



This paper is taken from

*Europe's Future: Citizenship in a Changing World
Proceedings of the thirteenth Conference of the
Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe
Academic Network*

London: CiCe 2011

edited by Peter Cunningham and Nathan Fretwell, published in London by CiCe,
ISBN 978-1-907675-02-7

Without explicit authorisation from CiCe (the copyright holder)

- only a single copy may be made by any individual or institution for the purposes of private study only
- multiple copies may be made only by
 - members of the CiCe Thematic Network Project or CiCe Association, or
 - a official of the European Commission
 - a member of the European parliament

If this paper is quoted or referred to it must always be acknowledged as
Clavier, L. (2011) Education for citizenship in upper secondary school and social network: Social contract versus technical contract, in P. Cunningham & N. Fretwell (eds.) Europe's Future: Citizenship in a Changing World. London: CiCe, pp. 84 - 90

© CiCe 2011

CiCe
Institute for Policy Studies in Education
London Metropolitan University
166 – 220 Holloway Road
London N7 8DB
UK

This paper does not necessarily represent the views of the CiCe Network.



Lifelong Learning Programme

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Acknowledgements:

This is taken from the book that is a collection of papers given at the annual CiCe Conference indicated. The CiCe Steering Group and the editor would like to thank

- All those who contributed to the Conference
- The CiCe administrative team at London Metropolitan University
- London Metropolitan University, for financial and other support for the programme, conference and publication
- The Lifelong Learning Programme and the personnel of the Education and Culture DG of the European Commission for their support and encouragement.

Education for citizenship in upper secondary school and social network: Social contract versus technical contract

Loïc Clavier
Nantes University (France)

Abstract

This paper is interested in citizenship education in schools when confronting the practical uses of social networks among teenagers. Citizenship education is often considered as a means of integration and social regulation. The effectiveness of such education is often assessed in terms of the quality of peace that reigns within the school. This paper explores relationships between students, especially those relationships at work in the context of social networks through image rights.

Keywords: *citizenship education; social contract; social networks.*

Introduction

This paper is interested in citizenship education in schools when confronting the practical uses of social networks among teenagers. Citizenship education is often considered as a means of integration and social regulation (Chauvigné, 2010). The effectiveness of such education is often assessed in terms of the quality of peace that reigns within the school. Such a sight (Clavier, 2010) contrasts the education of the ignorant to the education of the violent. Education thus develops two ethics (Mathei, 1999). The first is intended to be regarded as ignorant barbarians, which approximates the second as barbarism and violence. In addition, the work of these education paradigms competes as a result of the evaluation of the social climate of the institution. As Audigier (2007) argues, the political paradigm (the crucible Republican) competes with the emancipatory paradigm (act enlightened citizen) and with the sociocultural paradigm (to promote togetherness and salvation through economic integration). Herein, this paper investigates into the relationships between students and especially those relationships at work in the context of social networks through image rights. Indeed, personal teaching and education are often faced with incivility, related to misuse of images propagated on the web. These acts emerge suddenly and sometimes violently, with the knowledge of the educational community. This rupture more than anything, leads us to reflect on the one hand, on what happens in terms of citizenship education in schools and on the other hand, what leads a student to use techniques for digital, networked use, diverting the image of others, as if the "web" were a place of lawlessness.

This paper reflects on results of a survey of 150 college and high school students that shows a use of social networks in adolescents that relates to the knowledge and foundations of citizenship education. The paper first presents, at least in part, what underlies citizenship education in schools. It goes on to analyze a body of data indicating the practices of students regarding compliance with image laws, then reflects more widely on the evolution of the identity of the student and what that implies from an educational standpoint. Finally, by focusing on the ethical change in the concept of citizenship education (pacify the violent rather than educate the uneducated), we will see

how it is structured to build social capital and identity, all under the supervision of the group in social networks everywhere.

1. Education for citizenship in school

We consider here the results of research (Chauvigné, 2010) that shows the applications and impediments of citizenship education in upper secondary school in France. Such education is seen to be used more as a tool to standardize the behaviour of students as opposed to an emancipatory tool. However, this observation is weighted by the position that staff in charge of such education are responding in different contexts of action. It appears that education for citizenship is not only weakened by a lack of rationality, but also by a variety of representations and official guidelines intended to strengthen it. Such diversity fosters a break already identified by Audigier (2007) between political and social emancipation. The only evaluation criterion being institutionally imposed is quality of school peace. The issue takes precedence over other concepts at work in education. This semantic shift between ends and issues embodied by a pragmatic assessment focused on measuring social tranquillity, questions the legitimacy of this education.

