

*IBE Working Papers on Curriculum Issues N° 14*

**CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN LATIN AMERICA:  
PRIORITIES OF SCHOOL CURRICULA**



© Agencia UNO (Santiago de Chile) 2012

Geneva, Switzerland, June 2014

The series *IBE Working Papers on Curriculum Issues* is intended to share interim results of ongoing research and to increase access to a range of unpublished documents, reports and exploratory studies produced at UNESCO-IBE, by IBE partners or members of the IBE network on curriculum development. These Working Papers are disseminated to a wide audience of both academic and non-academic people and institutions for purposes of information and discussion. They have been approved for circulation by UNESCO-IBE but typically have not been formally edited or peer reviewed. Therefore, feedback on these documents is warmly encouraged.

*Previous issues:* ([Available online](#) on the IBE website)

4. *La compétence comme organisateur des programmes de formation revisitée, ou la nécessité de passer de ce concept à celui de « l'agir compétent ».* (By Ph. Jonnaert, J. Barrette, D. Masciotra and M. Yaya). September 2006.

5. *Desarrollos curriculares para la educación básica en el Cono Sur: Prioridades de política y desafíos de la práctica.* (By M. Palamidessi). October 2006.

6. *The Diversification of Secondary Education: School Curricula in Comparative Perspective.* (By A. Benavot). November 2006.

7. *L'approche par compétences en Afrique francophone : quelques tendances.* (By X. Roegiers). May 2008.

8. *Conocimiento complejo y competencias educativas.* (By I. Aguerrondo). May 2009.

9. *Currículo e inclusión en la región andina de América Latina.* (By L. Guerrero Ortiz y V. Villarán). October 2009.

10. *Porqué importa hoy el debate curricular.* (By J.C. Tedesco, R. Operti and M. Amadio). June 2013.

11. *The role of curriculum in fostering national cohesion and integration: Opportunities and challenges.* (By D. Njeng'ere). March 2014.

12. *Competency-based curriculum and curriculum autonomy in the Republic of Korea.* (By K. Lee). April 2014.

13. *Scotland: Education, curriculum and learning. The strengths, challenges and solutions in lifelong learning.* (By A. Armstrong). May 2014.

---

The opinions and findings expressed in the Working Papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of UNESCO-IBE or their sponsoring institutions. The designations employed and the presentation of the material do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO-IBE concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The documents published in this series and made available in PDF format can be quoted and cited without permission as long as UNESCO-IBE is mentioned as the original source and copyright holder, along with the title and year of publication. They may be freely translated into other languages, provided that an electronic copy of the translated document is sent to UNESCO-IBE (contact: [m.amadio@ibe.unesco.org](mailto:m.amadio@ibe.unesco.org)).

These electronic documents are available free of charge and permission is given to reproduce them for personal use only, as long as they are unaltered and complete. Copies may not be duplicated for commercial purposes. Posting of the PDFs to other websites is not authorized. However, direct hyperlinks to the documents made available on the IBE website (<http://www.ibe.unesco.org/>) can be established without written permission.

#### COVER

Photograph by Victor Pérez. Caption: Children playing with their mobile phones during a football match between Recoleta and Huechuraba (Santiago de Chile).

© Agencia UNO, 2012

IBE/2014/WP/14

**Citizenship education in Latin America:  
Priorities of school curricula**

by

Cristián Cox, Martín Bascope, Juan Carlos Castillo,  
Daniel Miranda and Macarena Bonhomme (\*)

Geneva, Switzerland, June 2014

UNESCO International Bureau of Education

---

(\*) Center for Research on Educational Policy and Practice (CEPPE), Catholic University of Chile, Santiago de Chile. This work was supported by the CIE01 project of the National Commission for Scientific and Technological Research (CONICYT, Chile) and project 1120630 of the National Fund for Scientific and Technological Development (FONDECYT, Chile). [Original: Spanish. English translation published in March 2015.]  
Email: [ccoxn@uc.cl](mailto:ccoxn@uc.cl)

## **Introduction**

Education is one of the key factors for citizenship and democratic development. In whatever manner they are understood, both are consolidated in values and competencies of individuals, and in the practices of cooperation and conflict characterizing their collective actions and the institutions they establish by political means. From any of these perspectives, the formative sequence of six, ten or twelve years offered by compulsory schooling in the various countries of Latin America is of great importance. It is at school that the practical implications of different concepts of freedom and authority combine for the first time, and students can have access to visions of society, a break with the unconditional nature of the home, and to an 'us', extensive or restricted, which is the basis of civic life (Crick 2003; Peña 2007). For the school institution provides the first opportunity for the sustained meeting with an 'others', real or imagined, more extensive than the family or the immediate community, and in so doing provides the most basic of conditions for cooperation between the different, which, since Aristotle, has been the hallmark of the political method of construction of order (Crick 1962).

The long historical relationship between schooling and the construction of national states in Latin America derives from the vision that the school is of key importance for 'educating the sovereign'. The effort for over a century to achieve universal coverages is inseparable from this purpose, the attainment of which is regarded as the cultural bedrock of a democracy that grew step by step, frequently interrupted, distorted and threatened. According to Alain Rouquié (2011), a democracy developed 'at the shade of dictatorships'. Post-2010 Latin America is celebrating its third decade without dictatorships and its horizon of political development is a far cry from the authoritarian danger, while also a long way from attaining the ideals of a full democracy in which civil, political and social rights are equitably enjoyed by all in societies less unequal than the present ones. In two major studies on democracy in the region conducted by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 2004 and by the UNDP jointly with the Organization of American States (OAS) in 2010, the contemporary democratic challenge facing the region is described as the passage from a democracy of voters to one of citizenship, meaning one that "uses political freedoms as a lever to build civil and social citizenship" (UNDP 2004:36), and explaining that "another political citizenship, [...] another social citizenship [...] and another civil citizenship" are achievable and required (UNDP-OAS 2010:44). This horizon, of renewed and counter-cultural importance of politics, defines in our view in ever more demanding terms the historically and sociologically key citizenship function of the school in the region, and provides the broadest meaning to the curriculum investigation and reflection presented in this document.

The theoretician of democracy Giovanni Sartori has eloquently argued that: "democracy is, first and foremost, an ideal. [...] Without an idealist tendency a democracy is not born and, if it is born, it swiftly deteriorates. More than any other political regime, democracy goes against the trend, against the inertial laws that govern human groups. Monocracies, autocracies, dictatorships are easy and just fall on us; democracies are difficult and must be fostered and believed in." (Sartori 1991:118).

Furthermore, for the moral philosopher Adela Cortina “an authentic political citizenship is made and (we are) not born in it” (Cortina 2010:56). If democracy is an ideal and a belief, and the school plays a key role in its cultural construction, our basic question concerns the functionality of the school curricula of the region for the establishment and development of a democratic belief. The curriculum and its relationship with the practices of the school institution, can recall the role of the *constitution* regarding the political system of a country (Tedesco, Operti and Amadio 2013). This work empirically interrogates the contents of various national citizenship education curricula, with the purpose of establishing bases for discussion and discernment regarding the relationship of their prescriptions with requirements of preparation for living together and more concretely with the question of how such prescriptions are responding to the need of preparing for the political dimension of this living together. In other words, the purpose is to compare various curriculum *constitutions*, in both their organization and contents, seeking to ascertain their relevance for the development of a full citizenship in the region.

This work focuses on the curricula of six Latin American countries – Colombia, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Mexico and Paraguay – which at the close of the past decade agreed to be part of the project Regional System of Evaluation and Development of Citizenship Competencies (SREDECC). With the support of the Inter-American Development Bank, SREDECC developed the Latin American module of the International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS-2009) undertaken by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), in addition to encouraging the participation of the countries in that study (Cox 2010; Schulz, Ainley, Friedman and Lietz 2011).

This document comprises four parts. The first section takes stock of the state of democratic belief in the region, drawing upon the most significant opinion studies of the past decade, so as to offer broader meaning bases for curriculum analysis and, more generally, for educational work in the field of citizenship. The second section describes the organizational (or structural) characteristics of the curricula of the six countries and presents a framework of categories for their comparative analysis. The subsequent section describes and analyses the contents of the six curricula examined and how they deal with the values, institutions and citizenship relations in their civic (political) and civil (coexistence) dimensions. On the basis of the most significant findings, the closing section includes some reflections regarding curriculum development with regard to citizenship.

## 1. Democratic belief in Latin America

It is important first to characterize the beliefs regarding democracy in the societies of Latin America. They represent the cultural substratum framing the effort of schools regarding citizenship education. The characteristics of such a substratum can help understanding the challenges faced not only by the curriculum but also by education in the region, and the dialectical relationship with the culture that the task of educating seeks to affect.

The predominance in the last three decades of democratically elected governments, as observed, is a step forward in a key dimension of political citizenship: the rule and practices making it possible to compete for power peacefully through transparent and periodical elections to choose rulers (UNDP 2004; UNDP-OAS 2010). For Rouquié “the valorization of the electoral act as a vector of change is one of the most impressive indicators of the advances of democracy in Latin America” (Rouquié 2011:347). At the same time, for a broad sector of the citizenry the meanings and loyalties aroused by democracy are still ambivalent and uncertain. According to the 2002 opinion poll on democracy in Latin America conducted in 18 countries of South and Central America by UNDP<sup>1</sup>, fewer than half (43%) of those consulted then had orientations and opinions of *democrats*; 26.5% were categorized as *non-democrats*; and 30.5% as ambivalent, namely with *delegative* conceptions of democracy.<sup>2</sup> They are in principle in agreement with democracy but believe it appropriate that governments should take antidemocratic decisions if, in their opinion, the circumstances so require. Hence 55% of those consulted would support an authoritarian government “if it could solve economic problems.” A similar proportion (56%) took the view that “economic development is more important than democracy.” (UNDP 2004:134).

The first survey on social cohesion in seven Latin American countries, conducted in 2007 through a joint effort of the research centres Corporation for Latin American Studies (CIEPLAN) of Santiago de Chile and the Fernando Henrique Cardoso Institute (iFHC) of São Paulo, with the backing of UNDP and the European Commission, asked about beliefs and values regarding democracy and about confidence in key political institutions.<sup>3</sup> Its results concur with respect to the proportion of ‘consistent’ democrats of the UNDP study.

The evidence presented in Table 1 below shows that democracy as a form of government ‘better than any other’ is affirmed by 61% of the sample as a whole, with the countries varying between the extremes of Argentina (75%) and Colombia

---

<sup>1</sup> The study is based on a public opinion poll involving 18,643 citizens, both men and women, of the following countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela. (UNDP 2004).

<sup>2</sup> The concept of ‘delegative democracy’ was coined by Guillermo O’Donnell in reference to countries where free and transparent elections are held but in which the rulers (especially presidents) feel authorized to act without institutional restrictions. (O’Donnell 1994).

<sup>3</sup> The survey covered a sample of 10,000 inhabitants, both men and women aged 18 or over belonging to all socio-economic levels of the main cities of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico and Peru, with probability sampling at the level of blocks or areas of residence of cities and by quotas in regard to individuals. (Valenzuela et al. 2008).

(51%). In most of the countries education increases the belief in democracy. Those polled with a higher educational level in all the countries believe democracy to be the best form of government, although the differences between countries are significant: Brazil and Guatemala are the countries where polarization as per level of education is lesser, and Chile and Colombia are those showing greater differences.

**Table 1. Democratic belief according to educational level in seven countries of Latin America, 2007**

<i>Democracy is better than any other form of government</i>	Primary	Secondary I	Secondary II	Higher	Total	Dif % (between Primary and Higher)
Argentina	64	71	77	89	75	25
Brazil	65	55	65	76	64	10
Chile	36	43	50	75	55	39
Colombia	38	46	47	70	51	33
Guatemala	53	47	56	60	54	7
Mexico	53	55	67	77	60	24
Peru	55	41	60	74	63	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>22</b>

Source: ECOSOCIAL-2007 survey (Schwartzman 2008).

