CHAPTER 3[1]

Evolution of Human Rights Education Models

Felisa L. Tibbitts[2]

Introduction

Human rights education (HRE) is a newly established field of educational theory and practice gaining increased attention and significance across the globe. This effort, which has gained momentum since the early 1990s, has spawned a growing body of educational theory, practice and research that often intersects with activities in other fields of educational study in schools, such as citizenship education, peace education, anti-racism education, Holocaust/ genocide education, education for sustainable development and education for intercultural understanding. However, HRE is not only aimed at the formal education sector but has deep roots in the non-formal education sector and also takes place in the training of professionals, such as journalists, teachers and law enforcement officials.

HRE is a deeply practical expression of the high-minded ideals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)—a deliberate attempt to foster a worldwide human rights culture.

In 2002, I published three models for categorizing human rights education practice in the formal and non-formal education sectors: Values and Awareness, Accountability and Transformation (Tibbitts 2002).[3] Infused within these Models of HRE was an understanding of educational programming, learning theory and social change. The original models were organized applying grounded theory from a practitioner's point of view about learner goals, target groups and other practical elements of educational programming, such as content and methodologies. The emerging models of HRE practice were linked with praxis and strategies for social change.

In this chapter, I suggest revisions to these models, based on the ensuing 13 years of scholarship, documentation and observation of practice across a range of teaching and learning settings globally, including my own.[4] This writing has been a reflexive praxis

---

[1] Tibbitts, F. (2017). Evolution of Human Rights Education Models. In Bajaj, M. (Ed.), *Human Rights Education: Theory, Research, Praxis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 69-95.

[2] Email:fltibbitts@gmail.com

[3] This article has been widely cited in the HRE literature and has been the basis for subsequent HRE models and critiques, some of which are identified in this chapter. I am using the term "transformation" rather than "transformational" in this article, a slight change from the original Models article, based solely on linguistic considerations.

[4] Since 2002, I continued to engage in HRE as an instructor of hundreds of teachers and adult learners in the human rights, humanitarian and development sectors through my position at Human Rights Education Associates (HREA) and an adjunct faculty member at various universities. I have developed HRE-related curriculum guides for the formal and nonformal sectors and carried out impact assessments for national and

that has allowed me to distill my own understanding of how the field of human rights education has evolved. This process is consistent with grounded theory, which calls for researchers to continuously refine their definition of concepts and to check their models.

In the first half of the chapter, I present the goals of HRE as preventing human rights violations, and human rights activism as a subset of activities within a broader social change effort. I then consider the theories of change for the HRE Models and learner outcomes in relation to both human rights activism and social change, recognizing the value of learners taking action in both the private and public domains in relation to social change. I identify new dimensions of the HRE models that add descriptive complexity and strengthen their analytical power. One new addition is teaching and learning practices, for which I present and critically review a range of methodologies used in HRE: didactic, participatory, empowerment and transformational. Two other elements added to the models are the learning context/sponsoring organization and the learner.

In the second part of the chapter, I revisit the original HRE models, critically applying these new dimensions. I argue that the original HRE models remain useful typologies for describing HRE practices and for critically analyzing their design in promoting agency in learners to take action to reduce human rights violations. However, I propose amendments to the models including a stronger association of the Values and Awareness Model with socialization, the Accountability Model with professional development, and the Transformation Model with activism.

Part 1. Key Concepts

Goals of Human Rights Education

The most widely accepted definition of human rights education (HRE) is that offered by the United Nations, whose General Assembly passed in December 2011 a Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training with the following language (Article 2)[5]:

> 1. Human rights education and training comprises all educational, training, information, awareness-raising and learning activities aimed at promoting universal respect for and observance of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and thus contributing, inter alia, to the prevention of human rights violations and abuses by providing persons with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviors, to empower them to contribute to the building and promotion of a universal culture of human rights.

---

cross-national programs. I have also engaged with inter-governmental human rights groups in developing policies, strategies and technical resources for implementing HRE-related norms and practices. These experiences have continuously provided me with opportunities to dialogue with colleagues from all parts of the world about HRE concepts and practices, including ongoing challenges and opportunities.

[5] I am using the UN policies as a key validator of HRE definitions, particularly as these have been influenced by practitioners, including NGOs such as Amnesty International, over the past decades. Thus, although the language of the documents remain general they nevertheless offer normative guidance that is based in part on input from the grassroots level.

> 2. Human rights education and training encompasses:
> (*a*) Education about human rights, which includes providing knowledge and understanding of human rights norms and principles, the values that underpin them and the mechanisms for their protection;
> (*b*) Education through human rights, which includes learning and teaching in a way that respects the rights of both educators and learners;
> (*c*) Education for human rights, which includes empowering persons to enjoy and exercise their rights and to respect and uphold the rights of others. (United Nations General Assembly 2011)

The first paragraph reaffirms the UN's long-standing definition that HRE has a place in all forms of education and training, including the formal, nonformal and informal sectors. These were represented across the original HRE Models.

The second paragraph reflects the evolution of HRE practice, sharing more details than the original UN definition, as HRE *about*, *through* and *for* human rights affirms the full spectrum of learner goals in accordance with knowledge/understanding, values, capacities and actions, with a framework of personal empowerment. This new, extended definition also draws attention to teaching and learning processes and reaffirms the outcomes of HRE as being oriented towards taking action "for" human rights.

