

LECTURERS' CONCEPTIONS OF ETHICAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AT THE HASHEMITE UNIVERSITY IN JORDAN

Dr.Tasneem Elkhateeb

Assistant Prof., Skills Department, Hail University, Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT: *This study aims to investigate the perceptions Lecturers' Conceptions of Ethical Citizenship Education at the Hashemite University in Jordan. The results of the study indicated that the lecturers perceptions includes that universities provide the students with knowledge, skills and attitudes but it's not concerned mainly with the ethical citizenship values of them. The lecturer's conceptions of their students were mainly focused on the academic dimensions. Implementing ethical citizenship education at the university has its obstacles and difficulties and it needs a shared decision, support and communication at all the levels.*

KEYWORDS: Lecturers' Conceptions, Ethical Citizenship Education, Hashemite University, Jordan

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays there is a global realization that if progress in all fields and aspects of academic activity is to be achieved, Education has to be taken to consideration and looked at very closely. One of the major consequences of this interest is the awareness of Ethics importance in education. Education has been recognized as an effective tool in changing and improving progress in all fields of life. Given ample proof of its viability over the centuries, and of its ability to change and to induce change and progress in society. Owing to the scope and pace of change, society has become increasingly knowledge-based so that higher learning and research now act as essential components of cultural, socio-economic and environmentally sustainable development of individuals, communities and nations (Obeidat, 2005).

Today's organizations realized that in the complex world we live in and the value laden decisions, a holistic approach for teaching is desirable. A holistic approach for teacher education is one that views the teacher as a multidimensional person who can deal with not only the cognitive dimension, but with the intellectual, spiritual, and moral dimensions as well. And our formal education has to integrate moral literacy, along with literacy in reading, writing, and arithmetic (Tuana, 2007).

Our human being grows and can only be achieved through living and interacting with others , the social aspect of human beings suggests the need for organizations that supports and manages the well being of their members .and through it people strive to achieve their goals in consistent with their believes and values . society as a whole , the family , the school, religious institutions, all play a vital role in transforming humans from a helpless infants into an independent , mature , and independent, wise adults (kanungo, 2007).

Jordan represents a regional model in planning, setting and implementing real development agenda; in order to meet challenges of globalization and technology, and to guarantee the welfare of its citizens. Jordan recognizes that students are the hidden power of the future, and knowing the right way of planning and using this power will be the best way to achieve its success (Awadallah, 2005).

As Khader (2010) mentioned the sector of higher education in Jordan plays a key remarkable role in the process of comprehensive development at various levels and areas. That is, during the last ten years (in the reign of His Majesty King Abdullah II), higher education in Jordan witnessed a significant progress in terms of the diversity of study programs, patterns of teaching and learning that control both the quality and quantity and expansion of higher education institutions (Brief on Higher Education Sector in Jordan, n. d., ¶ 4). In spite of the limited financial and human resources in the kingdom, higher education lies within the priorities of the State as of the role it plays in promoting the economic, social and knowledge level of the Jordanian citizen.

Statement of the Problem

Ethical citizenship has a vital role in the success of the university as a whole community rather than as a group of people set on achieving certain goals. Some may regard this vision as an impractical ideas rather than a practical reality. However, ethical citizenship is very central to sustaining the infrastructure that supports academic life and the relations between the university and society. This makes higher education more productive through a more efficient reward structure which integrates ethical citizenship values with academic progress.

The purpose of the current study was to answer the following question:

What are university lecturers' conceptions of ethics and citizenship education at the Hashemite University in Jordan?

Significance of the Study

One can argue that the significance of this study comes from the assumption that:

- Finding of this study will reveal the academic staff members' conceptions of ethical citizenship education at the Jordanian universities.
- Finding of this study will serve as input for higher education institutions in curriculums and programs development.
- Researchers and students in higher education.

The Study Objectives and Questions

The main purpose of the current study was to investigate what university lecturers think about ethical citizenship education. The reason for that is because university lecturers' thinking has a considerable effect on what subsequently occurs when lecturers and students come together. Pedagogical thinking informs educational practice. The aim of this study is to present some data in this respect, which illustrate what university lecturers at the Hashemite University think about some of the aspects of Ethics and Citizenship education in universities. In more details, the investigation attempted to answer the following research questions towards meeting the above stated purposes.

- 1- What are the university lecturers' conceptions of ethics and citizenship education at the Hashemite University in Jordan?

2- What is the relationship between the following demographic variables and the lecturers' conceptions of ethics and citizenship education at the Hashemite University: (a) the gender of the faculty members, (b) the type of college of the faculty members, (c) academic rank and (d) the number of experience years?

3- What are the obstacles that hinder fostering ethics and citizenship education at the Hashemite University in Jordan?

Definition of terms

Some brief definition of terms to be used in this study is as follows:

- Ethics

The basic concepts and fundamental principles of decent human conduct. It includes study of universal values such as the essential equality of all men and women, human or natural rights, obedience to the law of land, concern for health and safety and, increasingly, also for the natural environment (business dictionary, 2014) and this is the operational definition.

- Citizenship

Citizenship is defined operationally as the status of a person recognized under the custom or law of a state that bestows on that person (called a citizen) the rights and the duties of citizenship. That may include the right to vote, work and live in the country, the right to return to the country, the right to own real estate, legal protections against the country's government, and protection through the military or diplomacy (Wikipedia, 2013).

- Ethical citizenship

The concepts and practices of ethics and ethical citizenship have been elusive and contested notions throughout documented human history. The mere mention of the word "ethical" conjures a complicated web of questions and socio-cultural considerations. Additionally, many would argue that, in recent years, considerations of ethical citizenship have grown even more complicated, notably as our world has grown "smaller" and an eternally expanding rouse of perspectives are being integrated into the pot of global communication. Ethical citizenship is defined operationally as a communitarian relationship between members of a community based around a shared conception of the common good first defended by community Idealists (Missouri State, 2014).