Studies throughout the 2004-2012 period to measure democratic values and behaviours in the Americas, conducted by a consortium at present including nearly 30 academic institutions of North America and Latin America, note a similar and fundamentally stable situation regarding democratic belief (Seligson, Smith and Zeichmeister 2013). The LAPOP<sup>4</sup> study examines in detail the levels of support for the democratic political system and is based on replies from adults of voting age to questions on fair trial guarantees in courts of justice, respect for political institutions, protection of the basic rights of citizens, and the duty of support for the political system in general, among others; it likewise measures the levels of ‘political tolerance’ in the region, on the basis of questions on the acceptance or otherwise of granting different political rights to those opposed to the ‘system of government’<sup>5</sup>.

LAPOP combined the data on ‘support for the system’ (democratic politics) with those mentioned on ‘political tolerance’ in order to generate a typology of four ‘democratic attitudes’ and their distribution in the population. Throughout the 2004-2012 period it was found that only between a quarter and a third of the population, depending on the years of the measurements, expressed consistently democratic attitudes (high support for the system and high tolerance), while another quarter

<sup>4</sup> The Latin American Opinion Project–LAPOP was established as a research consortium in the field of political sciences 20 years ago and is today located in Vanderbilt University. The year 2004 saw the first systematized round of surveys of the Barometer of the Americas to measure democratic values and behaviours in the continent, using national probability samples of adults of voting age and in which 11 countries took part. In 2012 the Barometer of the Americas of the LAPOP Project interviewed over 41,000 persons in 26 countries, corresponding to North, Central and South America.

<sup>5</sup> The questions on political tolerance of the Barometer of the Americas concern the granting or not of rights to persons “who always speak ill of the country’s form of government”: right to vote, to demonstrate peacefully, to apply for posts, among others (Seligson, Smith and Zeichmeister 2013:201 and 204).

voiced support of the democratic system together with low tolerance (a condition that the study labels 'authoritarian stability'). A little more than the remaining 40%, without variation over the 2000s (45.3% in 2004 and 45.2% in 2012), expressed low support for the system combined with high or low tolerance, which in the interpretative categories of the LAPOP study would correspond to 'unstable democracy' and 'democracy at risk', respectively. (Seligson, Smith and Zeichmeister 2013; Chart VI.13, Table VI.3).

The same LAPOP study asked about democracy in a manner similar to that of the ECOSOCIAL survey, as a form of government in abstract terms,<sup>6</sup> finding in 2012 that, on a scale of 1 (total disagreement) to 100 (total agreement), the average for the Americas (Canada and the United States included) was 71.7. A level of support for democracy is then noted exceeding that found when asking about the orientations and values of 'support for the system' and 'political tolerance', which in equivalent scales of 1 to 100 show values fluctuating around 50 points (Seligson, Smith and Zeichmeister 2013; Charts VI.6, VI.8 and VI.9). LAPOP interprets this disparity as weakness of the cultural anchorage of democracy in the region (*ibid.*, p. 215). However, the disparity may signify that democracy is highly valued as a form of government and this may be a 'strong' aspect of culture, while at the same time the institutions that gives it life in each country are found less valuable.<sup>7</sup> The gap between democratic political ideals and the actual functioning of power and politics in Latin America is two-faced: there are authoritarian cultural traits in large groups, while the democratic ideal has a long life and majority cultural support, from which angle the reality of politics is deemed deficient.

The predominance of democratic belief and the traits of its ambivalence, consistently observed in the political culture of adults of the region, is endorsed in the new generation: grade 8 students of the six countries whose curricula we shall examine, and who were surveyed by the international ICCS-2009 study on traits of authoritarianism in governments, reveal the clear predominance of a pattern of democratic criteria that includes the acceptance of dictatorships under certain circumstances, as presented in Table 2 below.

---

<sup>6</sup> Taking the famous comment by Winston Churchill on democracy as "the worst form of government except for all the others", Barómetro-LAPOP asked: "democracy may have problems, but it is better than any other form of government. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?" (Seligson, Smith and Zeichmeister 2013:213; Question ING 4).

<sup>7</sup> The political scientist Pippa Norris refers to a similar disparity in contexts of the democracies of the developed world when she recognizes the multidimensional nature of support for democracy and establishes a distinction between support for the country as a political community and support for the political regime and the performance of its institutions. She views this as a key distinction for the development of "[...] critical citizens who are dissatisfied with established authorities and traditional hierarchical institutions, who feel that existing channels for participation fall short of democratic ideals, and who want to improve and reaffirm the institutional mechanisms of representative democracy." (Norris 1999:27).



**Table 2. Attitudes of grade 8 students towards authoritarian governments. Average six countries of Latin America (ICCS-2009 Study)**

<i>How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the government and its leaders/power?</i>	<b>Disagreeing and Strongly Disagreeing (%)</b>	<b>Agreeing and Strongly Agreeing (%)</b>
People whose opinions are different from those of the government must be considered its enemies.	83	17
It is better for government leaders to make decisions without consulting anyone	80	20
If the President does not agree with Congress he/she should dissolve it.	78	22
People in government must enforce their authority even if it means violating the rights of some citizens.	72	27
It is fair that the government does not comply with the law when it thinks it is not necessary.	69	31
The government should close communication media that are critical.	62	38
People in government lose part of their authority when they admit their mistakes.	51	49
The most important opinion of a country, should be that of the president.	47	73
Concentration of power in one person guarantees order	42	58

Source: Elaboration of the authors from Schultz, Ainley, Friedman, and Lietz (2011, Annex D, Chart 4.1).

Table 2 shows the average replies of students from Colombia, Chile, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Mexico, and Paraguay with reference to nine traits of authoritarianism in the government. As it can be observed, in only two of the nine statements on government and its leaders does agreement with them exceed disagreement; in one, opinion divides into practically equal parts, while in the remaining six over two thirds of the students are ‘disagreeing’ or ‘strongly disagreeing’, reflecting clear and discerning democratic criteria. However, what they state about dictatorships does not differ from the views of adults. The ICCS-2009 module for Latin America asked students to state their degree of agreement with declarations that dictatorships are justified ‘when they bring order and safety’ and ‘when they bring economic benefits’. On average, for the six countries 71% of students were in agreement with the first justification; and 68% agreed with the reference to economic benefits (Schulz, Ainley, Friedman and Lietz 2011:45).

Returning to Sartori’s quotation on democracy as an ideal, in our view the most significant question on the relations between democratic culture and the formative task of schools in Latin America, and more specifically their curricula, is how the school can help developing democratic belief in the absence of democratically robust institutions and practices in society. In what follows we will partially approach this question by asking what the curricula prioritize and emphasize, and what they ignore or minimize when it comes to the values, institutions and relationships characterizing a strong and consistent democratic culture.

## **2. Six nations and their curriculum organization for school citizenship education: categories for analysis**

School experience explicitly prepares for communal living, with others both close (bonding social capital) and afar (bridging social capital) (Putnam 2000). The prescribed curriculum of a national school system, as an official definition of the objectives and formative content of such an experience, corresponds to society's vision of itself (both real and desired or imagined) that it is sought to transmit to the new generation, and hence about such communal living and its constituent notions and values. The curriculum is clearly an elaboration inseparable from the history of the society and the education system in which it is inserted, and from the relations that such 'local' (i.e. national) history establishes with the global influences (Meyer and Ramírez, 2000; Schriewer 2003; Meyer 2008). The nature of the relationship between the historic and cultural macro-context and the micro-context of curriculum design in each country in the middle of the last decade, is the necessary basis for fully interpreting the differences and similarities observed in the curricula. In this document, however, we cannot go further than underlining the importance of a type of analysis that we will be unable to conduct. We will only enunciate the major socio-demographic and political differences between the countries whose curriculum prescriptions will be compared and analysed.

### *2.1. Socio-political contexts and curricula*

There is certainly a great deal of diversity between the societies of the Latin American region in terms of demography, economy, society, culture and politics (Hartlyn and Valenzuela 1997; Bethell 1994; Rouquié 2011). The same is applicable to the group of six countries whose curricula will be compared.

Table 3 below presents demographic, economic, social and basic educational features of the six countries, identifying significant differences between the societies under examination. They have very different sizes, gross domestic products (GDP) per capita, and human development indexes. In terms of internal violence, our sample of countries includes two of the most violent societies in the region (Colombia and Guatemala) as well as Chile, one of the least violent in terms of the number of homicides per 100,000 inhabitants. Likewise, their levels of educational development, considered here on the basis of net enrolment rates in secondary education, also reveal important differences.

**Table 3. Demographic indicators of social development of the six countries**

Country	Pop. (in millions) (2012) <sup>1</sup>	Human Dev't Index (value, position, category) (2012) <sup>2</sup>	GDP per capita (Atlas Method 2012) <sup>3</sup>	Homicides per 100.000 inhabitants per year <sup>4</sup>	Adult literacy rate (2011)	Net enrolment in secondary education % (2011)
<b>Colombia</b>	47.70	0,719 (91) High	7.020	38.8 (2007)	93.6	75.6
<b>Chile</b>	17.46	0,819 (40) Very high	14.310	8.1 (2008)	98.6	84.7
<b>Guatemala</b>	15.08	0,581(133) Medium	3.120	45.2 (2006)	75.9	46.4
<b>Mexico</b>	120.80	0,775 (61) High	9.640	11.6 (2008)	93.5	67.3
<b>Paraguay</b>	6.68	0,669(111) Medium	3.400	12.2 (2007)	93.9	61.0 (2010)
<b>Dominican Republic</b>	10.28	0,702 (96) Medium	5.470	21.5 (2007)	90.1	61.2

Sources:

<sup>1</sup> World Bank data (<http://datos.bancomundial.org/indicador/NY.GNP.PCAP.CD>; consulted on 21.03.2014).

<sup>2</sup> UNDP 2013.

<sup>3</sup> ECLAC 2013.

<sup>4</sup> Schulz, Ainley, Friedman and Lietz 2011 (Table 2.3).

According to a well-being index of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) which, among others, comprises indicators on the proportion of poor and destitute people, per capita social expenditure, and proportion of people working in the informal sector, the six countries of this study belong to the three categories that the analysis takes into account: category I, that of the greatest well-being, is occupied by Chile alone; category II by Colombia and Mexico; and category III, that of the least well-being, by Guatemala, Paraguay and the Dominican Republic (ECLAC 2010:203). In terms of political history, and with the risk intrinsic to the brevity we require, the six countries also differ notably.

The curriculum of Guatemala has as the most direct generation context that of a society coming out of a 30-year war. The Peace Accords (1995), and specifically that of Identity and Rights of the Indigenous Peoples<sup>8</sup> which assumes the challenge of preparing citizens who recognize, within the national unity, the socially and culturally diverse character of Guatemalan society, are of direct significance for understanding the curriculum generation context (Cox, Lira and Gazmuri 2009). In the Colombian case, the decades of confrontation between the state and the guerrilla and the impact of violence on society and culture, together with a system escaping the military dictatorships of the 1970s and 1980s in many

<sup>8</sup> This Accord was signed in Mexico City on 31 March 1995. The signatories were the Government of Guatemala and the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity (Cox, Lira and Gazmuri 2009).

other countries of the region, constitute the basic and distinctive political reality (Bethell 1994; Rouquié 2011).

With regard to the Dominican Republic and Paraguay, it should be mentioned that their political history in the twentieth century was marked by prolonged personal dictatorships, with their accompanying features of poor formal parodies of democratic institutions, and consistent development of electoral democracy only in the last two decades (Rouquié, 2011). Mexico and Chile display very different histories of democratic development, but with the common feature of comparatively more entrenched and mature party actors and democratic political institutions and cultures. Mexico in the mid-2000s was undergoing the major change of a first experience of real alternation in power after 70 years of single-party rule and political development of 'controlled inclusion' (Oxhorn 2011). In the case of Chile, with a political history of early consolidation of a centralized and strong state, political stability and an institutionalized party system (*ibid.*), the political context of curriculum generation of the 1990s, which was that prevailing until 2009 and is the subject of analysis here, corresponds to the socio-political and cultural context of the transition to democracy after more than a decade and a half of military and civil dictatorship between 1973 and 1990.

