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This qualitative multiple case study explores how six teachers are approaching the new Democratic Citizenship Education 1 official curriculum, especially its conflict theme, in Ecuadorian high schools. It adopts a mutual-adaption framework, which views policy and teachers’ particular approaches as mutually determining the implementation process, and uses the Concern-Based Adoption Model to further study teachers’ “adaptation” processes. It also uses a continuum going from a transmission (emphasizes transmitting socially-established knowledge) to a transformation conception (emphasizes questioning and transforming society) to analyze the type of citizenship education present in official curriculum, interpreted curricula (textbooks) and curriculum-in-use (teachers’ approaches). The main finding is that the teachers are not “approaching” the new official curriculum: they are using the lowest-cost available textbooks as their main guide. They did not seem to have changed their conceptions, objectives for student or practices – only the material they used. This is not surprising given the constraints they faced.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

... because without citizenship there can only be subjects or devotees but not free men capable of creating a better life for themselves. (Savater, 2010, p. 177)

Education is seen as essential in a democratic society, where citizens are to participate in the governing of society, rather than simply obey authority (i.e. Bai, 2001; Cevallos-Estarellas & Sigurdardottir, 2000; Civitas, 2006; Savater, 2010). In this sense, citizenship can be seen as the overarching purpose of education in democratic societies (Dewey, 1916 cited in Quaynor, 2012) or at least as one of its main goals (Sears, 2004).

Ecuador has recently renewed its emphasis on democratic citizenship education along with many changes in the education system. This study explores how high school teachers are approaching one of the new democratically-oriented citizenship education courses. In this chapter, I briefly present the context, my standpoint and an overview of the study.

Context

"There is no better time or place to study the contribution of education to democratic citizenship" (Reimers, 2007, p. 19, referring to Latin America)

In writings on citizenship and/or democracy, Latin American countries are frequently characterized as having high levels of economic inequity (Amadeo & Cepeda, 2008; Suarez, 2008). They are also characterized as being new democracies having only recently transitioned into democratic systems between 1978 and 1990, thus potentially with persisting authoritarian cultures (Amadeo & Cepeda, 2008; Freire, 1973; Magendzo, 2005; Nino, 1996; Reimers, 2007; Suarez, 2008) and relatively low levels of civic and democratic knowledge (Amadeo & Cepeda, 2008; Quaynor, 2012; Schulz, Ainley, Friedman, & Lietz, 2009a; Villegas-Reimers, 1996). Citizenship education is characterized as traditional and teacher-centered (Tibbitts & Torney-Purta, 1999; Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2004; Villegas-Reimers, 1996).

This may not be characteristic only of Latin America: In their study of civics in 28 countries, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald and Schulz (2001) found that “teacher-centered methods predominate… use of textbooks and recitation are especially prevalent” (p. 158) (also noted by others, such as Kerr, 2002; Schwille & Amadeo, 2002; Sears & Hughes, 1996). However, some say
this tendency is changing around the world, including Latin America (Amadeo & Cepeda, 2008; Suárez, 2008).

Between 1996 and 2006, Ecuador had ten different Presidents (and many more education Ministers). This period was characterized by political instability and financial hardship, with an acute financial crisis in 1999. Thus, along with the whole country, public education suffered. At the end of 2006, the Education Ministry and many social actors managed to organize a national plebiscite which voted for and approved a Ten-year Plan for Education (Ministerio de Educación, 2007). The newly elected President, Rafael Correa (who was re-elected and is still in power now), made a general commitment to reduce inequities in country, with a strong emphasis on improving public education.

To what degree and in what ways Correa’s government has improved education (or not) is highly debated. Nonetheless, many agree education that has been placed at the forefront of the political agenda and that there have been improvements in at least a few areas (i.e. Luna & Astorga, 2011). The public’s perception that education has improved in the last 10 years is one of the highest in Latin America (56%), and the lowest in believing it has retrogressed (7%) (OEI, 2012, data from Latinobarómetro, 2011).

The budget for education went from USD. 1088 million in 2006 to USD. 3.867 million in 2012 (SIISE, 2014). Access to education increased considerably after several strategies were put in place, i.e., eliminating all fees required of parents and giving uniforms, textbooks and breakfast to students. Indicators show increased access for those who traditionally were left out (people in the rural area, people with low SES and people from minority ethnic groups) (MinEduc, 2012d). Entry level salaries for teachers were raised from approximately USD. 400 a month to USD. 775.

With this new government focus on education, there have been many simultaneous changes affecting teachers, such as new curricula and programs for all grades (from early education to high school), standards and standardized national evaluations (including teacher evaluations), standardized procedures and tests for entering the teaching profession, professional development courses, new career paths, changes in the requirements for teacher promotion (MinEduc, 2012d) and a new education law with many changes in regulations (Asamblea Nacional, 2011), such as the requirement that teachers work 40 hours a week.
One further context factor worth noting is that, as was noted above for citizenship education worldwide, many write that Ecuadorian education tends to be teacher-centered and memoristic (i.e. Albuja, 2012; Cobo, 2008; Coyachamin, 2012; De la Torre, 2000; Fernandez, 2006; Landázuri, 1993; MinEduc, 2013; Morales, 2011; Ortiz, 2010; Palacios, 2012; Samaniego, 2008; Sinardet, 1999; Terán, 2004).

Whitman (2004) characterized it as “red pen, blue pen” education, highlighting the amount to dictation (titles in red, text in blue) and other teacher-centered practices he observed in classrooms all over the country. Bustos (1997), speaking of history instruction, characterizes the typical approach as “encyclopedic pedagogy” (p. 103). He further explains: “There is a belief that what is appropriate is to provide the student with a ‘good summary’, as exhaustive as possible, adjusted to the contents of the official program” (p. 103).^1^ Within this context, in September 2011, Ecuador began the implementation of a new nation-wide high school structure and curriculum (Asamblea Nacional del Ecuador, 2011; MinEduc, 2011a). Before this, at age 14, students had to choose a type of high school program that would strictly determine their future options: an academic type of program, which allowed students to enter university in a related field or one of many technical programs, which prepared students for the workforce (MinEduc, 2011b; Samaniego, 2008).

The new high school program establishes a common core of courses for all students, both in academic and technical programs, with the following three-fold goal: to prepare all students for (a) life and citizenship, (b) work and entrepreneurship and (c) post-secondary education (MinEduc, n.d.a). This common core includes subjects such as mathematics and literacy as well as three new courses (with an equal amount of hours as mathematics and literacy) related to democratic citizenship education. The new courses are (a) Developing Philosophical Thinking, (b) Education for Citizenship I and (c) Education for Citizenship II (MinEduc, n.d.a; MinEduc, 2011a). This study focuses on the second of the three courses, Citizenship Education I, henceforth referred to as EpC1.

---

^1^ Some relate this approach to education, and the inequities in the education system, to colonialism (i.e. Freire, 1973) and its Catholic churches (Nuñez, 1999) leading education in the country at least until the Liberal project in the 1890s (Fernandez, 2006; Sinardet, 1999), as well as the recent transition from authoritarian regimes to democracy in Latin America and thus presumably the persisting authoritarian culture (see above).
It is beyond the scope of this study to describe the official curriculum development process. However, I will attempt to briefly summarize the process through which all curricula for the new high school program were developed. First, starting in 2007, the Ministry of Education organized many meetings to discuss the new high school proposal with different stakeholders in education. Then, in 2010, the Ministry created draft proposals of the curricula with specialists and practitioners. In December of 2010, the Ministry uploaded the entire proposal with drafts of the curricula for all subjects onto its website to obtain comments from specialists, educators, students and other interested parties. The website received more than 230,000 visits.

The Ministry also organized meetings and workshops all over the country with different education stakeholders to obtain feedback regarding the proposed curricula. In May of 2011, the Ministry published revised proposals (MinEduc, 2011d). Still, there was much public discussion in Ecuador as to how “shared” the new vision for the high school program was (which includes EpC1). The Ministry listed the evidence of all public discussions held and online spaces available to comment on proposals (i.e. MinEduc, 2011c), while some organizations, such as the main teachers’ union, publicly claimed that the new proposal had not been discussed enough (i.e. EcuadorInmediato, 2011).

In addition to the specific courses for citizenship education in high school, national curricula specify that certain themes, such as democratic citizenship education, be continuously explored in all subjects and grades (MinEduc, 2010). High school students are also now required to complete 200 hours of community service before they graduate (Presidencia de la República del Ecuador [Presidencia], 2011). Also, all schools are required to have student governments elected by students (Presidencia, 2011).

Schools began offering the Developing Philosophical Thinking course to students in September 2011, Education for Citizenship I (EpC1) in September 2012 and Education for Citizenship II in September 2013 (Asamblea Nacional del Ecuador, 2011; MinEduc, 2011a). Thus, the EpC1 program this study focuses on was in its second year of implementation.

