

Civics and Citizenship

Theoretical Models and Experiences in Latin America

Benilde García-Cabrero,
Andrés Sandoval-Hernández,
Ernesto Treviño-Villarreal,
Silvia Diazgranados Ferráns and
María Guadalupe Pérez Martínez (Eds.)



SensePublishers

Civics and Citizenship

MORAL DEVELOPMENT AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Volume 12

Series Editors:

Fritz Oser (fritz.oser@unifr.ch),
University of Fribourg, Switzerland
Wiel Veugelers (w.veugelers@uvh.nl),
University of Humanistic Studies Utrecht,
The Netherlands

Editorial Board:

Nimrod Aloni, *Kibbutzim College of Education, Tel Aviv, Israel*
Marvin Berkowitz, *University of Missouri-St.Louis, U.S.A.*
Pietro Boscolo, *University of Padova, Italy*
Maria Rosa Buxarrais, *University of Barcelona, Spain*
Helen Haste, *University of Bath, U.K./Harvard University, U.S.A*
Dana Moree, *Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic*
Clark Power, *University of Notre Dame, U.S.A.*
Kirsi Tirri, *University of Helsinki, Finland/Stanford University, U.S.A.*
Joel Westheimer, *University of Ottawa, Canada*
William Wu, *Hong Kong Baptist University, China*

Scope:

‘Moral Development and Citizenship Education’ is a book series that focuses on the cultural development of our young people and the pedagogical ideas and educational arrangements to support this development. It includes the social, political and religious domains, as well as cognitive, emotional and action oriented content. The concept of citizenship has extended from being a pure political judgment, to include the social and interpersonal dynamics of people.

Morality has become a multifaceted and highly diversified construct that now includes cultural, developmental, situational and professional aspects. Its theoretical modelling, practical applications and measurements have become central scientific tasks. Citizenship and moral development are connected with the identity constitution of the next generations. A caring and supporting learning environment can help them to participate in society.

Books in this series will be based on different scientific and ideological theories, research methodologies and practical perspectives. The series has an international scope; it will support manuscripts from different parts of the world and it includes authors and practices from various countries and cultures, as well as comparative studies. The series seeks to stimulate a dialogue between different points of view, research traditions and cultures. It contains multi-authored handbooks, focussing on specific issues, and monographs. We invite books that challenge the academic community, bring new perspectives into the community and broaden the horizon of the domain of moral development and citizenship education.

Civics and Citizenship

Theoretical Models and Experiences in Latin America

Edited by

Benilde García-Cabrero

National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico

Andrés Sandoval-Hernández

University of Bath, UK

Ernesto Treviño-Villareal

Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, Chile

Silvia Diazgranados Ferrás

Harvard Graduate School of Education, USA

and

María Guadalupe Pérez Martínez

CONACYT – Autonomous University of Aguascalientes, Mexico



SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: 978-94-6351-066-0 (paperback)

ISBN: 978-94-6351-067-7 (hardback)

ISBN: 978-94-6351-068-4 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858,
3001 AW Rotterdam,
The Netherlands
<https://www.sensepublishers.com/>

All chapters in this book have undergone peer review.

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved © 2017 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	vii
<i>Judith Torney-Purta</i>	
Section 1: Civic Education: Theories and Models	
1. Culture and Civic Competence; Widening the Scope of the Civic Domain	3
<i>Helen Haste, Angela Bermudez and Mario Carretero</i>	
2. From Informed Social Reflection to Civic Engagement: How to Interpret What Youth Say and Do	17
<i>Janet Kwok and Robert L. Selman</i>	
Section 2: Comparative Politics in Civics in Latin America	
3. Civic and Ethical Education in Mexico: From Classic Civics to the Development of Civic and Citizenship Competencies	41
<i>Silvia Conde-Flores, Benilde García-Cabrero and Alejandro Alba-Meraz</i>	
4. Citizenship Education in Colombia: Towards the promotion of a Peace Culture	67
<i>Ana M. Velásquez, Rosario Jaramillo, José A. Mesa and Silvia Diazgranados Ferrás</i>	
5. Evolution of Citizenship Education in Chile: Recent Curricula Compared	85
<i>Cristián Cox and Carolina García</i>	
6. Building Citizenship in the Schools of Chile, Colombia and Mexico: The Role of Teacher's Practices and Attitudes	105
<i>Ernesto Treviño, Consuelo Béjares, Cristóbal Villalobos and Eloísa Naranjo</i>	
Section 3: Research in Civics, Ethics and Citizenship	
7. Affective and Cognitive Processes as Determinants of Civic Participation in Latin American Countries	129
<i>Benilde García-Cabrero, Andrés Sandoval-Hernández and María Guadalupe Pérez Martínez</i>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

8.	The Civic Competence Gaps in Chile, Colombia and Mexico and the Factors That Account for the Civic Knowledge Gap: Evidence from the 2009 International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS)	155
	<i>Silvia Diazgranados Ferráns and Andrés Sandoval-Hernández</i>	
9.	Aulas en Paz (Classrooms in Peace): Citizenship Competencies for Peace	193
	<i>José Fernando Mejía and Enrique Chaux</i>	
Section 4: Successful Practices in Civic Education		
10.	Developing Pedagogical and Democratic Citizenship Competencies: “Learning by Participating” Program	207
	<i>Marialí Cárdenas</i>	
11.	Good Practices on Civic Engagement in Chile and the Role of Promoting Prosocial Behaviors in School Settings	241
	<i>B. Paula Luengo Kanacri and Gloria Jiménez-Moya</i>	

JUDITH TORNEY-PURTA

FOREWORD

Young people's preparation for civic engagement and participation as citizens is receiving enhanced attention across the world. And rightly so, given the modest degree to which those entering young adulthood participate in politics and civic affairs in many world areas and the extent of their alienation. These low participation levels along with large differences associated with socio-economic status are of particular concern in Latin America.

