

Civic Education in Emerging Democracies

Terrence C. Mason
Indiana University, USA

How will we go about extending the concept of civic culture to the planet itself and developing a sense of the world public interest? How will we find ways to occupy the common space and share the common resources and the common opportunities in this company of strangers which is the human race, without obliterating or doing violence to deeply held values? Can we stay rooted in our own communities, retain the best of our own national ways, and still develop cooperative strategies for meeting human needs everywhere, in a linked system of mutual aid that respects the integrity of other ways of life? What kind of education would we need to prepare us for that?

-Elise Boulding, *Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World*, 1988, p. xix

How can we live together justly, in ways that are mutually satisfying, and which leave our differences, both individual and group, intact and our multiple identities recognized?

-Walter Parker, *Teaching Democracy: Unity and Diversity in Public Life*, 2003, p. 33

Introduction

When I was asked to prepare a presentation for this conference on the topic of “Civic Education in Emerging Democracies” it struck me as both an interesting opportunity and a somewhat daunting challenge. It provided me with an occasion to explore the current status of school programs to prepare citizens for democratic participation that are being conceptualized and enacted in countries emerging from various types of authoritarian political systems. I looked forward to examining the key trends, approaches, models that have been employed in the development of civic education programs for schools in emerging democracies. Since it is not enough to simply describe what is being done; it seemed essential to me to consider the efficacy of civic education efforts. Thus, I hoped to address the question of quality and program impact by asking, ‘Which kinds of civic education programs are associated with students’ acquisition of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions essential for the “enlightened political engagement (Parker, 2003) required of citizens in a democracy?’ In addition, as we gather to commemorate the fall of the Berlin wall it seemed worth asking, ‘What do we know about civic education in emerging democracies in 2009 that we didn’t know in 1989 since so much has been accomplished in this field over the last twenty years?’ In addition, I would like to offer some reflections on what the most promising trends in the field seem to be, what the enduring issues are, and where the future of civic education in emerging democracies lies. The ‘daunting challenge’ here of course is to condense all this into a relatively short presentation that will stimulate a lively discussion.

I embarked upon this task by consulting various on-line databases for information on current civic education work in ‘emerging democracies.’ This search yielded a number of valuable sources that I will draw from in my presentation here. Among the most useful of these was CERl, the Civic Education Resource Inventory (<http://ceri.civnet.org/>) which provided a wide array of research reports, curriculum documents, and conceptual articles on the development and implementation of civic education programs around the world. I will refer to a number of these sources in my paper here. I have also drawn from my own experience conceptualizing, developing, implementing, and reflecting on civic education in numerous countries where I have worked on civic education programs. So what I will

present here is an informal review of some recent literature on civic education work in emerging democracies combined with some commentary and conclusions based on my own experiences.

When people ask about my work in civic education in developing countries I often explain to them that countries such as Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Macedonia, where I have been actively involved in civic education, have undergone significant political changes in the last several decades that require a new kind of educational system that will promote the goals of democracy and a free and open society. I tell them that the work I do there is aimed at working with my colleagues in those countries to develop curriculum and teaching methods that will help students to understand the rights and responsibilities of citizens in a democracy, to acquire the skills needed to participate as active citizens in their communities, and to internalize a set democratic values or 'habits of mind' that will enable them to help sustain a democratic way of life. Sometimes people wonder why this is different from the kind of civic education that we offer in the U.S. or other Western countries, and I usually respond that it isn't, but the conditions in emerging democracies are different and therefore civic education must take into consideration the particular historical and contemporary circumstances in those settings. For example, civic education existed during the Soviet occupation in the Baltic countries as well as elsewhere in the former Soviet Union but it was aimed at inculcating Marxist/Leninist ideology and promoting allegiance to the state rather than encouraging such civic values as freedom, justice, and privacy. It is not surprising then, that we find a certain degree of skepticism among students in former Soviet countries about programs designed to promote civic literacy and responsibility. For example, the most recent IEA civic education study (Torney-Purta, et al., 2001) reported that only 40 percent of the 14 year-olds surveyed in Estonia trust the national government and these results are significantly below the international average. Given the history of government oppression in that country it is reasonable to expect that Estonian students might not embrace programs that encourage them to identify with and participate in their government. They have heard this call before and for many it did not lead to improved life circumstances or greater individual and civil liberties. In situations like this educators must take into consideration the predispositions of students toward the goals of civic education and their willingness to engage in the study of what it means to be a citizen in a democracy.

Before proceeding further, let me address the term 'emerging democracies' to clarify my understanding of what this means. I suspect that many of you, like me, consider all democracies to be 'emerging' since democracy itself is always a 'work in progress' continually moving toward the realization of ideals such as freedom, equality, and justice. So how does a country qualify as an 'emerging democracy?' First, there is a *temporal dimension*. All democracies 'emerged' at one time or another and many have slipped in and out of alignment with democratic principles of government over time, but in the contemporary context we refer to 'emerging democracies' as those states that have *recently*¹ established a form of democratic government and are actively working toward establishing and strengthening the institutions that support a democratic way of life (e.g. civil society, the rule of law based on a written constitution, free, open, and regular elections, protection of minority rights, etc.). The second dimension could be described as the *substantive dimension* and refers to how democracy is defined and carried out. Definitions of democracy abound as scholars have long disagreed about what we really mean by democracy² from Socrates' Athens, through the Roman Republic, the signing of the Magna Carta, the revolutions of 1776, 1789, and 1917, the two world wars fought to "make the world safe for democracy," the fall of the Berlin Wall, and finally into the post -9/11 era where questions about

¹ What constitutes 'recent' is somewhat subjective but it seems reasonable to consider the post-Communist democracies of Eastern Europe that were established in the 1990's and the democracies in Africa that have appeared since the 1960's following the end of the colonial period to be among countries that are considered 'emerging' democracies. Of course, many other examples exist in other parts of the world.

