sense of responsibility, leadership skills, curricular and co curricular activities, knowledge of current World events, civic research and facilities, law and religious studies, civic literacy and ethical awareness, crime prevention and human rights. For humanizing the civic characteristics and the accessibility as well as sustainability of the civic services in the universities, it is suggested that there should be no gap among learners, faculty and the management. The faculty and management be dedicated to student centered learning and the focus would be on the course learning and deliberate conclusions.

Keywords: Citizenship, University graduates, Civic characteristics, Civic services, Citizenship development.

INTRODUCTION

Citizenship and civic characteristics have been remained very important for preparing shared democratic life. These were about facilitating people to make their own judgments and to take carefulness for their own lives and communities. Chasing a line of exploration with reference to nationality indicate to spread out knowledge, skills, attitude which facilitate learners to contribute like energetic and knowledgeable citizens in our democratic society within an international perspective (National Goals for Schooling, Australia, 2010). Unfolding citizenship as an ingredient of education affirmed on a certain level that citizenship tendency is about incorporation into society. It is advantageous about surmounting structural difficulties to consensus: challenging cultural favoritism and unfairness in institutions; it also expressed on the societal and political stages as generating a public display that will facilitate to offer safety without the need for power (Osler & Starkey, 2011). Conversing civic learning for the 21st century, Cogan (2000) indicated the customary aims of universities in promoting citizenship learning has characteristically been a vital aim within syllabus of study in history. Citizenship in a number of nations paying attention upon mounting comprehension about government and other institutions; privileges and responsibilities of citizens and has been inclined mostly in the direction of the advancement of knowledge of national identity. Also supports to organizing them for the dealing and prospects of civically developed and operational life (Gearon, 2015). In the same way, Gabelnick (2011) has represented citizenship with civic characteristics as a function of higher education and he mentioned that enlightening a dedicated community,

universities have to revolutionize their programs of study and outlooks subsequently they may well educate learners to be good citizens. He also provided guidance for universities to deliver well for civic learning. In the same way De Simone (2001) reported presumptions concerning the forthcoming of civic advanced learning; that facilitates additional approach and mounting independence of education, and mentioned these varieties of strategies endorse the concept of anti-intellectual and anti-functional. Similarly, Smith (2002) indicated that universities are promoting the citizenship as patriotism that includes the show of affection, such as reaching out to embrace others in times of need. These acts of kindness were especially seen on September 11, 2001. A true patriot is someone who is willing to show love toward people, even at times when nobody is watching. As the world, its problems and consequences become more complex; so we need a new patriotism that is as old as the nation's founders and their vision of democracy because we are faced with the task of reorganizing some of our most resistant systems (O'Connell, 2011). Likewise, Vernon (2010) indicated the important factors of citizenship as morality and civic engagement, that academic and the community together must develop a civic morality. He said that in serving the community, academics develop an understanding within the community that they see the university and its academics as accountable to the community. The relationship and the work must be mutually informative and the function of civic engagement is a contemporary expression of the historic liberal arts mission of preparing students for public life as citizens and leaders (Latham, 2003). In the time of globalization as well as post nine/eleven (9/11), U.S. universities and colleges stand for essential problems concerning the civic training of the students who would facilitate to citizenship spirit with civic characteristics (Green, 2010). Furthermore King (2012) explained that academics and universities may formulate prospects in favor of students ethical, righteous and personality growth through the atmosphere they generate with their recognized set of courses. Moreover, Lisman (2012) affirmed that an outlines of the Community Involvement Program that was extended through a university; it was understood that these types of agendas can help out in widening the function of civic education and civic characteristics in population improvement. Universities should not simply edify, but must also train civic learners fairly diverse from those of the earlier period. Not only they should carry out civic study, but also trust loyalty with the private sector. As a fresh advancement to civic service, civic strategy learning for all apprentices is supported, by means of particular back-up for a fresh plan of civic learning for matures. The author suggests that universities assist civic learners and educators, exercise civic understanding sensibly so that advanced citizenship education promote all the functions of the public (Boyer & Hechinger, 2004). In the same way, Morse (2007) avowed that civic learning at university level in America has a rich service of practicing students for civic functions but such aims have missed their prominence within study programs. This information describes careful citizenship within a democratic culture and evaluates higher education's function in civic learning. Universities may facilitate to expand the proficiencies and necessities of citizenship and community livings; offer methods that campuses may produce a fresh atmosphere for seeking about the citizenship livings through education, supremacy, extracurricular activities, campus time as well as the public relationships. The role of universities to the citizenship education is greatly wider in comparison to the building of general public (Graham, 2005). Further, Delanty (2001) acknowledged that universities have a significant function in connection to the 'civilized citizenship' along with 'technical citizenship'. By means of 'civilized citizenship' he described a responsibility in favor of the university within the vital civilized trend. Through technical citizenship, Delanty observed the university within the finest location to associate the concerns of business, equipments and advertised powers by nationality. Universities make the accumulation of societal, opinionated and civilized thoughts along with standards common within a social order at every challenging circumstance. The major contributions of the universities to civic virtue are the spread of sense and practical wisdom in society (Blake et al., 2006). An additional contribution of universities related to citizenship draw closer the focus within the observation of Barnett & Standish (2016) as, citizens are not getting far into modern consideration of the universities prior to a citizen is trapped within complicated problems of public virtue. In simplest way Shils (2013) explained that universities also make participation to citizenship through their work in the education and training of professionals whose responsibility is to promote citizenship services. Moreover, it should be remembered that universities are also large corporate performers within their own local communities; means that these endorse appropriate employment practices and the promotion of economically appropriate policies (Ahier et al., 2003). According to Graham (2005) the factors like culture and technology, society and politics, understanding and literacy may well contribute to civic services. The experiences of university graduates in the life and work of the university as a whole are also rich for the enhancement of citizenship. This general point gives rise to a query about the extent to which universities directly concerned with the 'making of citizens'. The beginnings of higher education related to citizenship clear's the expansion of civic information and learning; causes the universal development of the graduates' brain and learning for citizenship (Schuller, 2004). It may not be denied that universities have a direct role in the 'making of good citizens' and such a role is a part of the aims and principles of higher education. These aims and principles of higher education are, of course, reputedly unmatched and explicit (Pring, 2016). Similarly, universities improve the broadmindedness and the encouragement of the young learners by facilitating them through introducing civic