The goal to prevent human rights violations is central to HRE. Human rights norms are codified in international law in an ongoing manner and are intended to be protected in national law, policies and practices. Human rights violations can result from direct action or inaction of governments or individuals. Combating human rights violations and the conditions of inequality and injustice that foster them requires a critical reflection and recognition of the symptoms and sources, and taking action so such violations no longer occur. The human rights (legal) standards are oriented towards the changed behavior of governments, as they are the entities that sign human rights treaties and voluntarily commit themselves to uphold them. Human rights activism therefore is oriented towards changing the behavior of governments, although the obligations of certain non-state actors such as multinational corporations and armed groups are increasingly addressed in human rights policy and scholarship.

Governments are not only law makers and foreign policy advisors but also flesh-and-blood people who are employees of the state, including the military, law enforcement officials, civil servants, social workers, health workers and teachers. Human rights activism therefore, by definition, is first oriented towards the changed behavior of governments and their representatives at all levels – national, sub-national and local – in relation to their behavior and the elimination of human rights violations. The original HRE Accountability Model was oriented towards the infusion of HRE within the training of government personnel so as to help ensure that they respect human rights in carrying out their responsibilities.

However, human rights activism takes place within a wider social change framework, one that involves the changed behavior of non-state actors, that is, everyday people in their

daily lives, regardless of whether or not they work for the government. The norms for such changed behavior can be fed through the human rights framework. The cross-cutting (human rights) values of non-discrimination, equality, inclusion and participation, as well as the norms associated with the human rights of specific groups, such as members of marginalized groups, women, children, migrants and persons with disabilities, are eligible to contribute to social change processes more generally, inspiring behavioral changes in anyone. The original HRE Transformation Model highlighted the empowerment of disadvantaged groups for organizing collectively, not only to carry out human rights activism but to carry forward social change more generally.

Social change and human rights activism are related but they are not synonymous. Human rights activism can be defined as collective action undertaken to influence the behavior of governments so that laws, policies and practices are consistent with human rights standards. An example of this would be mobilization for the release of prisoners of conscience or prisoners at Guantanamo, who have not been provided with the opportunity of a trial. This is the approach of traditional human rights groups.

Social change is a long-term process involving changes in beliefs and behaviors of both state and non-state actors. Human rights activism around changing government laws might be involved, but it would not represent the complete agenda. An example of this might be a lobbying effort to revise the Criminal Code to better protect victims of domestic violence, which might be part of a wider social movement to promote the equality of women.

The human rights movement as a whole has been perhaps overly defined by its association with legal standards and social action goals to influence political and legal environments. The women's movement has always recognized that gender equality would be brought about by a social movement that encompasses such legal and policy reforms but also through the empowerment of individual women. The aims of women's human rights organizations towards influencing both national protection systems as well as grassroots social change has required any human rights education programming that is organized to potentially contribute towards both.

Thus, consistent with the higher aim of HRE to reduce human rights violations, HRE can be oriented towards changes in the public domain (the behavior of governments) but also changes in the private domain (the behavior of individuals). The former calls for activism and collective action whereas the latter can occur through individual (non-legal) actions taken in the privacy of one's home, school or community.

In summary, the goals of HRE are oriented around the elimination of human rights violations. Through the lens of the legal standards, it is governments (signatories to treaties) that are ultimately responsible for preventing such abuses, both through their own behavior but also through their ability to influence the actions of citizens whose conduct may be negatively affecting the rights of others. Through the lens of social change, the goals of HRE can also be oriented towards the hearts, heads and hands of everyday people. This suggests that the original HRE Transformation Model would be

more accurately described as promoting a goal of social change, incorporating both "activism" including *collective action* and *community development* as well as undertaking *individual actions to reduce violations in one's personal life* and immediate environment.

HRE Theory of Change & Models

The original HRE Models generally associated program typologies with strategies for social change and human rights activism. The theory of change in these original models was linked with the learning process within formal and nonformal HRE programming. Thus the first "link" in the logic chain leading from HRE to taking action to reduce human rights violations is the individual (learner) and their experience in the HRE program.

In the Values and Awareness Model, there is no specific theory of change in place in relation to social change. The goals of socialization may affirm the existing human rights discourse and provide learners with knowledge of human rights. However, the agency of the learner is not encouraged nor empowerment to take action to reduce human rights violations.

In the Accountability Model, the theory of change was linked with the individual and his or her professional role. A successful HRE experience was intended to influence learners' knowledge, attitude and actions so that they would respect and promote human rights standards in their professional roles. The theory of change here is linked in part with the quality of the HRE learning experience and the disposition of the learner to apply the goals of HRE within the very specific roles and responsibilities they carried out in their work lives.[6] The related theory of change is that learners who successfully absorb the goals of the HRE program and find them relevant for their work life may have changed behaviors that result in the reduction of human rights violations. Law enforcement officials may be less inclined to single out minority group members and they may restrain themselves against use of excessive use of violence. Journalists may be more likely to report on human rights violations and to characterize them as such. Each of these behaviors, to the degree that they are associated with participation in an HRE program, can be seen as part of a logic chain between HRE and improved realization of human rights. In this approach, HRE methodologies that incorporate critical reflection on one's own work and capacity development in relation to the application of human rights norms to work responsibilities are key.

In the original Transformation Model, the HRE theory of change is quite prominent. In this approach, the HRE methodologies are associated with transformative and emancipatory learning (Bajaj, 2011; Keet, 2010).[7] HRE methodologies incorporate critical pedagogy and involve a critical reflection on society and conditions that result in injustice. This internal process can be a transformative one for those who have

[6] See also the Chapter by Pizmony-Levy and Jansen in this book on the training of professionals who work with asylum seekers.