- Academic citizenship

The phrase 'academic citizenship' has been subject to a variety of interpretations. In some American universities, the phrase is an expression used to refer to a code of behavior and values expected from university students. Such expectations normally incorporate reference to academic honesty, obligations to attend class, and submitting to standards of discipline and general behavior set out by the university and/or faculty. It is about what is expected of students in order to become bona fide members of the academic and university community. A more widespread interpretation of academic citizenship refers to the duties, responsibilities or virtues of academic faculty rather than students (Shils, 1997; Ward, 2003; Macfarlane, 2006). Those addressing the meaning of this phrase argue that although the dialogue of academic life often focuses on the rights of faculty to academic freedom, it is important not to lose sight of their obligations in relation to the communities they serve (e.g. Kennedy, 1997). It is this latter meaning of academic citizenship that will inform discussion within this paper.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: ETHICS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN UNIVERSITIES

As stated in (Esteban et al, 2014) Ethics and Citizenship education forms part of the very notion of higher education. In addition, it is the kind of education that has existed since the universities were first founded across Europe in the High Middle Ages (Ruegg, 1992). Classic reference works (Newman, 1852; Ortega & Gasset, 1930; Wyatt, 1990) and more recent works on the idea and mission of universities (Pelikan, 1992; Kerr, 2001; Scott, 2006) refer to such education in one way or another.

This is testimony to the fact that it is a substantial and not a superficial issue. However, there are various angles of approach to Ethics and Citizenship education. Different versions of such education have been developed for different reasons. When implemented, these versions shape it one way or another. We have roughly divided these different versions into three categories.

Three versions of Ethics and Citizenship education in universities

The first version we want to refer to is the one that considers that Ethics and Citizenship education has no place in universities:

“College and university teachers can (legitimately) do two things: (1) introduce students to bodies of knowledge [and]

(2) Equip those same students with the analytical skills... that will enable them to move confidently... That’s all there is to it, nothing more, nothing less.” (Stanley, 2008).

There are several reasons supporting this version. University education is identified with professional, technical and scientific education. That is the focus of its attention, and thus there is no place for any other type of education in universities. It is surprising to find that the opposite was the case in the very first universities, where a speculative kind of education oriented towards professional practice did not form part of the curricula of university education, which was wholly focused on intellectuality and the search for truth, good and beauty (Ruegg, 1992; Berube, 2007). However, when the first universities were founded, formalized mass education systems did not exist. These emerged in the mid 19th century in several European countries and the United States, and they took responsibility for the Ethics and Citizenship education of the new generations. Thus, universities divest themselves of one of the functions that gave them meaning. In addition, the defenders of this version not unjustifiably point out that the line separating Ethics and Citizenship education and indoctrination is too fine.

Authors like Derek Bok (Bok, 2007) warn of the dangers entailed by thoughts like those of Henry Giroux, which encourage critical pedagogy (Giroux, 2007). This is a version that, while it cannot be overlooked, has weaknesses. Among others, there is no guarantee that Ethics and Citizenship education will have been completed at the educational level prior to higher education.

Perhaps now more than ever, and owing to the individualism (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 1992) and disaffection towards social and political institutions that quite a few young people are displaying (Forbrig, 2005; Saha, Print & Edwards, 2007; Duke, 2008), we need European

universities that opt to educate professional young people who take responsibility for reality from an Ethics and Citizenship perspective (Steiner, 2004).

The second version is the one that considers Ethics and Citizenship education as an education in the major Ethics and Citizenship issues that we face today. In this respect, university students should acquire the highest level of moral reasoning development (Kohlberg, 1981, 1984). Topics such as justice, equity, sustainability, gender equality or multicultural coexistence are particular to this way of conceiving of Ethics and Citizenship education. At the present time, it is hard to find a university that incorporates such issues in its mission statement. However, this may be an incomplete version of Ethics and Citizenship education. Today's reality shows that while most students take on board the fact that a certain level Ethics and Citizenship is expected of them, they do not always rise to it (Procario-Foley & Bean, 2002;

The third version is the one that considers Ethics and Citizenship education as an education of an ethical nature (Lapsley & Clark, 2005; Nucci & Narvaez, 2008) and, therefore, it is focused on implementing a series of moral habits and certain ethical virtues. As Michael Sandel suggests, universities:

“... can't entirely dispense with the idea that their role is not only to advance certain ends but also to honor and reward certain virtues.” (Sandel, 2011).

It is clear that virtue can be understood in a Homeric, Aristotelian, Thomist or Christian sense, or in accordance with Franklin's contribution. Alasdair MacIntyre combines these three variants of virtue and defines virtue as:

“... an acquired human quality the possession and exercise of which tends to enable us to achieve those goods which are internal to practices and the lack of which effectively prevents us from achieving any such goods.” (MacIntyre, 1984) In this case, Ethics and Citizenship education in universities can be regarded as the conquest of certain virtues, which undoubtedly form part of a competent conduct. An appreciation of authorized voices, admiration for the best of what is said or respect towards forms would be among them (Perez-Diaz, 2010).

Citizenship Education for the 21st Century

Citizenship education can be defined as educating children, from early childhood, to become clear-thinking and enlightened citizens who participate in decisions concerning society. 'Society' is here understood in the special sense of a nation with a circumscribed territory which is recognized as a state.