When the new high school program was launched, the Ministry of Education in Ecuador (MinEduc) stressed that the implementation would be flexible. The structure and core courses for all students were established and MinEduc provided general curriculum guidelines as well as some teacher
guidelines and material online, but each school and teacher was free to design their own approach and syllabus as well as select textbooks and material (MinEduc, n.d.b).

**Researcher’s standpoint**

...any inquiry into a social process or phenomenon is also an inquiry into one’s self. (Ravitch & Riggan, 2012, p. 53)

I grew up in Ecuador, only travelling to Toronto recently to study at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). One of the things that pained me the most about living Ecuador were the great inequities I saw, especially in terms of the distribution of economic resources. Before travelling to OISE, I worked with the Deputy Minister of Education as a policy analyst. One of the Ministry initiatives in which I was involved was the new high school program, which includes the aforementioned courses in citizenship education.

From my work in the Ministry, I understood this new focus on citizenship education to be one of the ways in which those with the least power (many of whom attend public schools) could gain knowledge and skills that could enable them to participate more fully in the construction of a more just society. I realize now that this led me to focus my study on the official curriculum as the starting point and predisposed me to see the official curriculum in a positive light. I reviewed my analysis of the curriculum several times over several months, and made a conscious effort not to let this view govern my analysis.

Although my hopes related this new curriculum motivated me to conduct research in this area, I think teachers’ understandings are very important to determining how the curriculum expectations are actually put into practice. This is why I focused on learning about their views and their approaches. Having been a teacher myself for several years, I am interested in supporting teachers, who often face appalling constraints every day. Finally, and because of having worked in the Ministry of Education, I am also very interested in providing information that is useful to those in the Ministry who struggle against many odds to improve public education in Ecuador.

**Overview of the study**

*Educational change depends on what teachers do and think – it’s as simple and as complex as that. (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 117)
The main research question that this study seeks to address is *How are teachers approaching the new democratically-oriented citizenship education 1 official curriculum (EpC1), especially its conflict theme, in high schools in Ecuador?* The specific research questions are listed in Chapter 3.

To explore this issue, I use a qualitative multiple case study approach (Stake, 2006). This method allows for a detailed examination of various individual cases. For this study, this approach helped provide descriptions of the various adaptations that teachers are making of the policy. It also allows for an examination of what Stake defines as a *quintain* (the collection of cases), which, in this study, helped provide information regarding similarities and differences across cases. This study was possible due to the help of six teachers of the new citizenship education high school course in Quito, Ecuador who were willing to participate in the study. The participants were purposefully selected using a maximal variation sampling strategy, which involves the selection of individuals representing a wide range of characteristics (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Creswell, 2012). The data was collected by means of interviews, classroom observations and the analysis of documents. The data analysis was informed by two main theoretical frameworks, one related to democratic citizenship education and another related to educational change, both explained in Chapter 2, within an overarching conceptual framework explained in Chapter 3.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

{The] idea of socializing children into a society that has yet to be created, and by so doing making its creation possible, applies with particular force to education for democracy. (Osborne, 2001, p. 52)

In this chapter, I briefly explain the theoretical frameworks and concepts used in this study\(^2\). These are the foundations of the conceptual framework described in the next chapter. This chapter is divided into two subsections which reflect the main topics with which this research is concerned: educational change and democratically-oriented citizenship education.

**Educational Change**

*Implementation makes further policy; it does not simply put predetermined policy into practice. (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 92)*

The field of educational change is broad and thus considers a vast range of changes. For example, from voluntary to involuntary changes and from grassroots initiatives to government mandates. Educational change contemplates individual, organizational and system level changes with a range of stakeholders such as teachers, principals, students, district administrators, consultants, parents and community members, and governments. This study focuses specifically on teachers who are in the process of “implementing” a national government curriculum initiative.

**Policy implementation: Basic notions of change in education.**

*This... may at first seem to be a misnomer. How does one ‘measure implementation’? Implementation is a complex process or series of processes. (George, Hall & Stiegelbauer, 2006, p. vii)*

Change is a process, not an event (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2011). As Anderson (2010) explains, previously some policy-makers and external program developers assumed that implementation was as simple as replacing one program with another, just as farmers might exchange one technology for another. Researchers quickly found that a simple mandate or

---

\(^2\) As explained by Ravitch and Riggan (2011), people speaking of literature reviews generally mean one of two things: (a) a document that attempts to exhaustively describe what is known on a given topic or (b) a chapter in a thesis or dissertation which describes the main theoretical frameworks and concepts the researcher will use for his or her study. In order to ensure this chapter is a precise and relevant as possible, I have opted for the second type of literature review mentioned.
public declaration that a new program had officially been adopted did not mean that schools and practitioners had changed what they were doing. In other words, while governments can announce the adoption of a change initiative, it is individuals and organizations that implement change (Hall & Hord, 2011). And so, “change works or doesn’t work on the basis of individual and collective responses to it” (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 46).

Being a process, educational change takes place over time. Although the time varies according to the type of implementation, scope of change, the context, etc., some mention a timeframe of three to five years needed for teachers to put significant changes in teaching and learning into practice (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2011). Also, change involves learning (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2011). Whether it be learning how to use novel material, how to teach in a different way or to gain a different understanding, all change involves individuals learning something new. Thus, change can be understood as a learning process that takes place over time.

Also, change is multi-dimensional (Anderson, 2010; Leithwood, 1981). Anderson (2010 citing Hall & Loucks, 1981; Leithwood, 1981; Fullan, 1982) explains that, broadly speaking, educational changes may involve teachers changing materials (i.e. curriculum, textbooks), changing practices (i.e. teaching or assessment strategies, classroom management) and/or changing beliefs (understandings or conceptions about the subject matter, teaching, etc.).

Leithwood (1981) proposes the following nine dimensions with which to understand changes in curriculum:

- **Platform.** Beliefs and assumptions.
- **Objectives.** Intended outcomes for students.
- **Student entry behaviors.** Prerequisites students are meant to have before beginning a program.
- **Assessment tools and procedures.** Any means used to determine the extent to which students have achieved the objectives.
• **Instructional material.** Any written, visual, or audio material used by students.
• **Learner experiences.** Mental operations and physical acts in which students engage.
• **Teaching strategies.** Teacher behavior meant to facilitate student learning.
• **Content.** Facts, concepts, principles and thought systems.
• **Time.** The description of time allocated to different aspects of the curriculum.

As explained in the conceptual framework section, I will use these dimensions to analyze the new policy/curriculum, the textbooks and teachers’ approaches. However, I will not use all dimensions. Analyzing student entry behaviors is beyond the scope of this research. These are implicitly included in the curricula of subjects of the prior grade level. An in-depth analysis of time and how it implicitly establishes learning objective priorities is also beyond the scope of this study.

I will synthesize and use four dimensions in my analysis in the following way: (a) **conceptions** (which include “platform” as well as other beliefs and understandings), (b) **objectives** (which include “content”), (c) **materials** (“instructional material”) and (d) **practices** (which includes analyzing how teachers approach content, design learner experiences and put them into practice as well as evaluation, “assessment”).

**Policy implementation: The Mutual Adaptation theoretical framework.**

*Policy may learn from schools as well as schools from policy, not simply about the weakness of a particular policy (as under the critical role), but also about entirely new possibilities.* (Clune, 1990, p. 258)

There is a distinction in educational change literature that is particularly useful for this study; the distinction between two different views of policy implementation: **fidelity** and **mutual-adaptation.**

As Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) explain, within the **fidelity** perspective, the assumption is that it is both possible and desirable for educators to implement policies exactly as intended by developers.

Within the **mutual-adaptation** perspective, on the other hand, “change often is, and should be, a result of adaptations and decisions made by users as they work with the particular new policies or programs, with the policy or program and the user’s situation mutually determining the outcome” (p. 38). As Clune (1990) states, “from this point of view, policy is an endless, recursive dialogue, rather than a series of self-sealing implemented commands” (p. 258-9). Furthermore, as Anderson
(2010) explains, “changes occur both in implementer behaviors as well as in the innovation as initially conceived and designed by those promoting the change” (p. 11).

In 1991, Fullan and Stiegelbauer described the existence of both perspectives as a tension in the literature. However, in 2010 several years later, Anderson, having reviewed several studies, concluded that “whether by design or by default, mutual adaptation remains the most realistic conceptualization of what happens when educators genuinely attempt to implement new ideas, programs and practices” (p. 11). Researchers of citizenship education would probably agree. Many of them explain that what policy documents say and what happens in classrooms are different, thus implicitly noting that “mutual adaptation” indeed occurs (i.e. Hughes, Print & Sears, 2010; Kelly & Odama, 2011; Kerr, 2002; Mundy & Manion, 2008; Sears & Hughes, 2004; Torney-Purta, Schwille & Amadeo, 1999). Mutual-adaptation also seems to be more aligned with the basic notions of change in education mentioned above. As will be further explained, this study adopts mutual-adaptation as its main theoretical lens.