[7] M. Bajaj has identified a similar approach as "HRE for Transformative Action" and A. Keet has referred to "resistance" and "empowerment" approaches to HRE.

internalized oppression and have a "deficit" resulting from experiences of human rights violations. Thus transformative learning and emancipatory learning – related critical pedagogy – can bring about profound change in the individual learner. The theory of change is HRE leading to personal transformation, resulting in taking action to eliminate human rights violations.

The result is not only the cultivation of agency but specifically its application to reforming relationships and structures so that they are more equal, non-discriminating, participatory and consistent with human rights norms. As mentioned earlier, such changes might take place in the private domain (among family and friends) as well as in the public domain (in one's community and also including human rights activism).[8] Thus within the Transformation Model, we locate a theory of change that is explicitly oriented to both personal and social change.

HRE Teaching and Learning Practices

The original HRE Models did not address pedagogy or teaching methodologies in any depth, with the exception of the mention of transformative learning in relation to the Transformation Model. I propose a categorization of four kinds of methodologies used to deliver HRE. These methodologies intersect with other aspects of the HRE typologies, in particular the Goals for HRE and the learning environment/sponsoring institution. These methodologies are not mutually exclusive, as will be explained, but they do tend to be associated with specific HRE models.

Didactic methodologies. This teaching and learning process is one oriented towards the delivery of content to learners. It can intersect with schools and other environments influenced by a 'traditional' culture of education in which there is distance between the educator and the learners, where memorization and rote learning is routine, and where learners are not given opportunities to influence their own learning, for example, through open discussion. Critical reflection, even in relation to the learning process, is not encouraged. An example is introducing the UDHR and asking learners to memorize its content, without any preceding or ensuing activities that involve critique or application to social realities. The teaching of human rights standards in a didactic, hegemonic manner has been associated with the critiques of the human rights system itself being hegemonic and neo-colonial (Baxi 2007).

Such methodologies reflect the "banking" approach and are associated with the Values and Awareness Approach. Due to the lack of participation and critical reflection, this approach can be seen as one of (attempted) socialization. Given the definition of HRE being "about" "for" and "through" human rights, the focus on content and the application of didactic teaching methods reflects an incomplete, and potentially counterproductive,

[8] Impact assessments the author has carried out for nonformal HRE has shown that learners have taken steps to reduce human rights violations in many parts of their lives, including relationships with family members, with friends and authority figures at school. (See Tibbitts 2010, 2012).

approach to HRE that is only "about" human rights.[9]

Participatory/interactive methodologies are now almost invariably used in HRE. These are seen as a means of motivating and engaging learners in the learning process. Such methodologies are applied instrumentally with the purpose of learners better understanding human rights content and applying these values to issues at hand. An example is the popular "New Planet" exercise that introduces learners to the UDHR through an activity in which small groups have to develop a 'rights-based constitution' for a fictitious new planet and then compare their constitution with the content of the UDHR.

Participatory methodologies used for HRE result in engagement in the actual teaching and learning practices but are not actually intended to foster agency in the learner. Critical reflection on human rights values and standards and social problems may be addressed, but more as an analytical exercise, perhaps one aimed towards values clarification. Participatory learning takes place as part of the methodological recipe for both the Accountability and Transformative Models.

Empowerment methodologies are oriented towards the cultivation of agency in learners, through specific capacities such as leadership development and the integration of practices of non-discrimination in one's work roles. These various roads to empowerment are in relation to topics and issues of personal interest to the learner. What distinguishes empowerment methodologies from solely participatory ones is that empowerment methodologies explicitly see the learning process as instrumental for individuals having increased capacities to influence their environment.

The literature on HRE has gravitated towards empowerment as a key feature of successful programming and is associated most closely with the Accountability Model and the Transformative Model. At the same time, empowerment is a multifaceted and nuanced concept that is difficult to define in concrete and observable terms. Empowerment methodologies can be easily linked with the skill development required in the Accountability Model. Having the opportunity to develop concrete skills, such as developing organizational or leadership skills, can also be considered a form of "instrumental empowerment" (Ross et al, 2011).

Knowledge itself can be a form of empowerment, for example, learning about the law and how to use it to protect one's rights. Reflecting and recognizing that one's personal values are consistent with those contained in international human rights standards or that one's personal experiences of discrimination are shared by others, can also be empowering.

Transformative methodologies encompass and extend methodologies of instrumental empowerment. Both sets of methodologies are intended to cultivate agency in the

[9] Many textbook reforms, as discussed in Chapter Two, limit themselves to the "about." Training programs that facilitate educators applying participatory methods can help to overcome a purely didactic approach to HRE.

learner. However transformative methodologies are different in two respects. The first is that the agency of the learner is cultivated with the explicit aim of social transformation through human rights activism. HRE that prepares learners to organize human rights awareness-raising or campaigning can be associated with transformative methodologies, though this can still be considered a form of instrumental empowerment.

The second way in which transformative methodologies are different than empowerment methodologies is that they can also explicitly foster personal transformation, aligned with the concept of "intrinsic empowerment" (Ross et al, 2011). Transformative and emancipatory learning approaches, drawing from critical pedagogy, invite a critical reflection on power and oppression in one's local environment, usually as part of a close community of learners. Any subsequent reshaping of one's understanding of the world can result in taking actions to combat one's own oppression in one's family and immediate environment, consistent with wider processes of (privately experienced) social change in a society. When organized on a widespread basis with and for persons belonging to oppressed groups, such personal transformations are the basis of human rights activism.