First we need to look at the bigger picture. A great deal of attention from the press and policy makers often follows the release of results from International Large Scale Assessments (ILSAs) that rank countries' achievement scores in mathematics or science. However, attention from the press is often minimal for the ILSAs in civic and citizenship education. This may be because the measures in these studies deal with attitudes or expected participation, which are relatively difficult to explain to the public. The results require more contextualization for their interpretation than the rankings of country means on knowledge featured in other subject areas. The national context (both current and historical) as well as the local and neighborhood contexts shape the meaning of civic and political engagement, and these contexts differ markedly across countries. Attention should be paid to understanding the *meaning*, examining the *scope*, and assessing the *limitations* of research results in civic education.

This volume is valuable in attempting to attend to these needs in civic education research in three countries of Latin America. The book extends previous publications by reporting results derived from a range of methodologies. These included large-scale test and survey results, studies using students' responses to hypothetical scenarios, curriculum analyses and program designs accompanied by suggestions about ways to evaluate their accomplishments. The volume includes some secondary analysis of data from international large scale assessments as well as qualitative studies that either follow from these studies or are independently based on theory. A particular contribution of the book is that the authors describe research findings, curricular innovations and program resources previously accessible only to those who read Spanish.

The team of editors and the majority of the authors took part in a research project *The Civic Participation of High School Students in Mexico, Chile and Colombia: A Comparative Analysis* that was funded by the Mexican Council for Science and Technology (CONACYT is its acronym in Spanish). The Co-Investigators in

this project were: Benilde García-Cabrero (UNAM), Andrés Sandoval Hernández (IEA/University of Bath), Guadalupe Pérez-Martínez (UAA/CONACYT), Ernesto Treviño-Villareal (Universidad Católica de Chile) & Silvia Diazgranados-Ferrás (Harvard University), and they also served as editors of the book. These individuals represent valuable cross-national connections – Benilde García-Cabrero, Guadalupe Pérez-Martínez and Andrés Sandoval-Hernández from Mexico, Ernesto Treviño-Villareal from Chile, and Silvia Diazgranados Ferrás from Colombia. The authors of chapters in the book also include individuals from the United States, the United Kingdom and Spain. One editor (who is also a chapter author) has been associated directly with the IEA organization from which some of the data are drawn. Andrés Sandoval was the Head of the Research and Analysis Unit at IEA's Data Processing Center before taking his current position at the University of Bath in the United Kingdom.

This volume has a notable history in another way. It can be linked to earlier projects and evolving discourses in this area. My personal respect for several of the authors extends back more than 20 years, when Cristian Cox, Angela Bermudez and Rosario Jaramillo played important roles in facilitating the participation of Chile and of Colombia in the IEA CIVED Study and follow-up activities (Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2006; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, & Schulz, 2001; Torney-Purta, Schuille, & Amadeo, 1999). Cristian Cox was also instrumental in inviting me to prepare a chapter with Jo-Ann Amadeo (2015) in which we had the opportunity to reflect on the CIVED results in Chile. It was presented at a conference and published subsequently. We advanced the concept of *emergence* to describe the ways in which a number of seemingly simple factors came together over time to result in more complexity in civic outcomes than would have been expected from a simple set of independent socialization processes.

Efforts in Latin America were linked with the “New Civics Project” at Harvard University’s Graduate School of Education (funded by the Spencer Foundation) beginning in 2012. Professor Helen Haste among others has facilitated these connections to the field of moral education and its discourse-oriented approaches especially through the Association for Moral Education (AME). My respect for the range and depth of her work also extends back more than twenty years; we served as co-editors of a special issue on the development of political understanding (Haste & Torney-Purta, 1992). The development of political understanding was defined there as an expansion of social and moral understanding that arises as individuals construct knowledge in differing contexts. Her chapter, which opens this book on Latin America, and chapters by others link moral and ethical education and its theoretical base with civic education in valuable ways. In particular, Haste’s chapter sets the stage by describing the differences between *procedural democracy*, *deliberative democracy*, *democracy as social justice* and *democracy as a mode of living* (based on Gutman & Thompson, 2004; Hess & McAvoy, 2015; Arnot & Swartz, 2012; Biesta & Lawy, 2006; Carretero, Haste, & Bermudez, 2015). She argues that each type of democracy demands different types of civic knowledge and skills. Other important

factors are civic values, motivation, identity and action. Haste argues that one needs to pay attention to these distinctions in cross-national discussions because the field often has had too narrow a focus: “the more we explore the scope of civic competence and action, the more we come to recognize how idiosyncratic the US political system actually is and how problematic it is to generalize from that system” to civic education processes in general (p. 15). This quotation makes foreshadows many of the themes in later chapters.

Janet Kwok and Robert Selman in their chapter have provided an impressive theoretical framework on *informed social engagement* elaborating what appeared in their chapter in the *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth* (Sherrod, Torney-Purta, & Flanagan, 2010). Here they highlight models of reflective discourse that take contexts into account and explore affective and cognitive processes associated with civic participation. Three aspects are operationalized: Analysis of Evidence, Capacity for Empathy, and Sense of Agency. In fact, several chapters of the current volume adopt this framework for understanding informed social engagement, and one analyzes data from a large scale data set, the IEA’s International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS). This study’s instrumentation was based on the earlier CIVED study referred to above. In short, I am pleased to have been indirectly connected with some of the earlier publications by these authors and to have been asked to place this volume in the context of the field.