**Policy implementation: The Concern-Based Adoption Model (CBAM).**

*CBAM*... offers a number of important ways for understanding what change is about, especially as it relates to the people involved. (Hall & Hord, 2011, p. xxiv)

Researchers have found there are predictable patterns in the ways in which people respond to change (Hall & Hord, 2011). One empirically-based approach to studying teachers and change is the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM). This model was developed during the 1970’s and has had continual improvements up until the present date. It offers a theoretical framework and specific instruments to understand teachers’ change processes when implementing new programs (Hall & Hord, 2011; Anderson, 1997).

The CBAM model includes three diagnostic areas related to implementer change. The first, “Stages of Concern (SoC)”, explore personal “concerns” (attitudes, anxieties) about the change and how it is used. The second, “Levels of Use (LoU)”, explores the type of actions related to the implementation of a new innovation. Finally, the third, “Innovation Configurations maps – IC maps” explore the variations in patterns of use for different individuals implementing the same
They define criteria to reflect the essence of the change being sought. For example, IC maps provide examples of “ideal”, “acceptable” and “unacceptable” uses of the innovation on different dimensions.

For this study I use the Stages of Concern (SoC) and Level of Use (LoU) frameworks as proposed by CBAM to analyze teachers’ concerns and also the levels of use teachers were at when I visited their classrooms. I do not use Innovation Configuration maps (IC maps) as proposed by CBAM. Generally IC maps are jointly built by school stakeholders – not by a sole researcher. Also, IC maps include a detailed prescription of what the innovation should and should not look like. I did analyze variations of use for different individuals. However, I used a case study method and then described what each individual did. I did not place their use under categories of “ideal”, “acceptable” and “unacceptable” using an IC map. In the spirit of IC maps, however, I did analyze the curriculum, textbooks and individual cases in an attempt to describe what type of citizenship education was reflected in each and how these compared amongst each other. One of the aspects the CBAM emphasizes is teachers’ concerns about the change initiative. As stated by Hall and Hord (2011) “feelings and perceptions about an innovation or change process can help or disrupt [the change process]” (p. 68). The CBAM identifies seven different Stages of Concern (SoC) that educators typically reflect when implementing an innovation. At Stage 0 – unconcerned, teachers are concerned with other matters. At Stage 1 – informational, teachers’ major concern is obtaining more information about the initiative. During Stage 2 – personal, teachers are mainly concerned with how the change will affect them personally. With Stage 3 – management, the main concern is logistics, mechanisms, details and the use of time. Teachers preoccupied with the consequences of the innovation on student learning is manifested at Stage 4 – consequence. At Stage 5 – collaboration, teachers seek to work with others to improve the benefits for students. Some teachers
will seek to modify the program to increase the benefits for students; this is represented as Stage 6 – *refocusing*.

The stages do not necessarily represent a strict linear progression from one to another: teachers generally express concerns from many of the categories at once. However, it is usually possible to determine the types of concerns that a teacher emphasizes the most. The model offers instruments such as interview protocols to help identify what type of concerns educators are expressing the most (Hall & Hord, 2011).

The CBAM has also identified eight different Levels of Use (LoUs) of innovations typically presented by individuals implementing changes, whether mandated or voluntary changes. At Level O – *nonuse*, teachers know nothing about the implementation and are not trying to find more information about it. At Level I – *orientation*, teachers are getting to know a little about the innovation. Teachers preparing for the first application of the innovation is represented in Level II – *preparation*. At Level III – *mechanical use*, teachers are struggling day-to-day while trying to apply the new program. When the teacher is stabilized and uses the innovation “automatically”, Level IVA – *routine* is reflected. Level IVB – *refinement*, refers to the teacher refining the innovation to increase the benefits towards students. At Level V – *integration*, teachers work with colleagues, again to increase impact. Some teachers may make major changes in the new program or search for a new program, seeking to further meet students’ needs. This is Level VI – *Renewal*.

As with SoCs, these levels do not necessarily operate in a linear fashion. Individuals might reflect different levels for different components of the innovation, such as materials use and teaching practices (Hall & Hord, 2011). The model also offers instruments such as interview protocols that can be used to assess individual’s level of use.

**Policy implementation: Factors that can influence teachers’ approaches.**
The teacher’s preferred pedagogical style also shapes curriculum implementation... A teacher who prefers a direct teaching style may rely more heavily on one text, teaching from it and reinforcing its content through large-group classroom activities, homework assignments, and tests. (Werner, 1990, p. 110)

For this study I took an open-ended perspective on factors that might influence how teachers approach a new mandated curriculum. I did not pre-define a list of factors as I wanted to explore, more than predict, factors related to how teachers approached the new curriculum in the Ecuadorian context.

I did specifically plan to ask teachers about their concerns and relate them to their levels of use of the new curriculum with CBAM instruments. Apart from concerns, I did not pre-define what factors to explore except for the basic information I asked all potential participants in the initial survey (see Appendix B), such as years of experience in general, years of experience having previously taught civics, etc. However, I did remain attentive to any factors that the teachers mentioned or I observed. To break the ice and obtain this type of information, I asked teachers to tell me about their teaching experiences and what they studied at university (see Appendix E).

I also read of many factors that can influence the ways teachers approach changes in education in the literature I reviewed. For example, teachers’ perceptions of new programs (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2011); teachers’ beliefs (Anderson, 2010; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2011; Kerr, 2002); teachers’ concerns about the change initiative (Hall & Hord, 2011); teachers’ conceptions of curriculum content (i.e. democracy, citizenship, conflict) (Torney-Purta et al., 2001; Osler & Starkey, 2006; Williams, 2013); teachers’ previous experiences including previous experiences with change (Fullan and Stiegelbauer, 1991; Kerr, 2002) and teachers’ preferred pedagogical styles and previous practices (Anderson, 2010; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2011; Werner, 1991).

Other factors include school culture and traditions (Tyack & Cuban, 1995) and possibly, its socioeconomic status; what other demands the new program is competing with for teachers’ time and effort (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Werner, 1991); professional development opportunities (Anderson, 2010; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991); evaluation policies, quantity of content to be “covered” and time/effort afforded to classroom management (Merchán, 2002 & 2007 cited in Patiño, 2013); funding, resources and working conditions (Anderson, 2010); change facilitators (i.e.
principals’ support) (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2011) and the working relationship among teachers (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

This list of factors is by no means exhaustive. There are many other possible factors, such as the economic status and culture surrounding schools and the underlying ideas upon which teachers make choices. In the conclusions I attempt to briefly explore factors that may influence teachers’ approaches according to the data collected.

**Policy implementation/adaptation, curriculum implementation/adaptation.**

*The schools that participated in this case study as well as the entities in charge of the organization of the Ecuadorian school system state that the curriculum reform has been applied in all schools, however, in practice, there are aspects of the reform that after 10 year of implementation have still not landed in the classroom. (Calvas, 2010, p. 113)*

As previously noted, this study seeks to understand how teachers are approaching a new policy mandate, in this case, a new curriculum. Although the term “curriculum” is commonly used to refer to an official program of studies (Aoki, 1986/1991), many researchers find it useful to distinguish between various types or moments of curriculum. First, there are several terms used to refer explicitly to prescribed (mandated) curriculum documents and programs of study. Examples are “intended curriculum” (Jerome, 2008; Mintrop, 2002; Quaynor, 2012), “official curriculum” (Apple, 1990) and “curriculum-as-planned” (Aoki, 1986/1991; Werner, 1991).

Werner (1991) uses the term “curriculum materials” to refer to textbooks and materials which he notes “interpret” policy and “may become the de facto curriculum for teachers and students” (p. 109). This is also noted in the context of Latin America by Suárez (2008), who says textbooks “serve as an intermediate step between policy discourse and teacher practice” (p. 491).

Yet other researchers have a term for the curriculum being taught. For example, Werner (1991) mentions “curriculum-in-use” and Mintrop (2002) uses “implemented curriculum”. Distinguishing from the curriculum being taught, some have terms to describe the curriculum that students experience or learn, such as “curriculum as experienced by students” (Quaynor, 2012). Aoki (1986/1991), similar to Quaynor, uses the term “curriculum-as-lived-experience” to describe the curriculum that teachers and students experience.
Many authors further mention a “hidden curriculum” (i.e. Werner, 1991; Cevallos-Estarellas & Sigurdardottir, 2000; Osborne, 2001; Sears, 2004; Villegas-Reimers, 19963), which generally refers to all of the implicit messages students receive in schools about learning, social relationships, rules, etc. The hidden curriculum is of course not explicit. Thus, it is communicated in implicit ways: through actions and words of everyone in the school, the layout and type of infrastructure, the type and content of materials and extracurricular activities as well as who has access to them or not, etc.

