

# **ECEC NETWORK**

EUROPEAN CIVIC EDUCATION  
COLLABORATIVE NETWORK

# **TOWARDS A SHARED VISION OF CIVIC EDUCATION IN EUROPE**

**SPAIN, PORTUGAL, UK, CZECH REPUBLIC, MONTENEGRO, SLOVAKIA**



**TOWARDS A SHARED VISION OF CIVIC EDUCATION IN EUROPE**  
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK  
EUROPEAN FOUNDATION FOR SOCIETY AND EDUCATION (EFSE)

**PROGRAMME COORDINATION**

Miguel Ángel Sancho (EFSE)  
Lola Velarde (EFSE)

**RESEARCH TEAM**

**Coordinators:**

Concepción Naval. Universidad de Navarra (UNav), Spain.  
Juan Luis Fuentes. Universidad Complutense de Madrid (UCM), Spain.  
Rafael López-Meseguer. Universidad Internacional de La Rioja (UNIR), Spain.

**Collaborators:**

Andrew Peterson. The Jubilee Center for Character and Virtues, University of Birmingham, UK.  
Rodrigo Queiroz e Melo. Universidade Católica Portuguesa (UCP), Portugal.  
Patricia Dias. Universidade Católica Portuguesa (UCP), Portugal.

**PRACTITIONERS CONTRIBUTING**

Jana Feherpataky-Kuzmava. Institute for Active Citizenship (IPAO), Slovakia.  
Štefan Balog. ROMEA, Czech Republic.  
Elvira Hadzibegovic. Forum MNE, Montenegro.

**TECHNICAL TEAM**

Livia de Cendra (EFSE)  
Marta Hurtado (EFSE)  
Andrea Fleita (EFSE)

2024 EDITION

© Fundación Europea Sociedad y Educación  
José Abascal, 57 - 28003 Madrid  
[www.sociedadyleducacion.org](http://www.sociedadyleducacion.org)

© Authors

The European Foundation for Society and Education allows the exploitation of the results of the research, as well as the total or partial reproduction of this Report, as long as it is properly cited in accordance with academic standards, and does not imply a distortion, modification, alteration or damage to its legitimate interests or to its reputation.

## TOWARDS A SHARED VISION OF CIVIC EDUCATION IN EUROPE

The text presented here, supported by key ideas, is a theoretical argument that seeks to provide a shared vision of civic education in Europe today. It consists of 10 points. It is presented in a schematic format in order to make it dynamic and open-ended.

### **1. Civic education is a living concept, but has profound roots in the history of philosophical, political and pedagogical thinking.**

There is a plurality of ways to name aspects related to the civic dimensions of education. At present, there are many concepts under the umbrella of civic education (these include, human rights education; education for global citizenship, education for democratic citizenship), depending on the institutions that promote it (UNESCO, Council of the European Union, IEA, etc.). Precisely for this reason, the very concept of civic education, as an umbrella, elastic concept, is particularly useful (cf. Kells, 2022 and Anderson, 2023), but is one which needs clear definition.

Civic education is not a new concept. Rather, it is a timeless theoretical construct, with deep roots in the history of philosophical, political, and pedagogical thought. In fact, the debates about what constitutes civic virtue and whether it is or is not teachable have been constant in the intellectual history of the West and they nourish the content of the concept (López-Meseguer, 2022). But there is no doubt that citizenship is one of the pillars that was established in Athens and Rome that still

endures to this day. With more than two thousand years of distance, citizenship continues to be an explanation for the formation of democratic societies and the protection of life, with implications on our understanding of the world, although there is no lack of critical voices that point to its inability to explain and respond to some of the pressing issues of our present. Similarly, the formation of citizenship aligns with the formation of the social order, with the two maintaining each other. It also functions as a horizon of progress as it points to the type of formation necessary to face the challenges of the future from a social and political perspective.

In recent decades (since 1989, more specifically) there has been a growing interest in different parts of the world for an education system that has concern for the type of individual that a student is and can become, not only as a citizen but also as a person. We have witnessed a social or civic turn (or, perhaps more correctly, a re-turn) in education, which was later complemented by an ethical turn (Ibáñez-Martín, 2017), and which is necessary and fundamental for a complete education. This interest has led to the fact that it is increasingly common to find theoretical approaches to the classic concept of "character" and, more abundantly, references on how to implement an "education of character" in line with civic education (Naval, González, & Bernal, 2015).

## 2. Civic education plays a fundamental role in the future of society.

The social role played by civic education is conditioned, logically, by social and historical elements. Thus, the Greek concept *Paideia* -παιδεία- deeply rooted in Platonic thought, is difficult to translate into most modern languages without being simplistic, as it has an extensive and comprehensive meaning, which brought together the civic and the moral sense. Along with this, the concept incorporated other aspects,

### Key ideas:

- Civic education is an “umbrella concept” which covers multiple ways of referring to the education of citizens.
- Civic education is not a new concept; indeed, it is classical, with profound roots in the history of philosophical and pedagogical thinking.
- It has become ever more common to find theoretical approaches to the classic concept of “character” in the education of citizens.

such as the cultural, political, physical, or intellectual, conceiving a broad-spectrum upbringing that glimpsed on its horizon an ideal transmitted to other peoples of Antiquity and which remained over the centuries as a legacy for later generations "as the highest possible expression of humanity", in the words of Jaeger (2001, p. 5).

However, this concept of civic education, in the rise and death of civilizations has found various forms of expression throughout history, similar to the generic idea of education, which exhale different kinds of breaths and have come to meet a wide variety of social needs. Historicizing the idea of civic education and, specifically, the social role it has played in various social and historical contexts exceeds the objectives of this paper, so we limit ourselves to pointing out three functions that we consider essential to civic education in contemporary societies.

Firstly, it is easy to see the existence of a renewed interest in civic education as a mechanism for strengthening democracies (European Union, 2023; García Guitián, 2008). From the institutional level, a whole succession of institutional pronouncements at the national and international levels calling for strengthening the role of civic education in education systems can clearly be seen in the past decades (Bozec, 2023; Schulz et al, 2023). Such pronouncements have the particularity that they often go hand in hand with moments of democratic upheaval such as the 9/11 attacks, protests resulting from the economic crisis, the Paris attacks, or certain indicators that highlight a "crisis of democracy" (Kells, 2022). Civic education, therefore, is perceived today as a sort of solution or remedy to certain social and political problems (López-Meseguer, 2021). This then explains the integrating nature of the concept, which has been evolving to incorporate new sensitivities and demands originated in contemporary social movements (feminism, environmentalism, etc.). Going further, the functional logic underlying the relationship between education and politics would be as follows:

### Key ideas:

- The social function of civic education is conditioned by social and historical elements.
- Civic education has a threefold mission in contemporary societies: to strengthen democracy, to promote the feeling of belonging to a community, and to facilitate access to knowledge and civic character.

civic education, through formal, informal, and non-formal processes, would produce, in the short term, the acquisition of a series of citizenship competences in individuals that, in the medium and long term, will result in the strengthening of the civic culture of the community and therefore an improvement in the quality of democracy.