² See Appendix A for some variations on how democracy can be defined.

the nature of democracy have again taken center stage. Rather than venture into what Robert Dahl (1998) refers to as the “enormous and impenetrable thicket of ideas about democracy” (p. 37), I will offer Dahl’s five minimal criteria that define the key elements of democratic political systems:

1. Effective participation
2. Equality in voting
3. Gaining enlightened understanding
4. Exercising final control over the agenda
5. Inclusion of adults (Dahl, 1998, p. 38)

At the very least the civic education programs that are being introduced in emerging democracies by representatives of the ‘established democracies’ should seek to encourage a form of democratic political life that reflects these criteria.

What is being done? Two examples

So what kind of civic education programs have been developed to help educators in emerging democracies to transform what and how they teach about democracy? As a means of illustrating what is being done I have selected two examples of prominent civic education programs developed in the U.S. that are having a significant impact in emerging democracies: *Civitas International* and *Street Law*. I will provide brief descriptions of these two programs here followed by an analysis of them according to some criteria that have been articulated to define the characteristic of quality civic education.

Civitas International

Civitas International Programs are directed by the Center for Civic Education and funded by the U.S. Department of Education under the Education for Democracy Act approved by the United States Congress; additional support is provided by the U.S. Department of State, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and other sources. These programs have been in existence since 1995 and are designed to...

bring exemplary civic education curricula to students worldwide through partnerships with organizations in the United States and in more than 70 countries. This unique network of educators, civil society organizations, educational institutions, and governmental agencies has worked for more than a decade to develop quality curricular materials and train teachers throughout Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East. Many countries in the Civitas network collaborate with model civic education programs in U.S. states and in other countries to develop programs that address their specific civic education needs. (Center for Civic Education website, www.civiced.org)

The specific goals of *Civitas International* are to:

- Assist international educators in creating, adapting, implementing, and institutionalizing effective civic education programs in their countries
- Acquaint international educators with exemplary curricular materials and teacher training programs in civic education developed in the United States and other participating nations

- Create and implement civic education programs for students in the United States that will help them better understand the history and experiences of emerging and established democracies
- Facilitate the exchange of ideas and experiences in civic education among educational, governmental and private-sector leaders in the United States and other countries
- Encourage independent research and evaluation to determine the effects of civic education on the knowledge, skills, and character traits essential for the preservation and improvement of constitutional democracy (Center for Civic Education website, www.civiced.org)

Among the many programs that *Civitas* sponsors are *We the People: Project Citizen*, a curriculum designed to teach students how to identify problems in their communities, to examine the public policies associated with them, and to generate solutions and “action plans” aimed at resolving the problems that they identified and *Foundations of Democracy*, a curriculum that introduces concepts such as *Authority, Justice, Responsibility, and Privacy* to school-aged children. (See Table 1 for more details about *Civitas* programs.)

Street Law

Street Law is a nonprofit organization dedicated to providing practical, participatory education about law, democracy, and human rights. Through its philosophy and programs, people are empowered to transform democratic ideals into citizen action. *Street Law*’s international areas of expertise include, interactive teaching strategies, methods, lessons, and activities, democracy, constitutionalism, law, and human rights content ; and seminar and conference agenda and materials design (<http://www.streetlaw.org/en/Index.aspx>). Among the projects sponsored by *Street Law* are: the *Youth Act! Program, Deliberating in a Democracy, Public Legal Education Programs, and Connecting Islam and Democracy* (See Table 2 for more details about *Street Law* programs).

In order to assess whether programs like *Civitas* or *Street Law* are offering quality civic education, we must apply some criteria to an analysis of the learning opportunities for students that are included in these programs. If we apply the model of education for citizenship in a democracy proposed by Patrick and Vontz (2001) we find that a number of the key elements of quality civics instruction are evident in both the *Civitas* and the *Street Law* programs. Patrick and Vontz assert that the foundation for civic competence lies in the development of knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to core concepts. In their four-component model for civic education (knowledge, intellectual skills, participatory skills, and dispositions), they identify a set of concepts that form the basis of successful civic participation. These concepts fall into the categories of representative democracy (republicanism), constitutionalism, rights (liberalism), citizenship, civil society (free and open social system), market economy (free and open economic system), and types of public issues in a democracy such as those arising from the inevitable tensions between majority rule and minority rights or liberty and equality. If we look closely at the kinds of activities included in the *Civitas* and *Street Law* programs (see Tables 2 and 3) we can see that they both provide opportunities for students to gain important knowledge, skills, and dispositions through active, often community-based experiences (e.g. *Project Citizen, Youth Act!*). Furthermore, many of the ideas that fall within Patrick and Vontz’s conceptual categories such rule of law, popular sovereignty, minority rights, human rights, separation of powers, pluralism, and the common good are strongly emphasized in the programs sponsored by these two organizations. But does the Patrick and Vontz framework fully account for the kinds of civic education most needed in emerging democracies?³ A close examination of both the *Civitas* and *Street Law*

³ To be fair the Patrick and Vontz framework was developed for the U.S. context but it can serve as a point of departure for discussing how to conceptualize civic education in other cultures and contexts.

programs suggests that certain key concepts that they include in their model are either missing from or not strongly emphasized in the Patrick and Vontz framework (e.g. tolerance, diversity, peace, equity, social justice). Also, neither *Civitas* nor *Street Law* international programs address market economy issues. Thus, it may be that different frameworks for judging program quality and effectiveness are needed when assessing civic education programs in emerging democracies. Later in this presentation I will return to the elements of such possible alternative models.