Knowledge of the nation's institutions, and also an awareness that the rule of law applies to social and human relationships, obviously form part of any citizenship education course. Taken in this sense, citizenship education is based on the distinction between:

The individual as a subject of ethics and law, entitled to all the rights inherent in the human condition (human rights); and the citizen – entitled to the civil and political rights recognized by the national constitution of the country concerned. All human beings are both individuals and citizens of the society to which they belong. Therefore, human rights and citizen rights are interdependent. Men, women and children all come into the world as individual human

beings. Thanks to the immense historical conquest of human rights, we are equal, in rights and dignity, to all other human beings. When citizenship education has the purpose of 'educating future citizens' it must necessarily address children, young people and adults, who are living beings, having the status of human beings endowed with conscience and reason. It cannot, therefore, exclude consideration of individuals as subjects, each with individual characteristics. Moreover, human rights include civil and political rights, the latter obviously relating to the rights and obligations of citizens. Thus a comprehensive human rights education takes account of citizenship, and considers that good citizenship is connected with human rights as a whole.

Conversely, citizenship education which trains 'good' citizens, ie. Citizens aware of the human and political issues at stake in their society or nation, requires from each citizen ethical and moral qualities. All forms of citizenship education inculcate (or aim at inculcating) respect for others and recognition of the equality of all human beings; and at combating all forms of discrimination (racist, gender-based, religious, etc.) by fostering a spirit of tolerance and peace among human beings.

Thus, when we speak of the purposes to be ascribed to either citizenship education (producing citizens with moral qualities) or human rights education (comprising knowledge of the social and political rights of all human beings, and their recognition) we inevitably end up with the complementarities between citizenship and human rights. Depending on the cultural traditions of each education system, we shall have, in some cases, civics education, comprising knowledge of human rights and their exercise, and in others, human rights education, stressing civil and political rights as the basis of citizenship, and hence the national features assumed by these rights and guaranteed by states. Bearing in mind these complementarities, citizenship education means not only 'educating citizens' but also 'training children for adulthood and citizenship'.

Citizenship education has, therefore, three main objectives:

Educating people in citizenship and human rights through an understanding of the principles and institutions [which govern a state or nation]; learning to exercise one's judgments and critical faculty; and acquiring a sense of individual and community responsibilities. These three objectives correspond both to educating the individual as a subject of ethics and law, and to educating citizens. These objectives suggest four major themes for citizenship education:

The relations between individuals and society: individual and collective freedoms, and rejection of any kind of discrimination. The relations between citizens and the government: what is involved in democracy and the organization of the state. The relations between the citizen and democratic life. The responsibility of the individual and the citizen in the international community.

Democratic Culture and Citizenship Education

If there is one idea inherent in civics education, because it concerns politics and institutions, it is the idea of democracy. Comprehensive citizenship education cannot dispense with this concept or with knowledge of the institutions that enable a country to function democratically. Rather than confining ourselves to noting and describing institutions (the necessary but not sufficient requirement for civics education), we should explain how the

operation of the machinery of state respects government of the people by the people, and makes it accountable to citizens. However, this way of tackling democracy may seem remote and foreign to the world of school and of children. It is therefore desirable to imbue the whole of school life with a culture of democracy. Educational practice is of equal value with knowledge when we come to tackle civics education. One of the major flaws in civics instruction has been that it fails to bring democracy to life in schools, and remains at the stage of merely enunciating principles and describing institutions. When the organization of a school does not lead to a democratic mode of operating on which pupils can give their opinions, children and adolescents lose interest in citizenship and see only the mismatch between what adults say and what they do, between knowledge and action, a mismatch which they usually call 'hypocrisy'.

Schools should therefore set up 'governing boards' with representatives of pupils and staff, and other bodies in which pupils express their views and in which decisions are taken in consultation with everyone, both young people and adults. The representation of pupils in these various bodies can and should be achieved by an open election system which has the same qualities of transparency as in any democracy worthy of the name. If we are to develop a credible civics education, respect for others pupils and teachers, administrators and minor employees – and non-violence in attitudes and behavior must be the rule in schools. Respect for others, and their dignity, in the same way as the self-respect of a free autonomous individual, springs from each individual's personal ethic, the will to 'live together, with and for others in just institutions'.

These qualities, whether described as 'moral' or 'ethical', are required of all human beings and all citizens. They form part of both civic 'virtues' and individual 'virtues'. They enable each individual to live as a 'good' citizen. In other words, in citizenship education, respect for the 'Other', regarded as one's equal, with his or her individual differences and distinctive physical, intellectual and cultural features, is to be explained and above all experienced in daily life in all schools. Based on these principles of equal dignity and respect for others, citizenship education has the task of combating all forms of negative discrimination and racism, sexism and religious fanaticism. Thus citizenship education can be regarded as an ethical (or moral) education as well as education in citizenship.

A New Way of Teaching Citizenship Education

The introduction and continuance in schools of a democratic culture forbid dogmatism in any kind of civics education. The methods and approaches chosen are those based on discussion among pupils and between pupils and teachers, and make provision for children and young people to speak and express themselves. Modes of expression may be varied: in addition to oral exchanges, drawings, songs, poems, different kinds of written material are excellent instruments for reflection on citizenship, democracy, justice, freedom and peace. In a democracy, citizenship education seeks to educate citizens who will be free to make their own judgments and hold their own convictions. Compliance with existing laws should not prevent citizens from seeking and planning better and ever more just laws. Respect for law, which is one of the objectives of civics education, calls not for blind submission to rules and laws already passed but the ability to participate in drawing them up.

One of the practical tasks of citizenship education is therefore to look at the rules governing a school, improve them and reformulate them. The values transmitted by citizenship education

are not dogmatic principles laid down once and for all. A living culture calls for the creation of new values, although they should all be judged by the criterion of respect for others and for human dignity. Thus, with regard to the laws and values accepted by an entire social group, citizenship education can in no way be a catalogue of set questions and answers. Citizenship education should be the forum which gives rise to and nurtures a genuine culture of discussion. Whatever the problem posed, such as the ongoing development of humanity or the stability of the rule of law, an exchange of ideas, notions, judgments and individual opinions is necessary. Even among young children, dialogue of this kind is possible.