Secondly, to speak of civic education is to refer to the role it has played in promoting a sense of belonging to a community, country, or nation. Something that could be considered positive or even necessary for the maintenance of social cohesion and peaceful coexistence within a society, has sometimes been perceived as an identity tool, which has a double aspect. On the one hand, the understanding of a series of values, beliefs, ideals, languages, modes of existence, etc. that are perceived as one's own, and with which stable and enduring commitments are generated over time that give meaning to and guide one's own life; those that are shared by a group or community, whose common recognition strengthens interpersonal ties and elevates the idea of individual identification to that of collective identity (Parekh, 2006; Wulf et al., 2010). On the other hand, a monolithic, closed and static vision of this identity is likely to generate two intertwined effects: a) the exclusion of the different, of those who do not conform to the normative parameters established within the identity construct under a deterministic view of the human being (Todorov, 2010), and b) the blind cultivation of a reality closed in on itself, which abuses and manipulates the great principles and lofty ideals to the point of justifying violent methods for the sake of a critically raised ideal (Maalouf, 2009; Sen, 2007).

Thirdly, civic education is called upon to fulfil an epistemic function, given the global concern about three phenomena: the enormous political polarization-radicalization, the spread of hate speech, and the proliferation of post-truth (Cortina, 2022). In a recent article, Ben-Porath (2023) identifies extremism as one of the main civic challenges for schools and warns that it is not only an issue linked to the acquisition of democratic values, but also and fundamentally an epistemic challenge, i.e., one that refers to the way in which we access knowledge and teach our students to do so (Conroy, 2020). In this way, the presence of intellectual capacities or virtues - such as critical thinking, curiosity, the desire for true knowledge, humility, and intellectual honesty, among others (Baehr, 2013)- becomes relevant, not only as individual thinking capacities, but also as means for collective reflection and deliberation.

### 3. Civic education is fundamental for an integral education.

As pointed out in the document on the foundations of a whole child development (WCD) leadership program (EFSE, 2019), the concept of civic education can be understood as inheriting the two notions that make it up, as well as the close link that is established between them. Citizenship is a dimension of the person that is part of an integrated whole. Thus, citizenship refers to a category that transcends the individual and is located in the interpersonal sphere. It is therefore a plural concept that refers to others, not as isolated and independent individuals, but rather as the result of their interactions and relations, and the systemic whole that is more than the sum of its parts and thus acquires a new social entity. Consequently, civic life can be defined as an inherent human need, in that our complex anthropological configuration requires

interaction with others not only to survive but more importantly, to live well and to develop a full life. In this sense, it is necessary to make a series of considerations regarding the role of anthropology and communication and its impact on civic life.

#### Key ideas:

- Courteousness is a personal dimension and part of an integrated whole.
- Life shared with others is an essential component in order to have a fulfilled life.
- Social life is marked by words and ethical criteria, both of which characterise us as a species.

A. Life with others is an essential, not an accessory, component of what we can call a fulfilled life or, as Llano (2002, p. 126) points out, excellence "cannot be achieved by anyone individually, it has a communitarian nature". Social life is something that characterizes us as a species, distinguishes us from other animals, and makes us unique, along with other traits, as human beings.

B. Social life does not develop in an automatic and direct way but is mediated by two elements: the word -as the primary mode of communication and interpersonal interaction- and the ethical criterion - which structures the way in which the interaction takes place, giving social life a normative basis and, at the same time, because it is linked to life's ultimate purpose, pedagogical validity-.

Civic education can therefore be described as the educational orientation towards societal life with other individuals, not only as co-inhabitants of the same space but also with a deep sense of social coexistence where meaningful relationships take place and are necessary for a happy life (Ryan, Curren and Deci, 2013).

**4. There is a close link between civic education and moral education. Neither makes sense without the other.**

When we move from thinking about what is best for me as an individual to what is best for us as a society, we may encounter some difficulties. In the first instance, it may seem logical to accept the idea that, as human beings, we share the same goal, happiness, which is achieved, as mentioned in the previous section, through full development and an integral education. However, the good life is not monolithic; it may be the case that what appears to be convenient for the individual is not necessarily convenient for society as a whole or, in other words, not convenient for the common good. Practical conditioning factors -geography, economy, history, etc.- may establish certain conditions or limitations for the development and cultivation of happiness amongst some of the members of the community.

However, situations such as this may lead us to think that there is no link between ethics and civics, since civics, as it refers to the social aspect, is governed by different criteria. This is complex and dependent on a large number of people, which places it in a constant search to find a difficult balance that never fully satisfies everyone. This social and cultural pluralism is characteristic of liberal democracies where diverse ideas of how to achieve the common good coexist. For this reason, we seem obliged to place the civic in a less ambitious and demanding level than the ethical. We have to be satisfied with reaching agreements between citizens on what is

**Key ideas:**

- The good life is not set in stone; what is in someone's interest may not necessarily be convenient for the whole of society.
- Values education becomes indispensable in a context marked by the coexistence of diverse understanding of the common good.
- In the present context, courtesy, humility and solidarity are manifest values to promote a desire of belonging to the community.



desirable, and achieving circumstantial pacts that naturally vary in their unique socio-historical context and that have no other criterion of value than the weight of the will of the citizens to achieve these deals. Liberal democracy, as a concrete historical experience, supported by constitutional regimes, promotes the equal consideration of different conceptions of the good. Max Weber referred to this *de facto* situation resulting from modernity as a "polytheism" of values.

However, the existence of this *de facto* situation does not imply that cultivating specific values is not necessary; but rather the opposite. In a society where different positions on how to achieve the common good coexist, it is more necessary than ever to foster a moral sense of capability of bringing about a meeting or forum between these positions. The opposite, i.e., accepting a civic life devoid of ethics, would imply a certain instrumentalization of the rest of the individuals because if it is not possible to identify a common good superior to a circumstantial agreement of particular conveniences, those instrumentalized are used as means to our own individual ends and, consequently, the space for manipulation and domination widens considerably.

Recently, Bonotti and Zech (2023) defined cordiality or politeness as one of the most necessary components of current civic education. Politeness is understood as the acquisition of ways of acting and dialogue in the public space, based on respect for social norms and good manners. This communicative strategy is a great facilitator of communication and avoids conflicts, especially with political opponents who hold different positions. Likewise, it establishes an element of influence on the citizens, capable of tempering the social climate, and normalizes the way to act and relate to others, promoting or clouding coexistence.

However, as Bonotti and Zech (2023) themselves recognize, this is not the only, nor the most important component of the virtue of civility. We can find a second component with its own moral value, interrelated to the first, but of a different nature, which consists of perceiving the other in the public sphere as an equal.

The context of radicalization and political polarization pointed out by different authors such as Sandel (2020), who questions the quality of current democracies, (Gozálvez, Buxarrais, and Pérez, 2023), is characterized precisely not only by a loss of the first instrumental level of civility based on courtesy, but also by the technocratic abandonment committed by a certain political class that has stopped talking about moral issues and has thus provoked a disconnection with the working classes.

Arrogance and disdain for the lower social classes, sustained by the meritocratic logic, have promoted elites, polarizing society and suppressing the idea of the common good from the collective horizon. Consequently, for Sandel (2020), an ethic of humility and solidarity is needed to abandon the idea of self-sufficiency and its corrosive effect on civic ties, the sense of belonging to the community, and the desire to share spaces among those who think differently.