Then and now: Civic education since the fall of the Wall

What do we know about how to conceptualize civic education in emerging democracies in 2009 that we didn't know in 1989? Unfortunately, the empirical research in this area is fairly sparse but there are a few studies that have shed light on questions about civic education program effects (Finkel & Ernst, 2005). Early studies of the impact of civics instruction (conducted primarily in the U.S.) reported few positive results concerning the knowledge gained from civics instruction and how students' citizenship skills or attitudes improved (e.g., Langton & Jennings, 1968; Somit, Tannenhaus, Wilke, & Cooley, 1958; Ehman, 1980). These studies concluded that civics courses had minimal impact on students' knowledge about democracy and their orientation toward democratic values and participation and, until recently, the conventional wisdom in the field of political socialization viewed civics instruction as a weak intervention for preparing competent and active citizens (Leonard, 1999).

More recently, however, some new studies and the reexamination of the results of some earlier work have led to a more sanguine view of school-based civics programs and their potential for having a positive impact on students' knowledge about democratic citizenship. In general, some recent research has shown that students can make significant gains in civic knowledge as a result of instruction that is more student-centered and active (Niemi & Junn, 1998; Denver & Hands, 1990; Westholm, Lindquist, and Niemi, 1990; and Morduchowicz et al, 1996). These same studies also found, however, that democratic attitudes and values are much less malleable. As a result, Finkel and Ernst (2005) conclude that "there has not been much change in the long-standing view that (civics) instruction can do relatively little to alter democratic attitudes, values, dispositions, and skills related to political participation" (p. 337).

Finkel and Ernst contend, however, that "the impact of civic education... has not been adequately explored in the context of emerging democracies" (p. 338) and cite three sets of factors related to teacher characteristics and the instructional context that may significantly influence students' attitudes, particularly in emerging democracies where students may not often encounter pro-democracy messages elsewhere in their lives. First, they refer to the psychological research literature on attitude change and suggest that students in civics classes will be more likely to internalize positive attitudes and values about democracy when their teachers appear attractive, likeable, and credible (Eagly & Chaiken, 1983; McGuire, 1969). Second, attitude change is more likely to occur when teachers use active forms of teaching such as role-playing, dramatizations, and group decision-making, (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Zimbardo & Leippe, 1991; Soule, 2000). Finally, some studies have shown that gains in civic knowledge and improved attitudes about democracy may occur when teachers foster an open classroom climate that encourages the free exchange of ideas and opinions and where frequent discussion of controversial issues are held (Torney-Purta, et al, 2001; Hahn, 1998, Niemi & Junn, 1998). While Finkel & Ernst (2005) point out that little research on the role of these factors in civic learning has been carried out in emerging democracies, results from their own study of a high school civics program in South Africa supported some of the findings from previous U.S. - and European-based research. Among these were that civic education instruction resulted in higher levels of civic knowledge and that...

When students perceived their teachers to be highly knowledgeable, competent, likeable, and inspiring, they appeared to internalize attitudes and values supportive of democracy, such as an increased sense of the responsibilities of citizens in a democratic system and trust in political and social institutions, to a greater extent than students who received training from “poor” instructors or not at all. (p. 358)

Finkel & Ernst (2005) also found that students developed political tolerance and trust as well as other important civic skills and values when teachers used interactive and participatory teaching methods such as role-playing, simulations, and mock trials and elections. Such methods were shown to promote positive civic values and attitudes more effectively than classroom discussions and opportunities for students to express opinions on controversial political issues.

What then are the general lessons that can be drawn from the preceding? What matters most for civic educators seeking to develop and establish effective programs in emerging democracies? To begin with, the good news is that civic education itself seems to matter. The recent research cited here suggests that, contrary to earlier views, quality civic education instruction can yield positive results on measures of students’ civic knowledge and attitudes. The key here, however, is quality; we cannot assume that any form of civic education will foster the enlightened civic participation required of citizens in a democracy. We must be sure that our efforts to create and implement civic education curricula adhere to the highest standards of quality and reflect what we have learned from the research on civic education practices. Similarly, we can also conclude that method matters since studies have shown that active and interactive teaching methods promote greater content knowledge and lead to enhanced student attitudes toward democratic institutions and practices.

Some lessons learned

Let me now return to the initial questions that I presented at the beginning of the paper since to me they capture some of the key issues that civic educators face as they seek to build school programs in emerging democracies at this time. The essence of these questions seems to focus on whether we can create civic cultures in emerging democracies (or any others for that matter) that reflect the broad norms of democratic living within the particular circumstances, historical and contemporary, that exist and vary widely in societies across the planet. Just as we have seen that civic education itself and the methods we employ to enact it seem to matter, it appears that context and culture also matter (Stevick & Levinson, 2007). We cannot assume that ‘one size fits all’ when we try to implement ideas about civic education from one setting to another. Seeking ways to adapt to the culture and context in my own civic education curriculum work has raised a series of dilemmas that fall into three main categories: *conceptualizing democracy* (different views on the nature of democracy and how it should be cultivated by school-based programs), *civic/citizenship identity* (to whom do we “pledge allegiance” and how does that affect curriculum and instruction in civics?), and *value conflicts* (the influence of the ‘hidden curriculum’ imbedded in civics curriculum models imported from abroad). I will refer to examples from the two programs presented earlier here, *Civitas* and *Street Law*, to illustrate the dilemmas I have identified.

Conceptualizing democracy

As I have suggested earlier here democracy can be defined in many ways and how it is defined can have important implications for how we teach students about what it means to be citizen in a democracy. For example, whether our definition of democracy emphasizes individual liberty or the common good will influence what we teach students about citizenship. This issue is illustrated in the

following example taken from a workshop for teachers that I conducted in Latvia in 2006. The Latvian Ministry of Education had recently adopted 'social studies' as a part of its national curriculum and educators there were seeking to define this new part of the school curriculum. To engage the group of teachers I was working with in a discussion about this topic I shared with them the definition of social studies created by the National Council for the Social Studies in the U.S. that included the phrase, "...to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world (National Council for the Social Studies, 1993)." One of the teachers present commented that this definition would also be appropriate for Latvia if the part about 'the public good' was not included. I interpret this as meaning that the general *zeitgeist* in Latvia following fifty years of Soviet rule was not focused on the collective welfare of society as much as ensuring that individual citizens could exercise their rights. This example suggests that we cannot assume that everyone shares the same ideas about what democracy is or how it should be integrated into the school curriculum.