The specific methodologies of transformative and emancipatory learning are associated with critical pedagogy and Paulo Freire (1968, 1973). The HRE literature is strongly associated with critical pedagogy, which encourages learners to think critically on their situation, recognize connections between their individual problems and the social contexts in which they live and to take action against oppression. Critical pedagogy was and continues to be associated with the HRE Transformation Model, as this model is explicitly oriented towards a form of empowerment related to overcoming internalized oppression.

HRE Learning Context/Sponsor

The original HRE Models included examples of representative programming but did not comment on the specific institution or agency carrying out the training. The motivation for the sponsors in carrying out HRE will be reflected in the goals (wither explicit or implicit) as it is understood by the sponsors (including the trainers and teachers) and as interpreted by the learners. *Status in the curriculum* in formal education environments is key. HRE taking place in the classroom will be a validated one if it is part of the official curriculum and carried out by regular staff. However, there are degrees of validation in formal education. HRE will be viewed by learners as a more serious enterprise of the sponsoring school or professional training institution (such as a police academy) if it is required (rather than optional), is taught by a regular member of the faculty (rather than a guest), and has a significant amount of time devoted (not just one lesson).

There are other features of the sponsoring institution that will have bearing on the gravitas of HRE. One is the *consistency of HRE with the values of the institution sponsoring the HRE program*. In relation to the schools, training academies and higher education, to what degree do these institutions as a whole reflect the values of human rights? What might the learner grasp in terms of the "intentionality" of HRE within the

sponsoring institution and the teacher or trainer themselves? HRE may be marginalized in formal education institutions that have not aligned themselves with human rights-related values in a formal way and are not attentive to the application of such values in the learning environment. On the other hand, HRE carried out by human rights NGOs and other civil society organizations associated with social change will have considerable legitimacy with learners.

This leads to another important consideration in relation to the HRE sponsor, which is the prospect of *follow-up and longer term engagement*.[10] HRE that is carried out by human rights groups (usually in line with the Transformation Model) may provide the opportunity for learners to engage in ongoing HRE and activism. HRE carried out in a school or university setting might offer the opportunity for learners to self-organize in clubs or carry out activities in the local environment. Adult training institutions associated with the Accountability model may also have a high commitment to HRE and follow up with internal accountability measures to ensure that staff carries out their responsibilities in ways consistent with human rights principles. HRE carried out with a high level of commitment for the police can be followed up with strict oversight of staff behavior. In summary, it seems important to consider the institutional sponsors of HRE as a feature of the HRE Models.

The HRE Learner

Another element of HRE not originally addressed in the models is the learner herself. It is understood that each learner comes with her or his unique set of experiences, values and perspectives. HRE teaching and learning processes provide opportunities for these to be examined and potentially influenced. The identities of the learners in the original models were somewhat restricted: Values and Awareness -- children, youth and the general public; Accountability -- adults who were members of professional groups; Transformation -- members of marginalized groups. These are in sufficient for understanding the potential of HRE to achieve its goals with learners.

A cross-cutting dimension of learner background is their pre-existing values and attitudes, which are presumably related to previous experiences as well as personal dispositions. Learners who are attentive and empathetic to human rights violations and have a deep sense of justice are more likely to resonate to the value system of human rights (Müller 2009). This key background feature is intrinsic to members of marginalized groups (whom we anticipate have personally suffered discrimination) and is recognized in the Transformation Model. However, such personal features can, in principle, can apply to anyone.

The self-selection of learners into HRE programming allows for an alignment of pre-existing personal values with the message of HRE and increases the possibility that participation will lead to taking action of some kind. We would thus expect that the voluntary feature of nonformal HRE – found in the Transformation Model and in some

[10] Teleki (2007) confirmed the importance of follow-up with adults participating in HRE in her review of 27 HRE programs carried out for professional groups.

adult trainings associated with the Accountability Model – would strengthen its potential to encourage human rights activism and social change behavior. In these environments, teaching and learning processes will still be essential for cultivating specific capacities with learners. However, motivation and mobilization for activism and social transformation can emerge quickly.

We might expect the opposite in environments where conditions for HRE are "required," such as in schools or adult training in institutions (Values and Awareness and Accountability Models). HRE that is incorporated within the curriculum of formal education systems will need to be designed in anticipation of potential resistance or apathy among learners. Under such circumstances, we may find that the teaching and learning processes and the environment, discussed earlier in this section, will be particularly critical in moving learners from the minimum of engagement in the learning process to outcomes associated with the cultivation of agency and taking action for social transformation.

Summary

In this section, on the basis of scholarship, documented practices and my own experiences and field observations since 2002, I further defined and explored five conceptual categories relevant to HRE Models. These five categories will be used in the next section of this chapter to systematically reflect upon the original HRE Models and, in conjunction with additional information about HRE practices, suggest modification to these models that refine their underlying concepts and expand their descriptions and utility as analytic tools.

In terms of the Goals of HRE and the reduction of human rights violations, I distinguished between the goals of changed behavior of *state actors* (the aim of human rights activism, in relation to human rights (legal) standards) and the goal of changed behavior of *individuals* (an aim of social change, and influenced by the norms of human rights, including general values and standards). The HRE Models collectively address HRE carried out for both human rights activism and social change (with human rights activism as a specific strategy related to broader social change). In making this distinction, it is possible for HRE to be analyzed in relation to its direct role in supporting activism as well as its role in supporting the behavior of individuals in the private domain.

In terms of the HRE Theory of Change, we first acknowledge that we are working with the individual learner, though this learner may be part of a community engaging in HRE. The theory of change for learners within the Accountability and Transformation Model is oriented towards professional development and changes in the personal and public domains that result in the reduction of human rights violations. We see that there is no direct link between the original Values and Awareness Model and social change, as taking action is not explicitly encouraged.