**5. Civic education occurs in formal, informal and non-formal learning contexts, and does not exclude other areas where this type of learning may occur.**

In current pedagogical literature, the distinction between formal, non-formal, and informal education has been adopted -not without discussion- (Delors, 1996, Coombs, 1985). The difference between these categories, and especially between the last two -informal and non-formal-, is not always clear and can lead to confusion. It is evident that these concepts sometimes overlap. In the Spanish case, we may cite as an example the traditional distinction, still in force today, between regulated and non-regulated education, which in certain aspects would coincide with formal and non-formal. But what is of interest above all, is the fact that all these concepts arise in a specific context and are used today in a theoretical framework and with certain connotations. In order to use the appropriate terminology in each case, the context of the case in question must be taken into account.

**Key ideas:**

- The formal, informal and non-formal areas allow us to differentiate between spaces where civic education may be fostered.
- Civic education must be articulated by means of integral approaches which contemplate the various ways in which the acquisition of citizen skills may be fostered.

This distinction has been used to characterize the areas in which civic education takes place (López-Meseguer, 2023, 2024):

- a) Formal education: includes institutionalized academic education, from early childhood education to higher education. It encompasses, on the one hand, the set of curricular teachings in the field of citizenship,

formalized in recent years through specific subjects. But it would also include programs of a transversal nature that, at the initiative of the educational institution and with a certain curricular linkage, promote the acquisition of citizenship competences.

- b) Non-formal education: education that is provided in an organized and systematic way to meet particular needs, but outside the regular school system. This could be refresher courses, professional development courses, or social pedagogical activities. For an activity to be considered non-formal civic education, it must meet three requirements: i) it is carried out for the most part by non-regulated educational institutions; ii) its educational design must be structured; and iii) it must have an educational purpose related to citizenship issues.
- c) Informal education: another type of learning that takes place throughout life, and which takes place in settings where there is no rationally organized and programmed teaching: for example, in the family, in the cultural sphere and in the workplace. In relation to civic education, this area presents the most problems in terms of its determination, since it overlaps with the concept of political socialization. It is not surprising, therefore, that it has become somewhat of a *catch-all*.

Despite the widespread adoption of this divisive framework outlining areas where education takes place, it is worth bearing in mind the recommendation offered by the Delors report, denouncing reductionism of many pedagogical conceptions: "While formal education systems tend to give priority to the acquisition of knowledge, to the detriment of other forms of learning, it is important to conceive education as a whole. It is through this lens that educational reforms must seek inspiration and guidance, both in the development of programs and in the definition of new pedagogical policies" (Delors, J., *Learning: The Treasure Within*, 109).

Nowadays, when talking about education, the primary agent is often the school, and secondarily, the family. In pedagogical research, this central role of the school as an educational agent has been criticized since 1968 (cf. Reprint of Coombs, P. H., *La crisis mundial de la educación. Current Perspectives*, 1985), but the effectiveness of this warning has been scarce. And this is precisely why comprehensive approaches to civic education that jointly articulate the different ways of promoting the acquisition of citizenship competences by students are necessary (Naval et al., 2017; López-Meseguer, 2021).

## 6. Community life is one of the main “schools for democracy”.

There is substantive agreement among the main theorists of democracy that the viability of democracy depends to a large extent on the robustness of its associative life (Sandel, 1996; Young, 1989; Walzer, 1996; Habermas, 1996; Rosenblum, 1998). In this sense, along with the contemporary definition of liberal democracy, "we cannot obviate that organizations and interest groups actively participate in political decision-making processes, and the role they play is one of the criteria for evaluating the legitimacy of the system" (García Guitián, 2016, 77). Associations fulfil a double function for democracy (Hooghe, 2008): from the external point of view, they enable citizens to raise collective demands and, at the same time, seek to influence and compel governments to respond to those demands. From the internal point of view, associations are "schools of democracy," as Tocqueville characterized them. In the words of Warren (2001, 17): "Associations promise other ways of getting things done, from supporting public spheres and providing representation to cultivating the virtues of citizens and providing alternative forms of governance." In a similar vein, civic institutions have been calling for a greater presence and recognition of civil society in citizenship education (Council of Europe, 2010, 11):

"Member states should foster the role of non-governmental organizations and youth organizations in education for democratic citizenship and human rights education, especially in non-formal education. They should recognize these organizations and their activities as a valued part of the educational system, provide them where possible with the support they need, and make full use of the expertise they can contribute to all forms of education".

It follows, therefore, that there is a transcendental connection between the associative sphere and civic education, a space that is usually characterized as being between non-formal and informal education. Thus, several studies have highlighted

### Key ideas:

- Community life is one of the main “schools for democracy.”
- Non-formal civic education has been found to be a particularly effective area for the promotion of citizen competences.

non-formal and informal civic education as a particularly effective tool in promoting citizenship competences, in programs concerning a range of issues, such as the environment, social action, participation, and volunteering (Donbavand & Hoskins, 2021; Fitzgerald et al., 2021; Myoung & Liou, 2022). Furthermore, the findings of a recent survey (Slavkova & Kurilic, 2023) of 434 European organizations in 21 countries, describing and quantifying the variety of civic education activities, highlighted the need to boost impact by developing learning ecosystems of non-governmental organizations addressing funding issues, and cultivating greater support from the scientific community, especially concerning the evaluation of activities.

Given that an analysis of the literature shows that global citizenship education is gaining prominence in global public policy and that globalization processes create the need to reconsider how citizens participate in complex and interdependent societies (Alejo, 2020), non-governmental organizations play a fundamental role in citizenship education processes (Tarozzi, 2022; Sen, 2021) and as an alternative to the state in providing civic and global citizenship education (Noh, 2019).

From the above, we can see the importance of considering the associative sphere and the framework of non-formal civic education as spaces that are particularly conducive to the promotion of citizenship. The network we are setting up aims precisely at bringing to the surface citizen initiatives from civil society that result in the acquisition of citizenship competences for individuals.

## **7. Contemporary civic education demands a significant digital component as a space for public participation.**

The interest in further spaces for citizen participation increases as a discourse of democratic crisis or democratic deficit spreads (Merkel, 2014). In the field of social sciences, meanwhile, there has been a growing interest since the end of the last century in studies that attempt to relate the effects of certain participatory processes on the development of civic virtues (Pateman, 1970; Warren, 2001). Although this question has already been addressed -within the field of intellectual history- in the works of Aristotle or Tocqueville, it seems legitimate to ask: is political participation a form of civic education?

Traditionally, in the field of political science, the difference between conventional participation -from an institutional source, such as the exercise of the

right to vote- and non-conventional participation - less institutional forms, such as legitimate protest- is usually alluded to. The extent to which these forms of participation promote the development of citizenship competences could cause them to be considered as specific forms of informal civic education, according to the classification enunciated above. In this regard, the scientific literature is ambivalent: while some studies show a causal effect between such participation and certain learning related to citizenship (Mud, 2006), others believe that participatory theories of democracy are not able to prove the assumption of the civic effect of participation (Delli Carpini et al., 2004). In the educational sphere -school and university-, there are also conventional -election of representatives- and non-conventional participatory processes. Thus, the question arises: are these forms of civic education?