It may be the case that multiple definitions and approaches to democracy are needed as civic educators work in emerging democracies but who should decide which ones? Should not those with whom we are working in Lithuania, or Latvia, or Malawi have a voice in the kind of democracy that we are seeking to promote and the types of school programs that will best achieve those ends? At the very least, it would seem, there should be some kind of dialogue over these conceptual and definitional issues before the implementation of civic education programs is undertaken. Such a deliberative approach would call for the perspectives of all participants in the curriculum work itself to be heard and for a more workable consensus to arise from these discussions. Here I am advocating for a process similar to one that House and Howe (1999) have articulated for research and evaluation design in which they emphasize the crucial role of inclusion, dialogue, and deliberation. One can easily imagine the process of civic education curriculum development in programs like *Civitas* or *Street Law* following a parallel path to what Howe (2003) recommends for research methodology,

Critical dialogue includes clarifying the views and self-understandings of research participants but also subjecting these views and self-understandings to rational scrutiny. This kind of dialogue is deliberative, where deliberation is a cognitive activity in which participants and researchers collaboratively engage and from which the most rationally defensible conclusions emerge. (p. 139)

Encouraging discourse among participants about how democracy is defined represents an important step in adapting civics curriculum from abroad to the specific contexts found in emerging democracies today.

Civic/citizenship identity in an era of globalization

Recent debates about citizenship and civic education have considered the impact of globalization on the nature of citizenship and the focus of civic education curriculum. The process of globalization has influenced the idea of citizenship in several ways (Mason & Delandshere, 2006). To begin with the rise of supra-national entities such as the European Union have decoupled the traditional link between the citizen and the nation-state such that individuals may hold multiple civic identities simultaneously (e.g. a citizen of Latvia and the European Union). Conflicts between cultural and civic identities may force individuals to choose between a cultural identity (e.g. Albanian) and a political identity defined by the nation-state (e.g. Macedonian). Increased migration worldwide and variations in the legal definition of citizenship and how one attains it in different countries makes understanding the meaning of citizenship and how individuals interact within political systems yet more difficult. Finally,

recent discussions of *cosmopolitanism* have appealed to a form of global citizenship that transcends the boundaries of traditional national sovereignty (Appiah, 2006, Nussbaum, 2006, Rawls, 1999, Singer, 2002). Since education for democratic citizenship occurs to a large extent in schools, the impact of these shifts on how citizenship is conceptualized must be considered as well as their implications for curriculum. Programs for preparing future citizens must be sensitive to the role of local circumstances and multiple civic identities as they seek to foster understandings and attitudes necessary for effective civic participation in the contemporary global context. Indeed, the notion of program itself may have to be reinvented in a much more dynamic way.

For example, the *Civitas* and *Street Law* programs are primarily aimed at promoting curricula to advance civic learning in relation to the nation-state. The *Civitas* network is comprised of partnerships between U.S. states and emerging democracies around the world. Exchanges typically occur between representatives of U.S. states and educators from those countries with whom they are partnered. When students work on public policy issues in *Project Citizen*, they are asked to examine whether solutions they propose to problems are aligned with the national constitution. Most of *Street Law's* legal education programs focus on helping students understand and use their national legal systems and constitutions. Focusing on the nation-state has historical precedent since civic identity and political participation and allegiance have been defined in relation to sovereign nations since the 18th century if not before. Even advocates of cosmopolitanism recognize that the nation-state is the only political mechanism that can ensure the entitlements that citizens of democratic societies expect (Appiah, 2006), so there are practical reasons to focus citizenship education efforts toward allegiance and identify with the nation. How, then, can the focus on national citizenship be reconciled with moves toward cosmopolitan, global citizenship, or other forms of citizenship that have begun to emerge and are currently influencing the work of those involved in civic education worldwide? Perhaps an example will serve to illustrate the tension that exists around the issue of civic identity and how it might be addressed.

A number of *Civitas* partnerships are working in so called 'divided societies' such as Northern Ireland and Bosnia-Herzegovina. In order to engage students in the most pressing problems that confront their communities they must first define what they mean by 'community,' who is in it, who is not, and what are the commonalities that can bind a community together. In Northern Ireland, for example, this means bridging the divide between the Protestant and Catholic communities that have experienced conflict in that country for decades. *Project Citizen* has been adapted to include an exploration of the meaning of community and how young people from different religious backgrounds can work together toward the resolution of common problems within their communities. According to Civic Link, the *Civitas* partner organization in Northern Ireland,

Civic-Link Northern Ireland aims to promote increased understanding and positive relationships between young people from different identities. It is an action-based programme for secondary schools, using the theme of civic participation as a vehicle to develop cross-community partnerships. The project pairs up two schools within the same community area, and with similar socio-economic backgrounds, but from differing traditions. The young people involved identify and research a joint problem within their community, and then try to address it at a public policy level. (<http://www.civic-link.org/>)

Thus, *Civitas* here is explicitly confronting the issue of civic identity by bringing together groups of young people who do not see themselves as part of the same community and fostering dialogue among them to establish connections and a shared identity for the purpose of easing social and political conflict. Students focus on civic action and public policy but also directly engage in forms of conflict resolution.