Citizenship education needs also to be taught in ways that bring out the ever-constant link between knowledge and practice. The interaction between concepts and action gradually produces the ability to think in terms of values and to refer to them. Values are universal when they concern human rights: for example, the values of liberty, dignity, solidarity and tolerance. As they are firmly anchored and promoted in different cultures they can also concern a region of the world or even a special country, nation or religion. All should be made the subject of discussion and reflection and be studied in each course of citizenship education.

In other words, citizenship education is based on knowledge, practice and values that constantly interact. To be precise, let us say that awareness of the necessary reference to values gradually gives rise to practices and action which are themselves related to knowledge and skills about human rights and the institutions that regulate life in society. Pupils benefiting in this way from citizenship education learn step by step that citizenship unfolds and develops in a society imbued with values and in the human community as a whole.

Global Dimensions in Citizenship Education

The large worldwide population flows that are a characteristic feature of the modern world mean that schools cater for children from different cultural backgrounds. This cultural heterogeneity should be regarded as an opportunity for citizenship education. In this situation, children are all required to mingle with and thus learn about and understand cultures other than their own. Far from blurring the cultural diversity of pupils, citizenship education can bring out the value of differences while respecting and affirming the universality of human rights principles. Respect for others - a universal principle - means, in the daily life of the school, a dialogue with others, and taking an interest in other family lifestyles, social habits and cultural practices. Citizenship education is the ideal forum, since discussion on social issues can be organized so that opinions can be expressed on ways of looking at the world, in other words, on cultures.

This is a new form of action to combat racism. Racism is frequently due to the ignorance in which children are reared in respect of cultures other than that which is the majority culture of their country. Through knowledge of these other cultures and the very existence of multicultural life in the classroom, children are fortified against despising the 'Other' and against hostile indifference, both of which are sources of racist behavior (UNESCO, 2013).

What is Ethics?

Ethics (also known as moral philosophy) is a branch of philosophy that addresses questions about morality; that is, concepts such as good and bad, noble and ignoble, right and wrong, justice, and virtue.

Major branches of ethics as stated in the Wikipedia (2013) include:

- meta-ethics, about the theoretical meaning and reference of moral propositions and how their truth-values (if any) may be determined;
- normative ethics, about the practical means of determining a moral course of action;
- applied ethics, about how moral outcomes can be achieved in specific situations
- moral psychology, about how moral capacity or moral agency develops and what its nature is; and
- Descriptive ethics, about what moral values people actually abide by.

Normative ethical theories

- Virtue ethics, which was advocated by Aristotle, focuses on the inherent character of a person rather than on the specific actions he or she performs. Deontology argues that decisions should be made considering the factors of one's duties and other's rights. Some deontological theories include:

- Consequentialism (Teleology) argues that the morality of an action is contingent on the action's outcome or result. Consequentiality theories, differing by what they take to be valuable (Axiology), include:

- Utilitarianism, which holds that an action is right if it leads to the most happiness for the greatest number of people. (Historical Note: Prior to the coining of the term "consequentialism" by Anscombe in 1958 and the adoption of that term in the literature that followed, "utilitarianism" was the generic term for consequentialism, referring to all theories that promoted maximizing any form of utility, not just those that promoted maximizing happiness.)

- Hedonism, which holds that an action is right if it maximizes pleasure amongst people.

- Egoism, the belief that the moral person is the self-interested person, holds that an action is right if it maximizes good for the self.

- Situation Ethics, which holds that the correct action to take is the one which creates the most loving result, and that love should always be our goal.

- Intellectualism, which dictates that the best action is the one that best fosters and promotes knowledge.

- Welfarism, which argues that the best action is the one that most increases economic well-being or welfare.

- Preference utilitarianism, which holds that the best action is the one that leads to the most overall preference satisfaction.

- Consequentialist libertarianism, which holds that liberty should be maximized (Wikipedia, 2013).

Ethics is usually defined as a branch of philosophy that studies the difference between right and wrong. It's the moment of truth and the time in which everyone is faced with the difficult duty of having to make an ethical decision. The decisions makers are faced with great responsibility as the consequences of their actions impact not only the decision maker but also affects all people relevant to their institutions. Because Ethics is a must in education, it's a significant responsibility, and the importance of strengthening ethical reasoning in school led leaders to become increasingly interested in the ethical dimension of education. If you are a student, take a moment to ask yourself what you have learned about ethics in your time in the classroom. If you are a teacher or administrator, consider what your curriculum covers in this regard. We know that medical students engage medical ethics, law students

study legal ethics, business students take on business ethics, and military officers study military ethics, and so on. So let's ask ourselves, what should students and aspiring leaders in public affairs know about ethics to be considered professionals competent to practice?"(Rosenthal, 2009). Education itself is confronted therefore with formidable challenges and must proceed to the most radical change and renewal it has ever been required to undertake, so that our society, which is currently undergoing a profound crisis of values, can transcend mere economic considerations and incorporate deeper dimensions of morality and spirituality (Julliane et al, 2006).

Moral Literacy Is Needed

The moral literacy within the context of formal education includes three basic components which include:

1. Ethics sensitivity: This component is a key element of moral literacy; it is a developmental skill, not an innate ability. According to Tuana, training in ethics sensitivity can improve one's ability to recognize an ethical dilemma, judge its intensity, and formulate a response accordingly.
2. Ethical reasoning skills: This component involves understanding various ethical frameworks and identifying and assessing facts and values relevant to the moral issue.
3. Moral imagination: This component includes the cultivation of empathy and imagining oneself in another's situation. A morally imaginative person does more than merely recognize an ethical issue, but can appreciate the other's perspective, is empathetic, and has a highly developed sense of personal responsibility (Tuana, 2007).