Students are involved in activities that they see as on one side artificial and on the other as normal. The personnel, rooted in a school still very traditional in form, answers questions of efficiency and usefulness of knowledge posed by the parents of students. Citizenship education is not profitable in terms of direction or evaluation on the fringes of academic knowledge. There are tensions between standardization and empowerment for learning in this area of education. It should also be noted that student life in college has amplified the phenomenon. This note, intended to reveal the investment of student learning in public, becomes coercive and poses an assessment of behaviour. In turn, that tension has been hijacked by teams of teachers and educators: high marks are common, because they avoid stigmatizing difficult schools. As for schools, the lack of assessment of Legal and Social Civic Education has reduced the role of that discipline in learning. Finally, it should be noted that in a meaningful context, logic transmissive learning at the expense of a social constructivist approach, produces a fragmentation between knowledge and practice. Hyphenation is often identified in France between knowledge and practice that reinforces an exploitation of social citizenship education. Formations of citizenship both at school and in college courses fool the eye into believing that they produce social peace at the expense of empowerment. It seems that in many cases the evaluation of this education is limited to the collection of evidence that students have the ability to reproduce the expected behaviour. No one cares whether students understood the reasons underlying their actions or whether they are ready to promote! Direction and autonomy are not questioned in this vision of education.

This brief discussion allows us to focus on a particular component of that education, including education regarding image rights. In this particular context, we will focus on the activity of Supervisors¹. They contribute not only to education for citizenship, but

¹Education personnel are more commonly called education counselors. The supervisor (creation of the corporation in 1970 to take into account the student's speech and this, in response to the events of 1968 demonstrated the ineffectiveness of education facilities and student supervision within the living facilities) is primarily a versatile professional working in college or high school. He is the mediator, communicator, organizer, and above all it keeps track of students. Circular No. 82-482 of October 28, 1982 place them in its missions in teaching staff or management. This professional never work alone and he is the bearer of values embodied in the action. The credibility of the CPE is affirmed at the end of its action. He is the heir heads and supervisors remain responsible for monitoring student absenteeism. By changing the system (mass) and the urgent need for the

their missions are vigilant about the social peace of the institution and consider the student as a whole. They are at the crossroads of the tensions that we have identified above.

2. Respect for the right to the image: what education?

Supervisors are often at the front of the offence. Indeed, they are the first to receive complaints from the teacher, the student or his family regarding the misuse of an image disclosed on the web or through a social network, a Blog or other digital means.

Generally, access to computers in rooms for free agency, occurs during the lunch break, mobile phones with technical means to take pictures and distribute them with or without "special effects" requires a reorganization of monitoring and more generally, a reorientation of tracking time outside class. There is a complexity of the technical area required in a first time collaboration with teachers to enable the introduction of computer surveillance. Similarly, it is possible to increase vigilance in the use of digital devices within the facility. Bans for use or possession appeared in the Internal Regulations of the institutions. However, this coercive tool met with very limited success. Firstly because a defect is feasible without supervision, then because the effects of the dissemination of an image on a social network invite themselves in school even if this image was neither achieved, nor even posted in school.

Building on the previous results showing that school form prevented citizenship education at hand, particularly recognising the split between knowledge and practice, and its manipulation (to normalize school measured by the quality of School Peace), we conducted a survey of 100 students. This study, despite the number of students involved, was not intended for generalization and provides guidance for future research. Questions asked students to identify their practice in the use of images and their dissemination. The final idea was to check the state of knowledge regarding the rights to the images and to identify the connection they make to citizenship education.

The sample consists of fifty percent boys and fifty percent girls. Fifty percent of students are college students and fifty percent of high school students. It appears that students have in their vast majority (98%) access to an online social network and deposit photos taken with their phones. Twenty percent of them do not reveal their real identity on the social network and uses a pseudonym. As for the setup of their page, 70% are unable to describe the access restrictions. We can therefore infer that a large number of published information and images accessible to all users of the net are photos taken and posted online without asking permission of those photographed on the grounds that it is festive and convivial moments shared between them. Such exposure of their private life does not seem to bother them. Nearly eighty percent of them used an image with commentary to be deliberately offensive to one or more of their peers in the framework of "settling scores". This practice seems common and legitimate. The number of friends with whom they share information and reviews is an average of 80. This large number mainly covers an area corresponding to that of their school. This means that any settlement of account

organization of school life, it must take into account the whole of the student and to develop educational strategies. The educational mission is part of the school project. There is therefore no longer the sole head of security, he is involved. It has no reporting relationship with teachers and no longer the guarantor of student discipline within the institution. Its action refers to the part of school life, which in this circular, is defined as the time-throughs. He participated in the social peace in the school. Organizes the collective life-through and place the teenagers under the best conditions for individual and group life and personal development

by proxy announces itself loudly within the institution. Ten percent of students surveyed know that this type of action (defamation of a student, teacher) through the net is prohibited. The other students seem ignorant of it. Finally, all students having a relationship problem with a teacher who had issued a disparaging comment or a photo of the teacher and could achieve this using that teacher's image.

It appears that students are unfamiliar with the concept of image rights, and they give themselves the right to publish the fact that they are the owners of the photographs taken. The notion of rights of someone who has the pictures eliminates the concept of duty that they use the image responsibly. This therefore gives rise to some students being rejected and stigmatizing events group. We collected evidence that shows the suffering of some students affected by this phenomenon of ostracism.

However, the supervisor's work in the context of citizenship education, especially in activities related to online newspapers in college or upper secondary school students and to the concept of image rights. The fact remains that they are regularly confronted with violations. Parents or students are rarely asked to cease these actions. But what can they do when it takes place outside of the establishment, if not to advise parents on how to proceed so that the image disappears from the network and to meet with students involved in educational work? However, we clearly see the limits of their action in the school area. Not only are they given notice to find a solution for peace to be restored at school, but in addition they must do so in an emergency that does not spare the time for the learning of global citizenship. Faced with a situation of tension that can lead to violence (physical or moral) reaction is the subsequent healing and often attaches a reminder of the law.

Supervisors are caught in the crossfire of the institutional order of school peace, the limit of their action (on school grounds and the effectiveness of collaboration around the use of the computer), and an education citizenship under the proposed single aspect of social integration through standardization and tension (sources of school violence) imported from outside the institution.

Three difficulties come. The first is the school form that obscures the issues of production of meaning and empowerment in education. The second relates to the zone of lawlessness represented by social networks whose rules of operation and computer settings promote anarchy and overexposure to the privacy of teenagers. Moderation is the remarks after the event, "when she did ²". It requires the parents have some knowledge of law³ "he has no priority." The third is an obsession - peace in education, and therefore a fantasy vision of learning: the transmission can be done in a peaceful climate. Certainly, we can not educate on a battlefield, but education is not pacification. The purpose of education is autonomy, not social peace.

3. Peace and social education

We have already seen through the evidence gathered from a small population of students that the immediacy of image production and dissemination of unlimited use by the media obscures the notion of the rights to the image and obscures the respect of the rights and slashing each other in citizenship education reduced to social peace. Not only is the virtual considered ephemeral and inconsequential, but also as a space outside of any social contract. Freedom of expression is a mix of anarchy and insults. "Walls" of

² Some social networks are quite slow to remove the offending images. Such inertia discourages victims and encourages a sense of impunity.

³ The right image is not restricted, as many people think only "celebrities".

students insulting others supports the images, videos of bullying teachers invade the Internet and produce violence returning to the institution with a force often unexpected! The information missing from education in regard to new digital technologies and reticular engages us in an education such that we forget the empowering dimension.

The apparent shortfall, identified in this new citizenship education, between rights and duties creates a new situation to promote the property of true, good knowledge. It is not so ignorant that we must educate, but, at the time of Guizot⁴, the violent are less barbaric. Barbarism has changed direction, it is no more ignorance, but violence. Such moral education ignores the educational knowledge in the sense of light and causes a gap around image rights. Digital technology and networks applied to the image which provokes derision es la Bruyere (1756, p32) said: "mockery on the contrary, any injuries that which forgives less, it is the language of contempt and One of the ways he does best hear it attacks man in his last stronghold is the opinion he has of himself." This leads to violence just as cruel and destructive as physical violence. This "hyper-virtuality," not only because it crosses the barriers of time (synchronous or asynchronous), but also the social boundaries of its ease of implementation, becomes a disembodied brutal reality that denies the rights of another. Citizenship education in what it promotes as respect for rights is referred to a virtuality which defuses its action and highlights its fragility due to simple law enforcement. The social contract then seems in jeopardy.