An outgrowth of this work has been a shift from emphasizing rights guaranteed by national constitutions to those articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In some cases the human rights focus has reinforced the provisions of national constitutions while in other cases the UDHR and national constitutions are in conflict (e.g. the right to education). At a time in history when issues of basic human rights are being raised on a global scale and international bodies such as the World Court are adjudicating cases of rights violations, war crimes, and genocide, programs like *Civitas* and *Street Law* may need to reconsider whether national citizenship constitutes the sole point of reference for the issues that affect citizens. As conceptions of citizenship identity evolve in response to the forces of globalization, civic education programs in emerging democracies will need to continue to examine how they define citizenship and how they structure educational programs for civic learning.

Value conflicts

Just as the political context shapes definitions of democracy so too does the cultural context and the values that are embedded in it. During a recent *Civitas* exchange visit to India and Malawi in December of 2008 some issues arose that seem to suggest possible tensions between the cultural values and norms of the educators and students in those countries and our own. These tensions may point to ethical questions about the extent to which it is appropriate for curriculum workers from the U.S. and other Western countries to incorporate particular teaching methods in the programs that we present to our colleagues from emerging democracies. For example, as we know, competition has long been associated with many aspects of schooling in the U.S. From a competitive, normative grading system to interscholastic competitions in sports and academics, students often compete with each other to achieve success in school-sponsored activities. We know also that in other non-Western cultures, competitiveness is not considered to be a core virtue and may not be a value that schools desire to promote. In both India and Malawi, when we met with teachers, they raised questions about the competition that was incorporated into the *Project Citizen* curriculum. Concerns were raised about the motivational effects of having students compete as teams against other schools as they presented the results of their projects in the form of portfolios and project displays.⁴ One of the participants in the exchange, Kristal Curry, a former high school civics teacher from the U.S., offered the following summary of how the *Project Citizen* teachers viewed the influence of team competition on the overall effectiveness of the program:

They were very interested in thinking about how to make the process less competitive between students and schools, and how to make it more collaborative instead. For example, they liked the idea of a *Project Citizen* Camp where students and teachers from different schools could meet to discuss their experiences and collaborate on various projects, rather than having the entire set-up be so competitive. They also mentioned the possibility of students from different schools interacting on the same project, and expressed interest in collaborating with teachers across the city and across the country. This was one of the areas where the teachers showed the most enthusiasm; I got the impression that they did not feel like *Project Citizen* was most beneficial when it was competitive, and felt that collaboration better suited the purpose of the project.

⁴ Note that *Project Citizen*, as it was originally designed, was not intended to emphasize competition among students but in some cases this has become a key feature of the program.

Teachers in the U.S. and other Western countries also decry the overemphasis on competition in our schools, but in places like India social norms may render competition even more problematic and ill-suited for promoting civic learning. The high level of competitiveness created by the national examination system in India may also lead teachers to seek ways to diminish the role of competition in what is already a highly competitive school environment.

In India and Malawi we encountered another critique from teachers concerning the structure of *Project Citizen*. A common theme we heard echoed in our discussions with teachers and students in both countries was that too often students suffered a letdown when the *Project Citizen* action plans that they developed to resolve public policy issues were not implemented or acted upon. While the intent of *Project Citizen* is the *study* of how public policy is formulated and how citizens can influence it, it is not necessarily designed for advocacy and social action.⁵ Nonetheless, this shortcoming constitutes a real issue and a potential weakness from some participants' perspectives. In some cases local culture and tradition mitigate against having young people actively participate in the political realm, a world traditionally reserved for adults. We heard of public officials refusing to meet with students or ignoring their recommendations for solving community problems. Apparently in some countries where students have been ignored by policy makers, *Project Citizen* sponsors have recommended excluding the step in the process that involves meeting with public officials. While this may respect local traditions regarding young peoples' relationship to political institutions and practices, it eliminates an important aspect of *Project Citizen's* 'hands on' approach to civics. In India and Malawi educators continue to press for students to communicate with officials and to take active roles in the political process. Regardless of whether one favors supporting traditional norms of respect for authority and the hierarchical relationship between children and adults or encouraging activism on the part of young people, it is clear that in some cases the kind of civic engagement that is a structural feature of *Project Citizen* clashes with the social norms of some societies. As before, this constitutes a topic worth discussing among all stakeholders in the educational process, students, teachers, administrators, parents, and public officials. Such dialogue about the desired ends of civic education could represent a powerful means of accounting for cultural and contextual factors in civic education in emerging democracies.

Conclusions

Clearly, much important and successful work has been done to develop and implement civic education in emerging democracies and much has been learned along the way. On the surface it would appear that strong agreement exists about the idea of democracy and its inclusion as part of the school curriculum but as we have seen 'the devil is in the details' here and once we move from the general to the more specific and concrete, there is much less clarity about what form civic education should take and how it should be enacted in schools. Here are a few of the enduring issues that, from my perspective, should be considered as we move forward in this field.

As educators proceed with the work of civic education in emerging democracies they should pay attention to the idea, borrowed from the philosopher and social critic Jacques Barzun (1987), that democracy cannot be exported, but it can be imported. By regarding our colleagues in emerging democracies as 'importers' we shift the responsibility for deciding about what is worth importing and how it would be of use to the citizens of the country receiving it. It also requires the countries providing assistance to adopt a much more critical stance regarding the 'product' they have to share. Is the program suitable for the context under consideration? Are there elements of the program that are inappropriate or irrelevant? Are there aspects of the program that clash with local norms and values?

⁵ Funding from the U.S. Department of Education for *Project Citizen* limits the extent to which it should be used to support social activism.

By adopting an inclusive and deliberative approach, discussion of these matters will form a foundation for the later work of curriculum adaptation and implementation. In this case, discussion among participants and stakeholders about the meaning of democracy, the entity or entities to which citizens should direct their civic energies, and what constitutes effective and appropriate curriculum could establish a common ground from which to create civic education practices.