### Key ideas:

- Political participation is a form of civic education.
- Virtual media have become central to citizen participation, and thus to the civic education of citizens of all ages.

Our position in this regard, regardless of the evidentiary capacity at any given time of the civic effects derived from such processes, is unequivocal: participation, whether in the context of citizen participation or in the student context, constitutes a form of civic education since it provides opportunities for civic learning.

A specific modality of civic education called digital or media citizenship has forcefully emerged in recent decades and finds links with the previous modalities. Virtual media have become central elements for public participation, they are a relevant modulator of social movements and constitute a key channel of social and cultural influence and communication of political ideas (Castells, 2015). Therefore, they should be considered from the pedagogical perspective as tools for accessing ways of configuring the public under specific conditions (Fuentes and Belando, 2022), which give rise to a new form of media and information literacy, (UNESCO, 2023) and also to the emergence of new educational objectives, which are created by the availability of new technological media (Burbules and Callister, 2001). Therefore, some authors raise the possibility of considering access to digital channels -with the corresponding protection from the potential risks involved- and their derived consequences related to civic participation, as specific rights of children, which should be protected in international documents and cultivated through the curriculum of

educational institutions (Livingstone & Bulger, 2014; Third, Livingstone & Lansdown, 2019).

However, research in this area, linking the civic with the digital is still scarce, perhaps hampered by the false belief that young people are digital natives equipped with the innate tools needed to navigate virtual environments autonomously (Ben-Porath, 2023). A look at the most recent versions of the European Digital Competences Framework (DigCompEdu) promoted by the European Commission with the aim of providing an operational reference for the delimitation and assessment of educators' digital competences shows that despite the breadth of the approach, which considers 22 competences organized into 6 areas and 6 levels of development, the civic dimension occupies a secondary place. Similarly, academic publications show that there is still no research based on empirical evidence that delves with sufficient attention into the media and technological dimension of contemporary citizenship (Arcila, Loaiza, and Castaño, 2022). This, together with the fact that new contexts require specific adaptations of human capacities or virtues (Gozálvez et al. 2021; Fuentes and Valero-Berzosa, 2023), highlights the need for more studies from the perspective of civic education.

#### **8. There is a large and solid empirical evidence base on the development and effects of civic education.**

David E. Campbell, one of the most renowned scholars on civic education in the United States, published a study in 2019 entitled *What social scientists have learned about civic education: A review of the literature*. This study is perfectly complemented by another published in 2021 by other of the most prestigious social researchers in the field, Bryone Hoskins, who together with Steven Donbavand conducted a review of studies on civic education based on social experimentation. From such works, one can have an adequate understanding of what we know about the effectiveness of civic education in promoting citizenship competences.

In relation to this last point, it is important to note that within the academic community, there was a certain tendency towards scepticism regarding the potential benefits of this type of education (Campbell, 2019). This scepticism is based on research that, for decades, concluded that civic education does not produce significant effects in the short or medium term (Langton and Jennings, 1968). However, in recent years there has been a growing interest in the positive effects of this type of education

when it is implemented systematically (Donbavand and Hoskins, 2021), which has replaced the initial scepticism with an optimism that must be approached with caution.

Regarding what we have characterized as formal civic education, it is worth starting by pointing out that the effect of introducing specific citizenship subjects with respect to the acquisition of competences is under discussion (Hernández and Galáis, 2021). However, there is robust evidence that there is a certain compensatory effect, i.e., that the acquisition of competences is greater in cases where there was a previous deficit -family deprivation, socioeconomic disadvantage, etc.- (Neundorf et al., 2016). Beyond the greater or lesser overall effectiveness of formal civic education, which depends on the type of study and the reliability associated with it, various authors have highlighted the importance of its integration into the curriculum of educational systems (Hoskins et al., 2012; Kahne and Sporte, 2008). Other studies highlight the relevance and influence of textbooks in this context (Komalasari and Saripudin, 2018), while some advocate the introduction of innovative pedagogical approaches to improve the effectiveness of these teachings (Algan, Cahuc, and Shleifer, 2013).

Regarding informal learning, it has been shown that the school environment and classroom climate are closely related to the development of citizenship competences (Campbell, 2006; Hoskins et al., 2011; Quintelier and Hooghe, 2013; Kahne and Sporte, 2008). Likewise, a positive association has been observed between the creation of digital learning environments and certain forms of digital participation (Bowyer and Kahne, 2020). In relation to participation, it has been pointed out that conventional participation in school management, as well as other less traditional forms of participation, are important elements for the development of these competences (Quintelier and Hooghe, 2013; Rodríguez et al., 2016; Granizo et al., 2019). All in all, there is robust evidence that what has been characterized as school

### Key ideas:

- Civic education has shown to be effective in developing citizenship skills in the short term, but there is less evidence on its effects in the medium and long term.
- The effects of civic education depend on the ideal of citizenship that is to be promoted.



ethos is of paramount importance in the development of citizenship competences (Campbell, 2019).

Similarly, with regard to non-formal educational processes, empirical evidence suggests that participation in various associations promotes the development of citizenship competences (Kahne and Sporte, 2008; LeCompte et al., 2020). Associationism, as we have indicated before, constitutes an essential aspect of civic education. In addition, we have also made reference to a large amount of empirical evidence on the acquisition of citizenship competences through educational programs in the non-formal setting.

All in all, there is no doubt that there is robust evidence about the effects of civic education in the short term. However, as Campbell (2019) points out, greater research efforts are still needed to determine the influence of such educational processes in the medium and long term. Something that, according to his words, continues to be an undeciphered black box.

On the other hand, Professors Westheimer and Kahne (2004) posed a question that is also related to the effectiveness of civic education: what kind of citizen do we aspire to promote through education to sustain democracy? After analysing various educational programs in the United States, the authors provide a threefold answer.

Firstly, they describe the personally responsible citizen as the individual who feels the duty to fulfil his or her obligations to others and acts responsibly to complete actions for the development of society, such as donating blood, paying taxes, respecting the laws and traffic regulations, or even specific volunteer actions. Thus, values or virtues such as honesty, responsibility, generosity, self-discipline, and effort provide the framework for this concept of citizenship.

Secondly, the participatory citizen brings a higher degree of commitment to public affairs, with direct actions in the community, applying themselves in collective activities that require a greater knowledge of social functioning, as well as the implementation of specific skills in communication and group organization of social movements, management of entities, project design, etc.

Finally, the justice-oriented citizen is one who has a deeper vision of the political, economic, and social factors that structure contemporary states and, more specifically, of the factors that generate social injustices. Although they share the

active commitment to society with the participatory citizen, they are concerned with understanding the structural imbalances that maintain inequalities, and their link with the public sphere occupies a central place in their daily activities, as they go beyond collaborating with organizations that simply provide services, and are active in social and political movements that demand profound changes in the organization of society.

Beyond these three proposed categories, whose suitability has been a topic of discussion (Veugelers & De Groot, 2019; López-Meseguer & Martínez Rivas, 2023), the fundamental aspect of Westheimer and Khane's famous work is the conclusion that any civic education initiative will produce different effects according to the ideal of citizenship that one wishes to promote. Such a proposition is consistent with the available empirical evidence (Knowles, 2018).