In terms of HRE Teaching and Learning Practices I proposed four clusters of methodologies. The first is the didactic methodologies, which I argue are antithetical to the substance and goals of human rights education if they are the only methodology used. The Values and Awareness Model is the only model to rely on didactic methodologies.[11] The remaining three methodologies are distinct, though linked – moving from participatory (oriented towards the learning process), to empowerment (oriented towards general capacities), to transformative methodologies (orienting action towards social transformation).

In regards to learning environment/HRE sponsor, I have focused on the profile of the organization sponsoring HRE and their commitment to the values of human rights in their overall mission. In the formal education sector, such a commitment would be demonstrated in the placement of HRE within the curriculum of formal education, the preparation of regular staff to carry out HRE (not just contracting out to NGOs), the evidence of commitment to human rights values within the overall operation of the organization and follow-up supports. These features can be discerned by learners and signal the level of seriousness with which HRE is taking place. Such commitments are generally found within NGOs carrying out HRE (associated with the Transformation Model) but can also be found within the formal education sector for individual schools and training institutions.

Finally, in relation to learners I have recognized that background features of the learners are a key ingredient to their "readiness" to engage in HRE teaching and learning processes and to respond by taking action. The Transformation Model had recognized this potential for a category of learners – those coming from marginalized groups and who had suffered human rights violations. However, many learners may come predisposed to the 'message' of human rights and social justice, and with a desire to promote change. HRE that is provided on a voluntary basis is better positioned to bring about HRE learner outcomes than programs that are compulsory.

Part 2. Revised Models of HRE

Models represent an idealized framework for understanding human rights education practice. The original HRE Models were developed on the basis of grounded theory to distinguish between the primary practices at that time – efforts within the formal curriculum of schools, adult professional development, and nonformal HRE carried out by NGOs. The Emerging Models recognized target audiences, common approaches and topics, key program features and the plausible link between each model and social change strategies.

[11] Although the Values and Awareness Model was linked with the schooling sector in the Emerging Models article, this approach is not restricted to the schooling sector and can be found in trainings of a range of groups.

In the first half of the chapter, I identified new dimensions of the HRE models that add descriptive complexity and strengthen their analytical power. In this part of the chapter, I revisit the original HRE models, critically applying these new dimensions.

For each of the models, I overview their key features, drawing on the first part of this chapter. New components of the HRE models include:

- the nature of the sponsoring organizations
- whether learner participation is voluntary or involuntary
- integration of critical stance
- application of human rights norms
- learner outcomes in relation to agency and transformation
- teaching and learning strategies

For individual models I have revised my treatment of target audiences, content and strategies for reducing human rights violations. In my narrative description of each model, I highlight those features that have been modified from the 2002 version.

<Insert Table 1 Here>

Model 1. Values and Awareness - Socialization Model

Overview:

- Typically sponsored by government agencies or authorities
- Learner participation usually involuntary
- Usually found in the formal education sector, including schools through higher education, and in some public awareness campaigns
- Common target audiences: students, sometimes the general public
- Non-critical stance towards features of one's own society, the nature of power/authority, and the human rights system, though analytical skills may be applied in relation to the learning of human rights content
- Content oriented, with common topics such as the theory of human rights, human rights standards, the establishment of the United Nations, human rights institutions and NGOs, human rights violations in past history or "in other countries"
- Human rights norms and standards applied are general (such as "equality") and are knowledge of one's rights is intended to promote positive social behavior
- Teaching and learning strategies range from didactic to participatory
- Strategy for reducing human rights violations (passive): socialization, legitimizes human rights discourse

In this approach, we find a fragmented and incomplete approach to HRE, as analyzed through the UN definition "about" "through" and "for." There is no infusion of critical stance or an explicit aim to promote agency in the learner or social transformation. Human rights content and values are presented to be "learned." This model takes the risk of offering a superficial exposure to the human rights field which, in the worst case, can

be experienced as primarily ideological. For this reason, I have extended the title of this model to include the term socialization.

The Values and Awareness-Socialization Model is common in the formal education sector and specifically schools, thought it can be found in HRE carried out with other target groups as well. In schools, topics such as the theory of human rights and the establishment of the United Nations may be included in the curriculum and incorporated within "official" learning resources. HRE topics are integrated in a descriptive manner within carrier subjects, such as World History, Social Studies, or Citizenship Education. Human rights is not presented as an analytical framework or linked with social change, and lessons do not incorporate a critical perspective of one's own society, the nature of power/authority, and the human rights system itself. A key challenge for this model is how human rights educators working in schools and other settings can avoid the "banking" model of education warned of by Freire (1968).[12]

In this model, teaching and learning processes will likely reflect those that are already in use in the classroom. In schooling systems with traditional, didactic approaches, similar methodologies may be used for HRE. When these are applied to the learning of human rights standards, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, such methodologies can be seen as focusing on compliance or political literacy (Keet, 2012). Participatory exercises, to the degree that these are used in relation to human rights topics, will be carried out with the intention of promoting the learning of human rights concepts, rather than their application in the daily lives of learners. Learner awareness of their own rights can be a by-product of this approach but is typically presented in a way that does not invite challenges to the political system or other power structures.

Individual teachers may on their initiative carry out supplemental teaching and learning activities, in order to further student engagement with human rights learning. These might involve resources provided by human rights NGOs. When teachers carry out such HRE in order to promote agency and activism with their students, this effort does not fall under the Values and Awareness-Socialization Model, but rather under the Activism-Transformation Model.