The contributions of the book are wide ranging. First, both quantitative and qualitative approaches are included. These range from the large scale surveys of the International Civics and Citizenship project of 2009 (especially Schulz, Ainley, Friedman, & Lietz, 2011), to curriculum analysis in Chile, Colombia and Mexico, to other methodologies such as data obtained from the administration of hypothetical scenarios. Theory is used in several chapters to develop a conceptual framework that includes identity and motivation along with knowledge, skills, attitudes and participation. Some new ways of looking at political agency (often called efficacy) are proposed. Several very useful graphics are presented, for example when the *theories of change* implicit in specific programs such as *Schools of Peace* are described. In short, the authors make multiple and strong links to several streams of theory, research and practice.

The book identifies challenges and potential paths forward without adopting either an unrealistic utopian tone or an overly pessimistic view. It contains thoughtful remarks about the sometimes uncritical and unrealistic approach taken to fostering deliberative democracy (and other types of democracy as well). For example, the Treviño et al. chapter concludes as follows: “Probably the most worrisome finding is of lower levels of expected participation for female students, which may mark a trend of inequality and machismo that schools, families and society need to overcome” (p. 120).

Appropriately, the prescriptions advanced for the future are not limited to changes in the particular topics to be covered in the curriculum. The authors discuss ways to improve the extent to which the school’s climate encourages students’ participation and

overcomes what one calls “the conservative inertia of an institutional model created in the nineteenth century found in a crystallized school structure, which will hardly be transformed with superficial and cosmetic measures” (p. 57). Also important is the extent to which teachers are able to promote open classroom climates for respectful discussion of topics on which students have different points of view. The positive results of having access to such classroom climates is one of the most consistent findings from both large scale and smaller scale studies in the area of civic education. Other promising approaches are illustrated in chapters about specific countries: teacher training in Mexico, peace education in Colombia and service-learning in Chile.

In conclusion, I have been involved in studies of political socialization and civic education for 50 years (Torney-Purta, in press). During the 1960s we were limited to the early formulations of the theories of Albert Bandura and Lawrence Kohlberg that were available at that time. These theories were not always suitable for understanding the many facets of civic and political development. Furthermore, our data collection and analysis were very primitive by today’s standards. So I am gratified to see this third generation of scholars investigating vitally important topics in a region of the world where little attention has been paid to this issue. I am also pleased to see them employing a range of up-to-date methods and measures as well as theoretical approaches tailored to understanding civic and political development (rather than social development more broadly). In short, I commend the book for its topic, timeliness, breadth, and depth.

REFERENCES

- Arnot, M., & Swartz, S. (2012). Youth, citizenship and the politics of belonging. *Comparative Education*, 48(1), 1–10.
- Biesta, G., & Lawy, R. (2006). From teaching citizenship to learning democracy: Overcoming individualism in research, policy and practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36, 63–79.
- Carretero, M., Haste, H., & Bermudez, A. (2015). Civic education. In L. Corno & E. M. Anderman (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 295–308). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gutman, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haste, H., & Torney-Purta, J. (Eds.). (1992). *The development of political understanding*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass. (New Directions in Child Development)
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Friedman, T., & Lietz, P. (2011). *ICCS 2009 Latin American report: Civic knowledge among lower-secondary students in six Latin American countries*. Amsterdam, NL: IEA.
- Sherrod, L., Torney-Purta, J., & Flanagan, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Torney-Purta, J. (in press). Five decades contributing to the research foundations for enhancing and assessing students’ global awareness. In T. Kirkwood-Tucker (Ed.), *The global education movement: Narratives of distinguished global scholars* (pp. XX). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Torney-Purta, J., & Amadeo, J. (2004). *Strengthening democracy in the Americas through civic education: An empirical analysis of the views of students and teachers*. Washington, DC: Organization of American States.
- Torney-Purta, J., & Amadeo, J. (2015). El estudio de la educación cívica y política: Historia e implicancias para Chile y América Latina. In C. Cox & J. C. Castillo (Eds.), *Aprendizaje de la ciudadanía: Contextos, experiencias y resultados* (pp. 51–73). Santiago, Chile: Ediciones UC.

FOREWORD

- Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J., & Amadeo, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Civic education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA Civic education project*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age 14*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Judith Torney-Purta
Professor Emerita, University of Maryland
College Park, USA

SECTION 1

CIVIC EDUCATION: THEORIES AND MODELS

HELEN HASTE, ANGELA BERMUDEZ
AND MARIO CARRETERO

1. CULTURE AND CIVIC COMPETENCE

Widening the Scope of the Civic Domain

CHALLENGING AND CHANGING DEFINITIONS: NEW CIVICS

How we think about civic participation has changed dramatically in the last decade. This affects research and it affects education, practice and policy.

These changes derive in part from a changing perspective on democratic processes in stable industrialized societies, but in part also from taking seriously the conditions, forms of governance and factors involved in social change in societies either in transition, or subject to more problematic regimes. In summary, the definition of ‘civic’ has expanded considerably beyond voting behavior in conventional parliamentary elections.¹

‘New civics’ includes ‘unconventional’ forms of voice, including both legal and illegal protest, and a wide variety of communication routes to making one’s voice heard. It includes concerted organization towards impacting the bases of power, whether the most local or the most macro or global. It pays attention to volunteering, whether this is designed to challenge institutions or to operate within the status quo. It also recognizes the importance of single issue activism, not only partisanship, in both the democratic process and in understanding the motives for taking action. Perhaps particularly striking is the way that ‘new civics’ discussion has made explicit the inherent tension between the goal of creating citizens who will be actively involved in sustaining the existing socio-political system, and the goal of creating citizens who are equipped to challenge critically the status quo.

