



USAID/ARMENIA

ARMENIA CIVICS FOR ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITY EVIDENCE REVIEW

DISCLAIMER: The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) or the United States Government.

This Evidence Review was prepared by Dana Burde (New York University), Heddy Lahmann-Rosen (New York University), Andreas de Barros (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Miriam Counterman (The Cloudburst Group), Elisabeth King (New York University), Alejandro Ganimian (New York University), and Sorana Acris (New York University).

This document was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development, Democracy, Human Rights and Governance Center under the Learning, Evaluation and Research Activity II (LER II) contract: GS10F0218U/7200AA18M00017

Prepared by:

The Cloudburst Group
8400 Corporate Drive, Suite 550
Landover, MD 20785-2238
Tel: 301-918-4400

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	IV
INTRODUCTION: FOCUS OF THE REVIEW	1
CIVIC EDUCATION THEORY OF CHANGE	2
CIVIC EDUCATION EVIDENCE FROM PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND NONFORMAL PROGRAMS	3
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USAID	6
ESSENTIAL READINGS ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY	7
REFERENCES	9

ACRONYMS

NGO	Non-governmental organization
CfE	Civics for Engagement activity
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

I. INTRODUCTION: FOCUS OF THE REVIEW

This **targeted evidence review** of civic education among youth aged 10–29 in fragile democracies aims to inform the impact evaluation of the United States Agency for International Development’s (USAID’s) Armenia Civics for Engagement activity (CfE).¹ This activity includes both civic education in schools for youth aged 10–18 and non-formal civic education activities for the entire band of youth aged 10–29. This current review adapts and builds on a previous one completed for the same purpose but for primary school children in Liberia (see USAID, 2021).²

Seminal research on the determinants of democratic consolidation argues that citizens with strong democratic values are needed to build and sustain a democracy (Almond and Verba 1963; Dewey 1916; Lipset 1959). Many organizations develop and deliver civic education with this goal in mind, aiming to cultivate in youth the civic knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors that will allow them to actively engage in a democratic society (Carnegie Corporation of New York & CIRCLE, 2003; Torney-Purta et al., 2001). In conflict-affected and politically polarized societies, civic education is often also expected to foster peace, stability, and social cohesion by building or strengthening a collective civic identity (Levine & Bishai, 2010; Quaynor, 2012). More recently, civic education programs have also been designed to counter dis- and misinformation (see e.g., Van Bavel et al., 2021). Although these aspired outcomes are relatively consistent across the literature, program designs and demands on implementers differ substantially. Civic education can be delivered through: (1) in-class, lecture-based instruction, incorporated into a social studies curriculum, or as a stand-alone topic; (2) participatory learning, in or out of class, that can include such activities as role-playing a government hearing, taking part in a mock trial, or serving as a student poll worker; (3) service learning, such as having students or program participants research and take action on a social issue; and (4) extracurricular activities such as volunteering or participating in school governance (Campbell, 2019). With USAID Armenia’s CfE in mind, this review limits its focus to civic education programs that include significant in- or out-of-class instruction using either lecture-style or participatory teaching and that target youth. Even among these programs, there is important diversity.

This review draws on literature from fragile and transitional contexts,³ but due to the limited evidence stemming from these settings, the team also considered what may be learned from programs in established democracies. Armenia is undergoing a significant transition, including the 2018 Velvet Revolution, which ousted the previous regime, followed by parliamentary elections considered mostly free and fair (Freedom House, 2021). The 2020 war, increased political polarization, and ongoing tensions with Azerbaijan, however, present challenges to this progress, including “systemic corruption, opaque policymaking, a flawed electoral system, and weak rule of law” (Freedom House 2021). Armenian youth may also conceptualize democracy and citizenship in ways distinct from outside definitions (Babajanian, 2005; Hahn, 2010; Mason, 2009) and some reports indicate apathy among young people. These contextual realities greatly impact the specific goals, design, and implementation of civic education programs. Nonetheless, Armenia’s democratic institutions and strong civil society support opportunities for democratic transition (Ohanyan, 2020).

¹ The review is “targeted” as it reviewed key academic outlets, their publications, and documents cited therein. The review does not claim to be systematically “meta-analytic.” Instead, as common for broader reviews and documents that combine a variety of outcomes, we provide a narrative to synthesize findings (see Chandler et al. 2019).

² The current review adds pertinent geographic context and expands the age range of targeted formal and informal civic education of youths.

³ Freedom House classifies Armenia as a semi-consolidated authoritarian regime (2021).

This review will first discuss the pathways through which civic education is expected to affect democratic outcomes, followed by the evidence from the literature on the effectiveness of formal and nonformal civic education programs as well as programs aimed at promoting civic engagement in youth. Lastly, it will offer recommendations to USAID and its implementing partner on the proposed civic education intervention.

2. CIVIC EDUCATION THEORY OF CHANGE

How the intervention might work: Diversity across programs means that there is no single theory of change, although civic instruction is consistently expected to impact civic **knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors** (Donbavand & Hoskins, 2021).⁴ Civic *knowledge* is generally measured as a factual understanding of civics material, but curricula vary across programs. Civic *skills* can include an increased ability to collaborate, communicate, and think critically, or can refer to more technical skills such as being able to read a ballot. Targeted civic *attitudes* can encompass feelings of tolerance, trust in government institutions, efficacy, belief in the political rights of minorities, and a sense of national identity. Civic *behaviors* similarly vary, including political engagement, such as voting, signing a petition, or contacting a representative, and broader civic engagement, such as volunteering in your community or participating in civil society.

Despite the diverse programs and ways civic outcomes are operationalized, common pathways emerge across programs. In most descriptions, knowledge and/or skills develop first. Simple exposure to civic curricula through traditional teaching methods is expected to improve political knowledge (Finkel & Ernst, 2005), while more interactive and participatory methods are expected to improve civic skills (Ibid.; Soule, 2002). Attitudes and behaviors are typically theorized to follow from knowledge and skills, although the pathways are murkier. Greater civic knowledge may directly affect attitudes, encouraging democratic values and norms (Galston, 2004; Youniss, 2011). Gaining factual knowledge about democratic processes, learning civic skills that allow students to better engage in their communities, and developing attitudes that are supportive of democracy are expected to increase interest in political and social issues and to improve students' political efficacy, thus encouraging civic engagement behaviors (Finkel & Ernst, 2005; Niemi & Junn, 1998; Owen, 2015; Pasek et al., 2008). Generally, in education interventions, “head-first” approaches aim to change knowledge and attitudes in order to change behaviors, whereas “feet-first” approaches aim to change behaviors and then change attitudes (McCauley 2002). Another pathway includes interventions that endeavor to change people's perceptions of norms in order to encourage an individual to conform to those norms through their attitudes and behavior (Sonnenfeld et al. 2020; Tankard & Paluck, 2016).

Cautions: When theories of change are mentioned for civic education, the aspired outcomes follow a rough order (knowledge and/or skills, then attitudes and/or behaviors) and are typically thought to work together virtuously. However, attitudes or behaviors need not come after knowledge or skills; students may simply adopt democratic norms and values by being socialized in a democratic classroom and school climate (Finkel & Ernst, 2005; Galais, 2018; Torney-Purta et al., 2011). As discussed in the next section, there are also a host of assumptions that underlie the actualization of these theories of change (high-quality teaching or facilitation, regular attendance of teachers/facilitators and participants, an open climate, etc.), which are unfortunately not common in many developing democracies and are under threat in some established democracies. The content of the program matters too; sometimes history or social studies may increase polarization or contribute to conflict between groups (Burde, 2014; King, 2014). The effects

⁴ Here, the team focuses on the outcomes of civic education programs. A more full-fledged theory of change also posits that any given program is implemented as intended and taken up well, thus leading to immediate program outputs.

from interventions to promote social change may be incremental and slow, work in non-linear ways, and invoke backlash (Sonnenfeld et al. 2020). Some expected behavioral changes may include long-term effects of programming, prolonging the theory of change.

Although many democratic norms, values, and understandings of citizenship may form quite early in life and be hard to shift as students age (Keating et al., 2010; Sears et al., 1979; Van Deth et al., 2011), several interventions target youth and aim to do exactly that. The following is a discussion of the evidence of the effects of these interventions.

3. CIVIC EDUCATION EVIDENCE FROM PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND NONFORMAL PROGRAMS⁵

Has civic education effectively fostered youth civic outcomes? Some non-experimental, large-scale survey-based studies across established and emerging democracies have found strong links between the level of civic education students receive and students' civic knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors (Bachner, 2010; Callahan et al., 2010; Niemi & Junn, 1998; Keating et al., 2010; Saha, 2000; Schulz et al., 2010; Torney-Purta et al., 2002).⁶ While these prominent studies are often cited as indicative of civic education's effectiveness, their observational design limits the team's ability to draw conclusions on its causal effects. In addition, they focus primarily on in-school participants. Nonetheless, growing evidence arising from program evaluations, mostly quasi-experimental, bolsters the belief that civic education can improve knowledge. However, the evidence of its effects on skills, attitudes, and behaviors is weaker.

Civic education increases knowledge: Quasi-experimental evaluations of civic education programs in the United States have consistently found that civic instruction improves students' factual knowledge (McDevitt and Kioussis, 2004; Owen, 2015; Pasek et al., 2008). These programs, however, often include elements of service learning and out-of-class experiential methods that may be uncommon in low- and middle-income countries. In a rare, randomized experiment evaluating a solely classroom-based U.S. civics curriculum focused on constitutional rights and civil liberties, Green et al. (2011) also found that the "treated" students had significantly more political knowledge.

Outside of the US context, scholars have found similar, positive effects on knowledge. A large-scale survey that compared civic education among 14-year-olds in 28 countries and upper secondary students in 16 countries showed that younger and older adolescents had civic knowledge and an understanding of democratic processes and values (Torney-Purta et al., 2002). Younger adolescents in the Eastern European countries included in this study had similar knowledge and attitudes as young adolescents in Western European countries, but they had a lower level of knowledge related to civic and political action and engagement (Oesterrich, 2009). A recent qualitative study of a nonformal civic education program that brought youth from Eastern European countries to Poland to learn about democracy showed promising effects on participants' civic and political engagement (Pospieszna & Galus, 2020). Finkel (2014) compared four evaluations of USAID-funded programs in Poland, Kenya, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the

⁵ Nonformal programs include structured learning that takes place outside of the formal schooling curriculum, such as programs facilitated by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or civil society organizations and after-school or extracurricular activities.

⁶ The International Civic and Citizenship Education Study survey conducted by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (Schulz et al., 2010) has been leveraged by multiple studies focused on civic outcomes in Latin America in particular (see Caro & Schulz, 2012; Castillo et al., 2014; Castillo et al, 2015; Treviño et al., 2017), though there are few rigorous program evaluations to bolster the evidence base on program effectiveness (Bramwell, 2020).

Dominican Republic, and South Africa, finding that civic education was associated with improved knowledge across these disparate contexts.

Given the significant rise of dis- and misinformation in recent decades in the US and around the world, and the challenges this poses to democratic systems, a number of scholars have attempted to understand better how to mitigate these trends (Van Bavel et al., 2021). Two efforts stand out: (1) teaching fact-checking and (2) helping people acquire the ability to better spot fake news, for example, by cultivating media literacy. Although evidence shows that fact-checking works well to reduce belief in dis- and misinformation, its effects are significantly weakened in highly-charged political contexts or when bad actors spread disinformation deliberately (Van Bavel et al., 2021). An “inoculation” approach, as well as building media literacy, are conceptualized similarly to fact-checking but administered before disinformation reaches the target audience. Thus, an intervention to debunk fake news begins before the news is distributed (van der Linden, 2019; Martins et al., 2020; and Guess et al., 2020, cited in Van Bavel et al., 2021). Finally, research and critical thinking skills are likely key to recognizing and combating dis- and misinformation. Teachers in Finland believe that their unique civic education curriculum has been successful in building skills to combat dis- and misinformation among youth, although no experimental or quasi-experimental studies have been reported yet from this intervention (Henley, 2020).

A less clear impact on civic skills, attitudes, and behaviors: A few studies have drawn conflicting results regarding civic education’s ability to foster civic skills in post-conflict, emerging democracies. Soule (2002) studied seventh- and eighth-grade participants of the “CIVITAS Project Citizen” in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which encouraged students to research a public policy problem in their communities and propose a solution. Using a quasi-experimental design with matching control groups, she found that participating students developed better research skills. On the other hand, Finkel & Ernst (2005) found civic education in South Africa did not improve students’ ability to communicate, cooperate, solve problems, or lead a team.

The evidence on attitudinal change is similarly inconsistent. Slomczynski and Shabad (1998) studied a civic education program that exposed primary school students to pro-democratic values using participatory teaching methods in post-communist Poland. They found that treated students were less likely to hold strongly anti-democratic views when compared to a nonrandom control group. Barr et al. (2015) studied a professional development program for teachers in the United States. They found that the program led to improved civic efficacy and tolerance for others with different views, and more positive perceptions of opportunities afforded for engaging with civic matters. A qualitative evaluation of the *Schools Together* program in post-conflict Northern Ireland pointed to the potential benefits of complementing formal civic education with nonformal youth-led activities to facilitate dialogue on diversity in youth (O’Connor, 2012). On the other hand, using quasi-experimental approaches, Soule (2002) found no effect on students’ tolerance or interest in politics in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Finkel & Ernst (2005) found no effect on tolerance, civic duty, and institutional trust in South Africa. A randomized evaluation of a civic education program in Georgia, which combined traditional in-class civic curricula with NGO-supported service-learning projects, also found the intervention did not impact secondary students’ civic, democratic, or pro-social attitudes (USAID, 2019). A quasi-experimental study of a nonformal program with conflict-affected out-of-school youth in the Philippines which aimed to improve life skills, civic engagement, and employability through skills training showed improved rates of employment and leadership skills. While civic attitudes improved, improvements were greater for youth in the comparison group (EDC, 2016). Yet another evaluation of a civic education program in Mexico shows how some programs may only

impact a narrow set of civic skills and attitudes that are explicitly targeted by an intervention, while not affecting others (Reimers et al., 2015).

Findings regarding civic education's impact on behavior are even more varied and stem largely from the United States. Reviews of several programs that include in-class instruction on democratic institutions, processes, and values have found that such programs promote political engagement later in life, measured as an increased likelihood to vote, volunteer for a political candidate, participate in a march or protest, or contact a representative (Center for Civic Education, 2005; Gill et al., 2020; Owen, 2015). However, not all programs show positive results in terms of behavior changes. A review of nine studies of various civics curricula concludes that there is little evidence that civic education can impact voting behavior, though there is some evidence that it improves political expression, such as signing petitions or volunteering for a political cause (Manning & Edwards, 2014). The aforementioned evaluation of civic education in Georgia also found no evidence the program had enhanced future political participation (USAID, 2019). Although the program did find positive impacts on students' current civic engagement, these results may have been capturing student participation in the program's service learning activities.

These studies of in-class civic education's impact on skills, attitudes, and behavior are based on varied program curricula and approaches and are mostly nonexperimental. While the current evidence beyond increases in knowledge is not encouraging, more research is needed to better understand the impact of civic education in conflict-affected settings.

The learning environment matters: Numerous studies from established and emerging democracies confirm that learning civics in a climate that encourages students to openly express themselves and promotes discussions on controversial topics enhances the positive effects of civic education, particularly on skills, attitudes, and behaviors, where current research sees weak effects (Campbell, 2008; Claire, 2004; Finkel & Ernst, 2005; Hahn, 1998; Hoskins et al., 2021; Niemi & Junn, 1998; Torney-Purta, et al., 2001). Experimental evidence from similar educational interventions that do not explicitly study civic education but rather aim to influence student political attitudes and behaviors have indeed shown that classroom discussion of controversial topics can shape attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality, tolerance, social distance, and intergroup relations (Dhar et al., 2020; Neins et al., 2013). Research also points to the benefits of such participatory methods as role-playing and dramatizations in improving all targeted civic education outcomes (Hoskins et al., 2021; Soule, 2002) and especially attitudes (Finkel & Ernst, 2005). Indeed, Finkel and Ernst (2005) find that role-playing methods such as mock trials, simulated elections, and playing games that illustrate democracy or human rights issues significantly improve students' civic skills and attitudes supportive of political participation, tolerance, and institutional trust. They find that these participatory methods have a stronger effect on civic outcomes than mere exposure to civic curriculum and are also more effective than open classroom discussion alone (Finkel & Ernst, 2005). A few scholars stress that civic education is most effective when delivered consistently (Finkel & Ernst, 2005; Keating et al., 2010) and by teachers whom students consider to be competent, credible, likable, and interesting (Finkel & Ernst, 2005). The classroom approaches most linked to success may unfortunately not be common in many countries with authoritarian pasts (Levine & Bishai, 2010). Indeed, instruction in low-income countries generally emphasizes lectures and rote memorization, approaches that have consistently produced poor outcomes, even on reading and math (Pritchett, 2013).⁷

⁷ Recent research has also studied online approaches to civic education with secondary students in the US (see, for example, Kahne et al., 2016; McGrew et al., 2018; Owen, 2014). A recent experimental study provides promising

Programs may have differential effects: Studies have also found differential effects of civic education based on socio-economic status, family background, gender, and minority status. However, the influence of these factors is inconsistent. While a few in-school studies find that students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, those whose parents have less education, and those from minority and immigrant groups tend to exhibit lower civic outcomes across all dimensions (Galais, 2018; Levinson, 2010; Niemi & Junn, 2005; Soule, 2002), other evidence indicates civic education may disproportionately positively affect lower-income and minority groups (Hoskins et al., 2021; Langton & Jennings, 1968; Neundorf et al., 2016). Studies also find the impact of civic education may vary by gender, with girls exhibiting lower civic knowledge, skills, and engagement in some contexts (Bleck, 2015; Soule, 2002; Torney-Purta et al. 2001), though some studies find girls' civic outcomes were stronger (USAID, 2019).

A severe lack of rigorous evidence: Only very few of the reviewed studies satisfied the requirements to rigorously identify a cause-and-effect relationship. Even fewer were conducted in low- and middle-income countries.

Common review criteria for education studies, such as those established by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) What Works Clearinghouse (2020), give preference to randomized controlled trials (RCTs). They also detail which quasi-experimental methods may be acceptable to measure the causal effect of an intervention. Unfortunately, of the above-mentioned studies measuring program effects on students' factual knowledge, only one (Green et al., 2011) reports on a rigorous RCT, and this study was conducted in the United States. Of the four evaluations discussed by Finkel (2014), which come from less-developed countries, three employ rather weak quasi-experimental methods, and one experimental study is statistically underpowered (that is, its sample is too small to measure effects precisely). Similarly, of the above-mentioned studies measuring program effects on civic skills, attitudes, and behaviors, only four present experimental results, and two of those (Barr et al., 2015; Gill et al., 2020) come from the United States. The remaining two randomized experiments (USAID, 2019; Reimers et al., 2015) provide valuable exceptions that can inform subsequent evaluations in other contexts. One additional study (EDC, 2016) provides more rigorous quasi-experimental evidence; the remaining results should be regarded with greater caution. In summary, therefore, additional randomized evaluations would greatly contribute to a so-far rather limited body of knowledge on the effects of civic education programs in low- and middle-income countries.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USAID

The varied approaches, curricula, contexts, and outcome measures of most civic education and engagement research; a dearth of experimental evidence from conflict-affected contexts; and the lack of clear findings for programs aiming to influence skills, attitudes, and behaviors limit the lessons about “what works” to improve civic outcomes that are directly applicable to USAID’s civic education work with youth in Armenia. The findings from an evaluation of an Armenian civic engagement intervention could help address significant gaps in knowledge.

Nonetheless, some lessons from the literature may help improve effectiveness, including:

evidence for the potential of online approaches in emerging democracies, though the focus is on adult populations (Finkel et al., 2021). The possible implementation and impact of online learning with primary students in emerging democracies is yet largely unexplored, in part due to the lower online engagement of these groups.

1. Civic instruction should be consistently delivered, starting in the earliest grade possible.
2. Teachers implementing civic education should be trained in—and use—participatory methods and the open discussion of controversial issues instead of employing a lecture-style approach.
3. The program should be sensitive to contextual realities such as political polarization and potential apathy.
4. Implementers should be mindful of possible differential effects due to age, gender, and ethnic background and should consider strategies to mitigate these differences.
5. Collaboration with USAID/Armenia, its implementing partner, and the Ministry of Education are essential to ensure the program is implemented with fidelity and taken up well, is of high intensity, and is in strong contrast to the status quo.

ESSENTIAL READINGS ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Campbell, D. E. (2019). What social scientists have learned about civic education: A review of the literature. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 94(1), 32–47.

David Campbell, professor of political science from the University of Notre Dame, reviews the existing literature on civic education stemming mostly from political science, while also drawing on fields such as psychology, economics, and sociology. The author highlights four aspects of schooling that have been shown to impact civic outcomes: classroom instruction, extracurricular activities, service learning, and school ethos. Most relevant to USAID’s Armenia intervention is Campbell’s review of the research on classroom instruction, finding evidence that well-designed civic education can have long-lasting effects on student civic outcomes, especially through an open classroom climate. Campbell ultimately recommends that research on civic instruction emphasize randomized experiments to produce more evidence of causal mechanisms. While the article focuses on research in Western, liberal democracies, general lessons may be relevant to emerging democracies as well.

Finkel, S. E., & Ernst, H. R. (2005). Civic education in post-apartheid South Africa: Alternative paths to the development of political knowledge and democratic values. *Political Psychology*, 26(3), 333–364.

Steven Finkel, professor of political science at the University of Pittsburgh, and Howard Ernst, professor of political science at the United States Naval Academy, provide a rare rigorous evaluation of civic education in the context of emerging democracies. The authors examine the impact of civic education on South African secondary students as compared to a nonrandom comparison group. They measure the program’s impact on political knowledge, civic duty, tolerance, institutional trust, civic skills, and approval of legal forms of political participation and find that civic education instruction improved levels of civic knowledge. They detect little impact on civic skills and attitudes. They do find, however, that when teachers employ participatory teaching methods in an open classroom climate and when they are perceived by students as being credible and knowledgeable, civic education does improve democratic civic values and skills. While in the absence of random assignment the team cannot be certain the causal effect was accurately isolated, this study provides convincing evidence of the importance of teaching methods and quality.

Green, D. P., Aronow, P. M., Bergan, D. E., Greene, P., Paris, C., & Weinberger, B. I. (2011). Does knowledge of constitutional principles increase support for civil liberties? Results from a randomized field experiment. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(2), 463–476.

Donald P. Green, professor of political science at Columbia University (Yale University at the time of writing), with a team from Yale University and Michigan State University, presents the only known randomized evaluation of a stand-alone, solely classroom-based civics curriculum. More than 1,000 students in 59 U.S. high school classrooms were randomly assigned to receive a civics curriculum that stressed constitutional principles related to civil liberties while control groups were not exposed to this specific curriculum. They find that exposure to civic education has a significant effect on knowledge of civil liberties, though this knowledge dissipated after two years. They do not find that treated students increase their support of civil liberties, such as free speech, dissent, or due process, questioning whether there is indeed a causal pathway between civic knowledge and civic attitudes. While the research was undertaken in the United States, the findings and methodological approach of the evaluation can be instructive for USAID's proposed Armenian evaluation.

Mason, T. C. (2009). Civic education in emerging democracies. *Center of Civic Education*.

Professor Terrence Mason of the Indiana University School of Education discusses different models and approaches of civic education efforts in emerging democracies and reviews key issues that civic education implementers may face when working in emerging democracies. The author draws on the literature as well as his own experience working in civic education in developing countries. He gives a few examples of civic education programs developed in the United States and being implemented in emerging democracies, which combine in-class instruction and participatory methods. Mason contends that little empirical research exists on the effectiveness of such programs in emerging democracies. He nevertheless cites some lessons from current work, especially the importance of culture and context. He stresses that: teachers and students from emerging democracies may have different conceptualizations of democracy; may hold simultaneous cultural, ethnic, and national identities; and may hold cultural values and norms that are at odds with those held by program implementers from Western countries. Mason's discussion is particularly useful when considering how programs could be more sensitive to the specific contexts where they are being delivered.

Quaynor, L. J. (2012). Citizenship education in post-conflict contexts: A review of the literature. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 7(1), 33–57.

Laura Quaynor, assistant professor in the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) program at Johns Hopkins University, reviews the literature on civic education (referred to as citizenship education in the review) in post-conflict societies. She summarizes 33 studies from 18 post-conflict countries: mostly curricular analyses, quantitative surveys, and ethnographic studies. While the research presented is largely qualitative and observational, it may still offer useful takeaways for civic education programs in post-conflict settings. She finds some common trends among the studies that point to the unique challenges civic education programs may face in these settings. These challenges include the tendency to avoid controversial issues in the classroom, tensions between ethnic and national identities, high levels of distrust of political parties, and preferences for authoritarianism held by teachers and students.

REFERENCES

- Almond, G.A., and Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: Political attitudes in five western democracies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Babajanian, Babken V. (2005). Civic Participation in Post-Soviet Armenia. *Central Asian Survey*, 24(3), 261–279.
- Bachner, J. (2010). From classroom to voting booth: The effect of civic education on turnout. in New Orleans, LA: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Hotel InterContinental.
- Barr, D., Boulay, B., Selman, R., McCormick, R., Lowenstein, E., Gamse, B., Fine, M., & Leonard, M. B. (2015). A randomized controlled trial of professional development for interdisciplinary civic education: Impacts on humanities teachers and their students. *Teachers College Record*, 117(2), 1–52.
- Bleck, J. (2015). *Education and empowered citizenship in Mali*. JHU Press.
- Bramwell, D. (2020). Systematic review of empirical studies on citizenship education in Latin America 2000 to 2017 and research agenda proposal. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 19(2), 100–117.
- Burde, D. (2014). *Schools for Conflict or for Peace in Afghanistan*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Callahan, R.M., Muller, C., & Schiller, K.S. (2010). Preparing the next generation for electoral engagement: Social studies and the school context. *American Journal of Education*, 116(4), 525–556.
- Campbell, D.E. (2008). Voice in the classroom: How an open classroom climate fosters political engagement among adolescents. *Political Behavior*, 30(4), 437–454.
- Campbell, D.E. (2019). What social scientists have learned about civic education: A review of the literature. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 94(1), 32–47.
- Carnegie Corporation and CIRCLE. (2003). *The civic mission of schools*. Available at <http://www.civicmissionofschoools.org/>.
- Caro, D. H., & Schulz, W. (2012). Ten hypotheses about tolerance toward minorities among Latin American adolescents. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 11(3), 213–234.
- Castillo, J. C., Miranda, D., Bonhomme, M., Cox, C., & Bascopé, M. (2014). Social inequality and changes in students' expected political participation in Chile. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 9(2), 140–156
- Castillo, J. C., Miranda, D., Bonhomme, M., Cox, C., & Bascopé, M. (2015). Mitigating the political participation gap from the school: The roles of civic knowledge and classroom climate. *Journal of Youth studies*, 18(1), 16–35.
- Center for Civic Education. (2005). *Voting and political participation of We the People: The citizen and the constitution alumni in the 2004 election*. Center for Civic Education.
- Chandler, J., Cumpston, M., Li, T., Page, M. J., & Welch, V. A. (2019). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (J. P. T. Higgins & J. Thomas, Eds.; 2nd edition). Wiley-Blackwell.

- Claire, H. (2001). *Not aliens: primary school children and the citizenship/PSHE curriculum*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.
- Dewey, John. 1916. *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dhar, D., Jain, T., & Jayachandran, S. (2018). *Reshaping adolescents' gender attitudes: Evidence from a school-based experiment in India* (No. w25331). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Donbavand, S., & Hoskins, B. (2021). Citizenship education for political engagement; A systematic review of controlled trials. *Social Sciences*, 10(5), 151.
- Education Development Center, Inc. (2016). *Mindanao Youth for Development (MYDEV) Program FY15 Impact Evaluation Report*. USAID. https://www.edc.org/sites/default/files/uploads/MYDev%20Impact%20Eval_Master_FINAL.pdf
- Finkel, S.E. (2014). The impact of adult civic education programmes in developing democracies. *Public Administration and Development*, 34(3), 169–181.
- Finkel, S.E., & Ernst, H.R. (2005). Civic education in post-apartheid South Africa: Alternative paths to the development of political knowledge and democratic values. *Political Psychology*, 26(3), 333–364.
- Finkel, S., Neundorf, A., & Rascon Ramirez, E. G. (2021). Can Online Civic Education Induce Democratic Citizenship? Experimental Evidence from a New Democracy. *Experimental Evidence from a New Democracy* (February 3, 2021).
- Freedom House. (2021). *Freedom in the World 2021: Armenia*. Freedom House.
- Galais, C. (2018). How to make dutiful citizens and influence turnout: The effects of family and school dynamics on the duty to vote. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 51(3), 599–617.
- Galston, W.A. (2004). Civic education and political participation. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 37(2), 263–266.
- Gill, B., Whitesell, E. R., Corcoran, S. P., Tilley, C., Finucane, M., & Potamites, L. (2020). Can Charter Schools Boost Civic Participation? The Impact of Democracy Prep Public Schools on Voting Behavior. *American Political Science Review*, 114(4), 1386–1392.
- Green, D.P., Aronow, P.M., Bergan, D.E., Greene, P., Paris, C., & Weinberger, B.I. (2011). Does knowledge of constitutional principles increase support for civil liberties? Results from a randomized field experiment. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(2), 463–476.
- Hahn, C.L. (2010). Comparative civic education research: What we know and what we need to know. *Citizenship Teaching & Learning*, 6(1), 5–23.
- Henley, Jon. (2020). How Finland Starts its Fight Against Fake News in Primary Schools. *The Guardian*, 29 January 2020.
- Hoskins, B., Huang, L., & Arensmeier, C. (2021). Socioeconomic inequalities in civic learning in Nordic schools: Identifying the potential of in-school civic participation for disadvantaged students. *Northern Lights on Civic and Citizenship Education: A Cross-National Comparison of Nordic Data from ICCS*. Cham: Springer, 93–122.
- IES What Works Clearinghouse. (2020). *What Works Clearinghouse Standards Handbook, Version 4.1 [Handbook]*. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/referenceresources/WWC-Standards-Handbook-v4-1-508.pdf>

- Kahne, J., Hodgin, E., & Eidman-Aadahl, E. (2016). Redesigning civic education for the digital age: Participatory politics and the pursuit of democratic engagement. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(1), 1–35.
- Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E., & Lopes, J. (2010). Citizenship education in England 2001-2010: young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS).
- King, E. (2014). *From classrooms to conflict in Rwanda*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Langton, K.P., & Jennings, M.K. (1968). Political socialization and the high school civics curriculum in the United States. *American Political Science Review*, 62(3), 852–867.
- Levine, D.H., & Bishai, L.S. (2010). Civic education and peacebuilding: Examples from Iraq and Sudan. Special Report 254. *United States Institute of Peace*.
- Levinson, Meira. (2010). The Civic Empowerment Gap: Defining the Problem and Locating Solutions. In L. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C.A. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of research on civic engagement* (pp. 331–361). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lipset, S.M.. (1959). Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy." *American Polit. Sci. Rev.* 53 (1): 69–105.
- Manning, N., & Edwards, K. (2014). Does civic education for young people increase political participation? A systematic review. *Educational Review*, 66(1), 22–45.
- Mason, T.C. (2009). Civic education in emerging democracies. *Center of Civic Education*.
- McCauley, C. (2002). Head-first versus feet-first in peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo, (Eds.), *Peace Education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 247–257). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McDevitt, M., & Kiouisis, S. (2006). Experiments in political socialization: Kids Voting USA as a model for civic education reform. CIRCLE Working Paper 49. *Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), University of Maryland*.
- McGrew, S., Breakstone, J., Ortega, T., Smith, M., & Wineburg, S. (2018). Can students evaluate online sources? Learning from assessments of civic online reasoning. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 46(2), 165–193.
- Neins, U. Kerr, K., & Connolly, P. (2013). Evaluation of the effectiveness of the “Promoting Reconciliation Through a Shared Curriculum Experience” Programme. *Centre for Effective Education, Queen’s University Belfast, Belfast*
- Neundorf, A., Niemi, R. G., & Smets, K. (2016). The compensation effect of civic education on political engagement: How civics classes make up for missing parental socialization. *Political Behavior*, 38(4), 921–949.
- Niemi, R.G., & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education: What makes students learn*. Yale University Press.
- O’Connor, U. (2012). Schools together: Enhancing the citizenship curriculum through a non-formal education programme. *Journal of Peace Education*, 9(1), 31–48.
- Oesterrich, D. (2009). Civic education in Eastern Europe: results from the IEA civic education project. In *Nation-Building, Identity and Citizenship Education: Cross-cultural Perspectives, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research*. Zajda, J. et al. (eds.), (pp. 55–67). Dordrecht: Springer.

- Ohanyan, Anna. (2020). “Is Armenia’s Democracy on Borrowed Time?” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*.
- Owen, D. (2014, August). Civic Education and the Making of Citizens in the Digital Age. In *presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association*.
- Owen, D. (2015). High school students’ acquisition of civic knowledge: The impact of we the people. *Washington: Georgetown University*.
- Pasek, J., Feldman, L., Romer, D., & Jamieson, K.H. (2008). Schools as incubators of democratic participation: Building long-term political efficacy with civic education. *Applied Development Science, 12*(1), 26–37
- Pospieszna, P., & Galus, A. (2020). Promoting active youth: evidence from Polish NGO’s civic education programme in Eastern Europe. *Journal of International Relations and Development, 23*(1), 210–236.
- Pritchett, L. (2013). *The rebirth of education: Schooling ain't learning*. Center for Global Development.
- Quaynor, L.J. (2012). Citizenship education in post-conflict contexts: A review of the literature. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 7*(1), 33–57.
- Reimers, F. M., Ortega, M. E., & Cardenas, M. (2014). Empowering Teaching for Participatory Citizenship. Evaluating Alternative Civic Education Pedagogies in Secondary School in Mexico. *JSSE - Journal of Social Science Education, 4-2014 Civic Activism, Engagement and Education: Issues and Trends*.
- Russell, S.G. (2018). Global discourses and local practices: Teaching citizenship and human rights in postgenocide Rwanda. *Comparative Education Review, 62*(3), 385–408.
- Saha, L.J. 2000. Political activism and civic education among Australian secondary school students.” *Australian Journal of Education 44* (2): 155–174.
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International report: Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower-secondary school students in 38 countries*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Sears, D.O., Hensler, C.P., and Speer, L.K. 1979. Whites’ opposition to ‘busing’: Self-interest or symbolic politics?” *American Political Science Review 73* (2): 369–84.
- Slomczynski, K.M., & Shabad, G. (1998). Can support for democracy and the market be learned in school? A natural experiment in post-Communist Poland. *Political Psychology 19*(4), 749–779.
- Sonnenfeld, A., Doherty, J., Berretta, M., Shisler, B., Snilstveit, B., & Evers, J. (2021). Strengthening intergroup social cohesion in fragile situations. *The International Initiative for Impact Evaluation* (3ie).
- Soule, S. (2002, August). Creating a cohort committed to democracy? Civic education in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston Marriott Copley
- Stewart, T. (2011). Palestinian youth and non-formal service-learning: a model for personal development, long-term engagement, and peace building. *Development in Practice, 21*(3), 304–316.
- Tankard, M.E., & Paluck, E.L. (2016). Norm perception as a vehicle for social change. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 10*(1), 181–211.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. IEA Secretariat.

- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Husfeldt, V., Nikolova, R., & Amadeo, J. A. (2002). *Civic knowledge and engagement: An IEA study of upper secondary students in sixteen countries*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Treviño, E., Béjarés, C., Villalobos, C., & Naranjo, E. (2017). Influence of teachers and schools on students' civic outcomes in Latin America. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 110(6), 604–618.
- USAID. (2021). *Liberia Civic Education Evidence Review*, by Elisabeth King, Alejandro Ganimian, and Sorana Acris. USAID/Liberia.
- USAID. (2019). *Impact Evaluation of USAID/Georgia's Momavlis Taoba (MT) Civic Education Initiative (CEI)*, by National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago (NORC).
- Van Deth, J.W., Abendschön, S., & Vollmar, M. (2011). Children and politics: An empirical reassessment of early political socialization. *Political Psychology*, 32(1), 147–174.
- Youniss, J. (2011). Civic education: What schools can do to encourage civic identity and action. *Applied Developmental Science*, 15(2), 98–103.