The terms used to describe the various types or moments of curriculum seem to affirm that mutual-adaption is indeed the most realist description of what happens during the “implementation” of a new policy, in this case, a new curriculum. Or at least, that it is more realistic than a fidelity perspective. The initial official curriculum is seen as being adapted at many stages and in many different ways. For example, the “official curriculum” is interpreted or ignored differently in different textbooks and materials, adapted differently by different teachers, understood and incorporated differently by different students, etc.4

Inspired by the authors above, I will use the term “official-curriculum” to refer to the curriculum documents created by the Ecuadorian Ministry, the term “interpreted-curriculum” to refer to textbooks and materials and the term “curriculum-in-use” to refer to how teachers are approaching the new program. Unfortunately, it is beyond the scope of this research to analyze the hidden curriculum or the curriculum as learned by students.

I have explained that this study focuses on policy implementation using mutual-adaptation as the main framework, and also uses CBAM to understand the change process. I also explained that this particular policy is a new curriculum, and how this policy/curriculum implementation can also be viewed through the mutual-adaptation perspective as a curriculum adaptation.

However, this study also attempts to explore the content of the specific curriculum and teachers’ approaches related specifically to this citizenship education curriculum, rather than solely explore

3 Many cite Philip Jackson’s 1968 book Life in classrooms as the origin of the term “hidden curriculum”. As I was not able to obtain Philip’s book (it was a challenge to obtain certain books in Ecuador), I take the term from the sources I reviewed for this thesis.

4 A word of caution; the mutual-adaption perspective does not entail a merely linear logic, tracing how policies adapt “all the way down the line”. It refers to the various adaptions that exist; for example, policies proposed by governments can be incorporated and adapted by schools as well as policies proposed by schools can be incorporated and adapted by governments (Clune, 1990). In the area of curriculum, Aoki (1986/1991) clearly explains that a “linear movement from curriculum-as-plan to curriculum-as-lived experience” is naive by illustrating how a teacher must dwell in the Zone of Between, negotiating everyday between the “curriculum-as-planned” and the “curriculum-as-lived experience”. This being said, however, this research will mostly focus on the different adaptations made in different textbooks and the different adaptations being made daily by different teachers.
their approaches on generic aspects that could apply to any curriculum (math, music, etc.). The next section will describe various conceptions of democratically-oriented citizenship education, with a focus on conflict, that are later used to attempt to understand teachers’ approaches.

Democratically-oriented Citizenship Education and Conflict conceptions

Perennially a bulwark of national identity and allegiance for more authoritarian or populist regimes, civic education has been reconceived as a space for fostering democratic citizenship... (Levinson, Schugurensky & González, 2007, p. 2)

As explained by Hébert and Sears (2004),

Citizenship is about who we are, how we live together, and what kind of people our children are to become. As such, it is a normative concept meaning that it stems from a moral point of view. There are many competing proposals about what is necessary for good citizenship and effective citizenship education. (p. 2)

Many other authors explain how citizenship and democracy, and also education, are contested, normative concepts that are and will be continuously debated as they imply conceptions of the ideal society (i.e. Callan, 2004; Buenfil, 2011; Kerr & Cleaver, 2004; McLaughlin, 1992; Peters, 1979; Sears, 2004; Simon, 2008; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Still, some attempt general definitions, such as the following offered by Hébert and Sears (2004): “Citizenship refers to the relationship between the individual and the state, and among individuals” (p. 1). However, they also recognize that,

beyond these definitions, there is significant variation in beliefs about what constitutes an adequate model of citizenship, as well as an effective approach to citizenship education. The relationship between groups and the state are part of the on-going debate. (p. 1)

Even so, within a democratic conception of citizenship, not any “relationship between the individuals and the state, and among individuals” is considered acceptable. A democratic conception of citizenship entails, at the very least, citizens as self-governing and not dominated by external authority (i.e. Bai, 2001; Civitas, 2006). As Bai explains (2001): “Democracy literally means people (demos) having power (kratos), the power of self-determination and self-government... Democracy is a moral vision of life that condemns domination and promotes mutual governance, seeing the
latter as a better way to live” (pp. 307 & 309). In the words of a young Ecuadorian, “Democracy is that, it is the power of the people” (Gillman, 2010, p. 336).

Many authors writing about democratically-oriented citizenship education describe a broad framework. Programs of study can be understood as being more aligned to one of two extremes: a *transmission* paradigm (socially established knowledge and values are transmitted to prepare students to become “good citizens” in society as it currently stands) or a *transformation* paradigm (students have a critical understanding and participation in the transformation of their societies, which includes actively seeking to redress injustice (i.e. Banks, 2008; Bascopé, Bonhomme, Cox, Castillo & Miranda, 2013; Case & Clark, 1999; Evans, 2006; Knight-Abowitz & Harnish, 2006; McLaughlin, 1992; Sears & Hughes, 1996; Suárez, 2008; Tupper, Cappello & Sevigny, 2012; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004; Williams, 2013)\(^6\). In the words of Shaull (1999):

> Education either functions as an instrument that is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, or it becomes ‘the practice of freedom’, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. (p. 16)

Although citizenship education is not necessarily democratic as “indeed, authoritarian countries can and do develop citizenship programs to help sustain their form of government” (Amadeo & Cepeda, 2008, p. 2), this study focuses on a democratically-oriented citizenship education program in the context of a country that (officially) is democratic.

I will use the idea of citizenship education (CitEd) conceptions falling somewhere along a linear continuum going from a conception of CitEd as *transmission* to conception of CitEd as *transformation* as my main, broad theoretical framework related to democratically-oriented citizenship education (DoCitEd). Within this broad framework, I will focus on conflict, as explained below.

The following sections are a more detailed explanation of each of its components. A graphic depiction of this framework is found in Figure 1 below the description of each of its components. It

---

\(^5\) All citations originally in Spanish have been translated to English by the author.

\(^6\) There are many other similar labels, such as minimal/narrow/social initiation/traditional and maximal/broad/social reformation/modern, etc. However, they seemingly refer to the same basic idea.
includes the main components of the framework, illustrating the connections between conceptions of DoCitEd, conflict in DoCitEd and educational considerations aligned with differing conceptions.

**Democratic citizenship.**

The very idea of democracy, the meaning of democracy, must be continually explored afresh; it has to be constantly discovered, and rediscovered, remade and reorganized. (Dewey, 1937, p. 182).

As shown in Figure 1 below and previously mentioned, conceptions of democratically-oriented citizenship\(^7\) can be related to the broad conceptions of *transmission* and *transformation*, as two extremes of a continuum. With a *transmission* conception, I mean one where citizens are expected to be mostly unquestioning, hardworking, patriotic good neighbors whose participation in governance mainly consists of voting. With a *transformation* conception, I mean one where citizens can have multiple identities and alliances and actively participate in governing. They question and work to transform their societies, which includes seeking to redress injustice (see more details below).

As noted by Knight-Abowitz and Harnish (2006), transformation-type conceptions can be further subdivided into various discourses. They list five such discourses:

- **Feminist**: questions gendered thinking and constructions, seeking to rebalance power relations.
- **Cultural**: questions assimilation and citizenship linked to certain languages and cultures but not others.
- **Reconstructionist**: questions poverty and the existence of social classes.
- **Queer**: questions heteronormative and patriarchal “family” values, assumptions of dichotomous difference among genders and sexual orientations and all types of oppression.
- **Transnationalist**: questions nationalism and focuses on linkages among local, national, and international communities.

Given the scope of this research, I focus on the divide between the broad conceptions of transmission and transformation, lumping all of the above critical discourses into a grand “questioning of society” category under the label of transformation.

After reviewing the literature related to citizenship, democracy and education, I identified three major components related to goals for future citizens: general attitude, participation/virtues and

\(^7\) Although some think of “civics” as being on the transmission end of the continuum (transmission of functions of government) and of citizenship education being at the transformation end of the continuum, others use the terms interchangeably or speak of transmission and transformation conceptions within either term. I will use only “citizenship education” for consistency and not use the term “civics”.

affiliation/identity (the components related more specifically to the type of pedagogy are mentioned below). These are surely not the only aspects to be considered, but they are the main ones I identified in the literature and found useful for this study. I describe them in the following paragraphs. However, given this study’s emphasis on conflict, I focus on the general attitude and participation/virtues components. The analysis of EpC1’s approach to affiliation/identity (national identity, global citizenship, cultural identity, etc.) is beyond the scope of this study.