What has contributed to these changes? In stable democracies, in which political science orthodoxy had traditionally focused mainly on the institutions of representative government, the radical upheavals of late twentieth century gradually led to recognition that social movements were a significant aspect of political life not anomalies of extremism; protesters became agents of democracy not pathological deviants. In particular, there was considerable transformation of values and norms around the Civil Rights movement in the USA, environmentalism and the women’s and gay rights movements globally. These transformations were not just a matter of new legislation; they need to be analyzed and understood across a wide range of culturally-oriented disciplines and perspectives.

Increasingly, perspectives from other than Euro-American, ‘stable’ democracies have entered the agenda. In part this is due to research such as the IEA 28 nation

study of young people's civic knowledge and understanding, and the 2009 ICCS study, which brought attention to nations in Latin America and Asia whose profiles were different from many in Western societies.² In part it is due to increasing attention to theorists and activists (such as Paolo Freire and Frantz Fanon) working in areas of deprivation and political oppression where first-world procedures do not apply, and whose ideas and models of change have found parallels with resistance and innovative practices in marginalized groups throughout the world. In part also some preoccupations of specific nations have come to influence the field; examples are questions raised by situations of intractable ethnic or religious conflict, long term civil war and its aftermath, major political upheavals or regime change, or severe economic inequality. These conditions give a different perspective to socio-political processes than those encountered in stable democracies. Post-Apartheid South Africa, post-Soviet Eastern Europe, the Middle Eastern situation following the Iraq conflicts, and currently the ISIS effects, all challenge assumptions about stability and social change.

They also challenge the nature of citizens' agency. In stable democratic societies the citizen may influence government policy indirectly through voting or pressure group membership. Voices, prior to the emergence of social media, could be heard through petitions, letters to newspapers or radio phone-in programs. The sense of agency was limited; the routes to influence existed but they were constrained. In societies in transition subjective agency varies widely. At a time when new political parties or groups are forming, participants can have at least the illusion that 'their' agenda might triumph; alternatively some people are completely silenced or disempowered at such times. In the immediate post-Soviet era, young people in the new democracies felt highly engaged as new parties proliferated, many led by the young (van Hoorn et al., 2000; Andrews, 2007). They were soon disillusioned. However as with most activism, the experience led to new skills and a larger perspective of 'the state'.

NEW 'DEMOCRACY': THE ROLE OF MEDIA

Large scale social change, wherever it occurs, can also create significant new narratives for activism which come to impact globally and in a variety of political structures. Many social movements in the latter part of the twentieth century were strongly influenced by and modelled on Gandhi's non-violence – notably the US Civil Rights movement. As Andrews (2007) notes, the post-Apartheid Truth and Reconciliation processes contributed to thinking and practice around many post-conflict policies and movements. There are numerous historical examples. However perhaps the most currently significant development is the dramatic effect of social media, which has transformed the traditional hierarchies and gatekeepers of communication and voice. Digital media democratizes, in the sense that anyone can – in principle – gain a worldwide audience. This has its dark side as we all recognize, and also there is the 'echo chamber' effect: on the whole people tune in what is familiar and also largely consonant with their existing views.

As Allen and Light (2015) note, having ‘voice’ does not necessarily mean having ‘influence’. Nevertheless since the late nineties we have seen massive evidence of the ‘bottom-up’ power of media to mobilize, recruit, organize and publicize social movements with great impact. We see also the effect on participants. Having the means to exercise voice, especially when this has a tangible outcome, builds a sense of efficacy in participants and equips them with new civic skills. Quite small investment in technology enables formerly marginalized or disempowered groups to develop and implement strategies for impacting power structures and institutions, and in particular linking with collaborators across regional and national boundaries. It is here that the global aspects are evident. In countries where there is limited access to expensive computing there is nevertheless widespread use of cheap phones that in many places are now the primary resource for commerce, banking and news.

Large scale social action such as Arab Spring, Occupy movements everywhere, and ecological campaigns are matched by much smaller scale but nonetheless empowering activities such as Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR), widely being used both as a civic education tool and as a real life platform for local social change as described by Cammarota and Fine (2008), Flanagan and Christens (2011) and Brown and Rodriguez (2009). Numerous small organizations like the World Film Collective³ have enabled young people in very deprived contexts, such as favelas and refugee camps, to tell their own story through the use of cell phone videos, also in so doing, acquiring basic technical skills; both enhance efficacy and competences. As Jenkins and Shresthova (2016) and Zuckerman (2013) note, the huge potential of new media for creative mixing of visual and sound, remixing and reworking imagery, concepts, language and forms of interaction is being realized especially by young people, in all areas of life and art.⁴ And finally, a major democratizing factor of digital media is the pressure for public accountability that it places on people in power and in the public eye.

Traditionally, civic education has been conceptualized as, and researched as, school-based. Much of the data on youth civic beliefs, attitudes, knowledge and motivation have been gathered in schools or school-related activities such as service learning. The agenda and goals of civic education have been defined by what is feasible within the school environment, especially classroom practice. There has been a particular emphasis on civic knowledge, especially knowledge relating to the structure and processes of the country’s government, and also to the history narratives that sustain the local national identity (Carretero, 2011; Carretero & Bermudez, 2012; Lopez, Carretero, & Rodriguez, 2014; Carretero, Asensio, & Rodriguez, 2012). In some countries there is an explicit agenda of ideological education (for example China, as discussed by Kennedy, Fairbrother, & Zhao, 2014). In others the desired values, ethical perspectives and conceptions of good society and good governance are conveyed through the choice of historical, cultural and literary narratives and commemorative events. An emphasis on civic knowledge curricula reflects a cognitive model of learning, primarily of fact-based understanding. The content of that knowledge also reflects assumptions about what promotes civic engagement – for example that understanding how laws are made

and how governance is structured will motivate young people actively to sustain the system by voting. New civics challenges much of this and expands the agenda.