Ethics and Law

Ethics and law are very close mental concepts and this may cause confusion for researchers, but actually Ethics, doesn't mean simply compliance with law. Compliance is an essential part of ethics. But it is only a beginning. Compliance is a floor, a minimum upon which to build. Many actions in government, business, or private life comply with the law but are not optimal from an ethical perspective. Examples are all around us. British members of parliament may not have broken laws when they used expense accounts to bill tax payers for lifestyle enhancements such as moat cleaning, the upkeep of expensive second homes, or the rental of adult movies. But surely this kind of behavior was completely wrong (Rosenthal, 2009).

The problem of the relationship between ethics and law is a long-standing one in the realm of philosophy. It is doubtlessly one of the key questions for practical philosophy, which considers at least ethics, law, politics and religion. The language-object analyzed in this philosophical sphere is eminently prescriptive and evaluative, precisely because an attempt is made to guide behaviors thereby, taking for granted that human beings act "under the idea of freedom". To sum up, practical knowledge is "what is concerned with entities whose principles can be of another sort" (Aristotle), what is concerned with the sphere of "what is possible through freedom" (Kant).

Dimensions of Ethics

Despite the lack of a single theory or formula, Berlin and others do offer a framework for ethical reasoning. Inspired by Berlin and other pragmatists, this framework of ethics locates in three dimensions. The first dimension focuses on the decision maker—the actor or the agent who makes a choice. We can and should evaluate the acts of individuals, be they presidents, ministers, official representatives, community leaders, advocates, employees, consumers or citizens. Each has a role as an autonomous actor.

In addition to single actors, a discussion of agency must also consider the identity, values, and acts of collective actors such as states, corporations, non-governmental organizations, and international organizations. One of the most important trends of our time is the growing power of non-state actors—especially multinational corporations. Wal-Mart, Microsoft and other companies of this size and scope rival the capacities of many states in terms of their economic, political and social reach. It is therefore both necessary and proper to ask and answer questions relating to the moral choices of corporate entities. All are moral agents.

The second dimension of ethics has to do with the systems, social arrangements, and conditions that define our range of choices. In short, we need to examine the "rules of the game" by which we live and make decisions. We all live within sets of norms and expectations—some more fair and just than others. Perhaps the best way to illustrate this dimension is to show you examples of when "rational" choices within a set of arrangements yield "bad" or less-than-desirable results. In other words, in some systems, when you do the "right thing" within the system, the net result is sub-optimal.

The third dimension of ethics is the assertion that we often have the opportunity to improve our situation—to do better. One way to think of this is to consider standard ethics scenario like this: My mother is sick. I cannot afford medicine. So I steal the medicine from a pharmacy whose managers will not even notice that it is gone. Is stealing the medicine in this circumstance the right thing or the wrong thing to do? To further illustrate this third dimension, it is useful to note the distinction that Andrew Carnegie drew between charity and philanthropy. Charity, according to Carnegie, is the duty to attend to immediate and acute human suffering. Charity translates to feeding the hungry, tending to the sick and destitute, providing relief to victims of natural and manmade disasters, and giving shelter to the homeless. Philanthropy is something different—it is an endeavor that reaches above and beyond the imperatives of charity. Philanthropy explores new ways of living, new ideas and institutions to improve society (Wikipedia, 2010).

METHODOLOGY

The key focus of this research was to explore what university lecturers think about this kind of education. The reason for that is because university lecturers' thinking has a considerable bearing on what subsequently occurs when lecturers and students come together. Pedagogical thinking informs educational practice. The aim of this work is to present some data in this respect, which illustrate what university lecturers at the Hashemite University in Jordan think about some of the aspects of Ethics and Citizenship education in universities.

This study is quantitative in nature and was conducted using survey methodology. The survey was cross-sectional because the data were collected at one point in time. Means, Standard deviations, t-test, and one way analysis of variances (ANOVA) were utilized in this study. Means and standard deviations were used for identifying what university lecturers at the Hashemite University in Jordan think about some of the aspects of Ethics and Citizenship education at universities.. T-test and one-way analysis were used to determine whether, at a selected probability level ($\alpha < 0.05$), there are significant differences among university lecturer's perceptions about some of the aspects of Ethics and Citizenship education in universities and the following individual demographics of Lecturers: gender, academic rank, number of years teaching in the Hashemite University and, and the type of the college.

Population

The target population of this study consisted of all Lecturers at the Hashemite University in Jordan. Questionnaires were distributed to participants at the work place for completion at their own convenience to provide them with anonymity disclosing personal information about themselves and their conceptions of Ethical Citizenship Education at the Hashemite University.

Sample

Participants of this study were faculty members at all colleges and institutions at the Hashemite University in Jordan. Of 160 faculty members who taught during first semester 2014/2015, 112 agreed to participate in the study by voluntarily completing and returning usable surveys making the response rate 69%. The data collection method was a self-administered paper- based questionnaire. Data gained from the returned questionnaires indicated that the majority of the faculty members who responded were males (75%), while females were only (25%). A comparison of the group of respondents revealed that 44.5% of the faculties teach in social colleges, while 55.5% of the faculties teach in scientific colleges. Faculty members in this study ranged in total experience from 1 to 32 year. Additional demographic information indicated that 9.1% were full professors, 10.9% were associate professors, and 80% were assistant professors. Table 3.1 represents the descriptive statistics for the faculty members who participated in the study.

Table (3.1): Division of Faculty Members by Gender, Type of College, Academic Rank and Experience in Teaching.

variable	Number and Percentage of Total (112)
Gender	78 males (69.60%), 34 females (30.30%)
Type of college	60 scientific faculties (53.60%), 52 social science faculties (46.40%)
Academic rank	12 full prof. (10.71%), 12 Associate prof. (10.71%), 88 Assistant prof. (78.60%).
Experience years	39 with 1-5 years (34.8%), 40 with 6 -10 years (35.7%), 33 with 11-17 years (29.5%).