A related suggestion here concerns the idea of reciprocity in conducting international curriculum work. As a part of the deliberative model proposed here, it would be imperative that participants from the emerging democracies be given ample opportunity to present their own ideas and experiences about developing civic education curriculum. That is, they should not merely respond to ideas presented to them but they should take a more generative stance toward the process of curriculum development and in doing so offer guidance from their experiences to those from the more 'advanced' democracies. One thing that my own experience in international civic education work has revealed is that when exchange participants from Latvia, India, or Malawi share their stories about the struggles they have endured, the obstacles that they have overcome, and their commitment to democratic reforms, their U.S. counterparts learn valuable lessons about the meaning of their own democracy and the kind of society it provides. In the simplest terms, our colleagues from emerging democracies are often more attuned to challenges of building and maintaining a democratic culture than are many of those who take for granted the benefits afforded them by an open, democratic society. Programs like *Civitas* and *Street Law* have provided a forum for many groups and individuals to share their experiences with students, teachers, and other members of the international civic education community, but such opportunities should be further encouraged and extended.

Finally, the criteria by which we judge the quality and efficacy of civic education in emerging democracies should be reexamined in light of the specific contexts where programs are being developed and implemented. As a guide for identifying such criteria, Stevick and Levinson (2007) offer an alternative to focusing on whether particular practices are more "effective" by suggesting that civic educators address a different question, "What does this practice mean to the people who are engaged in it?" (p. 6). In this way the culture and context could be incorporated into models such as the Patrick and Vontz (2001) framework or other frameworks could be developed that are more sensitive to the specific, local circumstances. For example, in connection with curriculum work I am doing in Afghanistan, I recently came across a quotation from a tribal elder who was participating in one of the Loya Jurgas following the fall of the Taliban regime in which he asked, "Why do we need a constitution if we have the Koran?" Rather than simply dismissing this question or others like it, educators need to explore the complexities of traditional belief systems to see how democratic institutions fit within the cultural norms of particular societies. Recent scholarship on citizenship in Africa has raised questions about whether a civil society exists in African countries (Makumbe, 1998) or whether the concept of *Ubuntu* could serve as the basis for a more culturally appropriate civic education in that context (Enslin & Horsthemke, 2004). Answers to these questions could provide important insights into how to reconceptualize models of civic education in emerging democracies. As I have pointed out earlier globalization has had a significant impact on how citizenship is understood and how civic education is designed. While the integral role of the nation-state has not disappeared (nor should it), other civic identities from the local to the global cannot be ignored. The call for *ecological democracy* and a civic education that regards the stewardship of the planet as a key civic virtue (Houser, 2009) reflects this expanded view of what it means to be a responsible citizen in a global context.

The need for civic education in emerging democracies continues to represent a priority for those democracies as well as for the older, more established ones. We have much to learn from each other and our mutual interdependence will require that all democracies, old and new, work together to build upon successful models and programs and to make adjustments those that need improvement. We do this in the hope that future citizens everywhere will learn to participate with "the company of strangers

which is the human race” to create a democratic civic culture that will sustain a more just and equitable way of life for all.

Appendix A. Definitions of Democracy.

Among its various manifestations democracy has been characterized as:

- *direct* (Aristotle, 1943) wherein sovereignty resides in the assembly of all citizens who participate directly in decision-making on public issues,
- *traditional liberal* (Mill, 1958; Mill, 1965; Locke, 1965) where elected representatives exercise decision-making power on behalf of citizens according to the rule of law and a constitution which places constraints on the will of the majority and protect individual rights,
- *deliberative* (Gutmann & Thompson, 1996) where citizens and their representatives engage in discourse about public problems under conditions that are conducive to reasoned reflection and acceptance of multiple viewpoints
- *experiential* (Dewey, 1938) denoting a way of living with others characterized by social relations based upon equity, fairness, tolerance, mutual respect
- *participatory* or *strong* (Barber, 1984) focusing on inclusion, requires activity beyond merely voting, encourages reflection, incorporating conflict and dissent, and the views of those who are “on the margins;” promoting public spiritedness and action from the general citizenry, not just from elected officials and political leaders.
- *multicultural* (Banks, 1997; Kymlicka, 1995; Parker, 2003), explicitly incorporating socio-economic and cultural diversity into political diversity; concerned with those who are not participating in political discourse and activity and the means of access to participation for those on the margins,
- *critical* (Goodman, 1992) or *radical* (Trend, 1996) contrasting with liberal democracy and its focus on political institutions and ritualized practices (voting) advocating a broader and more active role for citizens and the development of a critical consciousness to reassess the institutional arrangements that define social and political relations locally and globally and arguing for new ways of thinking about diversity, liberty, and civic responsibility.

Appendix B.

Table 1. **Civitas International Programs**

Program	Description	Participating Countries
Cooperative Civic Education Exchange Program ⁶	The purpose of this program is to: develop exemplary curricula and teacher training programs in civics and government and make them available to educators from the United States and other eligible countries; assist eligible countries in the adaptation, implementation, and institutionalization of such programs; create and implement civics and government programs for students that draw upon the experiences of participating eligible countries; and provide a means for the exchange of ideas and experiences in civics and government among political, governmental, private sector, and education leaders of participating eligible countries.	U.S. and partner countries in East and Central Europe, Eurasia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia
Promoting Tolerance and Ethnic Reconciliation in the Balkans through Civic Education	A program funded by the State Department’s Bureau of Human Rights and Labor that uses the methodology of <i>Civic-Link</i> —an enhanced version of CCE’s <i>Project Citizen</i> program that fosters a more cohesive, tolerant, democratic culture in divided societies—to promote key democratic values like tolerance and equality, and create an ethnically diverse and sustainable capacity for training teachers in civic education programs in the Balkan region.	Bosnia Herzegovina, Serbia, Kosovo
Civic Education for Participation and Tolerance in Thailand	A program funded by the State Department’s Bureau of Human Rights and Labor that aims to increase civic and political participation, strengthen tolerance and respect for human rights and the rule of law, and improve civic education in Thailand through implementation of the Project Citizen and Foundations of Democracy curricula and development of a National Civic Education Campaign.	Thailand
Promoting Youth Participation in Local Government in Indonesia	A program funded by the State Department’s Bureau of Human Rights and Labor with the goal of building a network of Indonesian educational institutions and religious organizations, NGOs and regional education offices with the capacity to implement Project Citizen (Kami Bangsa Indonesia) and Foundations of Democracy (Dasar Dasar Demokrasi). Both programs have demonstrated their effectiveness in addressing the DRL bureau’s priorities for Indonesia by strengthening local representative government; fostering knowledge, attitudes, and political skills necessary for engaged citizenship; promoting gender equality and increased respect for human rights and the rule of law; and fostering tolerance in a unique, sustainable and cost-effective manner.	Indonesia
Promoting Democracy and	A program funded by the State Department’s Bureau of Human Rights and Labor that fosters tolerance of diversity and support for fundamental democratic values and principles in Malaysia	Malaysia