I labelled the first component general attitude, as many conceptions of citizenship speak of the degree to which it is hoped citizens will question --or not-- the current state of affairs. In a transmission conception of CitEd, the emphasis is on acceptance and on citizens being “good”; following the law, paying taxes, being honest, etc. (i.e. Banks, 2008; Bascopé et al., 2013; Case & Clark, 1999; McLaughlin, 1992; Nussbaum, 1997; Suárez, 2008; Tupper et al., 2012; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004; Williams, 2013). In a transformation conception, on the other hand, the emphasis is on questioning. Some emphasize the questioning of one’s own beliefs and the traditions of one’s group with Socrates as an inspiration (i.e. Nussbaum, 1997), some emphasize the questioning of the current world order (i.e. Andreotti, 2006) and others generally speak of the need to question society and its injustices, and to act to transform it (i.e. Banks, 2008; Bascopé et al., 2013; Case & Clark, 1999; Freire, 1998; Knight-Abowitz & Harnish, 2006; McLaughlin, 1992; Sears, 2004; Suárez, 2008; Tupper et al., 2012; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004; Williams, 2013).

Sometimes, in a transmission conception, civil and political rights are emphasized because they are thought to allow for individual freedom. Social and economic rights, on the other hand, are thought to infringe on individual freedom (Kabeer, 2005). In a transformation conception, on the other hand, “economic, social and cultural rights give substance to political and civil rights for the poor and marginalized… For example, it is difficult to exercise political and civil rights to the full, if hungry or homeless” (Kabeer, 2005, p. 2 & p. 8). Also, if all members of a society are assumed to have equal rights and are expected to participate in the governance of society, then it follows that allowing any type of discrimination is unethical and undermines democratic citizenship (i.e. Kabeer, 2005; Lister, 2008; Osler & Starkey, 2006). In the words of Freire (1998): “All discrimination is immoral… is a transgression of our essential humanity…. We must confront and struggle against any type of injustice or discrimination; it is what is ethical to do” (p. 60). Thus, a transformation conception is associated with a struggle for all people to have equal rights (social and cultural as
well as individual and political) and to eradicate all types of discrimination and injustice. However, there is of course continuous contention as to how these are to be understood.

With regards to the degree and type of participation as well as virtues expected from citizens, a transmission conception can be associated with a relatively non-participatory democracy, where citizens are expected to vote for representatives to govern in their place (i.e. Barber, 1996; Carr, 2008; Cevallos-Estarellas & Sigurdardottir, 2000; Portelli, 2001), or, in its extreme, with autocracy. In this conception, a “good” citizen is one who is informed enough to vote, individually responsible for her or his own welfare, and who follows the rules as well as social conventions (i.e. Banks, 2008; Carr, 2008; Kennedy, 2008; Knight-Abowitz & Harnish, 2006; McLaughlin, 1992; Sears, 2004; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). A transformation conception can be associated with a participatory conception of democracy, where citizens, collectively or individually, are expected to participate actively in the governance of their society and a “good” citizen is one who struggles against injustice (i.e. Banks, 2008; Callan, 2004; Carr, 2008; Freire, 1998; Kennedy, 2008; Knight-Abowitz & Harnish, 2006; McLaughlin, 1992; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). However, what exactly is meant by “injustice” and what appropriate means are to “struggle against it” are highly debated.

**Conflict, citizenship and education.**

The writing and research about conflict converge in two common ideas: conflict is normal in human relationships and conflict is a motor of change (Lederach & Maiese, 2003, p. 1).

As mentioned in the introduction, this research includes conflict in its conception of democratically-oriented citizenship education (DoCitEd). Some people may find this focus odd, for as Apple (1990) states: “A basic assumption seems to be that conflict among groups of people is inherently and fundamentally bad” (p. 87, italics from the original text).

However, Lederach (2006) explains that, at least within a “transformational” conception, “conflict is a normal and continuous dynamic within human relationships. Moreover, conflict brings with it the potential for constructive change” (par. 6). Constructive change, as the author explains, refers to reducing violence and increasing justice. Apple would probably agree. He (1990) describes the benefits of conflict such as that explicit attention to conflict can lead to progress in a society, motivate people to be creative and bring previously hidden structures and rules to consciousness, allowing for reflection and change.
Furthermore, some authors argue that conflict is inherent to a democracy, as all of the members of a society are called upon to jointly govern society and are considered to be equal. In such conditions, conflicts naturally arise and are should not to be stamped out by a dominating authority or “solved” by violent or coercive means (i.e. Bai, 2001; Civitas, 2006). For example, “democratic” processes – legislative, judicial, etc.– are designed to equitably and effectively manage conflict. However, even with such democratic processes in place, citizens in a democracy will continually face conflict. Thus, they are faced with the challenge of steering conflict towards a constructive type of change, as Lederach proposes.

For this research, I have adopted a framework proposed by Bickmore (i.e. 2011a; 2011b; 2008; 2006), who uses three broad goals or approaches for handling conflict to study conflict and citizenship: peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding. As can be seen in Figure 1, I have related this framework to the continuum between transmission to transformation concepts of DoCitEd. The author explains that peacekeeping refers to ensuring security and controlling violence. While peacekeeping may be necessary in a democracy, the author argues, the mere keeping of peace does not address underlying issues that cause or exacerbate conflicts. Peacekeeping might be related to a transmission type of DoCitEd, as it transmits and enforces rules but does not challenge the status quo. Peacemaking refers to conflict resolution and transformation, and involves dialogue and negotiation. It might include peacekeeping but, instead of merely suppressing expression of conflict, reflects democratic (dialogic) mechanisms to reach mutual understanding and solve conflicts.

Finally, peacebuilding aims to transform “underlying relationship injustices” (Bickmore, 2011a, p. 43). It includes “broad-based, long-range opportunities for students and staff in conflict resolution education, diversity and equity, dialogue and decision making about conflictual issues, and/or structures to strengthen community relationships” (Bickmore, 2011b, p. 656). Furthermore, the author states that “effective and sustainable peacebuilding requires a comprehensive system of nurturing equitable relationships, conflict resolution and anti-bias education, and accessible opportunities for negotiated and restorative conflict management to radically reduce the need for reactive or punitive security interventions” (p. 654). Peacebuilding can be related to a transformation conception, as both challenge the status quo and seek a more just society.
As previously mentioned, although there are many possible areas DoCitEd on which to focus, I chose to focus on conflict. Thus, I narrowed my analysis to the components of general attitude (degree of questioning) and participation/virtues (degree of participation in seeking to redress injustice), which closely relate to conflict, rather than other components such as identity.

Democratically-oriented citizenship education.

The procedures which are so central to successful discussion are precisely those which are the heart of an open and democratic society... principles which place the weight of argument above the weight of authority; principles which stress the importance of exposure to contradiction and criticism as a means of separating sustainable from unsustainable argument and opinion; principles which value the social processes of collaborative construction and deconstruction of meaning, explanation and belief. (Bridges, 2005, p. 60)

As shown in Figure 1, I have also chosen to think of the content of the citizenship education program as well as its pedagogy in terms of the broad conceptions of transmission and transformation. My main inspiration was Freire’s (1999) distinction between banking and critical models of education. With the term banking model, Freire (1999) describes a type of education where teachers (subjects) “deposit” information into students (objects), which are viewed as empty receptacles to be filled. This is a transmission view of education (transmitting knowledge to students for them to live in the world as it currently stands). As stated by Freire (1999):

… the more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passive role imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is... (p. 54)

Opposite to the banking model of education is a critical (problem-posing praxis) model of education. Freire (1999) posits that it is human beings’ vocation, our reason of being, to create our humanity, to seek freedom and justice. This model of education involves analysis of the current social order, through which students “come to see the world not as static but as transformable” (p. 62). This analysis is necessarily linked to action, creating cycles of reflection and action – praxis. In the words of Freire (1999):

Problem-posing [critical] education, as a humanist and liberating praxis… enables teachers and students to become Subjects of the educational process by overcoming authoritarianism

---

8 I adopt Anderson’s (2002) definition pedagogy: “The ensemble of instructional concepts, skills, tactics, strategies, and organizers available to teachers to create learning environments that encourage students to learn” p. 23

9 Freire (1998, 1999, 2005) also refers to this model with other terms, such as “liberating”, “problem-posing”, “dialogical” and “progressive”. I have chosen to use “critical”, as it “fits” more neatly with my framework.
and an alienating intellectualism… The world… becomes the object of that transforming action by men and women which results in their humanization. (p. 67)

As opposed to receiving “deposits” of knowledge from the teacher, Freire (1999) explains, “the students –no longer docile listeners– are critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher” (p. 62). Critical education requires respecting students’ autonomy and dignity (Freire, 2005). Using Freire’s models as a reference, but also drawing upon other authors, I will briefly describe the contents and the pedagogy of each conception.