Instrumentation

The instrument of the study consisted of:

The Questionnaire

The first part of this study aimed at identifying Lecturers' Conceptions of Ethical Citizenship Education, and in order to answer the study questions a questionnaire was used. Moreover, face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted. Issues of access and cooperation followed a routine process. After ethical approval from the Hashemite University was obtained, an approach was made to the University administration by a letter outlining the researcher's background, the nature of the investigation and the areas which would be covered in the questionnaires and interviews. After gaining the permission, the researcher arranged for the implementation of the study using the questionnaire and the interviews.

The Questionnaire was developed by the present researcher. Five specialists in education reviewed the developed questionnaire and two of them asked for some modifications. The final copy of the questionnaire took these modifications in consideration. The developed questionnaire comprises 30 items and each item has a five-point Likert rating scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Ethical Citizenship Education's Questionnaire describes Ethical Citizenship Education in terms of five dimensions. As shown in Table (3.2), computed coefficient alphas for each subscale were judged to be acceptable based on Nunnally and Bernstein's (1994) criterion of alpha being greater than 0.70.

Table 3.2

Reliability and Coefficients for the ethical citizenship education Questionnaire's dimensions

Domain	Alpha	No. of Items
University responsibility	0.82	8
Necessity of Ethical citizenship education	0.81	6
Expectations about students	0.72	4
Including Ethical citizenship education in curriculum	0.78	6
University role effectiveness	0.71	6

3.3.2 The interviews

The principal purpose of the interview was to gather information on what the interviewees know, think or like. In contrast with the open-ended questions, the interview in this study gives the interviewer the chance to ask for clarification for some points and the reasons behind some other points. Having decided on the interview, as a method of data collection, the next step to be addressed was related to the format of the interview itself, in particular, and whether the interview would be structured or unstructured. Between these two extremes lies the semi structured (Reid, 2006).

In the semi-structured interview, the interviewer sets up a general structure by deciding what ground is to be covered and what main questions are to be asked (Al- Nabhani, 2007). This was the most convenient to the present study as a balance between ensuring that all the information needed is collected and still there is a chance to probe deeper into respondents' answers and seek clarification or justification. The interviews in this study were semi-

structured interviews with five individuals from the top higher education academic staff members. The primary goal of the interview was not so much to receive standard answers to set questions, but rather to elicit in-depth information about the opinions and view points of the interviewees. Hence, what was of greatest importance in the interviews was to gain an understanding of the obstacles that might face the implementation of the Ethical Citizenship Education, from the perspectives of the interviewers?

In designing a semi-structured interview, care must be taken to phrase questions to ensure that the respondents can say what they want rather than using leading questions (Stringer, 2004). Two main questions were carefully structured to achieve the interview aims:

1. What is your initial response toward ethics and citizenship education at the Hashemite University?
2. What are the constraints that hinder fostering ethics and citizenship education at the Hashemite University?

All the interviews were conducted face to face and notes were taken. These lasted between 20 to 30 minutes. The purpose of these interviews was to establish the degree to which those who influence policy share the same perceptions as other stakeholders. It was also hoped that some informants would be able to indicate their perceptions of the facilitating factors that might help in the implementation and any obstacles that might be faced. Moreover, the interviews aimed to find out the interviewees' impressions of future trends in higher education development.

Validity

Validity or the indication that the questionnaire and the interviews are measuring what they supposed to measure is face validity. This means that the instruments were judged by those interested in the subject as being valid. The comments of these judges were incorporated in the improvement of the instruments by:

- Removing unsuitable statements (6 statements), and - separating statements which includes more than one idea into two different statements.

The questionnaire consisted of 30 items covering ethical citizenship education dimensions.

Reliability

The reliability of the study was achieved through using various methods in data collection. For example, the study used two main tools, the questionnaire and the interview. The questionnaire used both closed statements and open ended questions to ensure more valid answers. Moreover, the main instrument of the study was analyzed and resulted in an overall alpha level of 0.86.

Statistical Method

All responses of the respondents were coded, entered to the computer and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 15) to analyze the data.

1-In order to answer the study first question means and standard deviations of every dimension, and its enclosed statements were used.

In order to answer the second and third questions:

The Interviews and open ended questions were used and analyzed.

RESULTS

In order to gain a general view about the Lecturers' Conceptions of Ethical Citizenship Education at the Hashemite University all responses from the respondents were coded, entered into the computer, and analyzed using SPSS (version 15). Accuracy of data entry was examined by inspecting the minimum and maximum values of each variable. An examination of these values showed that no "out of range" values were entered. In addition, missing subjects were not detected either.

Question 1 addresses the Lecturers' Conceptions of Ethical Citizenship Education at the Hashemite University in Jordan. Means and standard deviations were used to answer this question. Starting with the mean, it's observable from table (4.1) that the lowest mean 3.01 (Expectations about students) and the highest mean is 4.36 (Necessity of Ethical citizenship education), this result can be justified with the assumption that lecturers conceived their students considering the universities as places where they could get a professional qualification or where they could acquire scientific and cultural knowledge, rather than as institutions with a social dimension or commitment to the communities to which they belonged or as institutions that would educate them from the viewpoint of Ethics and Citizenship. However they believe that the missions of universities were to educate students in an integral manner to convey the codes of ethics of each profession and to contribute to the construction of a fairer society.

Table 4.1

Mean and standard deviations of the five dimensions of Lecturers' conceptions

Domain	Mean	Std. deviation
University responsibility	3.91	0.78
Necessity of Ethical citizenship education	4.36	0.70
Expectations about students	3.01	1.20
including ethical citizenship education in curriculum	3.46	1.04
University role effectiveness	3.33	1.09

Question 2 concerns the relationship between the following demographic variables and the Lecturers' conceptions of ethics and citizenship education at the Hashemite University: (a) the gender of the faculty members, (b) the academic rank of the faculty members, (d) the type of college of the faculty members and (e) the number of years teaching of the faculty members. T-tests for independent samples were used to examine the difference in means between males and females, faculty members in social science colleges and faculty members in scientific colleges. However one-way analysis of variances was utilized to identify whether the variances of the three level groups of academic rank and the three level groups of experience years were equal or significantly different

Table (4.2) shows that there were no significant differences at the 0.05 level between faculty members' males and females on the dimensions of University responsibility, Necessity of Ethical citizenship education, including ethical citizenship education in curriculum and university role effectiveness, and expectations about students.