## 2.2. Curriculum expansion of citizenship education

Traditionally the curriculum referring to politics, the nation and the law took the shape of a subject, 'civic education', frequently taught at the end of secondary education, the focus of which was knowledge of government and its institutions. Internationally, this vision has been transcended (McLaughlin 1992; Kerr 2012; Davies 2012). The evolution of *civic education* into *citizenship education*<sup>9</sup> implies both a thematic expansion and a new conceptualization of learning in the area, centred on the concept of competence, which supposes shifting the focus from acquiring knowledge to *skills* and *attitudes*. To these are added the *contexts* and *relations* whereby the school institution fulfils the corresponding learning opportunities (Osley and Starkey 2006).

What can be observed in the curricula of the countries is a triple expansion of the traditional civic education: (1) thematic expansion, because the focus of the content of knowledge is extended from political institutions (nation, state, government, law) to social, moral and environmental issues; (2) quantitative expansion, since the presence of citizenship education is substantially redefined: from being located at the end of the schooling sequence (final grades of secondary education) it becomes present throughout it; and (3) formative expansion, with the setting out of learning goals which, together with knowledge, refer to skills and attitudes and to the very organization of the classroom or school which implicitly influences, or explicitly educates, in the social relations, the values and the knowledge that are deemed necessary for a full citizenship, generally treated by the curricula in both its social and its political dimension.<sup>10</sup> The expansion also includes

---

<sup>9</sup> Eloquently reflected in the change of name of the IEA international studies and tests of 1999 and 2009: from 'civic education' to 'civic and citizenship study'.

<sup>10</sup> The triad 'knowledge, skills, attitudes' that denote objectives and contents of curricula is in keeping with the general movement from contents to competencies observable in world school education (Richen and Salganik 2001; Eurydice 2005; Benavot and Braslavsky 2008; Osley and Starkey 2006;

an enrichment of the means and methods for educating in citizenship, where the overriding principle is the combination of opportunities of study and practices of participation, debate, decision and collective action.

In short, according to the distinction of McLaughlin (1992), echoed by Kerr (1999), Akar (2012) and others, between minimalist and maximalist approaches to citizenship education, the former leading to a minimal participation (voting and obeying the laws) and the latter to an active participation (of higher public commitment and orientation, which is expected to lead to change), it is clear that the curricula of the region in the late 1990s and the 2000s come under the maximalist approach. The schema shown in Table 4 below makes visible the dimensions of the sketched expansion and reorientation, observable in the official curricula of the countries of this study as well as in other Latin American countries.<sup>11</sup>

**Table 4. Expansion of the focus, sequence and formative aims of civic and citizenship education in Latin America**

Traditional citizenship education	Citizenship education in existing post-2000 curricula
Focus on political institutions	Double focus: political institutions + subject extension to 'current problems of society' and competencies for conflict-processing
Present in higher grades of secondary education	Present throughout the schooling sequence
Directed to acquisition of knowledge – focus on content	Directed to acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitudes in contexts of practice with predominance of participative and democratic relations

Source: Adapted by the authors from Cox, Jaramillo and Reimers 2005.

### 2.3. Curriculum organization of citizenship education

Currently, Latin American countries structure their national curriculum prescriptions in terms of both curriculum frameworks and study plans and programmes. Curriculum frameworks are understood as “[...] a technical tool that sets the parameters for the development of other curriculum documents such as study plans and syllabi, and [are] the outcome of a social agreement regarding the national priorities for education and the aspirations for the future society.” (Tedesco, Operti and Amadio 2013:9).

From the point of view of their organization, the curricula of the countries offer a picture of both continuities and differences between them. The fundamental common feature is that citizenship education is offered through different areas of the

---

Tedesco, Operti and Amadio 2013). More specifically, it is in keeping with the distinctions which, in this respect, provided the setting for the ICCS 2009 Study and its Latin American Regional Module.

<sup>11</sup> A curriculum analysis of the cases of Brazil, Argentina and Peru observes the same mentioned expansive characteristics (Cox, Lira and Gazmuri 2009).

curriculum and not in just one subject, and in all the countries it covers the entire formative sequence, from the first grade of primary education to the culmination of secondary education. The main difference is between countries that define their national curriculum in the form of curriculum frameworks and those doing so in the form of study programmes. Generally speaking, curriculum frameworks contain brief definitions of objectives and/or contents regarding what children and young people should know or be able to do regarding citizenship, while the study programmes include definitions which together with the former provide guidance or prescriptions on their pedagogical fulfilment (time, activities, work of the teacher, assessment), and are therefore more specific and prescriptive. As can be observed in the first two columns of Table 5 below, from the 'frameworks/programmes' axis of comparison the predominant form among the countries considered is that of study programmes. Four of them organize their curricula in these terms, and only Colombia and Chile define their curriculum on the basis of curriculum frameworks.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> It is noteworthy that in the curriculum regulations of Chile, in addition to the compulsory curriculum framework, the Ministry of Education defines study programmes in each of the areas of the curriculum which are optional for the educational units. Over 85% of the school institutions of Chile use the official programmes (Cox 2011). The curriculum analysis of this work, however, is based on the (compulsory) curriculum framework of this country and not on its (optional) study programmes.

**Table 5. Curriculum organization and subjects of citizenship education (primary and secondary levels) by countries, 2012 (\*)**

Country	Curriculum framework	Study programme	Main subjects			
			Civics	Hist. and/or Social sciences	Other subjects	Cross-curricular
Colombia	✓			✓ Basic standards of competencies in Social sciences		✓ Basic standards of citizenship competencies (general and specific)
Chile	✓	✓		✓ -Study and understanding of society -History and Social sciences	✓ -Philosophy and Psychology -Guidance	✓ -Cross-curricular fundamental objectives
Guatemala		✓	✓ - Citizenship training	✓ -Social sciences -Social sciences and Citizenship training	✓ -Social and Natural Environment -Natural sciences and Technology -Productivity and Development	
Mexico		✓	✓ Civic and ethical training	✓ -Study of local entity -History -Geography	✓ -Social and natural environment -Natural sciences	
Paraguay		✓	✓ Ethical and citizenship training	✓ - Social sciences - History and Geography	✓ Social life and work	
Dominican Republic		✓	✓ Moral and civic education	✓ Social sciences		✓ Cross-curricular axes of democracy and citizenship

Source: Elaboration of the authors from Cox 2010 and UNESCO-OREALC 2013.

(\*) For the six countries, except Chile, the curricula examined in this work were in force in 2012 (UNESCO-OREALC 2013). In the case of Chile, the curriculum being analysed corresponds to the Curriculum Framework approved in 1998 and in force until 2009.

If we look at the *subjects*, the predominance of two disciplinary areas is clear: Civic Education (under different headings) and History and Social Sciences. This combination is that of Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay and the Dominican Republic. The first three add other disciplines in which a double focus – economic and

environmental – can be seen. Chile and Colombia, however, classify their definitions in the subject of History and Social Sciences. On the other hand, neither Colombia nor the Dominican Republic defines contents of citizenship education in ‘other subjects’. Chile does so but, unlike Guatemala, Mexico and Paraguay, in relation not to topics or problems of economics, environment and development but to themes of ‘orientation-guidance’ and coexistence in lower secondary, and the disciplines of Philosophy and Psychology in upper secondary. Finally, Chile, Colombia and the Dominican Republic, as can be seen in the last column of Table 5, further define cross-curricular objectives of citizenship learning which are the responsibility of every teacher and cover all the learning experiences organized by the school.

These organizational differences of the curricula raise major questions on their implementation that are not the focus of this work. The main one has to do with the existence or lack of subject-specialist teachers to offer citizenship education. Comparing the effectiveness of different curriculum arrangements, with their correlates of teachers (specialized or not) and various types of learning opportunities in citizenship education, is a research question of evident value.<sup>13</sup>

#### *2.4. Categories of analysis of citizenship education in school curricula*

How can we analyse comparatively national curriculum definitions of citizenship education? This question has been addressed by a tradition of decades of research of international evaluative studies, started by Judith Torney-Purta in the 1970s in connection with measurements of citizenship learning in the school context by the aforesaid International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (Torney, Oppenheim and Farnen 1975). In 1999 the IEA carried out a comparative study of the curricula and the results of civic and citizenship learning in 24 countries (Torney-Purta, Schwille and Amadeo 1999), gathering the most significant themes of the curricula in terms of analytical categories of political science and democratic theory.<sup>14</sup> A decade later the same IEA conducted the International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS), in which the matrix of curriculum analysis categories was updated (Schulz, Fraillon, Ainley, Losito and Kerr 2008). Together with this, a group of Latin American experts taking part in the ICCS study drew up a special module of questions for application in the region (Schulz, Ainley, Friedman and Lietz 2011). Finally, Cox (2010) conducted an analysis of the curriculum documents of the six

---

<sup>13</sup> A recent comparative analysis of the effectiveness, in terms of promoting interest in politics, of various types of curriculum combinations of the options declared as present in the curricula of the 21 countries of the European Union that took part in the ICCS-2009 Test (‘separate subject’, ‘extracurricular activity’, ‘taught by teachers of related subjects’, ‘incorporated in all subjects’, ‘is not part of the school curriculum’), concludes that “the most successful formula seems to be the inclusion of extracurricular activities” (García-Albacete 2013:107). A recent United States study published by the American Political Science Association concludes, on the other hand, in favour of the subject of Civics or Social Studies in junior high or high school, as significantly increasing the chances that a citizen will vote and become involved in political campaign activities (Owen 2013:328). With regard to the special value found in the ‘extracurricular’ aspect in the European case, it is noteworthy that the evidence gathered from questionnaires of the same ICCS-2009 Test from teachers and directors in the six Latin American countries that took part in the IEA study is that in all of them, despite not being specified in the curricula, such ‘extracurricular’ opportunities of citizenship education were declared as on offer (Schulz, Ainley, Friedman and Lietz 2011; Table 2.4).

<sup>14</sup> Only Chile and Mexico took part in the 1999 CIVED study of Latin America. The six countries considered in this work participated in the 2009 ICCS study. On the evolution of the evaluative categories of the CIVED study, see Torney-Purta, Schwille and Amadeo (1999).



countries of the region taking part in the ICCS study, adding new categories to the instruments generated by that study, resulting in a matrix of 50 categories to compare school curricula for civic and citizenship education. This matrix was used in connection with the aforesaid SREDECC project to compare the citizenship learning opportunities in the curricula of the six countries, the same that we are using in this work. It is thus based on a scheme of categories of hybrid origin: it is both theoretically and inductively generated, on the one hand, and draws on referents of the First World and of Latin America, on the other.<sup>15</sup>

The categories generated by the mentioned sources and processes were organized in six ambits or dimensions which cover in a systematic way what is deemed necessary to include in the school experience for a relevant and quality citizenship education. The six dimensions are the following:

1. *Civic principles-values*: includes twelve categories on the orientations constituting the value or moral basis for 'life together in democracy'.
2. *Citizens and democratic participation*: consists of eleven categories focusing on the roles and relations of the citizens with the political order, namely the rights and duties defining their citizenship condition, the related actions (voting, representation, deliberation), and the various types of participation.
3. *Institutions*: contains twelve categories referring to the fundamental institutions of a democratic political system, together with one referred to civil actors, and another one concerning the concept of 'risks for democracy'.
4. *Identity, plurality and diversity*: consists of eight categories focusing on the cultural and symbolic basis of *us* and *them*, at the level of groups within the national society, and also from an international perspective (Latin American identity and cosmopolitanism).
5. *Coexistence and peace*: consists of three categories concerning the area of coexistence and the values of dialogue and the peaceful settlement of conflicts, and which combines as referent both social coexistence and the functioning of the State.<sup>16</sup>
6. *Macro-context*: retrieves for analysis three fundamental conditions for understanding the functioning of, and challenges to, contemporary citizenship represented by the economy and the world of work, sustainable development and environment, and the phenomenon of globalization.