## **9. Learning social habits is at the core of civic education.**

So far, we have discussed the concept of civic education, the social function it has played throughout history and its role in modern societies, as well as the different spheres in which it can take place. It now falls to us to deal with the content of civic education since, to paraphrase Socrates, it is not possible to discuss whether virtue is teachable until we elucidate what virtue is (Plato, 1998; Protagoras, 329d).

We may understand what it means to be a good citizen, but we must want to be one. Our proposal is to bet on social attitudes common to all actions of a good citizen. Attitudes such as optimism, altruism, responsibility -both social and political-, respect, loyalty, and justice. In short, a good citizen is one who not only knows but also cultivates and practices virtue, in the classical sense.

Virtue is the habit that disposes us to act properly. Etymologically it means strength, and it represents the effort of the person to order his temperament. Every virtue improves the character of the individual. Since society exists as a function of the people who make it up, the more virtuous the people, the better the society.

When we speak of social or civic virtues, we refer to those that play a facilitating role in the service to others, within society (Isaacs, 2000). We could say that they ensure the common good. A good citizen knows and feels that he/she is part of society as a whole. They never act alone seeking only their own benefit, but want to participate in the improvement of collective life, and they do so with pleasure. They are concerned

about the proper functioning of everything related to politics and social issues. But for this concern to be real, a good citizen needs to know, love, be tolerant, understanding, and open to the contrast of opinions different from their own. That is to say, to be respectful.

However, "respect" is not synonymous with "allowance", "acceptance" or "consent" to the initiatives of others, but rather knowing what the rest of society needs in order to achieve what is good for everyone; always with a critical sense, and without renouncing one's own principles, and always oriented towards justice, accepting the legitimately constituted authority within the legal framework.

All these characteristics of a good citizen - altruism, responsibility, respect, loyalty, critical thinking, justice- must be developed proactively. In our opinion, this is the way to educate and cultivate positive social habits. Firstly, it is necessary that the student knows what each virtue is and what it implies. Only on the basis of rational knowledge will it be possible to promote the attitudes and dispositions necessary to achieve over time, not guided and sporadic actions, but autonomous and stable ones.

We believe that reflection and learning about citizenship is only possible in a context that favours its authentic exercise. The fact is that "the recommendation of different authors is unanimous on the fundamental need in civic education for a methodological approach based on participatory and collaborative learning, focused more on student activity than on the acquisition of exclusively memorized knowledge, which involves students more in real and meaningful participatory collective processes than in disconnected or punctual practices" (Cabrera, 2007, 382). It is true that virtue requires practice, but this practice cannot be carried out irrationally and requires knowledge. Such knowledge

### Key ideas:

- A good citizen is one who cultivates and practices virtue, in the classical sense.
- To educate in a positive sense is the most propitious way of ensuring the development of positive social habits -optimistic altruism, responsibility - both social and political -, respect, loyalty and justice-.

will initially be insufficient; it won't be enough unless there is practice (Altarejos, 1991).

This is recognized by some proposals that place children and youth at the centre of the learning processes in general, and particularly in civic learning. These approaches propose to listen to their voices, to consider their actions and interests in the determination and development of social actions that concern them, and that put them in direct relation with their community of reference. The initiatives of authors such as Janusz Korczak (1976) in the first half of the 20th century in vulnerable environments -such as the Dom Sierot and Nasz Dom children's centres in Poland-, have arrived in to present day, adapting themselves to today's environment and led to considering children and youth not as future adults or potential citizens, but rather as full active participants in the societies to which they belong (Livingstone, Ólafsson & Pothong, 2023).

**10. The result of civic education, that is, citizen competence, includes the transmission of knowledge, cultivation of attitudes and the practice of skills and proficiencies -particularly participatory and communication ones-.**

Since the 1990s, there has been a significant change in the approach to civic education, characterized by an increase in the importance given to civic competences. This evolution, driven by EU institutions, is reflected in the coordinated promotion of social and civic competence as one of the fundamental pillars of lifelong learning, as stipulated in the 2006 Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council. This competence is understood as a set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enable individuals to actively and democratically participate in society by understanding political and social structures.

Civic competence, therefore, becomes an essential objective of civic education, following the trend previously established in the United States of America (Centre for Civic Education, 1994). From this, it has acquired greater political relevance and official recognition in European educational systems, becoming a central element of community identity.

Recently, the concept of civic competence has been expanded to a more updated notion called citizen competence. This new perspective emphasizes the ability of individuals to act as responsible citizens in all aspects of civic and social life, including an understanding of economic, legal, and political structures, as well as global challenges and sustainability efforts, as stated in the 2018 Council Recommendation.

In the field of academic research, several efforts have been made to operationalize the concept of civic competence. A prominent proposal is that of Hoskins and others (2012), which defines it as a set of knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes necessary for active citizenship. These authors propose four dimensions of the civic competence -civic values, social justice, participatory attitudes, and democratic knowledge and skills-, and two domains -cognitive and affective-attitudinal-. This approach has been widely adopted in international measurements of civic education and civic competence, although it has evolved towards greater differentiation between the domains, especially in the affective-attitudinal domain (Schulz et al., 2023).

Despite these advances, controversies persist regarding the conceptualization of civic education. Some authors question the validity of the indicators used, while others point out the lack of attention to normative aspects and political controversies inherent to citizenship and citizenship education. That is why any attempt to conceptualize and operationalize civic education and its results -citizenship competence- must take into account the following aspects (López-Meseguer and Mínguez Vallejos, 2024):

### Key ideas:

- Citizenship competence is the current method of understanding the result of civic education in educational systems.
- The *Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture* is presented as a consensual efficient framework to manage civic education in Europe.

- There is a need to advocate for a broad definition and operationalization of citizenship competence, rather than a narrow delimitation. This is because inclusions and exclusions of dimensions often respond to ideological or normative criteria, which may influence the perception of what constitutes a "good citizen," the "timely practices" of civic education, and the outcomes of educational processes.
- The concept of civic competence and the operationalization carried out will have to be modulated according to the referenced public (schoolchildren, university students, adult population) and the civic education field considered.
- Any attempt to operationalize the concept must be sensitive to the normative debates inherent in any reflection on education and citizenship.

In light of the above, an interesting proposal is the *Reference Framework of Competences for a Democratic Culture*, an initiative by the Council of Europe that has been developed with the consensus of various stakeholders through a participatory procedure incorporating experts of various types and geographical origins. This framework establishes 20 competences necessary for a democratic culture and can serve as a reference for both pedagogical practice and research. In the methodological section of this paper, this framework is described in greater detail and adapted to the specific objectives of the research.

### Reference Bibliography

- Alejo, A. (2020) Global Citizenship Education: The Case of Equipo Pueblo's Citizen Diplomacy Program in Mexico. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 15(2): 181-193.
- Algan, Y., Cahuc, P., & Shleifer, A. (2013). Teaching Practices and Social Capital. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 5(3), 189-210. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.5.3.189>
- Altarejos, F. (1991) (coord.). *Lo permanente y lo cambiante en la educación. / The permanent and the changing in education*. EUNSA.