**The Content.**

...to teach is not to transfer knowledge but to create the possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge. (Freire, 1998, p. 30)

The contents (the deposits) of banking education are typically facts or values that are “given” and content to be memorized. In critical problem-posing education, controversy and differing points of view are explored and students are expected to co-construct their own knowledge (Freire, 1999). Similarly, Apple (1990) speaks of “knowledge-as-given” and “knowledge-as-constructed”, two terms that, as shown in Figure 1, I have related to transmission and transformation. For Apple, the essence of “knowledge as constructed” is its emphasis on controversy. He argues that typically students are presented with one version of knowledge, as if it were the only one. For example, in science,

…children are presented with a consensus theory of science, one that underemphasizes the serious disagreement over methodology, goals, and other elements that make up the paradigms of activity of scientists… [S]tudents are not permitted to see that without disagreement and controversy science would not progress or would progress at a much slower pace. (p. 89)

He also explains that,

The perspective found in schools leans heavily upon how all elements of a society, from the postal worker and the firefighter in first grade to the partial institutions in civics courses in high school, are linked to each other in a functional relationship, each contributing to the ongoing maintenance of society. (p. 93)

Thus, he argues that this type of curricula focuses on “legitimation of the existing social order” (p. 93). He advocates, as does Freire, for an education that helps individuals understand and participate
in the transformation of society. Similarly, are more specifically in the realm of citizenship education, Losito and Mintrop (2001) point out that:

Civic education knowledge can be constructed as contested. A corresponding emphasis of civic education might be the fostering of critical thinking or political activism. Civic education knowledge can also be constructed as consensual, in which case knowledge transmission may be a more likely emphasis of instruction. (p. 167)

Thus, in a transmission conception, supposedly uncontroversial universal unequivocal knowledge “as given” is transmitted to students. This “knowledge as given” reflects an assumed consensus, which is generally the standpoint of the privileged. Closer to a transformation conception, authors in citizenship education generally argue that students need to study society and participate in changing its future (i.e. Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt & Nikolova, 2002; Osborne, 2001, Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr & Losito, 2009a; Sears, 2004; Torney-Purta et al., 2001; Whiteley, 2005).

This involves learning about and challenging all types of social exclusion/oppression (i.e. Amadeo & Cepeda, 2008; Banks, 2008; Freire, 1998; 1999; Kennedy, 2008; Sears, 2004; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). It also involves studying multiple perspectives, disciplinary conflicts, controversies, value issues, conflicts involved in the construction of knowledge (i.e. Apple, 1990; Freire, 1998).

Many also highlight the importance of learning being made relevant to students’ lives (i.e. Crick, Coates, Taylor, Ritchie, 2004; Dull & Murrow, 2008; Freire, 1998, 1999; Hahn, 1999; Osborne, 2001; Osler & Starkey, 2006; Sears, 2004; Villegas-Reimers, 1994b). Some Ecuadorian scholars take a similar perspective, arguing that studying multiple perspectives and stories leads to respect and understanding of difference (Terán, 2004). Others add that if the way historical knowledge is constructed is hidden from students, history can come to be seen as “given”, as a dogma (Patiño, 2013; Zaragoza, 1995).

The Pedagogy.

Case analysis, public issue research projects, model town councils, peace-building programs, community participation activities, public information exhibits, online international linkages, and youth forums make up the types of classroom and school-wide activities being encouraged (Evans, 2006, p. 416).
As briefly mentioned before, the methods of banking education are teacher-centered and focused mostly on rote memorization. Those of critical education, on the other hand, are student-centered and focused on the critical thinking, the construction of knowledge, dialogue and participation (Freire, 1999).

In a banking model of education, the types of questions most asked by teachers will probably be “information gathering” questions, where the teacher asks students about facts. In a transformation model of education, on the other hand, teachers might more often ask “interpretive” and “value” questions (Dull & Murrow, 2008). “Interpretive” questions inquire about how students interpret text (broadly understood) prompting student reflection and discussion on values and beliefs. “Value” questions prompt student reflection and discussion on values and beliefs. A subtype of “interpretive” and “value” questions, are what Hess (2004) calls “uptake” questions, “in which teachers ask students questions about what they and other students said” (p. 152), and thus facilitating discussion.

By far the instructional strategy most commonly linked to democratic citizenship education leaning toward the transformative side of the continuum is planned and structured dialogue and/or discussion of conflictual issues in the classroom. Some researchers highlight the complications associated with this activity, such as the tendency of teachers to avoid conflictual issues in the classroom, teachers’ fear of backlash if they do allow discussions of conflictual issues, teachers’ perception that they feel inadequately prepared to lead conflictual discussion in the classroom and the observation that in-depth discussions in classrooms rarely happen (Hess & Avery, 2008; Quaynor, 2012).

However, a larger number still highlight the great importance of dialogue and discussion of conflictual issues in forming students as future democratic citizens (i.e. Alviar-Martin, Randall, Usher & Engelhard, 2008; Amadeo et al., 2002; Avery, Levy & Simmons, 2013; Bickmore, 2010; Cevallos & Sigurdardottir, 2000; Crick et al., 2004; Dull & Murrow, 2008; Evans, 2006, 2008; Freire, 1998, 1999; Geboers, Geijsel, Admiraal & Dam, 2013; Hahn, 1998, 2010; Hess & Avery, 2008; Hess, 2004; Johnson & Johnson, 2009; Lederach, 2006; Osler & Starkey, 2006; Schulz, Ainley, Friedman & Lietz, 2009a; Schulz et al., 2009b; Sears, 2004; Terán, 2004; Tibbits &

\[10\] “Complex instructional practices that involve a sequence of steps for the teacher and students” (Anderson, 2002, p. 23).
As explained by Hess and Avery (2008), “much of the advocacy for discussion in democratic education is rooted in the belief that for a healthy democracy to exist, political discussion among citizens is public, robust, and ongoing” (p. 3). Finally, several theorists consider deliberation to be fundamental to democracies (i.e. Bai, 2001; Benhabib, 1996; Callan, 2001; Cohen, 1996; Elster, 1998; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Gutmann, 1999; Gutmann & Thompson, 1996; Nino, 1996; Valadez, 2001). Deliberation is a type of discussion but it has a clear purpose: making a decision. Thus, participants discuss to weigh pros and cons, to decide a course of action (Parker, 2006).

Researchers also show there are benefits to students of engaging in dialogue and/or classroom discussions of conflictual issues. This provided that certain conditions are met, such as the discussions taking place in an open and inclusive classroom environment. These benefits include higher levels of knowledge/skills (for example, critical thinking skills) and attitudes deemed positively related to citizenship (such as tolerance) (i.e. Amadeo et al., 2002; Geboers et al., 2013; Hahn, 1998; Hess, 2004; Quaynor, 2012; Schulz et al., 2009a, 2009b; Torney-Purta et al., 2001; Torney-Purta et al., 1999), as well as various cognitive and psychological benefits (Johnson & Johnson, 2009).

In addition, Bickmore (2011a; 2011b; 2008; 2006), Lederach (2006) and, in Ecuador, Terán (2004), posit that dialogue is fundamental for constructive change and creating peace. Also, many students report that they like participating in discussions of conflictual issues in schools (Avery et al., 2013; Hahn, 1998; Hess, 2004; Yamashita, 2006). Furthermore, according to Gillman (2010), Ecuadorian youth see the free expression of ideas as one of the main forms of democratic participation and as a way to create proposals for the “good of society”.

As one young Ecuadorian person in Gillman’s study states, democratic participation means “having liberty of thought and opinion, that is to say, having our own thoughts and not being controlled for what one says, or have the fear of saying what we feel” (p. 338). If this view is more widespread, then perhaps helping students further learn how to express their thoughts and participate in discussion would be quite important in an Ecuadorian context.
Many authors suggest that a transformation-type education is more conducive to democratic citizenship (i.e. Arthur, Davies & Hahn, 2008; Cevallos-Estarellas & Sigurdardottir, 2000; Glickman, 2002, Kerr, 2002; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). At least to the extent that it requires “students to experience democratic practices, question and deliberate, and [participate] in decision-making processes” (Amadeo & Cepeda, 2008, p. 2). In the words of Villegas-Reimers (1996), who studies democracy and citizenship in Latin America:

Traditional, lecture approaches to civic education, rote memorization, or highly abstract approaches are unlikely to develop attitudes and skills related to democratic culture. In fact, these approaches can be alienating to young people and work against their engagement in political affairs, and the civic education process. (p. 42)

Additionally, scholars in Ecuador in the area of social sciences advocate teaching students “how to think, not what to memorize” (Patiño, 2013; Samaniego, 1992; Zaragoza, 1995). Crick et al., say “transformative, dialogical and participatory pedagogies complement and sustain achievement rather than divert attention from it” (Glickman, 2002 also sustains this). Finally, an education such as the critical model that Freire proposes is consistent with what is known about learning as well as with what “good teachers have always known: that students are meaning-makers, that in their own way they are inquirers and theory builders” (Osborne, 2001, p. 47).

That being said, several authors (i.e. Dull & Murrow, 2008; Portelli, 2001; Villegas-Reimers, 1996) caution that, in the words of Osborne (2001) “the democratic classroom is too easily equated with any teaching strategy that can be said to be activity-based and student-centred” (p. 46). Osborne (2001) further notes that “what matters is the spirit in which teachers use their various teaching techniques and the purpose for which they employ them” (p. 47). Also, both he and Villegas-Reimers (1996) emphasize the need for a strong knowledge base, without which people have no basis to challenge what they are told. Thus, it can be argued that knowledge and understanding necessary for the questioning and changing of society are essential to a transformation conception.

The banking model of education (the transmission conception) can easily be associated with classrooms in which teachers seek to establish their authority, and maintain order and silence. It should be noted that according to several authors, such as Osler & Starkey (2006), authoritarian models go against democratic citizenship education. A critical model (the transformation conception), on the other hand, places dialogue at the center of the education process and seeks for students to become critical co-investigators and producers of knowledge (Freire, 1998; 1999).
Most of the authors I cited above as highlighting the importance of dialogue and discussion of conflictual issues in the classroom in DoCitEd also note that it is essential that these take place in an open and inclusive classroom climate. In order for students to benefit from these activities, they need to take place in a climate where (diverse) students feel respected and safe to participate. Also, as Crick et al. (2004) note “such pedagogies require quality in teacher-pupil relationships and pupil-pupil relationships that are inclusive and respectful” (p. 36). This includes concern for the autonomy, dignity and rights of all individuals in the classroom, but especially for students from minority groups (Freire, 2005; Osler & Starkey, 2006). It also includes “democratic principles such as antiracism, valuing diversity and promoting equity” (Osler & Starkey, 2006, p. 27). Samaniego (2008), writing in Ecuador, also highlights how essential non-authoritarian relationships and respect for diversity are for the teaching of citizenship.

The following page presents a graphic depiction of the Democratically-Oriented Citizenship Education (DoCitEd) theoretical framework used in this study (see Figure 1). It shows a broad continuum with two extremes: the transmission and transformation conceptions. I related the peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding framework to these broad conceptions. I related peacekeeping to a transmission conception as it seeks to transmit and enforce rules, and does not challenge the status quo. I place peacemaking in the middle, as it attempts to solve conflicts through dialogue and negotiation. I relate peacebuilding to transformation, as both aim to question the current state of affairs and redress injustice.

I describe the “conceptions” dimension, the DoCitEd focus, in two main sub categories: (a) a general attitude and (b) participation/virtues. These synthesize the conceptions by saying that a transmission conception has two main components: (a) accepting citizens following rules and (b) citizens being “good” neighbors (according to the status quo/majority view) with voting as their main form of participation. Transformation, on the other hand, can be synthesized in the following two components: (a) questioning and (b) actively seeking to redress injustice. These sub categories and their components are also extremes along a continuum.

I then focus on the “objectives” and “practices” dimensions of DoCitEd in two main sub categories: (a) content and (b) pedagogy. I synthesize the transmission conception with two components: (a) knowledge-as-given, as non conflictual and (b) teacher-centered knowledge transmission. I then synthesize the transformation conception, also with two related components: (a) knowledge-as-
constructed, as conflictual and (b) student-centered approaches and dialogue. These sub categories, and their components, are also extremes along a continuum.

I “lined up” these sub categories and components, attempting to show details of the transmission/transformation conceptions which would later be useful for analysis. However, one could question this approach, wondering whether the sub categories and their components indeed fit so neatly under the transmission/transformation labels. An interesting example to consider is the “pedagogy”. Could teacher-centered, knowledge transmission activities be used to accomplish a transformation goal? Yes, they could. For example, one could transmit valuable knowledge about participation mechanisms, rights, ways to claim their rights, etc. to disadvantaged students with a transformative goal. For them to have access to information that is often available mostly to the more privileged students. Also, both Osborne (2001) and Villegas-Reimers (1996) argue, having a strong knowledge base is essential in a transformation conception. Without it, people have no basis with which to question what they are told.

Could student-centered, dialogue-type activities be used to accomplish a transmission-type goal? Yes, it could. As I mentioned in the literature review chapter, several authors caution about too easily associating anything “student-centered” with a democratic approach. One can easily imagine a very entertaining, student-centered activity that includes dialogue… and serves to reinforce student acceptance and the status quo.

Thus, in my analysis, following the suggestion of Osborne (2001), I attempt to determine what type of activity it is and also its purpose/why the teacher is using it. I attempt to consider the sub categories in an individual manner for the analysis, but also relate them to the general broad goal in an attempt to better understand them.
Figure 1. Democratically-oriented citizenship education theoretical framework

**DoCitEd Framework**

**CONCEPTIONS**

- **Peacekeeping**
  - Accepting, following rules

- **Peacemaking**
  - Questioning

- **Peacebuilding**
  - Actively seeking to redress injustice

**OBJETIVES AND PRACTICES**

- **Content**
  - Knowledge as given, non conflictual
  - Knowledge as constructed, conflictual

- **Pedagogy**
  - Teacher centered, knowledge transmission
  - Student centered, dialogue
Finally, several researchers explore or consider broader strategies (beyond classrooms) for DoCitEd such as student councils or student participation in decision-making regarding school rules, peer mediation or conflict resolution programs and students’ participation in voluntary community service (i.e. Bickmore, K, 2011b; Bickmore & MacDonald, 2010; Davies, 1999; Hahn, 2010; Kahne & Middaugh, 2008; Kahne & Sporte, 2008; Kahne & Westheimer, 2003; Schwille & Amadeo, 2002; Tholander, 2007; Thornberg & Elvstrand, 2012). However, analyzing these types of strategies for DoCitEd is beyond the scope of this study, which focuses on what happens in the classroom. This remains an area for future research.

The next chapter begins with a discussion of this study’s conceptual framework, and, in describing it, summarizes the main points of this chapter: the main frameworks and concepts used in this study.
Chapter 3: Conceptual Framework, Research Design and Methodology

“School as policy constructor” requires a model of schools and teachers as involved in the social construction of reality (both knowledge and action) and a methodology that is correspondingly more anthropological and ethnographic. (Clune, 1991, p. 259)

In this chapter, I first explain the conceptual framework I employed for this study, which draws upon the theoretical frameworks and concepts presented in the previous chapter and links them to the research methodology chosen for this study. I then describe how the pre-data collection phase and the data collection phase of the study were conducted, review ethical considerations and describe the data analysis phase.

Conceptual Framework and Research Methodology

This section presents a conceptual framework, which provides “a conceptual link between the research problem, the literature and the methodology” (Bloomberg and Volpe, 2012, p. 86) selected for my study. It includes “the things being studied and their relationship to each other” (Punchy, 2000 cited in Bloomberg and Volpe, 2012, p. 88). This framework has constantly evolved as the research progressed. Its most recent version is depicted graphically in Figure 2 at the end of the section. I will attempt to explain it in the following paragraphs. 

I will first describe the elements under study; the white ovals in the graphic. In order to study how teachers are approaching the new DoCitEd course in Ecuador, specifically its conflict theme, I studied the official curriculum documents, textbooks and teaching approaches (through teacher interviews and classroom observations). I also studied teachers’ conceptions of citizenship and conflict, teachers’ concerns, factors teachers perceive help or hinder their teaching of the new program. I gathered contextual factors and used them to try and understand the findings.

A mutual-adaptation policy lens is the main theoretical framework orienting the whole study (see section one of the Literature Review chapter). As all other theoretical/conceptual elements in the framework, this is represented graphically with a grey square. The mutual-adaptation perspective

---

11 It is important to clarify that the figure specifically represents the “territory” of this study; it does not represent a change or curriculum implementation theory. For example, it does not imply that all changes in education and curriculum happen in a top-down fashion motivated by new policy mandates. It merely represents the areas on which this study focuses.

12 It is also important to note that Figure 2 does not imply that the possible factors mentioned as influencing teaching are the only factors possibly related to the types of adaptations that teachers might make. It simply highlights the areas on which this study will focus.
assumes that teachers, instead of maintaining exact fidelity to the original policy design, will adapt policies based on a variety of factors. In sum, schools and teachers also construct policy, not just policy-makers.