attributes and services (Preston, 2004). A prominent element here is a claim that the university is; first and foremost a haven that has a direct function in the making of good citizens and broadening civic services at higher educational levels. It is also a mechanism for accomplishing a meticulous reason of growing future's social scientists (Blake et al., 2006). The authenticity of the link between university and citizenship is one of the core objectives of civic education and it influences learners to play a cooperative part in the life of their foundations, environments, societies and the huge globe. It also facilitates them to study about our economy and democratic institutions and standards; win over admiration for diverse public, spiritual and racial distinctiveness; widens learner's capability to reflect on issues, and take part in deliberations (Fuller, 2008). Therefore, only the individuals having characteristics of good citizenship can really contribute to the nation building. So far there are rare studies to explore the citizenship among university graduates in Pakistan. Due to its importance in the advancement of social and democratic attitude, this study is preferred to carry out here in Pakistan. It is worth mentioning that the critical role of Pakistan as a factor in international constancy and global politics can only be cherished when it is positioned in the framework of a global revival of Islamic distinctiveness. Hence it is considered very imperative to deem a study as the role of universities in developing citizenship among university students in Pakistan in order to have deep understanding of baseline for auxiliary research and policy formulation for the development of the excellence of citizenship superiority and advancement. The current research meant at finding out the role of universities in developing citizenship among students: a case from Pakistan. The objective of the study was (i) to identify the efforts made by the universities for the development of good citizenship. Based upon the objective of the study, ensuing question was formulated (i) what efforts are being made by universities for the development of good citizenship? Owing to restricted time period, financial circumstances, related constraints with the researcher, the study was delimited to (i) two provinces of Pakistan i.e. the universities located in Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa; including Federal Area (Islamabad) and Northern Areas (Gilgit Baltistan), (ii) only Graduates (Master level) university students of the year 2014. The present study might come up a need to establish the citizenship learning with civic characteristics in Pakistani universities and advanced educational institutions; researchers, educationists be supposed to concerned in curriculum scheming, curriculum/ syllabi could be planned on a variety of stages keeping in mind the necessities in the framework of the sense of citizenship in the country. It promotes self confidence in youth, empowers them to partake optimistically by mounting the civic proficiency and understanding, desirable to claim their privileges. Also supports to organize them for the dealing and prospects of civically developed and operational life (Gearon, 2015). The study may well facilitate the students as well as the citizens in understanding the matters relating to societal righteousness, human rights, community consistency; guide the policy makers to face prejudice, discriminations and intolerance. This study would be accommodating to pull together the university students, faculty and the management and remain helpful to eradicate any crack among these three pillars. It would also be supportive to emphasize the responsibility of supervising and sustaining the civic services within the university.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study was focused on determining the role of universities in developing citizenship among students: a case from Pakistan. To accomplish this purpose the following procedures were adopted. The population of the present study comprised of all the Graduates (Master level) students of the universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Punjab province of Pakistan. There were forty four thousand two hundred and fifty (44250) Graduates (Master level) students within one hundred and three (103) Universities (both public and private sector) in Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa including Federal as well as Northern areas (Gilgit Baltistan) of Pakistan, from which sample was taken for the purpose of the study. To draw a suitable sample from the population, a multistage stratified random sampling technique was adopted. The whole population was divided into two foremost fragments, namely: the province of the Punjab with Federal Capital Area (Islamabad) and the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa with Northern Areas (Gilgit Baltistan). Fifteen hundred (1500) Graduates (Master level) students of the fifteen (15) selected universities (9 from Punjab and 6 from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa) were taken the sample of the study. Within each university ten departments (5 social sciences and 5 natural sciences) were selected and 100 students (50 students from social sciences and physical sciences each/ 10 students from each social/physical sciences department) of each university were selected for investigation. A questionnaire is that method which is used to accumulate the structured and unstructured information from the subjects in a consistent way (Somekh and Lewin, 2005). For the collection of research data regarding the identification of the efforts made by the universities for the development of good citizenship, the researcher developed an instrument i.e. a fifteen main civic services set scale. For this instrument, after passing through pilot testing and experts' opinions, all the instructed improvements and modifications were worked out. Then finally passed through judgmental validation and was used for further process. For the collection of research data, researcher himself visited the sampled universities/departments and administered the questionnaire to the respondents.