- Altarejos, F. and Naval, C. (1998). Virtualidad formativa de los derechos humanos: la educación cívica. / Formative virtuality of human rights: civic education. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 21, 511-528.
- Altarejos, F. and Naval, C. (2011). *Filosofía de la educación / Philosophy of education*. EUNSA.
- Alvira, R. (1995). Sobre la esencia de la familia / On the essence of the family, in Cruz, J., (ed.) *Metafísica de la familia / Metaphysics of the family*. EUNSA.
- Alvira, R. (1998). *El lugar al que se vuelve. Reflexiones sobre la familia. / The place to return to. Reflections on the family*. EUNSA.
- Anderson, L. W. (2023). Civic education, citizenship, and democracy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 31(103). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.31.7991>
- Arbués, E., Repáraz, C. and Naval, C. (2012). Los alumnos y la educación para la ciudadanía. Primeros resultados. / Students and citizenship education. First results. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 70(253), 417-439.
- Arcila, W., Loaiza, Y. and Castaño, G. (2022). Tendencias investigativas en los estudios sobre Alfabetización Mediática Informativa y Digital (AMID) en el campo educativo. / Research trends in Media, Information and Digital Literacy (MIDL) studies in the educational field. *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 33(2), 225-236. <https://doi.org/10.5209/rced.73935>
- Aristotle (ed. 1969). *Política / Politics*. Espasa Calpe.
- Arthur, J., Harrison, T. and Taylor, E. (2015). *Building Character Through Youth Social Action. Research Report*. Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues. University of Birmingham.
- Baerh, J. (2013). Educating for Intellectual Virtues: from theory to practice. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 47(2), 248-262. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12023>
- Bailin, S. and Siegel, H. (2003). Critical thinking. In N. Blake, P. Smeyers, R. Smith, and P. Standish (Eds.), *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education* (pp. 181-193). Blackwell Publishing.
- Barrio, J. M. (2000). *Elements of Pedagogical Anthropology. / Elementos de Antropología Pedagógica*. Rialp.

- Ben-Porath, S. (2023). Learning to avoid extremism. *Educational theory*, 73(3), 376-393.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12587>
- Bernal, A.; González-Torres, M.C.; Naval, C. (2015). La educación del carácter. Perspectivas internacionales. / Character education. International perspectives. *Participación educativa*, 4(6) (2nd period). Monograph: Values, virtues and school success, pp. 34-45.
- Bonotti, M. and Zech, S. (2023). Partisan civility and civic education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 52(1), 54-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2022.2108009>
- Bowyer, B., & Kahne, J. (2020). The digital dimensions of civic education: Assessing the effects of learning opportunities. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 69, 101162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2020.101162>
- Bozec, G. (2023). Making citizenship a practice? Citizenship in schools in contemporary France. En A. P. V. Kühn y G. Graiño, (Eds.). *La educación cívica en España y en perspectiva internacional* (pp. 287–306). Marcial Pons.
- Brezinka, (1990). *La educación en una sociedad en crisis. / Education in a society in crisis*. Narcea.
- Burbules, N. C. and Callister, T. A. (2001). *Educación: Riesgos y promesas de las nuevas tecnologías de la información. / Education: Risks and promise of new information technologies*. Granica.
- Carr, D. (2024). Satan's virtues: On the moral educational prospects of fictional character. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 82 (287), 5-16.  
<https://doi.org/10.22550/2174-0909.3923>
- Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*. Polity Press.
- Conroy, J. C. (2017). El Brexit y la alteridad: una modesta reflexión asistemática. / Brexit and otherness: a modest asystematic reflection. In J. A. Ibáñez-Martín and J. L. Fuentes (Coords.), *Educación y capacidades. Hacia un nuevo enfoque del desarrollo humano / Education and skills. Towards a new approach to human development* (pp. 41-52). Dykinson.



- Conroy, J. (2020). Chaos or coherence? Future directions for moral education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2020.1830578>
- Council of Europe. Competences for Democratic Culture (CDC). <https://www.coe.int/en/web/reference-framework-of-competences-for-democratic-culture/model>
- Coombs, P. H. (1985). *La crisis mundial de la educación. Perspectivas actuales. / The global crisis in education. Current perspectives*. Santillana.
- Cortina, A. (2022). Educar para una ciudadanía democrática en el siglo XXI. / Educating for democratic citizenship in the 21st century. In J. L. Fuentes, C. Fernández Salinero and J. Ahedo (Coords.), *Democracia y tradición en la teoría y práctica educativa del siglo XXI* (pp. 13-21). Narcea.
- Council of Europe (2010) *Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education. Report*, Council of Europe Publishing, EU.
- Curren, R., & Kotzee, B. (2014). Can virtue be measured? *Theory and Research in Education*, 12(3), 266-282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878514545205>
- Davies, I. and Chong, E. (2016). Current challenges for citizenship education in England. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 5 (1), 20-36. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-05-2015-0015>
- Delli Carpini, M., Cook, F., y Jacobs, L. (2004). Public deliberation, discursive participation, and citizen engagement: A review of the empirical literature. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 315-344. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.121003.091630>
- Delors, J. (1996). *La educación encierra un tesoro. / Learning: The Treasure Within*. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, Madrid, Spain. Santillana/UNESCO.
- Dewey, J. (1939). *Dewey Creative Democracy - The Task Before Us*.
- Dewey, J. (1988). *The Later Works (1925-1953)*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Donbavand S, Hoskins B (2021) Citizenship education for political engagement: A systematic review of controlled trials. *Social Sciences* 10(5): 151.

- European Union (2023). Council conclusions on the contribution of education and training to strengthening common European values and democratic citizenship, 15738/23, <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-15738-2023-INIT/en/pdf>
- EFSE (2019). *Leadership for Integral Education (LEI) Programme. Theoretical framework and domains of action*. European Foundation Society and Education.
- Fitzgerald JC, Cohen AK, Maker Castro E, et al. (2021) A systematic review of the last decade of civic education research in the United States. *Peabody Journal of Education* 96(3): 235-246.
- Frankl, V. E. (1979). *La idea psicológica del hombre. / The psychological idea of man*. Rialp.
- Fuentes, J. L., Martín-Ondarza, P. and Redondo Corcobado, P. (2020). El espacio como lugar para la educación cívica: diseño de un patio escolar mediante un proyecto de Aprendizaje - Servicio. / Space as a place for civic education: design of a school playground through a Service-Learning project. *RIED-Revista Iberoamericana de Educación a Distancia*, 23(1), 149-167. <https://doi.org/10.5944/ried.23.1.24496>
- Fuentes, J. L. and Belando, M. R. (2022). Redes sociales y otros canales digitales como medios de participación cívica: un estudio cualitativo de la juventud madrileña. / Social networks and other digital channels as means of civic participation: a qualitative study of Madrid youth. *Foro de Educación*, 20(1), 39-63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14516/fde.926>
- Fuentes, J. L. and Valero-Berzosa, J. (2023). New digital virtues or virtues for the digital context. Do we need a new model of character education? *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 81 (284), 123-141. <https://doi.org/10.22550/REP81-1-2023-07>
- Fuentes, J. L. and Sánchez-Pérez, Y. (2024). The complexity of ethical assessment: An interdisciplinary challenge for character education. *Nursing Ethics*, 31(1), 65-78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09697330231197710>
- García Guitián, E. (2008). Educación y competencias cívicas. / *Education and civic competences*. En R. del Águila, S. Escámez, y J. Tudela (Eds.), *Democracia, tolerancia y educación cívica / Democracy, tolerance and civic education* (pp. 79–96). Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