4. Social contract versus technical contract

The social contract is a difficulty. Is it possible to create, to imagine a voluntary act genesis of political power without being a constraint, or the resignation of the will of the slave against the master. Is it not an agreement, but a gesture of subjection by association? Rousseau then produces the concept of alienation as the abandonment of each not to a third party (the king for example) but by the will of all. This is known as a founding act that produces the political body. The great strength of this concept is that everyone gives to all without subduing someone in particular. Everyone wins and no one loses, "since there is no contractor on which to acquire the same right as he yields" (Ricoeur, 2006, p54). It is the passage from the state of nature to the state of society. The exchange of freedom (freedom against savage civil liberty), contrary to the exchange of property settled on the notion of equivalence that is beyond parity in producing humanity in its social dimension.

When considering the feedback from students, it seems that the technique reverses that principle by returning to the strict equivalence between what is assigned and what is acquired. What is technically possible is morally permitted. The virtual video games and communication spaces like social networks do not meet students' eyes to the same legal criteria as that of the everyday environment. Ignorance of the law or the difficulty to articulate a legal knowledge with practice can not alone explain the looting of image rights. Computer reticular establishes a territory which is governed not by human laws, but by technical laws. The social contract is replaced by the technical contract. The establishment of the virtuality occurs through values related to the operation and options of the program that manages the social network. The exchange of liberty is no longer to the largest number but to the sovereign, i.e. the platform that manages the network. The

⁴ "Ignorance makes people ferocious and turbulent [...] When the government took care to spread in favor of National Education, under the relation of religion, morality, politics, doctrines which are suitable its nature and its management, these doctrines will soon acquire a power against which fail are the differences of free spirit and all attempts of sedition. "François Guizot, memory for use in the History of my time, Michel Levy, 1858-1867, Volume 3, p14.

record number of users that his type of product has is such that it becomes impossible to superimpose ethical and moral laws derived directly from the technical requirements. From a voluntary divestiture proceeds humanity in its social dimension, it turns into a trade, of being to have it. It's back to the wild freedom and humanity which is spreading rather than in an institution but in a world without social equivalent. The contract is technical and institutionalization becomes inhuman⁵ in that it denies the basic rights of every individual through the privatization of public space by overexposure to privacy contracting.

Conclusion

Through an emerging research on the links between citizenship education and image rights, we wanted to bring out the difficulties of some players to complete their mission as educators. The complexity of these situations is very strong and committed terms of education (school form) with issues of education (social harmony at school). Together, these two axes are based on virtual territories that sow the seeds of tension in real schools. The schools of the 21st century have made the choice to educate the violent rather than judging the ignorant, perhaps hastily. The question of the sense of presence in school is too subversive to a student. The response of teenagers is like lightning fast time. If a student can show obedience within a school, this state does not demonstrate that he understood why he should obey and is ready to promote in the name of which he must obey. It invests virtual spaces governed by laws and makes learning techniques, sometimes in excessive pain, universes that exposes his private life and can ostracize. This seems pessimistic. Yet it has the merit of showing us a direction in which education no longer carries the humanist ideals of the Enlightenment. It remains to invent a humanism that educates the ignorant in a world grown complex. It becomes imperative to articulate technology and society by placing man at the centre

References

- Audigier, F. (2007) Education for citizenship in its contradictions, *International Review of Education*, No. 44, pp. 25-34
- Chauvigné, C. (2010) The implementation of citizenship education in schools of secondary education and its actors: study and analysis of teaching practice and education. Thesis Montpellier III
- Clavier, L. (2010) The citizenship education with technology. Sixth International Meeting on Jules Verne. Nantes.
- F. Guizot (1858-1867) remembered for use in the history of my time. Volume 3. Paris. Michael Levy.
- La Bruyere (1756) Characters, Volume second. Paris with David. 1756
- Mattei Jean-Francois., *Barbarism inner Essay on the filthy modern Paris*, PUF, 1999.
- Ricoeur Paul (2006), *Art Sale*, Dictionary of Philosophy. Paris. Albin Michel
- Rousseau J.J. (1762/2008) *The Social Contract*. Paris, Flammarion

⁵ Facts reported by various media reports, a situation that led to suicides