HOW CONCEPTUALIZING ‘DEMOCRACY’ DIRECTS EDUCATION

Underlying any conception of civic participation and the goals of civic education are assumptions about how democracy does, and should, function, even in societies which are less ‘democratic’ according to Euro-American criteria; not all civic education takes place within systems of representative democracy. There is no single definition of “democracy.” Gutmann and Thompson (2004) identify four conceptions informing different emphases in civic education programs: *procedural democracy*, *deliberative democracy*, *democracy as social justice*, and *democracy as a mode of living*. Each implies different goals for civic education and different learning processes.

Procedural democracy implies a system of political organization and decision-making based on representative and participatory procedures that are grounded on principles of freedom, equality, and the rule of law. Civic education aims to provide students with the knowledge necessary for voting in elections or campaigning for parties. In practice however, procedural democracy privileges majority views, achieving consensus, compliance with convention, and keeping order in a stable system. This may marginalize minority, controversial, novel, or particularly complex alternative views on public issues.

Deliberative democracy shares the underlying principles of procedural democracy, but also emphasizes the pervasiveness and importance of conflict, moral controversy, and dissent in social and political life. Procedural democracy’s conventional participation in elections or interest group bargaining is not the most adequate route to handling moral disagreements; therefore, it is important that citizens actively engage in the deliberation of public issues. As Hess and McAvoy (2015) explore, civic education for deliberation focuses on developing the capacities for critical inquiry, moral and political argumentation, and participating effectively in controversial dialogue.⁵

Proponents of *democracy as social justice* argue that focusing on political procedures does not adequately represent the complex, unequal, and conflictive nature of citizenship in contemporary societies. An “authentic” or “deep” democracy must be committed to assert moral equality and to protect dignity in equal terms for all. Unless socioeconomic (distributive) justice is guaranteed, the essential values of democracy are at stake. Civic education programs informed by democracy as social justice stress developing students’ capacity to critically understand the multiple forms of systemic violence, oppression, and exclusion. As spelt out by Arnot and Swartz (2012) and Levinson (2012), the goal is to help youth to become agents capable of confronting these barriers; preparing them to analyze power relationships, investigate the ambiguities of political issues, and embrace opportunities for social change.

In a fourth conception, explored particularly by Biesta and Lawy (2006) and Nussbaum (2006), *democracy is a mode of living* founded on values of inclusiveness,

pluralism, fairness, cooperation, dialogue, and non-violent resolution of conflict. This requires developing sensitivity, habits, and capacities to build and preserve relationships and connection across lines of difference.

All these models require civic knowledge. However procedural views emphasize knowledge of political institutions and constitutional procedures, deliberative models add knowledge of current public issues, and social justice models add knowledge of socioeconomic dynamics. Procedural models emphasize cognitive skills for effective analysis of information, whereas deliberative and social justice models emphasize skills for critical inquiry and controversial dialogue. Democracy as a way of life requires cognitive and socio-emotional skills necessary for fair and caring resolution of conflict.

WHAT MAKES CIVIC EDUCATION EFFECTIVE? THE CENTRALITY OF CULTURAL MODELS

The expansion of the domain of ‘new civics’ participation, and the realization that the variables involved are considerably broader than traditional models of civic development and education encompass, is accompanied by a shift in theory. Political scientists often use the term ‘political socialization’ which echoes a now-outmoded psychological model in which the essentially passive young person is molded by external forces. In this perspective, the focus of civic education was the transmission of factual knowledge and conventional values, primarily aiming to socialize the students into an existing socio-political order. However, for half a century the emergent cognitive model of development has cast the growing individual as an active processor of information and experience, successively restructuring and reflecting, producing increasingly complex and abstract understanding. According to this perspective the questions are: What elements of civic education are necessary to scaffold active learning and deep understanding? What happens in civic learning with increasing age? What happens in civic learning with increasing opportunity to engage with civic issues? The pedagogic implications are that education should foster increasingly sophisticated understanding of civic matters, and provide experiences and contexts to facilitate active, effective, and meaningful processing.

This focus is primarily on individual cognition and learning. In contrast, cultural models of development address the growing individual’s social and cultural context, the narratives, values, knowledge, and norms of action to which the growing individual is exposed in different sociocultural settings, interactions, and experiences that promote or inhibit effective and relevant learning. Learning results not only from formal teaching of information, but also from individuals’ interaction, dialogue, and performance of action within their social context. As argued throughout this volume, meaning and understanding are co-constructed and negotiated in social and cultural interactions, through dialogue with others and with cultural resources, not merely processed in individual cognition (Haste & Abrahams, 2008; Haste & Bermudez, 2016).

A cultural perspective requires educators to recognize and take account of the cultural messages and resources available to the growing individual (for example, linguistic, non-linguistic, and institutional messages about ethnicity, power, dominant values, and norms of behavior). Effective civic learning needs to use the resources of the cultural context, to facilitate interaction, critical reflection, and negotiation, for example with media and through experience and engagement with actual civic life. This includes paying attention to classroom and school climate (Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins D’Alessandro, 2013), community experience, service learning, family interactions, cultural narratives, norms and expectations, socioeconomic factors, and increasingly, social media. Furthermore, these parameters may operate differently in different national and cultural contexts; a Euro-American perspective is not enough.

THE COMPONENTS OF CIVIC COMPETENCE

Within the broader definition of civic participation we recognize four strands of skills and competence that contribute to the effective citizen, each of which have distinct educational implications. These are: *civic knowledge and understanding*; *civic skills*; *civic values, motivation, and identity*; and *civic action*.