- García Guitián, E. (2016). Representación y gobernabilidad: una reflexión sobre el papel de los ciudadanos organizados en las democracias / Representation and Governance: a reflection on the role of organised citizens in democracies. En Molins, J., Muñoz Márquez, L., y Medina Iborra, I. (eds). *Los grupos de interés en España y la influencia de los "lobbies" en la política española. / Interest groups in Spain and the influence of lobbies in Spanish politics.* Tecnos.
- García Morente, M. (1972). *Ensayo sobre la vida privada. / Essay on private life.* UCM.
- González (2013). Estrategias de aprendizaje. Definiciones, clasificaciones e instrumentos de medición. / Learning strategies. Definitions, classifications and measurement instruments. *Propósitos y Representaciones / Purposes and Representations.* 1, 2, 193-213.
- González Simancas, J.L. (1991). *Principios de la acción educativa. / Principles of educational action.* En *Lo permanente y lo cambiante en la educación.* Coord. by F. Altarejos, G. Castillo, F. Gómez Antón, J. González-Simancas, M.V. Gordillo, A.M. Navarro, G. Vázquez, 51-68.
- Gozálvez, V., Buxarrais, M. R. and Pérez, C. (2023). Towards a post-democratic era? Moral education against new forms of authoritarianism. *Journal of Moral Education*, 52(4), 474-488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2022.2159346>
- Gozálvez, V., Valero-Moya, A. and González-Martín, M. R. (2021). Critical thinking in social networks. A theoretical proposal for civic education in digital environments. *Estudios Sobre Educación*, 42, 35-54. <https://doi.org/10.15581/004.42.002>
- Granizo, L, Van der Meulen, K., y del Barrio, C. (2019). Voz y acción en el instituto: Cómo el alumnado de secundaria percibe su participación / Voice and action in high school: How secondary school students perceive their participation. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social*, 2019, 8(2), 131-145.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.* MIT Press.
- Harrison, T., Arthur, J., & Burn, E. (2016). (Eds.), *Character Education. Evaluation Handbook for Schools.* Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues. <http://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/1721/character-education/teacher-resources/evaluation-handbook-for-schools>

- Hernández E., & Galais C (2021) The long-lasting effects of citizenship education. *West European Politics* 45(5): 1130-1152.
- Hooghe, M. (2008). Voluntary associations and socialization. En Castiglione, Van Deth y Wolleb (eds). *Oxford Handbook of Social Capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoskins, B., Villalba, C., & Saisana, M. (2012). *The 2011 Civic Competence Composite Indicator (CCCI-2). Measuring young people's civic competence across Europe based on the IEA international citizenship and civic education study*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC68398/lbna25182enn.pdf>
- Ibáñez-Martín, J. A. (2017). *Horizontes para los educadores. Las profesiones educativas y la promoción de la plenitud humana / Horizons for educators. The educational professions and the promotion of human fulfilment*. Dykinson.
- Ibáñez-Martín, J. A. (2021). Teaching philosophy and cultivating intelligence. A second look at Critical Thinking and Indoctrination. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 79 (278), 33-50. <https://doi.org/10.22550/REP79-1-2021-11>
- Isaacs, D. (2000). *La educación de las virtudes humanas / The education of human virtues*. EUNSA.
- Jaeger, W. (2001). *Paideia. Los ideales de la cultura griega (Libro tercero). / Paideia. The ideals of Greek culture (Book three)*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Johnson, L. and Morris, P. (2012). Critical citizenship education in England and France: a comparative analysis. *Comparative Education*, 48(3), 283-301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2011.588885>
- Jover, G., González Martín, M. del R. and Fuentes, J. L. (2015). Exploración de nuevas vías de construcción mediática de la ciudadanía en la escuela: de «Antígona» a la narrativa transmedia. / Exploring new ways of media construction of citizenship at school: from "Antigone" to transmedia narrative. *Teoría de la Educación. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 27(1), 69-84. <https://doi.org/10.14201/teoredu20152716984>
- Kant, I. (2020). *Crítica de la razón práctica. / Critique of practical reason*. Verbum.

- Kells, S. (2022). Comprensión conceptual de la educación cívica en España y Estados Unidos: una revisión sistemática / Conceptual understanding of civic education in Spain and the United States: A systematic review. *Bordón. Journal of Pedagogy*, 74(1), 63-104. <https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2022.90636>
- Korczak, J. (1976). *Cómo hay que amar a un niño. / How to love a child*. Sociedad de Educación Atenas.
- Langton, K. P., & Jennings, M. K. (1968). Political socialization and the high school civics curriculum in the United States. *American political science review*, 62(3), 852-867. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1953435>
- LeCompte, K., Blevins, B., y Riggers-Piehl, T. (2020). Developing civic competence through action civics: A longitudinal look at the data. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 44(1), 127-137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2019.03.002>
- Levinson, M. (1999). *The Demands of Liberal Education*. Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, M., & Fay, J. (2019). *Democratic Discord in Schools: Cases and Commentaries in Educational Ethics*. Harvard Education Press.
- Lipman, M. (1991). *Thinking in education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Livingstone, S., & Bulger, M. (2014). A global research agenda for children's rights in the digital age. *Journal of Children and Media*, 8(4), 317-335.
- Livingstone, S., Ólafsson, K., & Pothong, K. (2023). Digital play on children's terms: A child rights approach to designing digital experiences. *New Media & Society*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231196579>
- López, N., Iriarte, C. and González, M.C. (2004). Aproximación y revisión del concepto "competencia social". / Approximation and revision of the concept of "social competence". *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 227, LXII, 143-156.
- López-Meseguer, R. (2021). *¿Educación cívica para una nueva política? Una aproximación interdisciplinar* [tesis doctoral]. / *Civic education for a new politics? An interdisciplinary approach* [doctoral thesis]. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- López-Meseguer, R. (2022). Debates clásicos, modernos y contemporáneos sobre la educación cívica. / Classical, modern and contemporary debates on civic

education. *Revista Internacional De Pensamiento Político*, 17(1), pp. 549–567.  
<https://doi.org/10.46661/revintpensampolit.6811>

López-Meseguer, R., Martínez Rivas, R. (2023). Tipos ideales de educación cívica: una aproximación desde la teoría política. / Ideal types of civic education: an approach from political theory. *Revista de Estudios Políticos*, (200), pp. 71-97.  
<https://doi.org/10.18042/cepc/rep.200.03>

López-Meseguer, R y Mínguez, R (2024). Educación cívica: análisis del concepto. / Civic education: analysis of the concept. *Teoría de la educación. Revista Interuniversitaria*. [text accepted and awaiting publication].

Llano, A. (2002). *La vida lograda. / The accomplished life*. Ariel.

Maalouf, A. (2009). *Identidades asesinas / Killer identities*. Alianza.

MacLaughlin, T. H. (2000). Citizenship Education in England: The Crick Report and Beyond. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 34(4), 541-570.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.00194>

Merkel, W. (2014). Is there a crisis of democracy?. *Democratic Theory*, 1(2), 11-25.  
<https://doi.org/10.3167/dt.2014.010202>

Millán-Puelles, A. (1983). *La formación de la personalidad humana / The formation of the human personality*. Rialp.