⁶ The Cooperative Education Exchange Program (CEEP) funded by the U.S. Department of Education includes both the Civitas International Exchange Program administered by the Center for Civic Education, which focuses on civic education, and the Economics International Program, administered by the Council for Economic Education.

Human Rights in Partnership with Islamic Leaders and Organizations in Malaysia	through expanded implementation of Project Citizen in secondary schools and universities, regional cooperation, and building sustainable training relationships between Malaysian universities and the schools they serve.	
Civitas Africa *	A program funded by the U.S. Department of Education with the primary goals of teaching the fundamental values, principles, and processes of democracy at precollegiate levels; fostering the development of competent and responsible participation by young people; and promoting mutual understanding and respect among African and U.S. teachers and students. To further these goals, Civitas Africa has the following objectives: develop and implement effective civic education curricula in African and U.S. school systems; provide professional development institutes for elementary and secondary teachers and preservice teacher-educators in Africa and the United States; increase the knowledge of African and U.S. educators and students about the history and governance of their countries; administer exchange visits of educators and civic leaders in the United States and selected African countries to improve education for democratic citizenship; support independent research and evaluation to determine the effects of civic education programs on the knowledge, skills, and character traits of students in Africa and the United States; conduct international meetings to plan and administer program activities	Senegal, Nigeria, South Africa, Mauritius, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, and the United States
Civitas Latin America*	A 5-year program funded by the U.S. Department of Education that was initiated September 1, 2002 covering the United States, Latin America and Caribbean region. The targeted populations of the Civitas Latin America program include: K-12 students in the public and private school systems, K-12 teachers in the public and private school systems, university professors, government education officials, parents, and civic/political leaders. The program aims to acquaint Latin American educators with exemplary curricular and teacher training programs in civic education developed in the United States. It also looks to assist Latin American educators in creating, adapting, implementing, and institutionalizing effective civic education programs in their own countries. Other objectives include to create and implement civic education programs for students in the United States that will help them better understand the history and experiences of emerging and advanced democracies in Latin America, and to facilitate the exchange of ideas and experience in civic education among educational, governmental, and private sector leaders in the United States and Latin America.	Mexico, Guatemala, Costa Rica, Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, Paraguay, Bolivia, Argentina, Brazil, Dominican Republic, and the United States
Arab Civitas – Strengthening Civic Education in Nine Arab Countries *	A program funded by USAID and the Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI) that established a network of NGOs focused on civic education with the goal of implementing programs in classrooms at elementary and secondary school levels in nine Arab countries. The programs focus on developing among students an understanding of the fundamental values, principles, and institutions of constitutional democracy; fostering a reasoned commitment to these values and principles; developing the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for competent and responsible participation in democratic government. Curricular materials developed by CCE have been translated into Arabic and adapted for use in Jordan, the West Bank, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco,	Jordan, the West Bank, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco, Yemen, Tunisia, Algeria, and Bahrain

Yemen, Tunisia, Algeria, and Bahrain. CCE's Project Citizen and Foundations of Democracy curricula form the backbone of these adapted programs.

*funding for these programs has ended

Appendix C.

Table 2. **Street Law International Programs**

Program	Description	Participating Countries
Deliberating in a Democracy	Deliberating in a Democracy challenges students in U.S. classrooms around the country to tackle current civic issues with partner schools in Central and Eastern European countries. Through classroom deliberation, videoconferences, and online discussion boards, students learn more about critical societal concerns through an international dialogue.	U.S., Azerbaijan, Czech Republic, Estonia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Ukraine
Public legal education programs	Law students teach the public practical law. Street Law programs provide law students with a rare opportunity to analyze state and local laws and procedures.	U.S., Belarus, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Nigeria, Poland, Russia, Slovakia
Street Law Nepal	Street Law, Inc. has partnered with UNICEF to encourage a culture of peace, human rights, and civic literacy in Nepal through training workshops and curricula development.	Nepal
Youth Act! Program	Program includes curriculum, training, and practical assistance to help young people develop the leadership and vision to advocate for meaningful change in their communities. Typically delivered through community-based youth programs or infused into social studies, civics and health classes, this program harnesses diverse learning styles and abilities laying the foundation for young citizens to make a difference throughout their lives.	Egypt, Moldova, Ukraine, United Kingdom
Central Europe and Russia: Building a Network	A grant from the Ford Foundation in 1997 allowed Street Law, Inc. to strengthen and build capacity in existing international law school-based Street Law programs. These successful programs also helped establish continuing partnerships with Constitutional and Legal Policy Institute (COLPI) and the American Bar Association’s Central European and Eurasian Law Initiative (ABA/CEELI).	Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Russia, Slovakia
Connecting Islam and Democracy	<i>Islam and Democracy: Toward Effective Citizenship</i> is an Arabic text connecting the tenets of Islam to the principles of democracy. Using Street Law, Inc.’s Democracy for All text as a framework, Street Law, Inc. staff, the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy, and experts from the participating countries collaborated to develop the text. Through interactive workshops, community leaders used this text to facilitate discussion about civil society and Arab culture.	Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco
Democracy	Street Law was a partner in a consortium of five U.S. democracy education organizations that designed	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Croatia,