Table 4.2

The Differences between Faculty Members' males and females in each dimension of the scale

Dimension	Gender	Mean	Std. deviation	t	Sig (2-tailed)
University responsibility	Male	3.83	0.64	0.35	0.94
	Female	3.74	0.55		
Necessity of Ethical citizenship education	Male	3.93	0.81	0.46	0.65
	Female	3.87	0.68		
Expectations about students	Male	3.62	0.65	3.69	0.00
	Female	3.23	0.60		
including ethical citizenship education in curriculum	Male	3.80	0.62	0.35	0.84
	Female	3.72	0.54		
University role effectiveness	Male	3.91	0.80	0.44	0.65
	Female	3.82	0.61		

Table (4.3) illustrates that there were significant differences at the 0.05 level between faculty members in scientific colleges and faculty members in social sciences colleges in all dimensions for the favor of faculty members in social sciences colleges. This result can be justified with the assumption that social sciences colleges are more familiar with this type of education during their learning and teaching experience.

Table (4.3)

The Differences between Faculty Members in scientific colleges (sc.) and Faculty Members in social sciences colleges (so.) in each dimension of the scale.

Dimension	Gender	Mean	Std. deviation	t	Sig (2-tailed)
University responsibility	Sc.	4.02	0.49	2.707	0.01
	So.	3.74	0.64		
Necessity of Ethical citizenship education	Sc.	4.18	0.51	4.18	0.51
	So.	3.83	0.83		
Expectations about students	Sc.	3.78	0.58	3.05	0.00
	So.	3.44	0.67		
including ethical citizenship education in curriculum	Sc.	4.00	0.46	2.80	0.01
	So.	3.70	0.60		
University role effectiveness	Sc.	3.78	0.58	3.01	0.00
	So.	3.44	0.67		

Utilizing one-way analysis of variance, as can be observed in table (4.4), showed that there were no significant differences among the three rank level groups (full, associate, and assistant professor) in each dimension of the scale. On the other hand, table (4.5) revealed that there were significant differences among the three experience years (1-5 Y, 6-10 Y, 11-17 Y) on the dimension of expectations about students for the favor of the third group (11-17). This result may be explained by their long experience and familiarity with students and their conceptions about ethical citizenship education.

Table (4.4)

The differences among the three rank level groups (full, associate, and assistant professor) in each dimension of the scale

Sum of Squares			df	F	Sig
University responsibility	Between group	1.78	4	1.142	0.338
	Within group	72.04	185		
	Total	73.82	189		
Necessity of Ethical citizenship education	Between group	1.52	4	0.610	0.656
	Within group	114.88	185		
	Total	116.40	189		
Expectations about students	Between group	3.160	4	1.803	0.130
	Within group	81.051	185		
	Total	84.211	189		
including ethical citizenship education in curriculum	Between group	1.856	4	0.01	0.366
	Within group	65.776	185		
	Total	67.632	189		
University role effectiveness	Between group	0.32	2	0.35	0.45
	Within group	74.48	187		
	Total	73.82	189		

Table (4.5)

The differences among the four experience level groups (1-5 Y, 6-10 Y, and 11-17 Y) in each dimension of the scale

Sum of Squares			df	F	Sig
University responsibility	Between group	0.34	2	0.43	0.65
	Within group	73.42	187		
	Total	73.28	189		
Necessity of Ethical citizenship education	Between group	0.12	2	0.10	0.91
	Within group	116.21	187		
	Total	116.40	189		
Expectations about students	Between group	6.05	2	7.19	0.01
	Within group	78.16	187		
	Total	84.21	189		
including ethical citizenship education in curriculum	Between group	0.72	2	0.01	0.366
	Within group	66.91	187		
	Total	67.63	189		
University role effectiveness	Between group	0.32	2	0.43	0.65
	Within group	74.48	187		
	Total	73.82	189		

Regarding the twelfth Question: What are the constraints that hinder fostering ethics and citizenship education at the Hashemite University? In light of the interview, the opinions of the interviewees could be summarized as in the following table.

Table 4.6
Interview Analysis

Theme	Interviewees attitudes
General view	Generally agree with the necessity of ethical citizenship education at the university
Possibilities of workability	Can be used to develop the educational process at the University
Obstacles	Centralization in decision making and planning Lack of funds Communication Culture of resisting change Lack of training Lack of clear standards

Although the results from the interviews appeared to support the idea of the ethical citizenship education, some of the issues that emerged warrant further consideration. Regarding the workability of this type of education, all the interviewees considered it as important and essential for the development and improvement of the University. One of the interviewees agreed with these ideas, and added a major comment that it was hard to separate these criteria out. They may all merge into one another to help the development. However, the effort should not be only from the top management but from all the stakeholders.

However, in order to implement ethical citizenship education at the University the belief, the support and particularly the commitment of top management is essential. Undoubtedly the commitment of all the stakeholders is essential, but this can be achieved through their participation. When stakeholders participate in decision making, planning and implementation, they feel that this is their own work, their own production not something imposed on them from above, so they make a commitment.

CONCLUSIONS

Education in a globalized world is increasingly putting emphasis on the importance of values, attitudes and communication skills as a critical complement to cognitive knowledge and skills. The education community is also paying increasing attention to the relevance of education in understanding and resolving social, political, cultural and global issues. This includes the role of education in supporting peace, human rights, equity, acceptance of diversity, and sustainable development.