Civic Knowledge and Understanding

The typical concentration on educating factual knowledge about democratic institutions, processes, and elements of national history is being challenged by a growing consensus that citizens also require knowledge and understanding about controversial issues, intergroup relations, local processes, and community affairs (Carretero, Haste, & Bermudez, 2015). There is also growing consensus that civic knowledge alone is not enough to foster active and responsible civic engagement. There is a relationship between civic knowledge and voting: those who intend to vote tend to have better knowledge and knowledge is needed for routes to political participation, monitoring of government actions, and exercising rights and responsibilities (Cox, Jaramillo, & Reimers, 2005). However, an active civil society requires also understanding of concepts and principles, the skills for reflective and responsible action, willingness to engage, and commitment to democratic values. Discrete knowledge becomes more meaningful as it is integrated with conceptual understanding. For example, students may “know” the list of core human rights, but they may not understand what the concept of “rights” actually entails, why they were codified in a particular historical time, or how they relate to specific conceptions of state.

As Barrett (2007) shows, understanding civic and social concepts progresses in parallel with the development of conceptual thinking. Students initially understand concepts in terms of more concrete, static and isolated characteristics and gradually progress to understand more abstract dimensions, increasingly complex conceptual networks in which different elements are interconnected.⁶

Civic Skills

There are a variety of skills necessary for effective civic participation. As Fine, Bermudez, and Barr (2007) explore, civic skills are often divided into intellectual skills, participatory skills, and socio-emotional skills. Youth are expected to make sound political choices, to take part in processes of collective decision-making, conflict resolution, and negotiation, in the discussion of controversial social and political issues, or the monitoring of government action on behalf of public interests. Knowledge and conceptual understanding are about ‘knowing what’; civic skills are procedural – ‘knowing how’.

Cognitive skills refer to the capacities that enable citizens to analyze and synthesize information and arguments, as well as evaluate, reach conclusions, take and defend positions on matters of public concern (Kirlin, 2003). Examples include considering different perspectives, interrogating and interpreting political communication, and supporting positions with evidence and good argumentation. Participatory skills are capacities for working with others, building coalitions, seeking consensus, negotiating differences, and managing conflict. There are skills for communication (public speaking, petitioning, lobbying, protesting), organization (mobilizing, securing funding, leading meetings), and collective decision-making (coordinating perspectives, evaluating alternative solutions, etc.) and also skills for group membership and for conflict resolution.

The Latin American module of the 2009 International Civic and Citizenship Study measures skills for:

- Living together in peace (peaceful resolution of conflict, assertiveness, communication);
 - Democratic participation (collective decision-making processes, advocacy, persuasive communication); and
 - Plurality and diversity (multi-perspectivity, confronting discrimination, and exclusion).
- Socio-emotional skills refer to the interpersonal capacities for handling oneself in healthy relationships with family, peers, and community members. Examples include dealing positively with peer pressure, developing non-abusive relationships, avoiding risky behavior, and coordinating one’s needs with the needs of others. These interpersonal skills also feed into “democracy as a way of life”.

Civic Values, Motivation, and Identity

A third dimension of civic learning comprises the development of values, motives, and identities that dispose citizens to engage effectively in democratic practices (Youniss & Levine, 2009). We noted earlier civic education strategies to instill the required civic values and attitudes for a virtuous citizen, such as taking responsibility voting and helping others, upholding the law, and monitoring current affairs in the media, also tolerance and respect for diversity, concern with the rights and welfare

of others, freedom, or justice. These pedagogical strategies include exemplar role models, illustrative storytelling, negative and positive reinforcement of behavior.

However, in cognitive developmental and cultural psychology approaches, value development is rooted in active meaning making and negotiation within social contexts. Pedagogical strategies such as the discussion of moral and civic dilemmas, the reflective analysis of moral contents in literature, or the creative production of personal moral narratives foster a reflective appropriation of social values and the development of moral judgment (Kohlberg, 1984; Selman & Kwok, 2010).

Moral values are important motivators for civic action because they make civic issues personally relevant, providing a sense of purpose for civic action especially with regard to single issues. While young people express very little interest in conventional “politics” or in joining a political party, they are concerned about and active in many community and environmental issues. Because single issues are frequently seen as morally charged they are affectively experienced which may contribute to a sense of personal responsibility.

The element of civic identity is often absent when civic education is defined in relation to conventional macro political processes such as voting, rather than on what actually motivates behavior. We argue that for effective education it is essential to start from where young people’s concerns and interests are, and to understand what the different factors that motivate those to engage are. Individual and collective identities are increasingly recognized as key features in the definition of civic motivation and commitments. For this reason, identity is crucial to why, when, and how people become engaged, and the meaning they make of such engagement in their particular socio-cultural contexts.

Civic identity is not a fixed feature of individual psychology, but rather an active and fluid psychosocial process through which citizens make sense of themselves in relation to their social reality, and negotiate their place and role within their civic communities. Civic identity includes one’s sense of agency and efficacy. Agency refers to the sense of being a meaningful actor, responsible to one’s community welfare. Efficacy refers to the confidence in one’s ability to take action, effect change, and achieve the desired results. In the civic realm, efficacy also involves the belief that it is possible, and worth trying, to make a difference through public action; this may determine whether a felt concern gets translated into engagement. As Kahne and Westheimer (2006) and Levinson (2012) demonstrate, a positive sense of agency and efficacy develops through civic practice.⁷

Civic Action

Experiencing civic action constitutes a fourth component of civic competence. Long before they become formal political citizens, young people interact in a variety of civic environments, which provide opportunities for age-appropriate, relevant, and meaningful learning. For example, Selman and Kwok (2010) show how young people are often confronted with situations that call them to stand up against

prejudice, discrimination, and harassment. Oser, Althof and Higgins-D'Alessandro (2008) report how school government affords opportunities for civic voice. Lievrouw (2011) describes how families, peer groups, and social media are sites for discussing controversial issues. Effective civic education needs to recognize the complexity of the wide variety of civic experiences that young people bring to the classroom, and their rich teaching opportunities. Real-life authentic civic action experience contributes to civic identity, motivation, purpose, responsibility, agency, and efficacy. It can provide the means for reflective practice necessary to connect abstract ideas with real-life situations.