Mutz, D. C. (2006). *Hearing the other side: Deliberative versus participatory democracy*. University Press.

Myoung E, Liou P (2022) Systematic review of empirical studies on international large-scale assessments of civic and citizenship education. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 66(7): 1269-1291.

Naval, C. (2000). Educación y derechos humanos / Education and human rights. *Humana Iura de derechos humanos Supplement. Persona y Derecho*, 10, 43-59.

Naval, C. (2003). Orígenes recientes y temas clave de la educación para la ciudadanía democrática actual. / Recent origins and key issues in education for democratic citizenship today. *Revista de Educación*. Núm. Extraordinario 2003, Ciudadanía y educación, MECD, 169-189.

- Naval, C. (2008). Universidad y conciencia cívica. Algunas experiencias fructíferas: service learning y campus compact. / University and civic awareness. Some fruitful experiences: service learning and campus compact. In M. Martínez (Ed.), *Aprendizaje servicio y responsabilidad social de las universidades* (pp. 57-80). Octaedro.
- Naval, C., Arbués, E. and Sádaba, C. (2015). *Aprendiendo a ser cívicos / Learning to be civic-minded*. Parliament of Navarre-University of Navarre.
- Naval, C.; González-Torres, M.C.; Bernal, A. (2015). Character Education, International Perspectives. *Pedagogia e Vita. Rivista di problema in educazione e formazione*, 73. Annuario 2015, pp. 155-184.
- Neundorf, A., Niemi, R. G., & Smets, K. (2016). The compensation effect of civic education on political engagement: How civics classes make up for missing parental socialization. *Political Behavior*, 38(4), 921-949. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-016-9341-0>
- Noh J (2019) The Legitimacy of Development Nongovernmental Organizations as Global Citizenship Education Providers in Korea. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 14(3): 241-259.
- Nucci, L. (2009). *Education in the Moral Domain*. Cambridge University Press.
- Parekh, B. (2005). *Repensando el multiculturalismo / Rethinking multiculturalism*. Itsmo.
- Peterson, A. (2011). The common good and citizenship education in England: a moral enterprise? *Journal of Moral Education*, 40(1), 19-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2011.541763>
- Pring, R. (1999) Political Education: relevance of the humanities. *Oxford Review of Education*, 25(1-2), 71-87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/030549899104134>
- Puig, J. M., Gijón, M., Martín, X. and Rubio, L. (2011). Aprendizaje-servicio y Educación para la Ciudadanía. / Service-learning and Citizenship Education. *Revista de Educación*, nº extraordinario, 45-67. <https://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/dam/jcr:240fb305-454b-4f53-93e3-9bf0932ef5e5/re201103-pdf.pdf>

- Neundorf, A., Niemi, R. G., & Smets, K. (2016). The compensation effect of civic education on political engagement: How civics classes make up for missing parental socialization. *Political Behavior*, 38(4), 921-949. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-016-9341-0>
- Quigley, C. F., & Herro, D. (2019). An educator's guide to STEAM. Engaging students using real-world problems. Teachers College Press.
- Rawls, J. (1993). Political liberalism. Columbia University Press.
- Recommendation of the Council, of 22 May 2018, on key competences for lifelong learning. *Official Journal of the European Union*. [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H0604\(01\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H0604(01))
- Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 18 December 2006, on key competences for lifelong learning. *Official Journal of the European Union*. 2006/962/EC. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32006H0962&from=EN>
- Redondo-Corcobado, P. (2024). Analysis and improvement guidelines for assessment models of ethical and civic competence in service-learning. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 82 (287), 125-134. <https://doi.org/10.22550/2174-0909.3932>
- Rodríguez, M., Kohen, R., Delval, J. & Messina, C. (2016). From democratic school to civic and political participation. *Cultura y Educación* 28, 99-129.
- Rosenblum, N.L (1998). *Membership and Morals: The Personal Uses of Pluralism in America*. Princeton University Press.
- Ryan, R., Curren, R. and Deci, E. (2013). What humans need: flourishing in Aristotelian philosophy and self-determination theory. In A. S. Waterman (Ed.), *The Best Within Us: Positive Psychology Perspectives on Eudaimonia* (pp. 57-75). American Psychological Association.
- Sandel, M. (1996). *Democracy and Its Discontents: America in Search of a Public Philosophy*. Harvard University Press.
- Sandel, M. (2020). *The tyranny of merit: what has become of the common good?* Debate.



- Sassen, S. (2011). *The City: Its Return as a Lens into Larger Economic and Technological Histories*. Keynote lecture. European Conference on Educational Research. Berlin.
- Sen, A. (2007). *Identidad y violencia. La ilusión del destino / Identity and violence. The illusion of destiny*. Katz.
- Siegel, H. (1988). *Educating Reason. Rationality, Critical Thinking, and Education*. Routledge.
- Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G., Ainley, J., Damiani, V., & Friedman, T. (2023). *IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2022 Assessment Framework*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-20113-4>
- Sen A (2021) Challenging or Consolidating Neoliberalism: Prominent Discursive Traces on a University-Level Citizenship Course. *Higher Education Research and Development* 40(3): 613-626.
- Slavkova L, Kurilic M (2023) *Great expectations. Demands and realities of civic education in Europe*. The CIVICS Innovation Hub. [https://thecivics.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Mapping-CE-in-Europe\\_Documentation.pdf](https://thecivics.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Mapping-CE-in-Europe_Documentation.pdf)
- Tarozzi M (2022) Implementing Global Citizenship Education Policy: The Bargaining Process of NGOs in Some European Countries. *Journal of Global Education and Research* 6(1): 82-97.
- Third, A., Livingstone, S., & Lansdown, G. (2019). Recognizing children's rights in relation to digital technologies: Challenges of voice and evidence, principle and practice. In *Research handbook on human rights and digital technology* (pp. 376-410). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Todorov, T. (2010). *Us and the others. Reflection on human diversity*. SigloXX1.
- UNESCO (2023). *Media and information literate citizens: think critically, click wisely!* <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000377068>
- Vattimo, G. (2010). Introduction. In R. Rorty, *An Ethics for Today: Finding Common Ground Between Philosophy and Religion* (pp. 1-5). Columbia University Press.
- Veugelers, W., & de Groot, I. (2019). Theory and practice of citizenship education. *Education for democratic intercultural citizenship*, 15, 14-41.

- Walker, D. I., Thoma, S. J., & Arthur, J. (2021). Assessing Ethical Reasoning among Junior British Army Officers Using the Army Intermediate Concept Measure (AICM). *Journal of Military Ethics*, 20(1), 2-20.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2021.1895965>
- Walzer, M (1998). On Involuntary Association. En Gutmann, A. (ed), *Freedom of Association* (64–74). Princeton University Press, 1998
- Warren, M. (2001). *Democracy and association*. Princeton University Press.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269.  
<https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002237>
- Wulf, C. (2010). *Ritual and Identity. The staging and performing of rituals in the lives of young people*. The Tufnell Press.
- Young, I. M (1989). Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship. *Ethics* 99, 250–74.
- Zabala, and Arnau (2007). *11 Key ideas. How to learn and teach competences*. Grao.