The data presented above enabled us to draw some conclusions that are worth taking into account. Ethical citizenship education is transformative, giving learners the opportunity and competencies to realize their rights and obligations to promote a better world and future. It draws upon learning from other transformative education processes including human rights

education, education for sustainable development, education for inter-national / inter-cultural understanding, and education for peace.

Ethical citizenship education is built on a lifelong learning perspective. It is not only for children and youth but also for adults. It can be delivered in all modes and venues of delivery, including formal, non-formal and informal education. The formal system, in most countries, could be the main mode of delivery for global citizenship education. It needs, however, to be complemented by the non-formal and informal systems. In these systems, flexible and variable pedagogical approaches may be more useful in targeting populations outside the formal system and those who are likely to engage with new information and communication technologies.

Universities provide the students with knowledge, skills and attitudes but it's not concerned mainly with the ethical citizenship values of them. The lecturer's conceptions of their students were mainly focused on the academic dimensions. Implementing ethical citizenship education at the university is not an easy issue, it has its obstacles and difficulties and it needs a shared decision, support and communication at all the levels.

REFERENCES

- Awadallah, B (2005). *Reform and development in Jordan*. Retrieved on February 16, 2014, from www.washingtoninstitute.org.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity: Theory, culture and society*. London: Sage.
- Berube, M. (2007). *What's Liberal about the Liberal Arts?* New York: W. W. Norton.
- Bok, D. (2007). *Our Underachieving Colleges*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Brief on Higher Education Sector in Jordan*. (n.d.). Retrieved from www.mohe.edu.jo
- Cortina, A. (2000). *Legislation Law and Ethics*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Duke, C. (2008). University Engagement: Avoidable Confusion and Inescapable Contradiction, *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 20, 1-11.
- Esteban, F., Mellen, T. & Buxarrais, M.R. (2014). University Lecturers' Conceptions of Ethics and Citizenship Education in the European Higher Education Area: a Case Study. *RUSC. Universities and Knowledge Society Journal*, 11(3). pp. 22-31
- Ethics. 2014. In *BusinessDictionary.com*. Retrieved November 8, 2014, from <http://www.BusinessDictionary.com/definition/ethics.html>
- Forbrig, J. (Ed.) (2005). *Revisiting youth political participation*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. London: Polity.
- Giroux, H. (2007). Academic repression in the first person. *The advocate*, February, 1.
- Hollimon, D & Basinger, D & smith, R & Leonard, P. (2009). Promoting Moral Literacy Teaching Competency. *Values and ethics in educational administration*. 7(2).1-8.
- Julliane, W, Marion, B & Raskin, M. (2006). The need for radical changes in field education. *Journal of Social Work Education*. (42), retrieved from www.questia.com .on 15/4/2010.
- Kanungo, R. (2007) *Ethical leadership*. England : open university press.
- Kennedy, B. D. (1997). *Academic duty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Khader, F, (2010). *Strategies and Roadmap for Effective Higher Education in Jordan*https://www.uop.edu.jo/download/Research/.../111_1548_khad.pdf, 2010.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The Meaning and Measurement of Moral Development*. Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on Moral Development. The Psychology Moral Development*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Lapsley, D., & Clark, F. (2005). *Character Psychology and Character Education*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Macfarlane, B. (2006). *The academic citizen: The virtue of service in university life*. London: Routledge.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). *Tras la virtud*. Barcelona: Editorial Critica.
- Newman, J. H. (1852). *The idea of a university*. New York: Longmans Green & Co, 1927.
- Nucci, L., & Narvaez, D. (2008). *Handbook of Moral and Character Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Obeidat, O. (2005). Recent trends in higher education sector, *Damascus University journal*. 21(2), 21-37.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1930). *La misión de la universidad*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Pelikan, J. (1992). *The idea of the University: a Re-examination*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Perez-Diaz, V. (2010). *Universidad, Ciudadanos y nómadas*. Oviedo: Ediciones Nobel.
- Procaro Foley, E., & Bean, D. (2002). Institutions of Higher Education: Cornerstones in Building Ethical Organizations, *Teaching Business Ethics*, 6, 101-116.
- Rosenthal, h (2014). Leadership as Practical Ethics, retrieved from https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/education/001/ethics/0003.html/pf_printable on 4-12-2014.
- Ruegg, W. (1992). *A history of the University in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saha, J. L., Print, M., & Edwards, K. (Eds.) (2007). *Youth and Political Participation*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Sandel, M. (2011). *Justicia. Hacemos lo que debemos*. Barcelona: Random House Mondadori.
- Scott, J. (2006). The Mission of the University: Medieval to Postmodern transformations. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), Winter, 1-39. doi <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2006.0007>
- Shils, E. (1997). *The calling of education: The academic ethic and other essays on higher education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stanley, F. (2008). *Save the World on Your Own Time*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Steiner, G. (2004). *The idea of Europe*. Tilburg: Uitgeverij Nexus.
- The Ethical Citizen: Can You Make a Difference? Missouri State. Public affairs. Retrieved from <http://publicaffairs.missouristate.edu/2015.htm> on 5-11-2014.
- Tuana, N. (2007). Conceptualizing moral literacy. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 45(4), 364-378.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2013), *Global Citizenship Education: An Emerging Perspective*: UNESCO Publication.
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service and the scholarship of engagement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wikipedia , the free encyclopedia. Retrieved from <http://en.wikipedia.org> on 2-5-2010.

Wikipedia , the free encyclopedia. Retrieved from <http://en.wikipedia.org> on 10-11-2013.

Wyatt, J. (1990). *Commitment to Higher Education. Seven West European Thinkers on the Essence of the University. Max Horkeimer, Karl Jaspers, F. R. Leavis, John Herny Newman, José Ortega y Gasset, Paul Tillich, Miguel de Unamuno*. Buckingham: SHRE and Open University Press.