This set of six thematic dimensions or ambits is specified in the matrix of categories presented in Table 6 below.

---

<sup>15</sup> For a comparative analysis of the categories of the ICCS-2009 study and of the Latin American module of the learning tests, and of their implications in terms of global/local relations, see Cox (2010). For a critical consideration of the cultural bases of the citizenship and representative democracy model from the angle of Latin American sociocultural realities, see Levinson (2005).

<sup>16</sup> The double dimension of category N° 44 in the matrix of Table 6 below advises for the future a distinction within it and the relocation of what is called 'conditions of the legitimate use of force by the State' in the 'Institutions' area.

**Table 6. Matrix of categories of analysis of objectives and contents of citizenship education in the school curricula of Latin America**

<p><b>I. Civic values and principles</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Freedom</li> <li>2. Equity</li> <li>3 Social Cohesion</li> <li>4. The Common Good</li> <li>5. Human Rights</li> <li>6. Social Justice</li> <li>7. Solidarity</li> <li>8. Equality</li> <li>9. Diversity</li> <li>10. Tolerance</li> <li>11. Pluralism</li> <li>12. Democracy</li> </ol> <p><b>II. Citizens and democratic participation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13 Citizens' rights</li> <li>14. Responsibilities and obligations of the citizen</li> <li>15. Voting (right, duty, responsibility)</li> <li>16. Representation –forms of representation</li> <li>17. Deliberation</li> <li>18. Negotiation and reaching of agreements</li> <li>19. Participation and decision-making: the majority and respect of minorities</li> <li>20. Critical reflection competencies for an active citizenry</li> <li>21. Participation in school governance and/or collective projects of social action</li> <li>22. Participation in political activities (debates, demonstrations, protests, parties)</li> <li>23. Accountability</li> </ol> <p><b>III. Institutions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24. The State</li> <li>25. Rule of law</li> <li>26. Branches of the democratic State (Executive, Legislative, Justice – Courts)</li> <li>27. Government – Public Administration; public institutions and services in the community</li> <li>28. National (federal) and regional government (states)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>29. Constitution, law, norm, legality, culture of legality</li> <li>30. Judicial system, penal system, police</li> <li>31. Armed Forces</li> <li>32. Political organizations in democratic society: political parties</li> <li>33. Elections, electoral system, electoral participation</li> <li>34. Professional or civil society organizations, social movements; trade unions; NGOs</li> <li>35. Risks for democracy: authoritarianism; clientelism; populism; nepotism; press monopoly; control of justice; organized crime</li> </ol> <p><b>IV. Identity, plurality and diversity</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>36. National identity</li> <li>37. Group identities (ethnic, regional, occupational, etc.)</li> <li>38. Multiculturalism; stereotypes and prejudices of race and gender</li> <li>39. Discrimination, exclusion</li> <li>40. Patriotism</li> <li>41. Nationalism</li> <li>42. Latin American identity</li> <li>43. Cosmopolitanism</li> </ol> <p><b>V. Coexistence (*) and peace</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>44. Illegitimacy of the use of force; conditions of legitimate use of force by the State</li> <li>45. Coexistence: Value, objective, characteristics</li> <li>46. Peaceful and negotiated settlement of conflicts</li> <li>47. Competencies of coexistence</li> </ol> <p><b>VI. Macro-context</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>48. The economy; work</li> <li>49. Sustainable development; environment</li> <li>50. Globalization</li> </ol>
---	--

Source: Cox 2010, based on: Schulz, Fraillon, Ainley, Losito and Kerr 2008; SREDECC Project Expert Group, Latin American Regional Test of Citizenship Competencies.

(\*) The Spanish term in the curricula is *convivencia*, which could be conveyed as 'living together', with the added connotation of day-to-day living. We have opted for the less interactional concept of *coexistence*, in order to include the state.

The curriculum analysis that follows is based on the quantification of the presence in the primary and secondary education curricula of the topics defined by the categories of the matrix of Table 6. The unit of analysis is the citation, or a complete definition (textual or paraphrased), of objectives or contents of the curriculum, as can be observed in the examples of Table 7 below.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup> The work of coding the contents of the curricula on the basis of the matrix counted on the decisive collaboration of experts taking part in the SREDECC project, namely: José Guillermo Ortiz

**Table 7. Examples of citations (contents) of curricula**

Category	Primary education	Secondary education
<b>Human rights</b>	Actions demonstrating respect for Human Rights, the complementarity and equality of opportunities and possibilities for women and men in their various (intercultural) activities. ( <i>Guatemala</i> , Basic National Curriculum, grade 4 primary)	Aspects of the historical development of human rights in Mexico and the world. Recognition of the value of the person: human dignity. Ambits and periods of the development of human rights. ( <i>Mexico</i> , Civic and Ethical Education, grades 2 and 3 secondary)
<b>Responsibilities and obligations of the citizen</b>	Understanding the individual rights and responsibilities involved in life in society. ( <i>Chile</i> , Fundamental Objective, Social Sciences, 8 <sup>th</sup> grade)	Assuming the defence and fulfilment of the rights and responsibilities of Dominican men and women in all manifestations of life. ( <i>Dominican Republic</i> , Basic Contents Social Sciences, grade 1 secondary)
<b>State</b>	Recognize some of the political systems established in various periods and cultures and the main ideas seeking to legitimate them ( <i>Colombia</i> , Basic Standards of Competencies in General and Specific Social Sciences, grades 6 and 7)	(The student...) analyses the paradigms of the new forms of linkage between State and Market. ( <i>Paraguay</i> , Social Sciences, grade 3 secondary)

Source: Cox 2010.

The citation focuses on a 'unit of meaning' often addressing more than one of the categories of the analytical matrix, which implies that one and the same citation may be counted more than once.<sup>18</sup>

The following analysis focuses on a description of thematic priorities per country and for the group of countries, and not the specific meanings that each curriculum conveys to the topic corresponding to a category. Furthermore, in this

---

(Colombia); Max Moder, Pablo Moscoso and Alejandro Prieto (Chile); Amelia García (Mexico); Mario von Ahn and Mayra de Corzantes (Guatemala); Estela de Armoa (Paraguay); and Josefina Zaiter (Dominican Republic).

<sup>18</sup> Methodologically, a similar approach is to be found in Suárez (2008), who compared the curricula of Argentina and Costa Rica counting keywords corresponding to what the work distinguishes as *modern civics / traditional civics*.

type of analysis it is not possible to discriminate in terms of 'positional value' of the citation, something which would be important to identify in future research.<sup>19</sup>

The national curriculum documents that have been analysed are listed in the Annex. They correspond to the official prescription of objectives and/or contents present in all the subjects and grades (both of primary/basic and secondary education) dealing with themes of citizenship education. Such subjects correspond to those mentioned for each country in Table 5 above. The curricula of Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay and the Dominican Republic were officially in force in 2012 (UNESCO-OREALC 2013); in the case of Chile, we used the curriculum framework officially effective in 2009, year in which the curriculum was further revised.

### **3. Priorities in curriculum content**

Contingency tables are presented below with the proportion of citations per category as against the total number of citations of the curriculum in each country, for subsequent comparison with the aggregated total of citations of the six countries considered. On this basis, it is indicated whether the country's proportion of citations differs significantly from the regional aggregate. The origin of this type of analysis are the tables of profiles used in correspondence analysis, a methodology for the examination of categorial variables that uses these tables as the raw material for the construction of charts summarizing a great deal of information (Benzécri 1979 and 1992; Greenacre 2007; Lebart, Morineau and Tabard 1977; Roux and Rouanet 2004). However, for the purposes of this study it suffices to present these tables to show the relative differences of the countries as against the region as a whole.

#### *3.1. Curriculum priorities by thematic areas*

Table 8 below shows the first of the contingency tables mentioned above, with the differences between the countries taking into consideration all the thematic domains in our analytical matrix and comprising the whole of the contents of the six countries' official curriculum documents with regard to citizenship.

---

<sup>19</sup> Clearly, a citation corresponding for instance to a transversal objective for three grades of secondary education, formulated as a standard, has not the same 'weight' in terms of prescription as a citation concerning a specific content within a thematic unit in one subject and one grade.

**Table 8. Countries' priorities across thematic areas**

	COL	CHI	GUA	MEX	PAR	RDO	Mass*
<b>Values</b> (12 categories)	30.4%	33.9% ▲	17.1% ▼	21.2%	22.0%	25.2%	<b>22.8%</b>
<b>Citizenship</b> (11 categories)	19.9%	14.6%	15.8%	17.9%	11.0%	22.1%	<b>16.3%</b>
<b>Institutions</b> (12 categories)	17.7%	11.9% ▼	15.8%	19.5%	19.2%	19.6%	<b>16.8%</b>
<b>Identity</b> (8 categories)	13.8% ▼	13.4% ▼	20.0%	14.5%	25.7% ▲	16.6%	<b>18.0%</b>
<b>Coexistence</b> (4 categories)	15.5% ▼	6.2%	12.2%	9.1%	3.7%	9.2% ▼	<b>9.8%</b>
<b>Context</b> (3 categories)	2.8% ▼	20.0%	19.0%	17.9%	18.4%	7.4% ▼	<b>16.2%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
<b>Total quotes</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>1.841</b>

COL = Colombia; CHI = Chile; GUA = Guatemala; MEX = Mexico; PAR = Paraguay; RDO = Dominican Republic.

(\*) In correspondence analysis the mass corresponds to the aggregate mean considering all countries together (Greenacre 2007).

▲	Proportion significantly above the mass
▼	Proportion significantly below the mass

The curricula have very different levels of specification in their prescriptions. The citizenship education curriculum of the Dominican Republic is the most concise, with 163 citations; in the same league is Colombia, with 181. At the opposite end (high specification) is that of Guatemala, with 695 citations. The other four countries define their citizenship curriculum in a comparable manner regarding the level of specification, their number of citations varying between 245 in the case of Paraguay and 297 for that of Mexico, as can be seen in the last row of Table 8.

Regarding the emphases of the contents between domains It is to be noted that, for the countries as a whole, in four areas the number of citations fluctuates around one sixth of the total (between 16% and 18%), with the Values dimension accounting for a higher percentage (22.8%), and the Coexistence dimension a markedly lower one (9.8%). The latter could be accounted for by the low number of categories (four) of this domain; nevertheless the Context dimension or ambit, with only three categories (economics, sustainable development, globalization), has a proportion of citations comparable to that of each of the dimensions of Citizenship, Institutions and Identity. The Identity dimension is particularly important for Paraguay and Guatemala, two multi-ethnic societies; likewise is the option of the Colombian curriculum for the Coexistence ambit, concentrating more citations than any other country. At the same time, Colombia's prescriptions are significant for their relative neglect of the ambits of Institutions, Identity and Context. The curriculum of Chile is notable for the importance given to the Values dimension, and that of Guatemala for the opposite.

In what follows priority will be given to an analysis of the first three ambits or dimensions of categories distinguished in our matrix – Values, Citizenship, Institutions – because they refer to the nucleus of the relationship with politics that the curricula thematise, while we shall tangentially address aspects of the curricula concerning the *Coexistence* ambit. On the other hand, we shall not be addressing the contents of the curricula concerning the Identity and Context dimensions.