Adult civic participation is linked to community engagement in adolescence. Youth organizing is a site of the development of civic competence. Cammarota and Fine (2008) and Ginwright (2010) show how community-based civic action is particularly salient among communities marginalized from the conventional political system. This form of civic engagement involves cooperation around targeted problem solving regarding issues of common concern. Participation requires and fosters coming together, working with others, mediating differences, managing conflict, and establishing shared goals in order to regulate, direct, and develop common affairs with a marked sense of "public good". Community activism is characterized by social responsibility and commitment to partner with others in understanding problems, and responsiveness in developing and implementing solutions. Furthermore, community activism builds interdependence and a strong sense of belonging to local environments (Kassimir & Flanagan, 2010).

As we noted earlier, and as Cammarota and Fine's (2008) and Flanagan and Christens's (2011) contributors show, youth participatory action research (YPAR) is an emergent version of community action, based in part on Freirian principles. The goal of YPAR is to generate positive identity, agency, and efficacy in the community through the ownership of local knowledge and expertise and integrating it with relevant scholarship. YPAR projects are student-led, but with advisory guidance from researchers; they draw upon unique local knowledge. The local actors are trained in skills, including exploring scholarly work, but the collaborative project is faithful to the authentic experience and interpretation of the community. YPAR's strong ethnographic stance challenges conventional research models but it also, importantly, challenges the implicit 'deficit' and 'pathological' models that inform much work on minority and underprivileged groups.

IMPLICATIONS

The broadening of definitions of 'civic participation' gives both researchers and practitioners a far more useful scope and range for understanding what contributes to being a citizen. It brings into recognition the fact that citizenship is far more than voting behavior, and that civic identity is as much a part of the self as moral or national identity. It challenges the long-standing artificiality of the distinction between our public and private lives, a distinction often blurred in our own subjectivity, and in

fact difficult to maintain once we attempt to understand the origins and contexts of motivations for civic action and engagement. This also has implications for education, by enabling young people to draw upon experiences in several areas of life, to make sense of their cognitive and affective responses and to consider a range of possible actions.

The breadth of scope also requires us to recognize that civic competences, reasoning, affect and behavior are not explicable only in terms of individual characteristics, nor can effective civic education be achieved if the learner is seen as isolated from the social context. The roles of cultural experience, resources and dialectic are inherent in all aspects of civic competence, expression and the education for their development. Cultural approaches give us a very rich theoretical and methodological framework for exploring and explaining.

The history of writing and research on civic participation and competences has been heavily Euro-American, often in fact just North American. The more we explore the scope of civic competence and action, the more we come to recognize how idiosyncratic the US political system actually is and how problematic it is to generalize from that system to others. As we have noted, the very narrow political spectrum of US politics renders it highly dubious even to make comparisons with Europe, whose significant mainstream leftist strand greatly extends the scope for political thought, action and structures. Increasingly, research and writing is emerging throughout the globe, and the fundamental assumptions of each nation, or cultural group, become explicit as we try to unpack the processes involved in analyzing civic participation and especially in developing useful pedagogy. These alternative perspectives are beginning to challenge the hegemony of Euro-American theorizing, and giving us new ways to think about many aspects of civic life and systems, which may enlighten everyone. We noted for example how Paolo Freire, a Latin American activist and theorist, is increasingly influencing work with marginalized young people in the US and Europe, with rich results both for action and theory. He is but one example. Haste's work in China, with Selman, Zhao and Luan (2014), has given her considerable insights into how culture constructs and constrains, and what assumptions about 'good citizenship' do not cross cultural boundaries. Such work is increasingly enhanced also by research from Latin American and other international experiences and civic life. It gives us many examples of how a richer perspective on culture and the scope of civic competence enables deeper understanding both of the relevant local conditions and contexts, and the extent to which such understandings can inform the larger global research and education communities.

NOTES

- ¹ We explore this more fully in Carretero, Haste and Bermudez (2015).
- ² See also: Torney-Purta, Lehman, Oswald & Schulz (2001), Torney-Purta and Barber (2011). <http://worldfilmcollective.com/archive/>
- ⁴ See also: Kahne, J., Lee, N., and Feezell, J. (2012), Ito (2010).
- ⁵ See also: Hess (2009), Stitzlein (2012), Bermudez (2015).

⁶ See also: Carretero, Castorina, and Levinas (2013), Van Sledright (2008).

⁷ See also: Haste (2013), Carretero, Haste and Bermudez (2015).