In some educational settings, the HRE programming may place a strong emphasis on values such as equality and respect for others. In this case, HRE in the Values and Awareness-Socialization Model is associated with socialization towards pro-social behavior. This highlights one of the many problematic areas of human rights in schools that values can be separated out from the fuller body of critical reflection, individual rights, international norms and legal standards, and taking action. Moreover, core human rights values, such as non-discrimination and participation, can be claimed by other values systems as well. What is unique to HRE is that such values are linked with the question of justice, the problematizing of state-citizen relations and government accountability.

[12] According to Freire, "In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing…a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as a process of inquiry."

Public awareness campaigns involving public art and advertising, media coverage, and community events may also fall under the Values and Awareness-Socialization Model. In order to be eligible to be included, such awareness campaigns would not be directly linked with mobilization.

In the Values and Awareness-Socialization Model, the strategy for reducing human rights violations is a passive one. HRE programming is not directly linked with the goal for learners to engage in human rights activism or social change. The most optimistic view we could have is that the validation of the human rights discourse, concern for those suffering from human rights violations and foundational knowledge about the international human rights system might be seen as a "primer" for other HRE efforts.

Model 2. Accountability – Professional Development model.

Overview:

- Sponsored by both government agencies and civil society organizations, sometimes in partnership
- Learner participation can be voluntary or involuntary
- Carried out in the formal (pre-service training) and the non-formal (in-service training, further training) education sectors
- Common target audiences: law enforcement officials, lawyers and judges, civil servants, health and social workers, educators, journalists, religious leaders
- Critical review of one's professional role in relation to the prevention of human rights violations, implying a critical stance towards one's own society
- Oriented towards agency: capacity and skill development as related to one's professional roles and responsibilities
- Content will depend upon the audience, but will include some content background on human rights, links with national protection systems and existing codes of ethics or potential human rights violations relevant for the professional group being trained
- Human rights norms and standards applied are those relevant for the professional group, though appeals to personal value systems may be incorporated
- Teaching and learning strategies range from participatory to instrumentally empowering[13]
- Strategy for reducing human rights violations (active – agency): application of human rights values and standards within one's professional role in order to eliminate human rights violations carried out by self and others

In this model, HRE is carried out with the explicit aim to develop the motivation and capacities of members of professional groups to fulfill their responsibilities in ways that are consistent with human rights values (i.e., do not violate human rights) and/or that actively promote the application of human rights norms in codes of conduct, professional standards and local laws. For this reason, the model is named the Accountability Model,

[13] If didactic methods are used, then the HRE program belongs under the Values and Awareness-Socialization Model, even if adult professional learners are involved.

though I have extended this title to include Professional Development, in order to make this approach clearer.

As this approach is skills oriented, there is acute attention to teaching and learning processes that are successful with adult learners, moving beyond participatory engagement strategies to those that foster capacity-development in areas relevant to the professional roles and responsibilities of the learner. This approach can, therefore, be directly associated with the principle of intrinsic empowerment, viewing this from the perspective of increased capacities.

Under the Accountability Model, learners are already expected to be directly or indirectly associated with the guarantee of human rights through their professional roles. In this group, human rights education focuses on the ways in which professional responsibilities involve either (a) directly monitoring human rights violations and advocating with the necessary authorities; or (b) taking special care to protect the rights of people (especially vulnerable populations) for which they have some responsibility. Because the nature of capacity development will be specific to the target audience, it is helpful to distinguish further between types of professional groups. I propose the following categories:

(1) Professional groups, such as law enforcement officials, members of the armed service, civil servants and health and social workers, business/private sector management, who need to understand and comply with human rights norms and related standards of professional conduct. Some key human rights principles that would apply would include non-violation of human rights and non-discrimination.

(2) Lawyers, who need to know how to bring claims based on human rights norms, and judges, who need to be able to recognize such claims. The underlying strategy is advocacy for human rights using national legal norms.

(3) Secular and religious community leaders and journalists, who can be trained to identify and report human rights violations and promote public knowledge about such violations.[14]

(4) Educators, who can integrate human rights themes and pedagogy within their existing teaching in ways that promote agency and activism among learners.

Within this model, the assumption of all educational programming is that the learners will be directly involved in the protection of individual and group rights. The threat of the violation of rights, therefore, as seen as inherent to their work and the strategy for reducing human rights violations is to influence how people carry out their professional responsibilities. The specific content, skills and applications for HRE are customized for

[14] Although awareness-raising workshops carried out with these groups in a couple of the REAP sections were categorized within the Values and Awareness Model because of their sensitization goal, it is possible that these trainings might fall under the Accountability Model, depending upon how relevant the training content was for the contexts these groups work in, and the emphasis places on application in the workplace. Without further information on these specific trainings, this cannot be determined.

each category, in accordance with the professional culture and violations that have been taking place in the local environment.

HRE carried out with professional groups can be organized through pre-service courses within training academies or higher education institutes and trainings carried out once these professionals are on the job. As with other kinds of trainings, when they are carried out by persons with the same professional background, this can assist in understanding the conditions under which people are working, and aim the HRE in a practical, applied and sympathetic manner.

The overall educational context is highly relevant. HRE may take place as a "normal" part of induction training. HRE in-service trainings might also be organized as a high-level political response to have members of the professional group more carefully abide by human rights values. This can be the case when groups, such as the police or health workers, are accused of systematic and widespread discriminatory behavior towards a certain group in society.

An important feature of the context for this model is where the HRE lies in relation to other standards or measures of accountability in relation to the application of HRE to the behavior of these professional groups. Is the HRE aligned with any revisions in professional standards or codes of conduct? Is there accountability in relation to how "human rights-abiding" members of these groups will be, for example, through the ability of members of the public to file complaints, internal monitoring and disciplinary procedures or the presence of an active national human rights institution?