Understandable instructions were prearranged in favor of the respondents. The respondents were requested to follow the appropriate technique as to think about each statement and mark the answer pages sincerely as well as cautiously. Also they were requested to return the filled questionnaire as soon as possible. The collaboration as well as the keen interest of the respondents made it promising to have a 100 % return rate of the administered instrument.

Following the marking procedure, the researcher prepared, set and tabularized the collected information. For the numerical analysis of data, SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) and Microsoft Excel were used. Arithmetic mean, proportions, frequency and Run test were applied as statistical tools for the analysis of data. These analyses extracted comprehensive results related to present study. On the basis of these outcomes, the researcher explored the findings, and conclusions were also drawn in the light of these findings.

RESULTS

For the identification of the efforts made by the universities to develop citizenship services, a scale consist of fifteen main civic services was used. The respondents were given a choice of YES/NO in front of each civic development opportunity. The provision of civic development opportunity has been identified by scores as well as the percentages of the respondents. The analyses of civic services provided in the universities are given below in Table 1.

Table 1: Services provided by universities to develop patriotism/sense of responsibility/leadership skills/co-curricular activities

Sr. No	Opportunity	Provision		Z	P
		No	Yes		
1	To celebrate national days.	96 (6%)	1404 (94%)	3.421	0.001
2	Assistance for students in solving their own problems.	310 (21%)	1190 (79%)	3.929	0
3	Leadership courses, field work and community service.	844 (56%)	656 (44%)	8.205	0
4	Sports and games.	378 (25%)	1122 (75%)	2.5	0
5	No program.	1485 (99%)	15 (1%)	2.752	0.006

Table 1 indicates the development of patriotism, sense of responsibility, leadership skills and co curricular activities by the universities. Ninety four percent university students agreed that university provide opportunity to 'celebrate national days' for developing patriotism and this response was significant ($Z= 3.421$, $p<0.05$), and seventy nine percent university students significantly ($Z=3.929$, $p<0.05$) agreed with 'assistance for students in solving their own problems'. Similarly, forty four percent students were in favor of 'leadership courses, field work and community service' that response was significant ($Z=8.205$, $p<0.05$), and 'sports/games' was favored by seventy five percent university students with a significant ($Z=2.500$, $p<0.05$) response, while only one percent responded that no such programs were in their university and their response was too significant ($Z=2.752$, $p<0.05$).

Table 2: Services provided by universities to develop curriculum/social activities/knowledge of current World events/civic research

Sr. No	Opportunity	Provision		Z	P
		No	Yes		
1	Better integration of multicultural and civic education initiatives.	295 (20%)	1205 (80%)	2.941	0.003
2	A social service program.	410 (27%)	1090 (73%)	4.023	0
3	Global historiography	347 (23%)	1153 (77%)	4.392	0
4	Research projects for civic development.	378 (25%)	1122 (75%)	5.447	0
5	No program.	1433 (96%)	67 (4%)	3.105	0.002

Table 2 reflects the civic services provided by universities to develop curriculum, social activities, knowledge of current World events, and civic research. A significant ($Z=2.941$, $p<0.05$) response was approved by eighty percent students in favor of 'better integration of multicultural and civic education initiatives' and 'a social service program' was significantly ($Z=4.023$, $p<0.05$) selected by seventy three percent students. Correspondingly, seventy seven percent university students significantly ($Z=4.392$, $p<0.05$) responded to have 'global historiography' and a significant ($Z=5.447$, $p<0.05$) response was also reflected by seventy five percent students in support of 'research projects for civic development', whereas only four percent students significantly ($Z=3.105$, $p<0.05$) responded to have no such programs in their university.

Table 3: Services provided by universities to develop civic facilities/ law and religious studies/digital civic literacy and classroom curriculum/ ethical awareness and social responsibility.

Sr. No	Opportunity	Provision		Z	P
		No	Yes		
1	Centre for social justice and civic engagement.	411 (27%)	1089 (73%)	3.253	0.001
2	Centre for advanced Islamic research.	592 (40%)	908 (60%)	7.066	0
3	Printable curriculum.	452 (30%)	1048 (70%)	4.147	0
4	Industry speakers to give their perspectives on ethical issues.	223 (15%)	1277 (85%)	3.339	0.001
5	No program.	1430 (95%)	70 (5%)	4.48	0

Table 3 shows law and religious studies, digital civic literacy and classroom curriculum, ethical awareness and social responsibility as the civic services provided by universities to widen civic facilities. The 'center for social justice and civic engagement' was significantly ($Z=3.253$, $p<0.05$) favored by seventy three percent students and sixty percent students significantly ($Z=7.066$, $p<0.05$) replied for 'center for advanced Islamic research'. In the same way, the civic service 'printable curriculum' was significantly ($Z=4.147$, $p<0.05$) selected by seventy percent university students and eighty five percent students significantly ($Z=3.339$, $p<0.05$) agreed to have 'industry speakers to give their perspectives on ethical issues' while merely five percent significantly ($Z=4.480$, $p<0.05$) responded that no such programs were in their university.

Table 4: Services provided by universities to develop crime prevention/ human rights/civic participation

Sr. No	Opportunity	Provision		Z	P
		No	Yes		
1	Crimes fighting project.	261 (17%)	1239 (83%)	4.061	0
2	Human rights study center.	265 (18%)	1235 (82%)	8.205	0
3	Association with national and international NGO/UN organizations.	413 (28%)	1087 (72%)	2.941	0.003
4	Digital library, Media library, e-learning labs, conference rooms, students project lab, workshop rooms, media research center, display center, student data management, playgrounds, museum, fire safety, employment agency or Job Shops, Cafeteria, stores, market, banks, transport, hostels, mosque, Health center, blood donation center and student teacher center.	472 (32%)	1028 (68%)	2.752	0.006
5	No program.	1435 (96%)	65 (4%)	6.105	0

Table 4 gives the statistical details regarding the civic services offered by the universities to enhance crime prevention, human rights, and civic participation. A significant ($Z=4.061$, $p<0.05$) response to have 'crimes fighting project' was given by eighty three percent students and 'human rights study centre' was significantly ($Z=8.205$, $p<0.05$) selected by eighty two percent university students. Equally, seventy two percent significantly ($Z=2.94$, $p<0.05$) replied to have 'association with national and international NGO / UN organizations' and a significant ($Z=2.752$, $p<0.05$) response was given by sixty eight percent students in favor of 'digital library, media library, e- learning labs, conference rooms, students project lab, workshop rooms, media research center, display center, student data management, playgrounds, museum, fire safety, employment agency or job shops, cafeteria, stores, market, banks, transport, hostels, mosque, Health center, blood donation center and student teacher center', but only four percent significantly ($Z=6.105$, $p<0.05$) responded that no such programs were in their university.