REFERENCES

- Allen, D., & Light, J. (2015). *From voice to influence*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Andrews, M. (2007). *Shaping history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arnot, M., & Swartz, S. (2012). Youth citizenship and the politics of belonging. *Comparative Education*, 48(1), 1–10.
- Barrett, M. (2007). *Children's knowledge, beliefs and feelings about nations and national groups*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Bermudez, A. (2015). Four tools for critical inquiry in history and civic education. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 52, 102–118.
- Biesta, G., & Lawy, R. (2006). From teaching citizenship to learning democracy: Overcoming individualism in research, policy and practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(1), 63–79.
- Brown, T. M., & Rodríguez, L. F. (Eds.). (2009). *Youth in participatory action research: New directions for youth development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Cammarota, J., & Fine, M. (2008). *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Carretero, M. (2011). *Constructing patriotism: Teaching history and memories in global worlds*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Carretero, M., & Bermudez, A. (2012). Constructing histories. In J. Valsiner (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 625–646). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carretero, M., Asensio, M., & Rodríguez-Moneo, M. (Eds.). (2012). *History education and the construction of national identities*. Charlotte, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Carretero, M., Castorina, J. A., & Levinas, M. L. (2013). Conceptual change and historical narratives about the nation. A theoretical and empirical approach. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), *International handbook of research in conceptual change* (pp. 269–287). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Carretero, M., Haste, H., & Bermudez, A. (2015). Civic education. In L. Corno & E. M. Anderman (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 295–308). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cox, C. B., Jaramillo, R., & Reimers, F. (2005). *Education for citizenship and democracy in the Americas: An agenda for action*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Fine, M., Bermudez, A., & Barr, D. (2007). *Civic learning survey—Developed for the National Professional Development and Evaluation Project (NPDEP), a longitudinal outcome study of the facing history and ourselves program from 2005–2010*. Brookline, MA: Facing History and Ourselves.
- Flanagan, C., & Christens, B. D. (Eds.). (2011). Youth civic development; work at the cutting edge. In C. A. Flanagan & B. D. Christens (Eds.), *New directions for child and adolescent development* (p. 134). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Freire, P. (1970). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Ginwright, S. (2008). Collective radical imagination; youth participatory action research and the art of emancipatory knowledge. In J. Cammarota & M. Fine (Eds.), *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion* (pp. 13–22). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ginwright, S. (2010). *Black youth rising: activism and radical healing in urban America*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haste, H. (2004). Constructing the citizen. *Political Psychology*, 25(3), 413–439.
- Haste, H. (2010). Citizenship education: A critical look at a contested field. In L. R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth* (pp. 161–188). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Haste, H. (2013). Culture, tools and subjectivity: The (re)construction of self. In T. Magioglou (Ed.), *Culture and political psychology* (pp. 27–48). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishers.

- Haste, H., & Abrahams, S. (2008). Morality, culture and the dialogic self: Taking cultural pluralism seriously. *Journal of Moral Education, 37*(3), 357–374.
- Haste, H., & Bermudez, A. (2016). The power of story: History, narrative and civic identity. In M. Carretero, S. Berger, & M. Grever (Eds.), *International handbook of research in historical culture and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hess, D. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hess, D., & McAvoy, P. (2015). *The political classroom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ito, M. (2010). *Hanging out, messing around and geeking out*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jenkins, H., & Shresthova, S. (2016). *By any media necessary: The new activism of youth*. New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (2006, April). The limits of political efficacy: Educating citizens for a democratic society. *PS Online*, 289–296.
- Kahne, J., Lee, N., & Feezell, J. (2012). *Digital media literacy education and online civic and political participation*. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from <http://www.civicsurvey.org/publications/46>
- Kassimir, R., & Flanagan, C. (2010). Youth civic engagement in the developing world: Challenges and opportunities. In L. R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth* (pp. 91–113). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Kennedy, K. J., Fairbrother, G. P., & Zhao, Z. (2014). *Citizenship education in China: Preparing citizens for the “Chinese Century”*. London: Routledge.
- Kirlin, M. (2003). *The role of civic skills in fostering civic engagement (CIRCLE-Working paper 06: CIRCLE)*. Medford, MA: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Levinson, M. (2012). *No citizen left behind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lievrouw, L. A. (2011). *Alternative and activist new media*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Lopez, C., Carretero, M., & Rodriguez-Moneo, M. (2014). Conquest or reconquest? Students’ conceptions of nation embedded in a historical narrative. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 24*(2), 252–285. doi:10.1080/10508406.2014.919863
- Nussbaum, M. (2006). Education and democratic citizenship: Capabilities and quality education. *Journal of Human Development, 7*(3), 385–398.
- Oser, F., Althof, W., & Higgins-D’Alessandro, A. (2008). The just community approach to moral education: System change or individual change? *Journal of Moral Education, 37*(3), 395–415.
- Seider, S. (2012). *Character compass: How powerful school culture can point students towards success*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Selman, R., & Kwok, J. (2010). Informed social reflection: Its development and importance for adolescents’ civic engagement. In L. R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth* (pp. 651–685). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Sherrod, L. R., Torney-Purta, J., & Flanagan, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Stitzlein, S. M. (2012). *Teaching for dissent: Citizenship education and political activism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins D’Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(3), 357–387.
- Torney-Purta, J., & Barber, C. (2011). Fostering young people’s support for participatory human rights through their developmental niches. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 81*(4), 473–481.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Van Hoorn, J., Komlosi, A., Suchar, E., & Samuelson, D. (2000). *Adolescent development and rapid social change*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Van Sledright, B. A. (2008). Narratives of nation-state, historical knowledge, and school history. *Review of Research in Education, 32*, 109–146.

- West, C. (2004). *Democracy matters: Winning the fight against imperialism*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Westheimer, J. (2008). On the relationship between political and moral engagement. In F. Oser & W. Veugelers (Eds.), *Getting involved: Global citizenship development and sources of moral values* (pp. 17–30). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237–269.
- Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Roots of civic identity: International perspectives on community service and activism in youth*. New York, NY: Cambridge UP.
- Youniss, J. (2011). Civic education: What schools can do to encourage civic identity and action. *Applied Developmental Science*, 15(2), 98–103.
- Youniss, J., & Levine, P. (2009). *Engaging young people in civic life*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Zhao, X., Selman, R. L., Haste, H., & Luan, Z. (2014). Compliant, cynical or critical: Chinese youth's explanations of social problems and individual civic responsibility. *Youth & Society*. doi:10.1177/0044118X14559504
- Zuckerman, E. (2013). *Digital cosmopolitans*. New York, NY: Norton.

Helen Haste
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

Angela Bermudez
Center for Applied Ethics
Deusto University

Mario Carretero
Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO)