Learning Citizenship by Practicing Democracy

Learning Citizenship by Practicing Democracy: International Initiatives and Perspectives

Edited by

Elizabeth Pinnington and Daniel Schugurensky

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PUBLISHING

Learning Citizenship by Practicing Democracy: International Initiatives and Perspectives,
Edited by Elizabeth Pinnington and Daniel Schugurensky

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1722-8, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1722-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors would like to thank Nelson Rosales and Ravi Badri for their conscientious editing work, as well as the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for its support of this project.

PROLOGUE

In October 2008, the Transformative Learning Centre of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (University of Toronto) organized its second international conference on citizenship learning and participatory democracy. This conference, entitled *Learning Democracy by Doing: Alternative Practices in Citizenship Learning and Participatory Democracy*, welcomed close to 300 delegates from 5 continents. Over the course of 4 days, practitioners and scholars shared more than 150 papers in panel discussions, roundtables and keynote addresses. The overwhelming popularity of the conference spoke to a growing interest to make democracy more relevant and connected to people's everyday lives and to connect citizenship education to the development of a critical, informed, engaged and caring citizenry.

This book, *Learning Citizenship by Practicing Democracy: International Initiatives and Perspectives*, brings together a selected collection of the papers submitted to the conference. Some contributors are well-known scholars, educators and activists who have many of years experience working to make democracy more participatory in their own contexts. Other contributors are emerging voices, sharing innovative perspectives and practices from movements they are involved in, or actively supporting through research and education.

As editors, our intention was that, as much as possible, we could compile a volume on citizenship education and participatory democracy that includes different perspectives, academic traditions, ideological persuasions and geographical locations. The result of that effort is this book with twenty articles (18 chapters, an introductory essay, and a postscript) that deal with realities in institutions and communities in both the global North and the global South.

The contributions of this book are organized in to three thematic sections, according to three different spaces in which democracy is learned or practiced: I) educational institutions, II) community organizations, and III) co-governance (participatory budgeting).

In the introductory essay, Daniel Schugurensky explores some connections between citizenship learning and participatory democracy, argues that participatory education (PAREDU) can complement parallel proposals like participatory economics (PARECON) and participatory

politics (PARPOLITY), and identifies six areas to consider in terms of research and practice.

In *Part I: Learning Democracy in Educational Institutions*, the different authors discuss the possibilities and challenges of learning democracy in educational institutions, from primary schools to universities. Felix Bivens and Peter Taylor, as well as John Annette, discuss British and Canadian institutions of higher education as sites for democratic learning and social change. Patricia Grossi, Beatriz Aguinsky and Mario Grossi present the case of restorative justice circles used to create more democratic spaces for conflict resolution in public schools in Brazil. The next three chapters discuss the possibilities and challenges of learning democratic skills, values and dispositions through public school curricula in Hong Kong (Shun Wing Ng), Pakistan (Karim Panah) and Québec (David Lefrançois and Marc-André Éthier).

Part II: Learning Democracy in Communities, includes examples of participatory democracy experiments in seven different countries. Manjula Bharathy discusses the gendering of democracy in the Kerala People's Plan in India. Jim Crowther, Ian Martin, and Mae Shaw, from Scotland, present their ideas about democratic community education and present ten propositions on democracy and on learning for democracy. Tor Iorapuu describes how community groups used theatre and soccer as vehicles to create spaces to learn about electoral practices and engage in participatory democracy in Nigeria. Amy Lang examines the differences in civic learning acquired by participants in the Citizens' Assemblies on Electoral Reform (an innovative experiment of 'randomocracy') in two Canadian provinces: British Columbia and Ontario. Camila Piñeiro Harnecker distinguishes between the development of workers' collective consciousness and social consciousness in workplace democracies and analyzes them in a study on Venezuelan cooperatives. Lake Sagaris examines instances of democratic citizenship learning in a neighborhood organization in Santiago, Chile. Finally, Astrid von Kotze shares the possibilities of public art projects to create democratic links between deeply divided communities in Durban, South Africa.

Part III: Learning Democracy in Participatory Budgeting, is devoted entirely to the learning dimension of this innovative citizen-driven model of resource allocations. As participatory budgeting process enters its third decade, we chose to highlight examples from three continents where it is being implemented at the municipal level. The section begins with an introductory chapter by Josh Lerner that highlights the main exchanges that took place at a roundtable discussion about participatory budgeting during the *Learning Democracy by Doing* conference. In the second

chapter, Alberto Ford draws on his experience as a researcher and participant in both the participatory budgeting and neighborhood councils in Rosario (Argentina) to reflect on the democratic learning and practices that arise from these two different contexts. In the third chapter, Ligia Lüchmann presents her research about democratic learning in ongoing experiments with participatory budgeting in Santa Catarina, Brazil. In the final two chapters, Elizabeth Pinnington and Daniel Schugurensky, as well as Julien Talpin, present research findings about democratic learning and change through participatory budgeting experiments in Canada and Europe respectively.

In the postscript of the book, Jenny Pearce discusses some of the challenges faced by radical democrats and outlines three contemporary political paradoxes that relate to the practice of participatory democracy.

Overall, the articles in this volume represent a wide variety of viewpoints, as the authors come from varied geographical and disciplinary locations. We see this book not as an isolated material, but as part of the worldwide movement for deepening democracy and for an emancipatory citizenship education. One of our modest contributions to this process consists of bringing together the twin fields of participatory democracy and citizenship education, and promoting connections that will hopefully lead to improvements in theory, research and practice. While these two fields are part of the same family and are naturally bound to meet and connect, sometimes they act like those distant cousins who seldom talk to each other. We hope you enjoy the book and that the reading inspires you to continue or take up your own critiques, learning and participation in democratic dialogues, debates, and spaces in your communities.

—Elizabeth Pinnington and Daniel Schugurensky
University of Toronto, August 2009

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

CITIZENSHIP LEARNING FOR AND THROUGH PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

DANIEL SCHUGURENSKY

Introduction

Traditionally, both in terms of research and practice, the fields of participatory democracy and citizenship education have operated independently of each other. With few exceptions, citizenship education programs have not incorporated participatory democracy as a key curriculum component, and participatory democracy experiments have not considered the educational dimension as a central piece of the process. However, in recent years there has been a growing interest in establishing closer relationships between these two areas of human activity. This chapter explores some of these relationships, and proposes an agenda for research and practice.

Citizenship

Paraphrasing the Archbishop of York, who once said that the main purpose of education is to produce citizens, Eleanor Roosevelt (1930) argued that the true purpose of education is to produce *good* citizens (italics added). Although formulated in different ways, this argument has been repeated over and over by educators and non-educators alike, to the point that today it is commonplace to say that one of the main purposes of education is the advancement of citizenship. However, there is no single agreed-upon definition of what a citizen is or what a good citizen does. This is largely due to the fact that citizenship is a dynamic, contextual, contested and multidimensional concept. It is dynamic because its meanings and characteristics have changed throughout history. It is contextual because, at any given time, it has different interpretations and

applications in different societies. It is contested because, even in the same time and the same society, there are disagreements about what citizenship is and what it should be. Lastly, the term citizenship is multidimensional, because it connotes at least four different dimensions: status (membership), identity (feelings of belonging), civic virtues (dispositions, values and behaviors) and agency (engagement, political efficacy and power).

In his influential analysis of the connections between inequality, citizenship rights and capitalism, T.H. Marshall (1950) conceptualized citizenship as a status bestowed on those who are full members of a political community, and noted while in principle those who possess the status are equal, in reality the fulfillment of citizenship depends on a person's access to civil, political and social rights. This is due, he argued, to the contradiction between citizenship and the capitalist class system.

Hence, in considering the notion of citizenship as status it is relevant to distinguish between ideal and real citizenship, which brings our attention to the difference between formal and substantive democracy. In other words, formal equality is meaningless if it is contradicted by economic, social, political and cultural inequalities. Hence the importance of considering the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion operating in a particular social context, and of igniting political-pedagogical projects that redouble efforts to narrow the gap between formal and substantive democracy.