One of the learnings of the past decade is the importance of incorporating within any HRE – including that for professionals who might technically be viewed as perpetrators – a core focus on the learner as a human being. This means understanding in a manner that is cross cutting across all HRE programming that each learner brings his or her own mix of experiences and values, vulnerabilities and aspirations to HRE. Working with professionals as individuals first, and then as a social worker, teacher, lawyer or law enforcement officer, is essential for enabling contact with HRE to be one that is honest and critical. For this reason, HRE programming in the Accountability-Professional Development Model can appeal to the personal value systems of learners. It is possible that this can lead to intrinsic empowerment and activism extending beyond the prescribed roles of the professional, though this is not the aim of this model.

Model 3. Activism-Transformation model.

Overview:

- Typically sponsored by civil society organizations (including human rights and development NGOs, community-service organizations and faith-based groups)
- Learner participation is usually voluntary
- Generally carried out in the nonformal education sector, including trainings, popular education, youth and community development
- Common target audiences: marginalized populations, youth

- Critical stance towards features of one's own society or local environment, the nature of power/authority, and the human rights system itself
- Oriented towards transformation: increased self confidence, capacity-development for taking action, and participation in human rights activism/ long-term social change
- Content will depend upon the audience and local context, but may include some content background on human rights, a focus on the learner's own rights, contemporary human rights violations and the work of groups combating such abuses
- Human rights norms and standards applied are relevant for the learners with strong appeals to personal value systems so that human rights norms are internalized and solidarity is promoted
- Teaching and learning strategies range from instrumentally empowering to intrinsically empowering/transformational
- Strategy for reducing human rights violations (active – transformation): integration of human rights values and standards within one's analytical framework, taking action to reduce human rights violations within one's private and public domains, participation in collective action and the creation of social change agents

HRE programming falling under the Activism-Transformation model is explicitly aimed at bringing about human rights activism and social change. I have added "activism" to the title of this model to reflect this explicit aim. This kind of programming is usually nonformal and voluntary. It is often carried out by a range of civil society organizations oriented towards marginalized groups, youth, community development and the training of human rights workers.[15]

Within this approach, HRE concentrates on the internationalization of human rights values and critical perspectives. Thus in applying the human rights lens meaningfully in their own lives, learners may demonstrate new behavior in their personal domain (addressing unequal relations in the family) as well as in the public domain (for example, participating in campaigns or affiliating with a human rights NGO). The strategy for reducing human rights violations is thus immediate and personal as well as long-term, public and collective.

Teaching and learning processes will involve methodologies of participation, empowerment but also transformation by incorporating critical pedagogy within the HRE program goals. These kinds of HRE programming incorporate a critical stance towards features of one's own society, the nature of power/authority, and even the human rights system itself.

Different kinds of HRE programs fall under the Activism-Transformation model. There are those that are solely focused on activism, such as the training of human rights

[15] Teachers in schools who sponsor human rights or children's rights clubs normally do so in affiliation with such a group and their efforts would thus fall under this model.

workers. This link is a self-evident one and represents a form of instrumental empowerment.

Another type of HRE program falling within the category of Activism-Transformation is aimed specifically towards marginalized and excluded groups, such as women, migrants and refugees, minority groups that have experienced systematic discrimination, persons with disabilities and the extreme poor. Learners coming from groups identified as marginalized may have personally experienced human rights violations and internalized oppression. An immediate aim of HRE is healing, intrinsic empowerment and personal transformation as demonstrated through increased self confidence and capacity for taking action to reduce human rights violations that are being personally experienced. These learners with enhanced critical consciousness may take action in their personal sphere and also engage in human rights activism and long-term social change efforts.

The Activism-Transformation Model also applies to HRE that is carried out as part of youth development and community development, of which HRE may be one component of a wider strategy of leadership and capacity development. These programs share a common goal to encourage learners to take action to reduce human rights violations. Some programs have used the critical HRE framework to review local conditions and to self-organize for change, such as the case of Tostan in West Africa that has encouraged women to organize effectively around abandoning the practice of female genital cutting (Gillespie and Melching 2010). Human rights clubs in schools can serve this purpose by fostering an analysis of human rights issues, encouraging youth to take leadership in organizing awareness raising and mobilization actions. There are examples of Human Rights Cities (Marks and Modrowski 2008) where community members come together to review their community through a human rights lens, identifying ways in which human rights violations can be reduced and then organizing solutions.

Nonformal HRE is almost invariably carried out by civil society organizations. Such organizations are explicitly oriented towards the critical framework of human rights. This, combined with the voluntary nature of participation, create ideal circumstances for fostering activism, in particular, activism driven by the goals and interests of the learners. The self-selection of persons into HRE opportunities suggests a pre-existing alignment of personal values with the human rights message. Students who decide to participate in Amnesty International school groups or women who participate in women's human rights training programs are likely to be predisposed to benefit from and act upon the experiences they gain. The voluntary nature of their involvement suggests the potential for the internalization of human rights norms and their application in ways that are personally meaningful.

Concluding Thoughts

In the second part of the chapter, I revisited the original HRE models. I argued that the original HRE models remain useful typologies for describing HRE practices and for critically analyzing their design in promoting agency in learners to take action to reduce human rights violations. I proposed amendments to the models including: a stronger

association of the Values and Awareness Model with socialization, the Accountability Model with professional development, and the Transformation Model with activism.