Education Exchange Project	and operated the Democracy Education Exchange Project (DEEP). The program's goal was to help students in Central and Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union develop the knowledge, skills, and character traits essential to preserving and improving democracy.	Czech Republic, Estonia, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Moldova, Poland, Russia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan
Open Society Institute/Street Law Network Program	A grant from the Open Society Institute, part of the Soros Foundation network, funded the development of the Open Society Institute/Street Law Network Program. The goal of the program was to develop practical law texts for secondary schools and to train educators in interactive teaching methods in Eastern and Central Europe, Central Asia, and Mongolia.	Armenia, Belarus, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

<http://www.streetlaw.org>

References

- Appiah, K.A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, New York: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Aristotle (1943). *Politics*. (trans. Benjamin Jowett). New York: Modern Library.
- Banks, J. A. (1997). *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Barzun, J. (1987). Is democratic theory for export? *Ethics and International Affairs*, 53-71.
- Butts, R.F. (1989). *The Civic Mission in Educational Reform: Perspectives for the Public and the Profession*. Stanford, CA: The Hoover Institution Press.
- Boulding, E. (1988). *Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World*, New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dahl, R. (1998). *On Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Denver, D., & Hands, H. (1990). Does studying politics make a difference? The political knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of school students. *British Journal of Political Science*, 20, 63-88.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Eagly, A.H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The Psychology of Attitudes*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Ehman, L.H. (1980). The American school in the political socialization process. *Review of Educational Research*, 50, 99-199.
- Enslin, P. & Horsthemke, K. (2004). Can ubuntu provide a model for citizenship education in African democracies? *Comparative Education*, 40, 4, 545-558.
- Finkel, S.E. & Ernst, H.R. (2005). Civic education in post-apartheid South Africa: Alternative paths to the development of political knowledge and democratic values, *Political Psychology*, 26, 3, 333-363.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Goodman, J. 1992. *Elementary Schooling for Critical Democracy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Gutmann, A. & Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hahn, C. L. (1998). *Becoming Political: Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- House, E. & Howe, K. R. (1999). *Values in Education and Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Houser, N.O. (2009). Ecological democracy: An environmental approach to citizenship education. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 37, 2, 192-214.
- Howe, K. R. (2003). *Closing Methodological Divides: Toward Democratic Educational Research*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. New York: Clarendon Press.
- Langton, K. & Jennings, K.M. (1968). Political socialization and the high school civics curriculum. *American Political Science Review*, 62, 852-867.
- Leonard, S.T. (1999). Pure futility and waste: Academic political science and civic education. *Political Science and Politics*, 32, 749-754.
- Locke, J. (1965). *Two Treatises of Government*. Ed. Peter Laslett. New York: New American Library.
- Makumbe, J.E. (1998). Is there a civil society in Africa? *International Affairs*, 74, 2, 305-317.
- Mason, T.C. & Delandshere, G. (April, 2006). Critical approaches to research and evaluation in civic

- education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- McGuire, W. (1969). The nature of attitudes and attitude change. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson, (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (2nd ed. Vol. 3, pp. 136-314). Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Mill, J.S. (1958). *Considerations on Representative Government*. (1861). New York: Liberal Arts Press.
- Mill, J.S. (1965). Principles of Political Economy. 1848, 1871. In *Collected Works*, Ed. J.M. Robson, vol. 3. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Morduchowitz, R., Catterburg, E., Niemi, R., & Bell, F. (1996). Teaching political science knowledge and democratic values in a new democracy: An Argentine experiment. *Comparative Politics*, 28, 465-476.
- National Council for the Social Studies, 1993. "A Vision of Powerful Teaching and Learning in the Social Studies: Building Social Understanding and Civic Efficacy." *Social Education*, 57: 213-223.
- Niemi, R. G. & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Nussbaum, M.C. (2006). *Frontiers of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching Democracy: Unity and Diversity in Public Life*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Patrick, J. and Vontz, T. (2001). Components of education for democratic citizenship in the preparation of social studies teachers. In J. Patrick and R. Leming (Eds.) *Principles and Practices of Democracy in the Education of Social Studies Teachers, Vol. 1, Civic Learning in Teacher Education*; ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Sciences.
- Rawls, J. (1999). *The Law of Peoples*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Somit, A., Tannenhaus, J., Wilke, W.H., & Cooley, R.W. (1958). The effects of the introductory political science course on student attitudes toward personal participation. *American Political Science Review*, 52, 11129-1132.
- Soule, S. (2000). *Beyond communism and war: The effect of civic education on the democratic behavior and attitudes of Bosnian and Herzegovinian youth*. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*, New York: Anchor Books.
- Singer, P. (2002). *One World: The Ethics of Globalization*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Stevick, E. D., & Levinson, B.A.U. (2007). Introduction: Cultural context and diversity in the study of democratic citizenship education. In E.D. Stevick and B.A.U. Levinson (Eds.) *Reimagining Civic Education: How Diverse Societies Form Democratic Citizens* (pp. 1-14). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- 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, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. – IEA Phase II.
- Trend, D. 1996). *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship, and the State*. New York: Routledge.
- Westholm, A., Lindquist, A., & Niemi, R. (1990). Education and the making of the informed citizen: Political literacy and the outside world. In Orit Ichilov (Ed.) *Political Socialization, Citizen Education, and Democracy* (pp. 177-204). New York: Columbia University.
- Zimbardo, P.G., & Lippé, T. (1991). *The Psychology of Attitude Change and Social Influence*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.