### 3.2. The values prioritized in the curricula

Table 9 sets out for all the values considered in the analysis (*Human Rights, Diversity, Democracy, Tolerance, Social Justice, Equality, Equity, Freedom, Common Good, Solidarity, Pluralism, Social Cohesion*), the proportion in which each of them features in the curricula of both primary and secondary education of the six countries. The percentage of the case, for each value in each country, is calculated as against the total number of citations referred to values in the curriculum of each country. Each citation, in turn, refers to a learning objective or content of the curriculum in which the value in question is made explicit. The values in Table 9 below are given in descending order of presence, according to the number of citations obtained on average by the curricula of the six countries, as can be seen in the last column.

**Table 9. Percentages of citations for 12 values in primary and secondary education curricula of six Latin American countries**

	COL	CHI	GUA	MEX	PAR	RDO	Mass
Diversity	12.7%	19,0%	16.8%	11.1%	27.8%	17.1%	<b>17.3%</b>
Human Rights	9.1%	10,7%	19.3%	12.7%	22.2%	17.1%	<b>15.4%</b>
Democracy	10.9%	9,5%	6.7%	20.6%	9.3%	17.1%	<b>11.3%</b>
Social Justice	10.9%	10,7%	12.6%	11.1%	3.7%	0.0% ▼	<b>9.4%</b>
Tolerance	12.7%	13,1%	10.9%	3.2% ▼	7.4%	7.3%	<b>9.6%</b>
Equality	1.8% ▼	10,7%	9.2%	15.9%	9.3%	2.4%	<b>8.9%</b>
Equity	1.8% ▼	9,5%	10.9%	4.8%	1.9% ▼	12.2%	<b>7.5%</b>
Freedom	3.6%	6,0%	2.5%	15.9% ▲	5.6%	2.4%	<b>5.8%</b>
Common Good	7.3%	4,8%	5.9%	1.6%	3.7%	9.8%	<b>5.3%</b>
Solidarity	12.7%	3,6%	4.2%	1.6%	0.0% ▼	9.8%	<b>4.8%</b>
Pluralism	16.4% ▲	2,4%	0.8% ▼	0.0% ▼	5.6%	4.9%	<b>4.1%</b>
Social Cohesion	0.0% ▼	0,0% ▼	0.0% ▼	1.6%	3.7%	0.0% ▼	<b>0.7%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Total quotes</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>420</b>

COL = Colombia; CHI = Chile; GUA = Guatemala; MEX = Mexico; PAR = Paraguay; RDO = Dominican Republic.

▲	Proportion significantly above the mass
▼	Proportion significantly below the mass

In terms of greater presence in the curriculum documents, *Diversity, Human Rights* and *Democracy* are the three values that on average are most emphasized by the six countries. Then there are four values, namely *Social Justice, Tolerance, Equality* and *Equity*, which are comparably addressed in the curricula, without being emphasized or neglected, the corresponding percentage of citations varying between 9.5% and 7.4%. In the lower third of Table 9 it can be seen that the curricula place less emphasis on the values of *Freedom, Common Good, Solidarity, Pluralism* and *Social Cohesion*. Three of these values, comparatively not prioritized,

have a direct relationship with the respect for others, close and distant, which raises questions we shall address in the closing section.

Together with the 'regional average', Table 9 gives an idea of the most marked national differences. *Diversity* is the value most cited in the national cases of Chile and Paraguay; *Human Rights* in the cases of Paraguay and Guatemala; and *Democracy* in the cases of Mexico and the Dominican Republic. The curriculum of Colombia gives more importance than any other to the value of *Pluralism*, and at the same time it is the one which places the least emphasis on the values *Equality* and *Equity*. Similarly, Mexico's curricular prescriptions give more importance to the value of *Freedom* than any other of the countries considered and, at the same time, its curriculum is the one which allocates least importance to *Tolerance*. The curriculum of the Dominican Republic is the only one not referring to the value *Social Justice*, and that of Paraguay is likewise alone in not mentioning the value *Solidarity*.<sup>20</sup>

It is clear that with twelve values and six countries the analytical possibilities are more than those that can be managed in this work. We shall select for a brief analysis the primacy of the value *Diversity* and what happens with the value *Tolerance*<sup>21</sup> from the viewpoint of whether the curricula accord priority to its sociocultural or political dimension; we shall then interpret the treatment by the curricula of the values referring to the relationship with 'the others'; finally, the *Human Rights* and *Democracy* values will be addressed.

### 3.2.1. *Diversity and Tolerance*

The *Diversity* value is defined in the curricula both as an abstract principle of respect for differences and rejection of discrimination, and as referring to specific sources of differentiation, of which three types can be distinguished. On the one hand, those of ethnic, linguistic and cultural origin, which lead to contents in the curricular documents on recognition, respect and care of multiculturalism; on the other, there are concepts of diversity coming from physical, demographic, social and economic origins, which prompt listings of the sources of differences to be respected, and discriminations to be avoided (diversity of physique, gender, age, economic situation, or specific conditions of marginality, like 'street children'). There is a third source of diversity to which the learning goals and contents of the curricula of some of the countries refer to as 'viewpoints and opinion'. In the cases of Guatemala, Paraguay, and also Mexico, the value of *Diversity* is articulated with reference to notions of *multiculturalism*, a prominent feature in the social and cultural environment of these societies. At the same time, in all the countries the curricula propose, in terms of principle, respect for diversity. The political dimension of respect and valuing of diversity, namely of the opinions and points of view of 'the other', is highlighted only in the curriculum of Chile, and mentioned in those of Mexico and Guatemala. The

---

<sup>20</sup> These differences between the countries regarding the values they emphasize and those they do not, those they highlight and those they omit, are interesting in themselves and their interpretation would make it necessary, as mentioned, to go far beyond the limits of this work, linking these preferences with the history and political, as well as educational, culture of each of the countries, and with the actors, conditions and processes of elaboration of the school curriculum.

<sup>21</sup> As mentioned in the initial section, *Tolerance* occupies an important place in the evaluation of democratic belief in the region by the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP).

discernible pattern then is the predominance in the curricula of an ethnic and cultural vision of diversity, followed by the socio-economic, demographic and human vision, and, in third place, the dimension of diversity which is more directly related to political aspects such as the respect and acceptance of different ideas, viewpoints and opinions.<sup>22</sup>

As already observed when examining democratic belief in the region on the basis of the adult opinion studies, political tolerance is a consistently deficient disposition in extensive groups of the Latin American population. With this as the backdrop, the value *Tolerance* in the curricula takes on a special significance. It comes in the intermediate zone of Table 9 in terms of emphasis. More notable is the fact that the curriculum objectives and contents of the case, in accordance with what has just been highlighted regarding *Diversity*, are formulated in sociocultural and 'daily living together' or coexistence terms, and only exceptionally in terms of politics.<sup>23</sup>

### 3.2.2. Society and Community

How do the curricula of the region define their fundamental value orientations regarding the individual, the community and society? Let us examine this issue in terms of the curricular emphasis in their definition of 'the others', and whether the referent in their definitions of certain values is society as a whole, or rather communities or parts of such society, in which relationships are assumed more in personal terms (face-to-face encounters; within-group or community relationships), than in terms of major social categories (ethnic, or socio-economic groups).

The values *Equality*, *Justice* and *Equity* are linked with *macro* notions relating with the distribution of power and opportunities in society. Their generic framework is equality; their referents are more the structures and institutions rather than the individuals, and the implied processes (from a politics and policies viewpoint) are those of distribution and integration. On examining the relations between society and education, Dubet, Durut-Bellat and Véréout (2010) conceive this in terms of integration, alluding to labour markets and their public regulation.<sup>24</sup> The values *Inclusion*, *Solidarity*, *Common Good* and *Social Cohesion*, on the other hand, signify relationships with culture and attitudes to others in terms of persons and of society, their referents are both *micro* and *macro*, and the basic processes they indicate are of cultural and relational construction rather than distributions based on the social division of labour and State pro-welfare processes. This area can be conceived, following Dubet and his colleagues, in terms of cohesion, regarding what they define as "[...] the values, the culture, and the set of attitudes prompting individuals to collaborate in a manner based on solidarity." (Dubet *et al.* 2010:50).

---

<sup>22</sup> With regard to *Diversity*, it is noteworthy that the curricula of the six countries are consistent in rejecting discrimination and exclusion based on the various criteria alluded to, but not yet formulated according to the present concepts and vision of 'inclusive education', which is coherent with the fact that the curricula were all formulated in the middle or last third of the past decade.

<sup>23</sup> An examination of the citations related to *Tolerance* concludes that only the curricula of Colombia and Guatemala make any reference to political tolerance.

<sup>24</sup> "[...] a society is all the more integrated when inequalities are weak, when all individuals have a place in active life, and where social protection is strong." (Dubet, Durut-Bellat and Véréout 2010:36).



Regarding the referred distinction, the curricula as a whole, on average, come up with a similar number of citations for both conceptual poles: the citations of the curricula for the values *Equality*, *Justice* and *Equity* ('Others-Society') represent 26.2% of the total referring to values; the corresponding figure for the values *Diversity*, *Solidarity*, *Common Good*, and *Social Cohesion* ('Others-Community'), is 28.1%.

If these two definitions of values referring to the 'other' are examined not from an overall perspective but by country, a clear differentiation can be noted as shown in Table 10 below.

**Table 10. 'Society' or 'community' emphasis in the definitions of the curricula by country**

	<b>CHI</b> (% citations)	<b>GUA</b> (% citations)	<b>MEX</b> (% citations)	<b>PAR</b> (% citations)	<b>RDO</b> (% citations)	<b>COL</b> (% citations)
<b>'Society' (integration)</b> <i>Equality, Social Justice, Equity</i>	33.0	32.7	31.8	14.9	14.6	14.5
<b>'Community' (cohesion)</b> <i>Diversity, Solidarity, Common Good, Social Cohesion</i>	27.3	26.9	15.9	35.2	36.7	32.7

COL = Colombia; CHI = Chile; GUA = Guatemala; MEX = Mexico; PAR = Paraguay; RDO = Dominican Republic.

The curricula differ sharply regarding the importance placed on the values of the 'society' pole. On the one hand, the curricula of Chile, Guatemala and Mexico show percentages of 33.0, 32.7 and 31.8%, respectively, when their citations devoted to the values of *Equality*, *Social Justice* and *Equity* are added up. On the other hand, the curricula of Paraguay, the Dominican Republic and Colombia show a markedly lower presence of these values, with percentages corresponding to a half of those referred to (14.9, 14.6 and 14.5%, respectively). Likewise, if we add up the citations referring to the four values considered in the 'community' pole (*Diversity*, *Solidarity*, *Common Good*, *Social Cohesion*), the differences are also marked between the two sets of countries. The curricula of Paraguay, the Dominican Republic and Colombia emphasize these values, accounting for 35.2, 36.7 and 32.7% of the total citations of the Values area, respectively. This is in contrast particularly with the curriculum of Mexico (15.9%), but also with the fewer number of citations found in the curricula of Chile and Guatemala concerning the values of the 'community' pole (27.3 and 26.9%, respectively).

Therefore, it seems that there are curricula emphasizing an orientation towards the integration of society, which implies a preference for criteria of distributive justice and a relationship with an extensive, generic 'others', in terms of social categories rather than of persons. On the other hand, there are curricula stressing an orientation towards cohesion which accentuate mutually supportive attitudes with a personalized and closer 'others', therefore opting for coexistence (or 'living together') and the cultural bases or sense of relationship with others, rather than a more abstract and political vision of such relationships.

### 3.2.3. *Mega-values: Human Rights and Democracy*

Among the values promoted by the curricula there are two areas, *Human Rights* and *Democracy*, that we propose to regard as *mega-values*, or pillars of moral construction that education seeks to inculcate in the new generation with reference to individual-society relations. One axis (Human Rights) establishes the ethical bases of freedom and solidarity among citizens, the other one (Democracy) underlies the need of some legitimized procedures for political participation, representation and decision-making. It is interesting to note that all the six countries give similar importance to these overarching values, excepting Guatemala and Paraguay, which more than double their references to Human Rights by comparison with Democracy.

The doctrine of *Human Rights* can be regarded as the ultimate moral foundation of contemporary curricula in the region and also beyond it (Ramírez, Suárez and Meyer 2008; Magendzo 2009; IIDH 2010), and *Democracy* can be viewed as the only legitimate framework for processing differences about the type of order sought. The value and thematic area *Human Rights* has evolved in the region, as in the rest of the world, from the defence of the political rights violated by authoritarian regimes, to the defence of the rights of women, children, ethnic minorities, sexual minorities and indigenous peoples. In terms of topics covered, there is also a marked expansion, from civil and political rights – right to a legal process, right to expression and vote, etc. – to social rights – education, health, right to one's own language and culture (Ramírez, Suárez and Meyer 2008; IIDH 2010). This is reflected particularly in the cases of Guatemala, Paraguay and the Dominican Republic.

The mega-value *Democracy* is thematized by all the curricula in terms of the 'democratic coexistence' and 'political regime' distinction. All the curricula, except in the case of the Dominican Republic (which does not refer to 'political regime'), define contents in both dimensions and with comparable emphasis. Regarding the more clearly political dimensions of the value-concept *Democracy*, namely in the 'political regime' axis, it is possible to distinguish between curricula focusing on the institutions and mechanisms of the democratic political system, without any qualification, and those that distinguish types of democracy and/or put forward critical perspectives on the relationship between political power and political system. The curricula of Chile and Mexico are the most specific in terms of *Democracy* as a political regime. The Mexican curriculum is the only one of the six, for example, which refers to the political party system; the curriculum of Chile is the only one which, at the secondary level, explicitly addresses fundamental political concepts together with the subject matter of relations between power and politics. On the

other hand, the curricula of Colombia, Guatemala and Paraguay refer to types of democracy (representative, participatory, social).

*3.3. Priorities of the curricula regarding citizenship: rights, obligations, participation, voting*

What balance can be found between rights and obligations in terms of their thematic presence in the curricula? What type of participation – intra-school or directly political – do they favour thematically? What importance do the curricula attach to voting when referring to the relationship of citizens with the political system? These questions are addressed in Table 11 below, which shows the counting of citations in accordance with eleven thematic categories specifying the relations of citizens with key processes of democratic politics.

**Table 11. Citizenship: rights, obligations, participation, voting**

	COL	CHI	GUA	MEX	PAR	RDO	Mass
Citizens' rights	33.3%	15.8%	22.7%	13.2%	18.5%	22.2%	<b>21.3%</b>
Participation in school governance and/or collective social action projects	30.6%	13.2%	10.9%	13.2%	14.8%	30.6%	<b>16.7%</b>
Deliberation	13.9%	5.3%	15.5%	17.0%	0.0% ▼	8.3%	<b>12.0%</b>
Negotiating and reaching agreements	0.0% ▼	5.3%	14.6%	18.9%	7.4%	0.0% ▼	<b>10.0%</b>
Responsibilities and obligations of the citizen	0.0% ▼	13.2%	10.9%	5.7%	11.1%	11.1%	<b>9.3%</b>
Critical reflection competencies for an active citizenship	2.8%	23.7%	12.7%	0.0% ▼	3.7%	8.3%	<b>9.7%</b>
Representation – forms of representation	8.3%	5.3%	5.5%	7.6%	11.1%	5.6%	<b>6.7%</b>
Participation and decision-making: majority and respect of minorities	5.6%	15.8%	0.9% ▼	9.4%	7.4%	11.1%	<b>7.0%</b>
Accountability	0.0% ▼	2.6%	5.5%	5.7%	25.9% ▲	0.0% ▼	<b>5.7%</b>
Voting (right, duty, responsibility)	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	7.6%	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	<b>1.3%</b>
Participation in political activities (debates, demonstrations, protests, parties)	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	0.9%	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	<b>0.3%</b>
<i>Total</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<b>Total quotes</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>300</b>

▲ Proportion significantly above the mass  
 ▼ Proportion significantly below the mass

Table 11 sets out a group of eleven categories specifying multiple dimensions of the concept of citizenship that can be arranged around the following four axes: (1) rights and obligations of the citizen; (2) participation (participation in school governance, political participation, participation and decision-making); (3) political process, which includes five typical action categories (voting, deliberation, negotiation and agreements, representation, accountability); and (4) critical reflection for active citizenship.

The last column of Table 11 clearly shows that 'Rights' is the thematic category most present in the curricula of the six countries (20.7% of all citations), and that its conceptual and moral counterpart – 'Responsibilities and Obligations' – is markedly less present (9.0%). Particularly notable in this respect is the curriculum of Colombia, which concentrates its prescriptions on *Rights* (33.3%) and makes no reference at all to the 'Obligations' dimension, bearing in mind that in the democratic culture rights cannot be separated from duties, contention, subjection to rules, and, in its classical republican aspect, virtue.<sup>25</sup>

With respect to the evidently central thematic category of Voting, in five of the six national cases (Colombia, Chile, Guatemala, Paraguay and the Dominican Republic), no mention is made of the right, duty or responsibility to vote, either in basic or in secondary education. Only the curriculum of Mexico addresses the matter explicitly. This is a remarkable and hard to explain silence, as voting is the most basic of the political rights/obligations related to sovereignty, representation and democratic legitimacy. As we will see in the case of the 'Institutions' domain, the curricula do refer to 'Elections, electoral system, electoral participation' (with the exception of Colombia), which makes the silence on voting even more blatant. The curricula thus propose contents about the institution of elections but not about the relationship of each citizen with it through voting, arguably the most primordial and fundamental act of political participation.

In the Participation axis with its three categories – Participation in school governance and/or collective social action projects; Participation and decision-making; Majority and respect of minorities; Participation in political activities (debates, demonstrations, protests, parties) – what stands out is the greater presence of the first of them in the average of the six curricula, namely of objectives, contents and activities referring to participation of students either in school governance or in school or out-of-school social activities (16% of all citations). All the curricula contain prescriptions regarding this type of participation. On the other hand, what is practically absent from the curricula (0.3% of all citations in this domain), are goals or contents referred to the direct participation of pupils and students in political activities, such as policy debates or participation in

---

<sup>25</sup> In his analysis of the erosion of politics in contemporary society, the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman rightly observes that: "The art of politics (particularly democratic politics) is about two key things. First, it's about 'dismantling' the limits to citizens' freedom and second, it is about self-limitation: meaning the capacity to make citizens free in order to enable them to set, individually and collectively, their own, individual and collective limits. The second point has been all but lost. All limits are off-limits." (Bauman 1999:4). This phenomenon is consistent with that identified by Inglehart and the world values survey as the growing presence of self-expression values (Inglehart 2008).

demonstrations, protests and political parties.<sup>26</sup> In this case, only the curriculum of Guatemala has a content corresponding to such participation (which refers to participation in political debates). With respect to the third aspect contemplated by the curricula in the participation theme – the majorities/minorities dynamic in decision-making – the curricula also attach less importance to it (6.7% of all citations in this ambit).

In the Political Process axis, we grouped five categories relating to activities and roles which directly impinge on capacities demanded by political processes in general, for which the curricula propose the following objectives or contents in descending order of presence: deliberation (12%), negotiation and reaching of agreements (10%), representation (8.0%), accountability (5.7%), and the already mentioned paradox implying the absence of voting as an educational topic, with five of the six countries lacking prescriptions in this respect. The curriculum of Mexico, on the other hand, has contents on voting in both basic and secondary education.

The curricula of Colombia and the Dominican Republic, besides not referring to voting, do not include objectives or contents regarding ‘negotiation and reaching of agreements’ or ‘accountability’. By contrast, this latter category is the most important for the curriculum of Paraguay, with the highest presence of citations (25.9% of the total of its curriculum in this area), just as ‘negotiation and reaching of agreements’ features most prominently in the curriculum of Mexico (18.9% of the total citations).

Finally, regarding ‘Critical reflection competencies for an active citizenship’ (9% of the total citations of the whole group of countries), the curriculum of Chile gives to this category the greatest relative importance among the eleven categories of the area (21.1% of all citations), contrasting with Mexico, which does not explicitly indicate in its curriculum documents any contents or goals aimed at facilitating the development of this type of competencies.

### *3.4. Institutions*

The *Institutions* domain refers thematically to curricular contents related to the key institutions of the democratic political system. Table 12 below encompasses ten categories referring to political institutions, of which one concerns civil society organizations, and one at another analytical level referring to risks for democracy. This domain as a whole can be visualized as ‘structuring’ democratic life, just as the preceding domain (Citizenship) can be seen as its processing and relational dimensions.

---

<sup>26</sup> The category comes from the framework of the ICCS-2009 study and suggests an ‘active’ conception of democracy, as it was formulated in educational terms in the very influential Crick Report titled *Education for the Teaching of Citizenship and Democracy in Schools* published in 1998 (see Lockyer, Crick and Annette 2003).

**Table 12. Institutions**

	COL	CHI	GUA	MEX	PAR	RDO	Mass
Constitution, law, norm, legality, culture of legality	43.8%	16.1%	22.7%	36.2%	23.4%	28.1%	<b>27.4%</b>
Professional or civil society organizations, social movements; trade unions; NGOs	0.0% ▼	12.9%	16.4%	10.3%	8.5%	18.8%	<b>12.3%</b>
Government – Public Administration; public institutions and services in the community	9.4%	3.2% ▼	11.8%	13.8%	14.9%	9.4%	<b>11.3%</b>
State	6.3%	19.4%	7.3%	5.2%	23.4% ▲	3.1%	<b>10.0%</b>
Political organizations in the democratic society: Political parties	6.3%	12.9%	7.3%	12.1% ▲	8.5%	12.5%	<b>9.4%</b>
Branches of the Democratic State (Executive, Legislative, Justice (Courts))	0.0% ▼	6.5%	10.9%	6.9%	4.3%	15.6%	<b>8.1%</b>
Risks for democracy: Authoritarianism; clientelism, populism, nepotism press monopoly; control of justice	9.4%	0.0% ▼	12.7%	1.7% ▼	10.6%	3.1%	<b>7.7%</b>
Elections, electoral system, electoral participation	0.0% ▼	16.1%	9.1%	8.6%	2.1%	6.3%	<b>7.4%</b>
Rule of Law	18.8% ▲	3.2%	0.0% ▼	5.2%	2.1%	0.0% ▼	<b>3.6%</b>
Judicial system, penal system, police	6.3%	6.5%	1.8%	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	<b>1.9%</b>
Armed Forces	0.0% ▼	3.2%	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	3.1%	<b>0.7%</b>
National (federal) and regional government (states)	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	2.1%	0.0% ▼	<b>0.3%</b>
<i>Total</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<b>Total quotes</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>310</b>
	▲	Proportion significantly above the mass					
	▼	Proportion significantly below the mass					

The category under the Institutions domain most commonly found in the curricula is that of 'Constitution, law, norm, legality, culture of legality' (27.4% of citations). In fact, for all the countries excepting Chile this is the most important category in terms of the number of citations.

Next in order of importance is the category 'Professional or civil society organizations' (12.3%), which has an incidence comparable (slightly higher in fact) to that of each of the Government, State, Political Organizations, and Branches of the State categories that follow it. These, if added-up, together with the 'Elections, Electoral System' category, account for 46.2% of the citations in this area. The low presence of 'Elections, Electoral System' (7.4% of the relevant total of citations), gives added meaning to the silence of the curricula on voting.

Within the Institutions domain there are 25% of empty 'cells', namely of thematic categories not addressed in the curricula, such as Penal System, Armed Forces, and National/regional government. Regarding the first two, it is clear that the curricula do not address the legitimate use of force in social life, which is paradoxical in a region where citizen insecurity is seen as a major political problem (UNDP-OAS 2010).<sup>27</sup> Concerning the sub-national governments theme, it is surprising that the only federal country (Mexico) does not refer to the topic, while this is addressed by the curriculum of Paraguay, a country of unitary State organization (and the smallest of the six considered).

In terms of differences by country, it is noteworthy the exceptional nature of the curriculum of Colombia, whose prescriptions leave out five of the twelve categories of the institutional area (including 'Branches of the State' and 'Elections and Electoral system') and concentrate 62% of all citations of the area in the categories 'Constitution' and 'Rule of Law'. Regarding the 'Risks for Democracy' category, the curriculum of Chile does not address it and those of Mexico and the Dominican Republic only marginally (1.7% and 3.1% of their citations, respectively), while the curricula of Colombia, Guatemala and Paraguay attach greater importance to it (around 10% of the citations).

### *3.5. Coexistence and politics: the civic and civil aspects of curricula*

Table 13 below echoes a central distinction in international literature and evaluations of citizenship education, referring to the knowledge and competencies enabling formal civic or political participation on the one hand and, on the other, 'living together' or coexistence with others (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr and Losito 2011). It is a relevant distinction for issues related to social cohesion and the links with close and distant 'others' (Granovetter 1978; Putnam 2000 and 2007; Green and Jaanmat 2011), and for understanding the social and cultural bases of democratic politics.

---

<sup>27</sup> The 2010 Report on the development of democracy in the region concludes defining the theme of public security, and the question of 'how to cope effectively with citizen insecurity from the angle of democracy', as one of the three basic axes of the democratic development agenda of Latin America. The other two are 'A new fiscal system' and 'Social integration'. (UNDP-OAS 2010; Chapter 5).



From this perspective, the curricula were examined first in terms of their treatment of basic themes of formal political or civic participation. Five categories previously examined were selected, namely: 'Political organizations in society', 'Branches of the State', 'Representation-forms of representation', 'Elections-electoral system', and 'Voting'. Secondly, the curricula were analysed in terms of their approach regarding participation in civil life, or 'living together' in contexts of civil or community organizations. Four categories were selected, of which three of them from the dimension – not yet addressed – of 'Coexistence and Peace' (see Table 6): 'Coexistence competencies', 'Coexistence', and 'Conflict settlement', plus the category 'Professional or civil society organizations' from the domain of Institutions. The presence in the curricula of these two key dimensions of coexistence (or 'living together') is covered in detail by the percentages of citations in Table 13 below.

**Table 13. Formal (civic) versus coexistence (civil) participation**

<b>Civic participation</b>	<b>COL</b>	<b>CHI</b>	<b>GUA</b>	<b>MEX</b>	<b>PAR</b>	<b>RDO</b>	<b>Mass</b>
Political organizations in society	7.4%	10.8%	5.8%	12.3%	19.1%	12.5%	<b>9.3%</b>
State branches	0.0% ▼	5.4%	8.8%	7.0%	9.5%	15.6%	<b>8.0%</b>
Representation—forms of representation	11.1%	16.2%	4.4%	7.0%	14.3%	6.3%	<b>7.7%</b>
Elections—electoral system	0.0% ▼	13.5%	7.3%	8.8%	4.8%	6.3%	<b>7.4%</b>
Voting	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	7.0%	0.0% ▼	0.0% ▼	<b>1.3%</b>
<b>Sub total</b>							<b>33.7%</b>
<hr/>							
<b>Civil participation</b>							
Coexistence competencies	40.7% ▲	21.6%	17.5%	17.5%	4.8% ▼	12.5%	<b>18.7%</b>
Coexistence	14.8%	16.2%	20.4%	14.0%	4.8% ▼	28.1%	<b>18.0%</b>
Conflict settlement	25.9%	5.4% ▼	22.6%	15.8%	23.8%	0.0% ▼	<b>17.4%</b>
Professional or civil society organizations	0.0% ▼	10.8%	13.1%	10.5%	19.1%	18.8%	<b>12.2%</b>
<b>Sub total</b>							<b>66.3%</b>
<hr/>							
<i>Total</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<b>Total quotes</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>311</b>

▲ Proportion significantly above the mass

▼ Proportion significantly below the mass

The most important finding emerging from Table 13 is that, of the total number of citations examined, one third of them refer to civic participation and two thirds to civil participation. The curricula of five of the six countries give markedly greater importance in their prescriptions to themes relating to civil life than to those concerning civic life. Only in the curriculum of Paraguay both dimensions have a comparable presence, although favouring the civil dimension (47.7% for civic participation and 52.3% for civil participation).

The lesser presence of contents concerning the relationship with political institutions and democratic political procedures, added to the greater emphasis on relations of interpersonal or intra-group civility, have clear implications for the relationship with politics that the educational experience of the majorities favours. For the Latin American educational field in general, and for its institutions and processes of curriculum design in particular, this fact, together with the challenges revealed by the surveys on democratic beliefs in the region, should constitute an important focus of analysis and concern. It is hard to overstate the importance of including in the debate the issue of the contribution of education to democratic politics, especially in societies of high socio-economic inequality as are, comparatively speaking, all those of Latin America. In these societies, according to evidence from our own analysis of the students' replies to questions on expected future civic and civil participation of the Latin American countries that participated in the ICCS-2009 study (Castillo et al. 2014), a key finding is that expectation of future political participation is greater among the young people from families of higher socio-economic status and greater cultural capital. Within this framework of intergenerational transmission of political inequality (Schlozman et al. 2012), the civic/civil distinction and its conscious and balanced handling by the national curriculum prescriptions – with its expected impact on textbooks and teacher training –, opens up a new and necessary perspective for curriculum development.

#### **4. Conclusion: relative weakness of politics and of the 'common'**

The existing citizenship education curricula in the six Latin American countries are very rich in terms of learning goals and contents, evidencing a triple expansion of the area that is thematic, organizational (presence both in primary and secondary education), and formative, putting forward objectives and contents focusing not only on knowledge but also on skills and attitudes. As it was argued, the overall vision corresponds to the maximalist paradigm of citizenship education in the school context (McLaughlin 1992; Kerr 1999). Likewise, the analysis has revealed gaps regarding themes of great significance and implication, such as voting or institutions such as courts of justice and the penal system. Also noteworthy is the subordination of themes such as the values relating to what is common and to citizens' duties. It is therefore possible to discern a pattern raising questions about how adequately the curricula are addressing the political area of life in society and the cultural prerequisites for democratic participation in it.

The analysis of the values promoted in the curricula reveals, on the one hand, low priority for the principles of Common Good, Solidarity and Social Cohesion.

Likewise, the way in which the curricula deal with the values of Diversity and Tolerance, in both their definition and their application, is predominantly sociocultural, and only exceptionally referred to the political area. The analysis of the values also points to the existence of two types of vision and conceptualization of 'the others'. On the one hand, the curricula of Chile, Mexico and Guatemala promote a vision of 'the others' in terms of 'macro' social categories having society as main referent. On the other, the curricula of Colombia, Paraguay and the Dominican Republic endorse a vision of 'the others' in terms of relations among persons rather than of social categories, having as their referent the community rather than society.

In the Citizenship domain it was found that the curricula consistently emphasize more the rights rather than the obligations and responsibilities of citizens. Another key finding in this domain is the absence of references to 'voting' (as right, duty and responsibility) in five out of the six curricula that were analysed.

With regard to the *civic* (formal political)/*civil* (coexistence) distinction in the curricula of the six countries altogether, the analysis shows that two thirds of the curricular content in the relevant analytic categories refers to the coexistence dimension (or 'living together'), and one third to the political or civic dimension, namely participation in formal political institutions.

How should we interpret this set of characteristics of the current curricula prescribing the type of opportunities for citizenship learning that the respective school systems attempt to organize and offer?

Our analysis confirms that there has been a shift in the curricula, consisting in moving away from the traditional civic education, which focused on the institutions of politics and was offered in the final grades of secondary education, in favour of the adoption of a new paradigm – fully aligned with world trends (Meyer 2008) – involving both the expansion and redefinition of the foci of the formative scope of this curricular area. What is observable in this change is a consistent subordination of the contents regarding politics. This is evident in each of the thematic areas that were examined, showing: the subordination of the values related to what is common and the relative lack of political referents for the values of Diversity and Tolerance; the low presence of references to obligations and responsibilities of the citizen, as the almost complete absence of references to voting, in the Citizenship area; the prioritization of community over society in three out of the six curricula; and the strong preponderance, in the average of the six curricula, of contents of the civil (coexistence) dimension over those of the civic (political) dimension of citizenship.

The comparative analysis of the six curricula thus makes it clear that not enough priority is being given to educating for an appreciation of the affairs of the city (politics) as a whole, the emphasis being rather on celebrating sociocultural diversity and pluralism in coexistence with immediate 'others', and hence appreciating the values of groups and/or communities that make up the actual contexts of interaction of individuals.

On the basis of our comparative analysis of greater or lesser presence of selected topics, it can be observed that the curricula do not favour the political

domain, that in which all groups and communities come together with their diverse interests, and in which the definitions of the common good are institutionally elaborated and the rules of the social order as a whole are elaborated and established. This raises questions about the functionality of these curricula for the cultural base (knowledge and dispositions) of what can be defined, following Putnam, as *bridging social capital* (Putnam 2000 and 2007), which is essential for societal cohesion as well as the functioning of the national-level democratic political system. The relative weakness in national curricular prescriptions of the relationship with the institution 'State' and the democratic political procedures, replaced by relationships of interpersonal or inter-group civility, deserves to be studied and made a topic of discussion and deliberation in the educational field in general, and in the area of curriculum design in particular. In contexts of marked social inequality and institutional weaknesses of democratic politics which characterize many national contexts in the Latin American region, the possibility for education to counterbalance the anti-political trends of the market culture become highly important. In this regard, national curriculum design and development processes along with international stakeholders and organizations have a decisive role to play. We believe that adopting such a perspective is necessary if education is to contend with the challenging deficiencies of democratic belief in the region and provide the adequate responses.

## Bibliography

- Akar, B. 2012. "The space between civic education and active citizenship in Lebanon." Pp. 154-170 in: *Rethinking education for social cohesion. International case studies*, edited by M. Shuayb. London: Palgrave, Macmillan.
- Bauman, Z. 1999. *In search of politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Benavot, A. y C. Braslavsky (Editores). 2008. *El conocimiento escolar en una perspectiva histórica y comparativa. Cambios de currículos en la educación primaria y secundaria*. Buenos Aires: Granica.
- Benzécri, J. P. 1979. "Sur le calcul des taux d'inertie dans l'analyse d'un questionnaire." *Cahiers de l'analyse des données* 4(3), 377–379.
- . 1992. *Correspondence analysis handbook*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Bethell, L. (Ed.). 1994. *The Cambridge History of Latin America. Volume 6: 1930 to the Present*. (Part 2: Politics and Society). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castillo, J.C., D. Miranda, M. Bascopé, C. Cox y M. Bonhomme. 2014. "Social background and citizenship participation in Latin American schools." Accepted for publication, *Journal of Educational Change* (Boston).
- Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL). 2010. *La hora de la igualdad. Brechas por cerrar, caminos por abrir*. Santiago de Chile: CEPAL.
- . 2013. *Anuario estadístico 2013*. Santiago de Chile: CEPAL.
- Cortina, A. 2010. *Justicia cordial*. Madrid: Editorial Trotta.
- Cox, C. 2010. *Informe de Referente Regional 2010. Oportunidades de aprendizaje escolar de la ciudadanía en América Latina: currículos comparados*. Sistema Regional de Evaluación y Desarrollo de Competencias Ciudadanas (SREDECC), Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo. Bogotá: CERLALC.
- . 2011. "Le curriculum scolaire au Chili. Genèse, mise en œuvre et développement." *Revue internationale d'éducation Sèvres* 56, 51-61.
- Cox, C., R. Jaramillo y F. Reimers. 2005. *Educación para la ciudadanía y la democracia en las Américas: Una agenda para la acción*. Departamento de Desarrollo Sostenible, Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo. Washington DC: BID.
- Cox, C., R. Lira y R. Gazmuri. 2009. "Currículos escolares y sus orientaciones sobre historia, sociedad y política: significados para la cohesión social en Latinoamérica." Pp. 231-288 en: *Políticas educacionales y cohesión social en América Latina*, editado por S. Schwartzman y C. Cox. Santiago de Chile y Sao Paulo: Uqbar Editores y Elsevier.
- Crick, B. 1962. *In defense of politics*. Fifth edition (2000). London and New York: Continuum.
- . 2003. "The English Citizenship Order 1999: Context, content and presuppositions." Pp. 1-14 in: *Education for democratic citizenship. Issues of theory and practice*, edited by A. Lockyer, B. Crick and J. Annette. Aldershot (UK): Ashgate Publishing.
- Davies, I. 2012. "Perspectives on citizenship education." Pp. 32-40 in: *Debates in citizenship education*, edited by J. Arthur and H. Cremin. London: Routledge.
- Dubet, F., M. Duru-Bellat et A. Vêréout. 2010. *Les sociétés et leur école*. Paris: Seuil.
- Eurydice. 2005. *La educación para la ciudadanía en el contexto escolar europeo*. Bruselas: Eurydice.

- García-Albacete, G. M. 2013. "Promoting Political Interest in Schools: The Role of Civic Education." Pp. 91-114 in: *Growing into politics. Contexts and timing of political socialization*, edited by S. Abendschön. Colchester (UK): European Consortium for Political Research Press.
- Granovetter, M. S. 1978. "The strength of weak ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6), 1360-80.
- Green, A. and Janmaat, J. G. 2011. *Regimes of social cohesion. Societies and the crisis of globalization*. Basingstoke (UK): Palgrave Macmillan.
- Greenacre, M. 2007. *Correspondence analysis in practice*. Second edition. Boca Raton, London, New York: Tylor and Francis Group (Chapman and Hall/CRC).
- Hartlyn, J. and A. Valenzuela. 1994. "Democracy in Latin America since 1930." Pp. 99-162 in: *The Cambridge History of Latin America, Volume 6: 1930 to the Present* (Part 2: Politics and Society), edited by L. Bethell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inglehart, R. F. 2008. "Changing values among Western publics from 1970 to 2006." *West European Politics* 31(1-2), 130-146.
- Instituto Interamericano de Derechos Humanos (IIDH). 2010. *VIII Informe Interamericano de la educación en derechos humanos. Desarrollo de conocimientos específicos de derechos humanos en los programas de estudio: 10 a 14 años*. San José: IIDH.
- Kerr, D. 1999. "Citizenship education in the curriculum: an international review." *The School Field* 10(3/4), 5-32.
- . 2012. "Comparative and international perspectives on citizenship education." Pp. 17-31 in: *Debates in citizenship education*, edited by J. Arthur and H. Cremin. London: Routledge.
- Lebart, L., A. Morineau et N. Tabard. 1977. *Techniques de la description statistique : méthodes et logiciels pour l'analyse des grands tableaux*. Paris: Dunod.
- Lockyer, A., B. Crick and J. Annette (Eds.). 2003. *Education for democratic citizenship. Issues of theory and practice*. Aldershot (UK): Ashgate Publishing.
- Levinson, B. 2005. "Programs for democratic citizenship in Mexico's Ministry of Education: Local appropriations of global cultural flows." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 12 (1), 251-284.
- Magendzo, A. (Ed.). 2009. *Pensamiento e ideas-fuerza de la educación en derechos humanos en Iberoamérica*. Santiago de Chile: UNESCO-OREALC.
- Mardones, R. 2010. "Hacia una precisión conceptual de la fraternidad política." En: *Estudios recientes sobre fraternidad: de la enunciación como principio a la consolidación como perspectiva*, editado por O. Barreneche. Buenos Aires: Editorial Ciudad Nueva.
- McLaughlin, T. 1992. "Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective." *Journal of Moral Education* 21(3), 235-250.
- Meyer, J. W. 2008. "Los modelos mundiales, los currículos nacionales y la centralidad de lo individual." Pp. 405-424 en: *El conocimiento escolar en una perspectiva histórica y comparativa*, editado por A. Benavot y C. Braslavsky. Buenos Aires: Granica.
- Meyer, J. W. and F. Ramírez. 2000. "The world institutionalization of education." Pp. 111-132 in: *Discourse formation in comparative education*, edited by J. Schriewer. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Mullis, V.S., M.O. Martin, et al. 2002. *Marcos teóricos y especificaciones de evaluación de TIMSS 2003*. TIMSS International Study Center, Boston College. Madrid: INCE, Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.

- Norris, P. (Ed.). 1999. *Critical citizens: Global support for democratic government*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- O'Donnell, G. 1994. "Delegative democracy." *Journal of Democracy* 5(1), 94-108.
- Osley, A. and H. Starkey. 2006. "Education for democratic citizenship. A review of research, policy and practice 1995-2005." *Research Papers in Education* 24, 433-466.
- Owen, D. 2013. "The influence of civic education on electoral engagement and voting." Pp. 313-332 in: *Teaching civic engagement: from student to active citizen*, edited by A. Rios et al. Washington DC: American Political Science Association.
- Oxhorn, P. 2011. *Sustaining civil society. Economic change, democracy, and the social construction of citizenship in Latin America*. University Park PA: Penn State University Press.
- Peña, C. 2007. "Educación y ciudadanía: los problemas subyacentes." *Pensamiento Educativo* 40(1), 31-44.
- Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD). 2004. *La democracia en América Latina: Hacia una democracia de ciudadanos y ciudadanas*. New York y Buenos Aires: PNUD.
- . 2013. *Informe sobre desarrollo humano 2013*. New York: PNUD.
- Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo, Secretaría General de la Organización de los Estados Americanos (PNUD-OEA). 2010. *Nuestra democracia*. Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Putnam, R. 2000. *Bowling alone. The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- . 2007. "E Pluribus Unum: diversity and community in the twenty-first century." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 20, 139-174.
- Ramírez, F., D. Suárez y J. Meyer. 2008. "El ascenso mundial de la educación en la esfera de los derechos humanos." Pp. 75-98 en: *El conocimiento escolar en una perspectiva histórica y comparativa*, editado por A. Benavot y C. Braslavsky. Buenos Aires: Granica.
- Rouquié, A. 2011. *A la sombra de las dictaduras. La democracia en América Latina*. Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Roux, B. L. and H. Rouanet. 2004. *Geometric data analysis: From correspondence analysis to structured data analysis*. New York: Springer.
- Rychen, D. S. and L. H. Salganik (Eds.). 2001. *Defining and selecting key competencies*. Göttingen: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Sartori, G. 1991. "Democracia." *Revista de Ciencia Política* 13(1-2), 77-96.
- Schlozman, K. L., S. Verba, H. E. Brady and N. Burns. 2012. "The intergenerational persistence of economic inequality." P. 177-198 in: *The unheavenly chorus: Unequal political voice and the broken promise of American democracy*, edited by K. Schlozman, S. Verba and H. Brady. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schriewer, J. 2003. "Globalisation in education: Process and discourse." *Policy Futures in Education* 2, 271-283.
- Schulz, W., J. Ainley, J. Fraillon, D. Kerr and B. Losito. 2011. *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower secondary school students in 38 countries*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., J. Ainley, T. Friedman y P. Lietz. 2011. *Informe Latinoamericano del ICCS 2009. Actitudes y conocimientos cívicos de estudiantes de secundaria*



- en seis países de América Latina*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., J. Fraillon, J. Ainley, B. Losito and D. Kerr. 2008. *International Civic and Citizenship Education Study. Assessment framework*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schwartzman, S. 2008. "Educación, movilidad y valores democráticos." Pp. 87-101 en: *Vínculos, creencias e ilusiones. La cohesión social de los latinoamericanos*, editado por E. Valenzuela *et al.* Colección de la Corporación de Estudios para Latinoamérica (CIEPLAN, Chile) y del Instituto Fernando Henrique Cardoso (iFHC, Brasil). Santiago de Chile: Uqbar Editores.
- Seligson A. M., A. E. Smith y E. Zechmeister (Editores). 2013. *La cultura política de la democracia en las Américas, 2012: Hacia la igualdad de oportunidades*. USAID, LAPOP (Proyecto de Opinión Pública de América Latina) y Vanderbilt University.
- Suárez, D. 2008. "Rewriting citizenship? Civic education in Costa Rica and Argentina." *Comparative Education* 44(4), 485-503.
- Tedesco, J. C., R. Opertti y M. Amadio. 2013. *Porqué importa hoy el debate curricular*. UNESCO-IBE Working Papers on Curriculum Issues No. 10. Ginebra: UNESCO-IBE.
- Torney, J., A. N. Oppenheim and R. F. Farnen. 1975. *Civic education in ten countries: An empirical study*. New York: John Wiley.
- Torney-Purta, J., J. Schwille, and J. A. Amadeo. 1999. *Civic education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Torney-Purta, J y J. A. Amadeo. 2004. *Fortaleciendo la democracia en las Américas a través de la educación cívica: un análisis empírico que destaca las opiniones de los estudiantes y los maestros*. Washington DC: Organización de los Estados Americanos (OEA).
- UNESCO-OREALC (Oficina Regional de Educación para América Latina y el Caribe). 2013. *Tercer estudio regional comparativo y explicativo TERCE. Análisis curricular*. Laboratorio Latinoamericano de Evaluación de la Calidad de la Educación (LLECE). Santiago de Chile: UNESCO-OREALC.
- Valenzuela, E. *et al.* 2008. *Vínculos, creencias e ilusiones. La cohesión social de los latinoamericanos*. Colección de la Corporación de Estudios para Latinoamérica (CIEPLAN, Chile) y del Instituto Fernando Henrique Cardoso (iFHC, Brasil). Santiago de Chile: Uqbar Editores.

**Official curriculum documents of the six countries included in the analysis**

Country	Documents
<b>Colombia</b>	<p>Estándares básicos de competencias en lenguaje, matemáticas, ciencias y ciudadanas. Guía sobre lo que los estudiantes deben saber y saber hacer con lo que aprenden (2006).                      Estándares básicos de competencias ciudadanas generales y específicas, 8º a 11º grado primaria.                      Estándares básicos de competencias en ciencias sociales generales y específicas, 8º a 11º grado primaria.</p>
<b>Chile</b>	<p>Objetivos fundamentales y contenidos mínimos obligatorios para la educación básica, Actualización 2002 (Decreto Supremo 232).                      Objetivos fundamentales y contenidos mínimos obligatorios para la educación media, Actualización 2005 (Decreto Supremo 220).</p>
<b>Dominican Republic</b>	<p>Contenidos básicos de las áreas curriculares, Serie Desarrollo Curricular, 2006-2007.                      Programa para la asignatura educación moral y cívica, nivel básico (Ordenanza 3-99 2000).                      Programa para la asignatura educación moral y cívica, nivel medio (Ordenanza 3-99 2002).</p>
<b>Guatemala</b>	<p>Currículum nacional base del nivel primario.                      Currículum nacional base, ciclo básico del nivel medio (versión preliminar, 2007).</p>
<b>Mexico</b>	<p>Programas de estudio 2009, educación básica primaria.                      Programa de estudios 2006, educación secundaria (Acuerdo 384).</p>
<b>Paraguay</b>	<p>Programas de estudio de ciencias sociales para 4º, 5º y 6º grado de básica y 1º y 2º grado de media.                      Programa de estudio de ciencias sociales específico para 3º grado de media.                      Programa de estudio de historia y geografía para 1º y 2º grado de media.                      Programas de estudio de formación ética y ciudadana para 7º, 8º y 9º grado de básica.                      Programas de estudio vida social y trabajo para 1º, 2º y 3º grado de básica.                      (<i>Últimos ajustes a algunos de estos programas introducidos en 2008</i>)</p>

---

Sources: Cox 2010, UNESCO-OREALC 2013.