The Activism-Transformation Model now includes any kind of HRE programming that cultivates activism (regardless of whether the learner is a member of a marginalized group). Within the Accountability-Professional Development Model, sub-groups of adult learners are broken out, with implications for HRE program goals, content and approaches. The Values and Awareness-Socialization model—if implemented in isolation and not as a first step towards more comprehensive HRE—continues to be a problematic one within HRE practices, as it is not designed to cultivate either learner agency or social transformation.

A considerable amount of HRE scholarship and programming remains focused on the formal schooling sector despite the challenges for carrying out critical HRE. In the years to come, I hope that ongoing reflexive praxis will result in the reorienting of HRE programming currently falling within the Values and Awareness-Socialization category. We should see a general movement of HRE methodologically away from didactic approaches towards those that foster empowerment and transformation.

Through revisiting and revising the 2002 HRE Models I have tried to offer a more complex and accurate description of the programming falling within each of them. These revised models should provide a clearer analytical framework for reviewing and designing HRE in keeping with its central mission to contribute to the reduction of human rights violations. Because of the international standards associated with HRE, I am convinced that this field will have staying power. However, these origins, the claims of universality and the hierarchical nature of the government institutions sponsoring HRE means that there will be an inevitable and ongoing struggle to keep HRE close to critical pedagogy, its original mother. I am optimistic about this enterprise if we human rights educators continue to reflect upon, critique, and improve our efforts.

REFERENCES

Bajaj, M. 2011. “Human rights education: Ideology, location, and approaches.” *Human Rights Quarterly* 33: 481-508.

Baxi, U. 2007. *Human rights in a posthuman world*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Freire, P. 1968. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, P. 1973. *Education for Critical Consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.

Gillespie, D. and Melching, M. 2010. The Transformative Power of Democracy and Human Rights in Nonformal Education: The Case of Tostan. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 60(5): 477-498.

Keet, A. 2012. “Discourse, betrayal, critique: The renewal of human rights education.” In *Safe spaces: Human rights education in diverse contexts*, edited by C. Roux: 7-27. Rotterdam: SensePublishers.

Keet, A. 2010. “A Conceptual Typology of Human Rights Education and Associated Pedagogical Forms.” *Journal of Human Rights Education*, 2(1): 30-41.

Müller, L. 2009. *Human Rights Education in German Schools and Post-Secondary Institutions*. Research in Human Rights Education, Series, No. 2. Amsterdam/Cambridge: Human Rights Education Associates.

Ross, H.A., Shah, P.P. and Wang, L. 2011. “Situating Empowerment for Millennial Schoolgirls in Gujarat, India and Shaanxi, China.” *Feminist Formations*, 23(3): 23-47.

Teleki, K. 2007. *Human Rights Training for Adults: What Twenty-six Evaluation Studies Say About Design, Implementation and Follow-Up*. Research in Human Rights Education, Series, No. 1. Amsterdam/Cambridge: Human Rights Education Associates.

Tibbitts, F. with Batik, E. 2012. *Impact Assessment of the Human Rights Education Program for Women (HREP)*. Prepared for Women for Women’s Human Rights – New Ways, Istanbul.

Tibbitts, F. with Foong, D., Kasprzak, T., Keet, A. and Melouk, M. 2010. *Impact Assessment of Rights-Education-Action Program (REAP).* Prepared for Amnesty International-Norway and Amnesty International –IS.

Tibbitts, F. 2002. “Understanding what we do: Emerging models for human rights education.” *International Review of Education* 48(3-4): 531-549.

Marks, S.P. and Modrowski, K.A. (with W. Lichem). 2008. *Human Rights Cities: Civic Engagement for Societal Development.* Nairobi: UN Habitat.

United Nations, General Assembly. 2011. *United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training*. GA 66/127, Art. 2, paras. 1-2. Geneva: United Nations.

Table 1. Key Features of Revised Human Rights Education Models

MODEL / FEATURES	Values and Awareness - Socialization	Accountability – Professional Development	Activism- Transformation
Sponsors	Typically government agencies or authorities	Both government agencies & civil society orgs, sometimes in partnership	Typically sponsored by civil society organizations
Kind of learner participation	Usually involuntary	Both voluntary and involuntary	Usually voluntary
Education sector	Usually in the formal education sector	Both formal (pre-service) and non-formal (in-service) sectors	Usually in the non-formal education sector, including youth and community development
Common target audiences	Students, sometimes the general public	Law enforcement officials, lawyers & judges, civil servants, health & social workers, educators, journalists, religious leaders	Marginalized populations, youth
Incorporation of critical stance	Non-critical stance	Critical view of one's professional role in relation to prevention of HR violations	Critical stance towards one's society or local environment, the nature of power, the human rights system itself
Orientation	Transmission of information	Development of capacities related to work roles and responsibilities	Personal transformation, human rights activism, social change
Key content	General human rights theory, history and content, with some attention to learner's rights	HR content relevant for group, with links to national protection systems and professional codes of conduct	HR content relevant for learner, with strong focus on learner's rights and contemporary , local human rights violations
Treatment of human rights norms & standards	General treatment, with reference of norms to promote positive social behavior	Selected as relevant for professional group; may include appeal to personal value systems	Selected as relevant for the learners, with strong appeal to personal value systems
Teaching and learning strategies	Didactic to participatory	Participatory to instrumentally empowering	Instrumentally to intrinsically empowering/ transformational
Strategy for reducing human rights violations	Passive: socialization and legitimization of human rights discourse	Active – agency: application of human rights values & standards within one's	Active – transformational: integration within one's analytical framework,

		professional role	taking action to reduce violations in both private and public domains, participation in collective action and creation of social change agents