DISCUSSION

The present research was carried out to examine the role of universities in developing citizenship among students: a case from Pakistan. Results of the statistical measures regarding the objective of the study i.e. efforts made by the universities for the development of the good citizenship have been discussed as under: Rising patriotism, a huge number of the students (94%) were in favor 'to celebrate national days' with a significant response ($Z= 3.421$, $p<0.05$); elevating the sense of civic responsibility, a large proportion of the students (79%) agreed with 'assistance for students in solving their own problems' with a significant response ($Z=3.929$, $p<0.05$); (44%) students significantly ($Z=8.205$, $p<0.05$) replied for 'leadership courses, field work and community service'; a substantial number (75%) of the students significantly ($Z=2.500$, $p<0.05$) replied to have 'sports and games' while only (1%) commented that there were no such programs in their university with a significant response ($Z=2.752$, $p<0.05$). Developing curriculum, a large number of the students (80%) agreed with 'better integration of multicultural and civic education initiatives' with a significant response ($Z=2.941$, $p<0.05$); mounting social activities, (73%) of the students significantly ($Z=4.023$, $p<0.05$) supported to have 'a social service program'; raising knowledge of current World events, most of the students (77%) agreed to have 'global historiography' with a significant response ($Z=4.392$, $p<0.05$); increasing civic research, (75%) of the students supported 'research projects for civic development' with a significant response ($Z=5.447$, $p<0.05$) while only (4%) marked that there were no such programs in their university with a significant response ($Z=3.105$, $p<0.05$). Growing civic facilities, most of the students (73%) were significantly ($Z=3.253$, $p<0.05$) agreed to have 'center for social justice and civic engagement'; intensifying law and religious studies, a substantial number of students (60%) supporting for 'centre for advanced Islamic research' with a significant response ($Z=7.066$, $p<0.05$); rising digital civic literacy and classroom curriculum, a large number of the students (70%) were significantly ($Z=4.147$, $p<0.05$) in favor of 'printable curriculum'; escalating students' ethical awareness and social responsibility, a large number of the students (85%) agreed to have 'industry speakers to give their perspectives on ethical issues' with a significant response ($Z=3.339$, $p<0.05$) while only (5%) significantly ($Z=4.480$, $p<0.05$) responded that there were no such programs in their university. Implementing crime prevention, most of the students (83%) significantly ($Z=4.061$, $p<0.05$) agreed to have 'crimes fighting project'; growing human rights, a substantial number of the students (82%) supported to have 'human rights study Centre' with a significant response ($Z=8.205$, $p<0.05$); a large number of the students (72%) agreed to have 'association with national and international NGO / UN organizations' with a significant response ($Z=2.94$, $p<0.05$); raising civic participation, most of the university students (68%) agreed to have 'cafeteria, stores, banks, transport, hostels, mosque, digital library, media library, e learning labs, conference rooms, students project lab, workshop rooms, media research centre, display Centre, student data management, video conferencing, playgrounds, museum, fire safety, employment agency or job shops' with a significant response ($Z=2.752$, $p<0.05$) while only (4%) significantly ($Z=6.105$, $p<0.05$) commented that there were no such programs in their university.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the research results/findings and discussion it is concluded that most of the universities develop a moderate level of citizenship in terms of social responsibility, civic professionalism, morality and honesty, tolerance, acceptance, civic participation, accountability, patriotism and obedience, knowledge and understanding, reliability (promise-keeping). Universities provide the opportunities to celebrate national days; to organize students party/get to gather with games and quiz related to our country and to plan for trips to national monuments. Universities offer assistance for students in solving their own problems; community based leadership programs; leadership skills seminars; co-curricular activities; more opportunities for students to participate in the democratic governance of the institution and articulation of theories about how students