While status refers to rights and duties, identity refers to issues of belonging and meaning. Whereas status is about being a member of a community, identity is about feeling like a member of that particular community. The distinction between status and identity is particularly evident in multiethnic, multilingual, multicultural and multi-religious states, and particularly in nation-states that are multi-nation states. In these cases, identity is rooted in factors like a common history, language, religion, values, traditions and culture, which seldom coincide with the artificial territory of a nation-state. The difference between citizenship as status and identity is clear in the cases of nation-states that were built after a process of conquest and colonization, usually by displacing, dominating or eliminating groups that lived there. Another example of a mismatch between status and identity can be observed among people with internationalist inclinations who are legally citizens of their nation-states but define themselves as citizens of the world, even if 'planetary citizenship' is not yet a legal condition.

Citizenship as civic virtues alludes to the values, attitudes and behaviors that are expected of ‘good citizens’. In the same way that there is no universal agreement on the good society, the abstract notion of the

good citizen may evoke different traits, images and role models. For some, the main civic virtues of a good citizen are patriotism, obedience, diligence and religiosity. Others emphasize philanthropy, compassion, empathy, respect, tolerance, solidarity, and individual responsibility, while for others civic virtues relate to knowledge of social reality, critical analytical skills, interest for the common good, civic participation, and inclination towards social justice. The ideal of a 'good citizen' promoted by the state varies according to historical, ideological and political contexts. For instance, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the *Handbook for New Canadians* emphasized that the good citizen loves God, the Empire and Canada, works hard, is brave, is clean, and is every inch a Man *(*Fitzpatrick 1919). Today, Canadian textbooks portray a good citizen as an informed, critical, purposeful, active and caring person who values freedom, respects cultural differences, and is committed to democracy, peace and social justice (Evans, et al. 2000, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2004).

Citizenship as agency invokes the idea of citizens as social actors, and hence to their capacity of exerting power. Ruth Lister (1998) distinguishes between being a citizen and acting as a citizen. Being a citizen is about enjoying the rights necessary for agency and social and political participation, and acting as a citizen involves fulfilling the full potential of that status**.** The exercise of citizenship, individual or collective, does not occur in a vacuum, but in concrete social relations mediated by power. To some extent, power structures determine what citizens can and cannot do, or feel allowed to do. As Marx noted, people have the power to make their own history, albeit not as they please, under circumstances not chosen by themselves. Following this dialectical approach, Freire (1995) cautioned against both voluntarism and determinism. Voluntarism is a kind of idealism that attributes to the will of the individual the power to change all things. Determinism is a sort of mechanic structuralism that underestimates the role of agents in historical processes. The notion of agency, then, recognizes that social action occurs in a context marked by a constant interplay of domination and contestation, of control structures and liberating forces, of limits and possibilities. It also calls our attention to the intensity and types of citizen action.

In relation to intensity, while it is possible to talk in general terms about 'passive' and 'active' citizenship, in real life these should be understood as end points of a continuum rather than as dichotomous categories. In relation to types of citizen action, different conceptions of the good citizen promoted by schools have different expectations for action. For instance, responsible citizens are expected to avoid littering, pick up litter made by others, give blood, recycle, volunteer, pay taxes, exercise, stay out of debt

and the like. Participatory citizens are expected to take active part in the civic affairs and social life of the community, and assume leading roles in neighbourhood associations, school councils, or political parties. Justice-oriented citizens are expected to be able to critically analyze structures of inequality, consider collective strategies to challenge injustice and, whenever possible, address root causes of social problems (Westheimer and Khane 2004).

The first two models promote actions that develop character and service, and encourage charity and volunteerism. These are necessary but not sufficient conditions for building a democratic and just society, as this also requires critical understandings of unequal social structures and engaging in emancipatory political struggles. Citizenship as agency, then, has to do with the willingness to ask difficult questions, with the confidence that one's agency can influence changes (political efficacy) and with the collective capacity to address injustices and build a better society.

Citizenship Education

Citizenship education programs may address simultaneously the four dimensions of citizenship, but frequently emphasize one of them. Traditional programs that focus on citizenship as status often emphasize formal membership to a nation-state and the teaching of ‘civics.’ These programs concentrate on facts about national history and geography, government institutions and the law, and tend to promote the ‘official story’ of a nation's development, instilling uncritical patriotism, naturalizing unequal social relations and exalting certain national heroes. Frequently, these programs conflate formal and real membership, as well as political and economic democracy, as if they were one and the same. In the margins, however, there are other programs that contrast the official perspective with the one of oppressed peoples. These programs also question taken-for-granted rules of inclusion and exclusion, interpret the law in the context of social dynamics of power and struggles, and promote the fulfillment of citizenships rights within a human rights framework.

Programs emphasizing citizenship as identity tend to stress nation building and the assimilation of minority groups to the dominant group. Often, this has meant the mainstreaming and 'malestreaming' of curriculum content, and the elevation of the hegemonic language, religion and culture to the pedestal of civilization. In some countries, the metaphor of the 'melting pot' is used to justify an educational policy of forced assimilation (e.g. residential schools for indigenous peoples). Other programs, however, promote the development of diversified curricula, and the development of

multicultural and intercultural education. Although there is some overlap between multicultural and intercultural education, a few differences can be noted. While multicultural education usually consists of knowing about other groups that coexist in the same territory, intercultural education promotes mutual recognition and equitable relations. Whereas multicultural education tends to take a superficial and uncritical approach (focusing on the 3Fs of folklore, food and festivities and the 3Ds of dance, dress and diet), intercultural education aims at encouraging deeper analyses and interactions, challenging discrimination and advancing social justice. Intercultural education tries to address the difficult balance between fostering equality while respecting difference, and is often inspired by related approaches like critical multiculturalism and anti-racist education (May 1994, Kanpol and McLaren 1995, Sabariego 2002). Other citizenship education programs strive at developing a planetary consciousness and an identity as world citizens. These programs are usually known as 'global education', and are often connected to peace education and environmental education approaches.

Programs that focus on the development of civic virtues (often known as 'moral education') tend to emphasize a set of values and dispositions. In each context, the particular selection of values promoted by a particular program will depend on a variety of social, institutional and personal factors. Two main approaches tend to prevail in the pedagogy of values and beliefs: character education and values clarification. Character education programs tend to instill a set of values and dispositions through exhortations and inducements. In theory, these programs claim to teach respect, responsibility and autonomy, but in practice they often use a pedagogy of indoctrination that fosters blind patriotism, uncritical obedience to authority, industriousness, faith in the status quo and the like (Kohn 1997). Values clarification programs aim at helping learners develop their own values by examining ethical dilemmas and examining different perspectives. In this approach there are no right or wrong set of values: any value is valid as long as it is a personal value. This approach has been criticized for proposing to examine values in a valueless vacuum, which runs the risk of falling in an extreme moral relativism in which all values are acceptable, even if they are based on racist, sexist or homophobic attitudes (Leming 1997, Howe and Covell 2005).

In between these two approaches, several models can be found. One of them is the cognitive development approach proposed by Kohlberg (1985), who argued that educators should be allowed to promote certain values, but that a democratic structure is needed to limit the power of the instructor to indoctrinate students. The most common approach in educational

institutions is to avoid open discussions about controversial issues among participants. Many instructors fear conflict, and hence tend to implement a 'safe curriculum' that reduces risks. Others, however, believe that the best way to nurture civic virtues is to welcome controversial topics and hard questions, as well as to encourage participants to ‘not to get along’ and make their differences explicit. This implies recognizing the plurality of viewpoints among participants and to facilitate a respectful dialogue among them (McLaughlin 2004, Hughes and Sears 2004, Hess 2009).

Programs that focus on citizenship as agency tend to promote the development of an active, engaged, and committed citizenry. Instead of conceiving learners only as economic producers and consumers, these programs also conceive of them as active citizens who can become 'masters of their own destiny' (Coady 1939). This implies a citizenship education that goes beyond the segmented model of education for *leadership* and for *followership* in which the elites are groomed to rule and make decisions while the masses are trained to follow orders and to be political spectators (I. Lister 1998). An education for active citizenship, thus, aims at nurturing citizens as political subjects. This means that, among other things, they are informed about the issues of the day, have a critical understanding of those issues, and are ready to propose alternatives and to influence decisions when needed through individual and collective action (M. Mayo 2005, P. Mayo 2004). It also aims at nurturing community development initiatives that foster self-reliance, empowerment, grassroots democracy and social transformation. This tradition of citizenship education for social action can be found, among other places, in Highlander’s Citizenship Schools (deeply connected to the civil rights movement of the 1950s) and in popular education initiatives, particularly in the global south.[1]

Drawing on these traditions, citizenship building and citizenship education are intrinsically connected to social action and to the twin

[1] Popular education is characterized by four main features: 1) a rejection of the neutrality of education, which implies a recognition of the relations between knowledge and power and between structure and agency, and the acknowledgment that education can play a role to reinforce but also to challenge oppressive social relations and seek social justice; 2) an explicit political commitment to work with the poor and the most marginalized sectors of society, and to assist social movements in fostering progressive social and economic change; 3) a participatory and dialogical pedagogy that focuses on the collective, departs from people’s daily lived experiences and promotes an integration of popular and systematized (scientific) knowledge, and 4) a constant attempt to relate education and social action, linking critical reflection with participatory research, mobilization and organization strategies (Schugurensky 2000).

project of widening and deepening democracy. As a political-pedagogical project, citizenship education should provide not only information about democracy but also opportunities to experience it. As Dewey noted, if knowledge is conceived as something external to experience, human beings are deprived of the capacity to direct their societies and control the institutions that affect their lives. He also astutely observed that experiences can be "miseducative" when they have the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience, and hence argued that the central problem of an education based upon experience is to select the kind of present experiences that live fruitfully and creatively in subsequent experiences (Dewey 1938, 25).

Educators can contribute to this by designing spaces and processes that nurture –not inhibit– citizenship learning, as well as by facilitating reflection over practice. Indeed, while learning something without putting it into practice reduces long-lasting changes in knowledge, belief systems and dispositions, to experience something without the opportunity to make meaning of it (through critical reflection in social interaction) limits the potential to create self-aware and proactive citizens (Wenger 1998, Merrifield 2001) and to improve the quality of the next experience.

Citizenship education is usually associated with educational institutions, where it is often implemented as a subject matter, but sometimes as cross-curricular approaches, as extracurricular programs or as a broader institutional project that shapes most activities (see Part 1). Although schools are important sites of citizenship learning, the acquisition of (and reflection on) citizenship knowledge, skills, attitudes and values constitutes a complex process that spans from cradle to grave, and includes a broad variety of settings. For instance, the family, media, community associations, workplaces and social movements are powerful socialization agencies for the development of citizenship values and political competencies (see Part 2). The 'cradle to grave' metaphor may suggest a chronological sequence, but lifelong citizenship learning is seldom a continuous, uninterrupted and linear accumulation of learning experiences. It is a messy complex of learning experiences that complement and contradict each other, challenging some of our prior assumptions and creating significant tensions in our consciousness (Mezirow 2000).

Enter Participatory Democracy

During the last few decades, in many parts of the world, it is possible to observe high levels of dissatisfaction with the dynamics of representative

democracy. This is expressed, among other things, in low voting turnouts and distrust of politicians. For instance, a study by the Commonwealth Foundation (1999) in over forty countries found a high level of citizens' disillusionment with their governments and with their political representatives, based on concerns about corruption, lack of responsiveness to the needs of the poor, and the limited opportunities for participation. In Argentina, at the turn of the twenty first century, people took to the streets under the slogan 'all politicians should leave'. A few years later, one of the largest surveys on this topic that included 50,000 people from 68 countries (BBC-Gallup 2005) revealed that two thirds of people worldwide feel unrepresented by their governments, less than half feel that elections in their country are free and fair, and only 13% trust politicians (making them the least trusted group, below military, religious and business leaders). Around the same time, 61% of people in the UK reported that they felt they could not influence public bodies (Take Part Network 2006). Moreover, representative democracy, with its adversarial nature and a political culture based on leveraging power relations, leaves little room for constructive dialogue and problem-solving. This, among other reasons, puts many women off from running for office. In Canada, for instance, only one in five members of the Parliament are women.

The dissatisfaction with this model of 'thin democracy' premised on passive citizenship, elections regulated by marketing strategies, and political institutions influenced by money has led to calls for a 'thick democracy' that is premised on societal wellbeing, human rights and participation. Indeed, the aforementioned research of the Commonwealth Foundation found that citizens want to see a society in which they can participate, first in terms of equal rights and justice, and second in responsive and inclusive governance. Indeed, participants observed that a good society is one in which they can participate in public spheres to make their own contribution toward the public good, and one in which they are heard and consulted on a regular basis and not only at the time of an election. In short, people want more than a ballot box: "they are asking for participation and inclusion in the decisions taken and policies made by public agencies and officials" (ibid, 38).

This has led to the emergence of a movement known as "deepening democracy" or "living democracy" (Fung and Wright 2003, Lappe 2006) and to an explosion of participatory democracy experiments around the world. The Power Inquiry distinguished six broad categories of democratic experiments: electoral, consultative, deliberative, co-governance, direct democracy, and e-democracy innovations (Smith 2005). After assessing 57 such innovations using several criteria (e.g. inclusiveness, form of

involvement, decision-making power, scale and transferability, resource implications, three exceptional innovations in terms of increasing and deepening participation were identified: participatory budgeting (see Part 3), citizens' assemblies on electoral reform (see chapter 10), and citizen initiatives and popular referenda (widely used in Switzerland). The evidence from these and other participatory democracy experiments suggest that ordinary citizens (alone or in collaboration with professional politicians and technical experts) have the capacity and skills to discuss and make sound recommendations on complex public policy issues (Murillo and Pizano 2003, Smith 2005, Annette 2009). This requires, among other things, good access to information, equality among participants, and opportunities to deliberate in a safe space.

Indeed, for democratic innovations to be successful and overcome some of the potential risks associated with these initiatives (co-optation, clientelism, tokenism, parochialism, exclusion, internal inequalities, etc.), certain enabling conditions and structures need to be present. Appropriate institutional arrangements are crucial because citizen participation cannot occur in a vacuum and good democratic processes do not happen by chance. They need an inclusive environment that encourages openness, dialogue, diversity of viewpoints, tolerance and broad analyses, all based on equitable criteria, clear links between deliberation, decision-making and implementation, and justice-oriented public policies. These institutional arrangements are aligned with recent international approaches to "good governance," which include eight features: participation, rule of law, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientation, and equity and inclusiveness (United Nations 2007). The challenge, however, lies in improving the interface between good governance and a mobilized civil society, combining the best of the technocratic approach, with its emphasis on institutional design, and the communitarian approach, with emphasis on grassroots democracy (Heller 2001, Gaventa 2004).

In this regard, it is helpful to look at the 'real utopias' approach, which is based on three principles, three design properties, and one primary background condition for successful empowered participatory governance (Fung and Wright 2003). The three principles are *practical orientation* (addressing a specific area of public concern), *bottom-up participation* (empowered involvement of ordinary citizens and officials) and *deliberative solution generation* (orientation towards solving problems). The three features of institutional design are *devolution* (transferring decision-making and implementation power to local action units), *coordination* (local units are linked to each other and to different

government levels in order to allocate resources, solve problems, and transfer innovations and learning) and *state centrality* (democratization of administrative bureaucracies charged with solving those problems). The background condition is a rough equality of power among participants for the purpose of deliberative decision. I would argue that another background condition is a government that is responsive to its citizens and has the political will to share power with them.

Fung and Wright argue that the presence of these features allow participatory democracy experiments to solve pressing social problems effectively, to generate more fairness and equity in their communities, and to produce broad, deep and meaningful civic participation. To these three important impacts I would like to add a fourth one, known in the literature as 'the educative effect.'

The Educative Effect: The Pedagogical Dimension of Participatory Democracy

Historically, references to the educational impact of participation can be found in many authors including Aristotle, J.J. Rousseau, Machiavelli, J.S. Mills, G.D.H. Cole, Kaufman[2] and Pateman. However, we still have little empirical evidence of the nature and extent of the 'educative effect' because research on this is still in its infancy (Mansbridge 1999, Merrifield 2001). Fortunately, a growing number of studies are exploring this connection. Using different methodological approaches and tools, these studies are shedding more light on the subjective dimension of participatory democracy.

For instance, in a meta-study, Berry et al. (1993) concluded that when participatory democracy provides opportunities for meaningful involvement in politics where ordinary citizens make decisions about the allocation of goods and services in their neighborhoods, they become more knowledgeable, more tolerant, more efficacious, and more confident in government. In a study on Mozambique, Marshall (1993) found that direct democracy practices in village meetings helped participants to think together about the transforming of their circumstances and themselves. In a study on women who participated in the management of neighbourhood centers in Australia, Foley (1999) found that participants acquired a great

[2] Arnold Kaufman (1960), who coined the term 'participatory democracy', argued that its main justifying function is not the extent to which it protects or stabilizes a community, its contribution to the development of human powers of thought, feeling and action.

variety of instrumental and political skills (from budgeting and accounting to collective planning and decision-making) but also important values and worldviews. In a study on public land management meetings in three rural communities in the Midwest US, Halvorsen (2003) found that high quality participation positively transformed participant beliefs. Among other things, participants became more tolerant of different opinions, valued the inclusion of diverse viewpoints in meetings, and increased their expectations of government accountability. Our own studies on participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, Montevideo, Rosario, Toronto and Guelph, and on cooperatives in Canada, Argentina and Venezuela, confirm those findings. We explored four main areas of learning and change (knowledge, skills, values and attitudes, and practices) and found that all participants experience at least some learning and change (in some cases significant learning and changes) as a result of their participation (e.g. Schugurensky 2004, Schugurensky, Mundel and Duguid 2006, Lerner and Schugurensky 2007, Pinnington and Schugurensky in Chapter 17).

These findings confirm the old dictum that one of the most effective ways to learn democracy is by doing it. Thus, it can be claimed that participatory democracy not only contributes to the construction of more transparent, efficient, equitable and democratic ways of governing, but also provides a privileged learning site for learning the competencies and values of citizenship. Through participation in deliberation and decision-making (and in collectively elaborating fair and workable criteria for making decisions), citizens develop not only a variety of civic virtues (solidarity, tolerance, openness, responsibility, respect, etc.), but also social, cultural and political capital (understood as the capacity for self-governance and for influencing political decisions). Moreover, certain types of participatory democracy (like participatory budgeting or workers' cooperatives) constitute for many people an entry point to political life and a democratic space to develop a more horizontal political culture.

A Participatory Triad: PARECON, PARPOLITICS, PAREDU

We are entering the second decade of the twenty first century, but our democracies and our education systems are organized around institutions that were designed in the nineteenth century. Representative democracy is still needed –there is no doubt about it, just for reasons of scale– but it can be complemented with participatory democracy processes. Likewise, the hierarchical and bureaucratic features of the educational system (designed for the demands of the industrial revolution) could be softened and

eventually replaced with a more participatory and democratic model. The two main economic and social systems of the twentieth century (capitalism and centrally planned socialism) failed in realizing a more democratic and just society, and in generating the conditions for full human development to occur among the majorities of this planet.

Two decades ago, Albert and Hahnel (1991) proposed a democratization of the economic sphere through a model known as PARECON, or participatory economics, that is inspired by co-operatives and the social economy. In this model, based on values of equity, solidarity, diversity, workers' self-management and efficiency, the production, consumption and allocation of resources are guided by participatory decision-making. To complement PARECON with a political vision, Shalom (2004) proposed a model called PARPOLITY, or Participatory Politics, which is based on freedom, self-management, justice, solidarity and tolerance, and calls for a system of participatory democracy in which every person can have the opportunity to influence a decision proportionate to the degree to which she or he is affected by that decision. To complement PARECON and PARPOLITY with an educational dimension, I would like to suggest that we need to develop a model that we could tentatively call PAREDU, or participatory education, whose first goal would be to expand and improve the connections between citizenship education and participatory democracy.

Six areas for research and practice for PAREDU

Traditionally, both in terms of research and practice, the fields of participatory democracy and citizenship education have operated independently of each other. With few exceptions, citizenship education programs have not incorporated participatory democracy as a key curriculum component, and participatory democracy experiments have not considered the educational dimension as a central piece of the process. However, there is growing interest in establishing closer relationships between these two areas of human endeavor. We can identify at least six areas that deserve attention for better understanding and strengthening connections between participatory democracy and citizenship learning: democratic educational institutions, pre-service capacity building, in-service capacity building, informal education, internal exchanges, and external exchanges.

Educational institutions and programs constitute formidable spaces to nurture citizens oriented towards the common good, willing to resolve differences through dialogue and able to develop self-governed structures.

Currently, there are approximately 200 democratic schools that operate according to democratic principles, including participatory democracy and sometimes implement participatory budgeting. Additionally, there are many programs in higher education and in the non-formal sector that aim to foster democratic practices and active citizenship. *Pre-service capacity building* consists of educational activities that prepare participants to engage effectively in democratic deliberation and decision-making, and range from self-directed materials to workshops. Sometimes, like in the Venezuelan communal councils, educational materials include self-evaluations. Other times, like the Ontario Citizen Assembly for Electoral Reform, the learning stage is incorporated as the first phase of the process itself. In-service capacity building usually consists of short courses, workshops and information sessions for participants already engaged in the process. Less frequently, it includes mentoring of newer generations of participants by older ones.

Informal education refers to the deliberate arrangement of situations to nurture certain informal learning experiences. It does not have teachers, facilitators, curriculum materials or textbooks, but has a design and a pedagogical intention developed a priori by someone who is not the learner (e.g. the participatory budget bus tour in Porto Alegre or the caravans of citizenship of the children's participatory budget in Barra Mansa). *Internal exchanges* refer to the learning about participatory democracy structures and processes shared among members of the same community of interest or institutional system (e.g. within health, education, housing, recreation, municipalities, workplaces, etc.), especially within the same geographic community. *External exchanges* refer to the sharing of experiences among different geographic communities and/or sectors in order to learn from each other, be it face-to-face or online.

In closing, the aim of PAREDU is to promote a positive mutual reinforcement between citizenship learning and participatory democracy. The better the quality of the democratic process, the better the quality of the learning experience, and the better equipped citizens are with the basics of democratic processes, and the more oriented they are to the values and principles of democracy, the greater likelihood that the process is increasingly more fair, inclusive, transparent, and enjoyable.

To cultivate this 'virtuous circle' of reciprocal relations between citizenship education and participatory democracy, PAREDU has to nurture 'schools of citizenship' in both formal and non-formal educational settings, as well as in other associational spaces. Over time, this can lead to the development of an archipelago of democratic learning communities. This can make a significant contribution to the 'deepening democracy'

project, because the more active and participatory citizens become, the more democratic the processes are likely to be in those communities. In other words, participatory democracy nurtures citizenship learning, and citizenship learning enhances participatory democracy processes. By nourishing the existing reciprocal relation between citizenship learning and participatory democracy through a variety of educational and institutional interventions we can help to develop both more democratic citizens and healthier democracies. Of course, this process does not occur overnight, and it is full of obstacles, difficulties and distortions, but this is not a reason to give up because, as Dewey noted, the cure for the problems of democracy is more, not less, democracy.

References

Annette, J. 2009. Active learning for active citizenship. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 4*(2): 149-160

Albert, M. and R. Hahnel 1991. The Political Economy of Participatory Economics. NJ: Princeton University Press.

Baierle, S. 1998. The explosion of experience: the emergence of a new ethical-political principle in popular movements in Porto Alegre, Brazil. In S. Alvarez, E. Daguino and A. Escobar (eds.), *Culture of Politics, Politics of Culture*: 118-138. Boulder: Westview Press.

BBC-Gallup. 2005.Who Runs Your World? http://www.bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2005/09_september/15/world.shtml (Accessed June 10, 2009).

Berry, J., K. Portney, and K. Thomson. 1993. *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. 2005. *A Look at Canada*. Ottawa: CIC.

Coady, M. 1939. *Masters of their Own Destiny*. New York: Harper and Bros.

Commonwealth Foundation. 1999. *Citizens and Governance: Civil Society in the New Millennium*. London: Commonwealth Foundation.

Dewey, J. 1938. *Experience and Education.* The Kappa Delta Pi Lecture Series. New York: Collier Books, Macmillan.

Evans, M., R. Evans, M. Slodovnick, and T. Zoric. 2000. *Citizenship: Issues and Action*. Pearson Education Canada.

Fitzpatrick, A. 1919. *Handbook for New Canadians.* Toronto: Ryerson Press.

Foley, G. 1999. *Learning in Social Action: A contribution to understanding informal education*. Leicester: NIACE.