develop civically. For growing social activities and civic research, universities provide departments of social work; grants to improve the social work and research that enhances the ability of social workers; research projects for civic development; centre for social justice and civic engagement; center for law and religious studies with international religious studies; printable curriculum and curriculum toolkits. For exercising crime prevention, universities provide crimes fighting projects; services of trained drug and bomb detection canine team and for intensifying human rights, universities present human rights study center; seminars/conferences/workshops; association with national and international NGO / UN organizations; and disaster management/earth quake training center. Also provide almost all basic civic facilities/services i.e. cafeteria, banks, transport, hostels, mosque, blood donation center and student teacher center; playgrounds, museum, employment agency or job shops. On the other hand it is also concluded that few universities were not contributing in the civic development of the students and the students were not satisfied with the civic services provided by these universities because the focus was on putting the good rates and rest of the curricular activities and personal grooming were put behind. These universities did not offer leadership skills seminars or leadership programs. As curriculum is a key factor for the development of the civic education. Universities provided some basic course work and tricks/guidelines but no practical. There is an urgent need of more opportunities for students to partake in the democratic governance of these universities and more discussion/articulation of theories about how students develop civically. Nearly all of the universities offered basic civic facilities however, some universities are still deprived of department of social work or a social service program, global terrorism data base, council for civic development, skill development programs, human rights study center, disaster management center and center for social justice and, civic engagement.

REFERENCES

- Ahier J, Beck M (2003). *Graduate Citizens? Issues of Citizenship and Higher Education*, London: Routledge Falmer.
- Barnett R (2016). *Beyond All Reason: Living with Ideology in the University*, Buckingham: UK.SRHE/Open University Press.
- Blake NR, Smith S (2006). *The Universities We Need: Higher Education After Dearing*. London: Kogan Page.
- Boyer EL, Hechinger FM (2004). *Higher Learning in the Nation's Service: A Carnegie Foundation Essay*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Cogan J (2000). *Citizenship education for the 21st century: setting the context. An international perspective on education*. Cogan Page: London.
- Delanty G (2001). *Challenging Knowledge: The University in the Knowledge Society*, Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, UK.
- De Simone DM (2001). The Consequences of Democratizing Knowledge: Reconsidering Richard Hofstadter and the History of Education. *The History Teacher*, 34(3), 373-382.
- Fuller T (2008). *The Voice of Liberal Learning: Michael Oakeshott on Education*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Gabelnick F (2011). Educating a Committed Citizenry. *Change*, 78, 30-35.
- Gearon L (2015). *Learning to teach citizenship in the secondary school: A companion to school experience: Second edition*.
- Graham (2005). *Citizenship and Higher Education. The role of universities in communities and societies*.
- Green MF (2010). The Challenge of Internationalizing Undergraduate Education-In the age of globalization and post 9/11, U.S. colleges and universities face urgent questions about how to educate students who will contribute to civic life, both locally and globally and understand that the fate of nations, individuals, and the planet are inextricably linked. *Change*, 34(3), 12.
- King PM (2012). Character and Civic Education: What Does It Take? *Educational Record*, 78(3-4), 87-93.

- Latham AA (2003). Liberal education for global citizenship: reviewing Macalester's traditions of public scholarship and civic learning. Macalester College, Project Pericles.
- Lisman CD (2012). New directions for community college. The engaged campus. Community College of Aurora. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 96(53-60).
- Morse SW (2007). *Renewing Civic Capacity: Preparing College Students for Service and Citizenship*. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 8). Washington, DC.
- National Goals for Schooling (2010). *Shape of the Australian Curriculum: History*, National Curriculum Board.
- O'Connell B (2011). *Civil Society; the Underpinning of American Democracy*. University Press of New England. Hanover.
- Osler A, Starkey H (2011). *Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press. UK.
- Preston L (2004). *Australian International Research in Civic and Environmental Education*.
- Pring R (2016). Political education: relevance of the humanities. *Oxford Review of Education*, 25, 71–87.
- Schuller T, Hammond PC, Brassett-Grundy A and Bynner (2004). *The Benefits of Learning: The Impact of Education on Health, Family Life and Social Capital*, London.
- Shils E (2013). *The Calling of Education: The Academic Ethic and Other Essays on Higher Education*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith G (2002). *The Importance of Patriotism*. Omnibus online.
- Somekh B, Cathy L (2005). *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*, New Delhi.
- Vernon L, Tomas R (2010). *The Man and His Work*; Bilingual Review Press.