This theoretical framework links directly to the qualitative multiple case study methodology I use for the study (Stake, 2006), which is represented in the white square with rounded edges. This methodology allows for the study of individual cases, that is to say, the various adaptations teachers make of the curriculum. In the words of Stake (2006), “an important reason for doing the multicase study is to determine how the program or phenomenon performs in different environments” (p. 23). It also allows for the analysis of the quintain (the collection of cases) which is especially recommended for providing information useful for policy (Stake, 2006).

I include dimensions of change as an extension of the mutual-adaptation perspective, as it provides tools for which to analyze the proposed changed and its “adaptations”. The arrows show that the official curriculum, the interpreted curricula and the curricula-in-use will be analyzed according to the four dimensions mentioned in the literature review chapter.

I also conceptualize CBAM (see subsection two of the Literature Review chapter) as an extension of the mutual-adaptation perspective, providing more detailed frameworks for the analysis of the change process. I use CBAM, as shown by the arrows in the graphic, to analyze the teaching (the level of use of the program teachers are at - LoU), teachers’ concerns (SoC) and the factors teachers report help or hinder their teaching of the program (SoC).

I also use a democratically-oriented citizenship education framework (see Figure 1 and the second section of the Literature Review for details). I will use this theoretical framework to analyze the official curriculum document/official curriculum, textbooks/interpreted curricula and the teaching/curricula-in-use (which includes the hidden curriculum).
Figure 2. Conceptual framework

*How are teachers approaching the new democratically-oriented citizenship education 1 official curriculum (EpC1), especially its conflict theme, in high schools in Ecuador?*
The above conceptual framework will be used to explore the main research question for this study, How are teachers approaching the new democratically-oriented citizenship education 1 official curriculum, especially its conflict theme, (EpC1) in high schools in Ecuador? …as well as the following specific research questions:

- How are citizenship education and conflict conceptualized in the EpC1 curriculum policy document?
- How do teachers conceptualize citizenship education and conflict?
- What is the teachers’ current level of use of the program?
- How are teachers implementing the program in their classrooms and school?
- What are teachers’ concerns regarding the program?
- What factors do teachers perceive help and hinder their implementation of the program?

As change takes place over time (Anderson, 2010; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2011), where possible, the study also explains differences occurring over time. Studying the evolving adaptations to the current curriculum mandate over time would be ideal. However, this is beyond the scope of this study, which was conducted during the second year of implementation. Also, unfortunately, all teachers had only begun teaching the program this year. It also only took place two months after the school year had begun, not during a whole school year. Thus, the information regarding changes over time will not be substantial.

**Pre-data collection phase**

In this subsection, I explain the sampling strategy I used for this study as well as how I identified and recruited participants.

**Sampling.**

This study was achieved with the help of six participants; six public school teachers of the new citizenship education high school course in Quito, Ecuador. The rationale for limiting the teachers to the capital city and surrounding areas of Quito, Ecuador were practical; having all of the schools in the area where I live makes the study more feasible in terms of time and money. The rationale for limiting the cases to six (or seven, if the final participant had not left the study), was in part based on a range of cases Stake (2006) states as appropriate for a multicase study (4-10) and in part due to the same practical reasons mentioned above.
The sampling method used for this study was *maximal variation sampling*, which allows for the selection of individuals representing a range of characteristics or traits (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Creswell, 2012). According to Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) “individuals are selected because they represent the widest possible range of characteristics being studied” (p. 248). These same authors explain that the wide variations are useful when identifying patterns in the information collected. This particular sampling strategy was chosen mainly because the variability in sample characteristics strengthens the arguments for potential generalizability of findings that hold across the six cases regardless of their differences. Also, greater variation can help gain an understanding of what matters and how.

I attempted to choose participants with a wide range of characteristics in two main areas: (a) their characteristics as teachers and (b) the type of school in which they taught. With regards to the characteristics of teachers, I attempted to achieve a balance between female and male teacher as well as ensuring that the teachers had a range of years of experience. I had also attempted to manage a balance between teachers who had taught civics before EpC1 was created and those who had not, as well as a balance between teachers who had taught EpC1 the previous year and those who were just beginning this year (although on this last area of variability, I was not successful). With regards to the characteristics of schools, I chose two different characteristics, representing the main different types of public high schools in Ecuador. The first are high schools focused on technical education versus those focused on academic education. The second characteristic is whether the school is in an urban or a rural setting.\(^\text{13}\).

**Identifying and Recruiting Participants.**

In order to enter schools in Ecuador, it was necessary to receive permission from the Ministry of Education. I obtained a meeting with the Ministry, and was given permission to conduct my study after filling in the required paperwork. Initially, I had planned to send emails to teachers for recruitment. However, the Ministry explained that this was not possible or even practical, and

\(^{13}\) I had initially established this distinction between urban and rural, and was assigned schools that were “rural” according to the Ministry database. However, once I visited these schools, I thought they might be better described as “peri-urban”, as they were in semi urban areas that were quite close to the capital city. Thus, I will henceforth use the term peri-urban instead of rural. I consider that I managed to have a variation of schools among the categories of “urban” and “peri-urban”, but not rural schools... which I suggest as an area for future research.
offered instead to help me select schools to visit to recruit participants. Thus, I obtained a list of 20 schools to visit, which were varied in terms of location (urban or peri-urban) and programs offered (academic or vocational) as I had asked, but also in relation to whether or not the school had a great majority of male or female students. I then went to the schools and asked to speak with the principal to tell them about the study and ask for permission to invite their EpC1 teachers to participate.

If the principals agreed to speak with me, I handed them the letter of permission from the Ministry as well as a letter summarizing the study and asking for their permission to conduct the study in their school (Appendix A). I then spoke to the teachers if they allowed it. The initial plan was to hand all EpC1 teachers in the school a short survey to fill in (see Appendix B), in order to pool together all the data and then select the most varied group of teachers possible. In practice, this only occurred in one school where there were a large number of EpC1 teachers. In other schools, either there was only one EpC1 teacher or the principal determined exactly which teacher I could approach. When I spoke with the teachers and explained the study, if they were interested, they filled in the short survey to obtain the information and handed them a brief informative letter (Appendix C) as well as a consent letter that explained all the details, such as the promise of anonymity and confidentiality (see Appendix D). I found that after going to the school, taking the principals’ time, taking the teachers’ time and having them agree to participate, I would not be able to reject them if they did not fit my maximal variation sampling strategy. Thus, I did not visit all 20 schools on the list. A few schools declined the offer to participate in the study, so I did visit more than six schools (approximately ten), but once I had six participants (I actually had seven, two from the same school, but one of them decided not to participate in the end), I stopped recruiting. Even so, and perhaps partly due to my strategic choices regarding the order in which to visit the schools and the requests I made to principals about which types of teachers I wanted to recruit, I managed to obtain participants with a wide variety of characteristics.

**Data collection**

---

14 Although the Ministry selected schools based on my sampling needs, after the list was reviewed by the person in charge of schools in the Quito area, it is possible that the final list of schools sent to me represented the “better off” schools.

15 In some cases, the principal told me other EpC1 teachers were too busy with other assigned activities, and thus only to speak with one person. In other cases, it seemed to me that the principal either tried to assign the teacher they thought was the best or the teacher they thought was struggling the most (in order to obtain feedback). I suppose this added to the variation in the sample.
To obtain information on how teachers are approaching the new curriculum, as well as their conceptions and concerns, I collected data from documents, interviews and especially observations. Because researchers need to get to know a case personally, “the most meaningful data-gathering methods are often observational” (Stake, 2006, p. 4).

**Interviews.**

I conducted two formal one-on-one semi-structured interviews with each teacher (see Appendix E)\(^\text{16}\), as well as a few informal interviews before and after classroom observations (mentioned below). The first interview took approximately one hour and a half and the second one took approximately one hour, and both took place at times and locations most convenient for the participants.

The first interview focused on teachers’ conceptualizations of citizenship education and conflict, their teaching practices (objectives, methods, activities, materials, classroom environment, assessments and activities outside the classroom) and if/how these have changed since the first year of implementation and since before the new program began. The second interview focused on teachers’ experience implementing the new program: their concerns, their level of use and factors that help or hinder their efforts to implement the program, and also included a few questions related to the observations I had previously conducted. This second interview was based, in part, on instruments for CBAM proposed by Hall and Hord (2011).

Before interviewing the participants, I piloted the interview questions with a citizenship education teacher from a private school in Ecuador, as well as a Canadian high school teacher who had taught civics, and made a few changes based on their observations. For the interviews, I used a digital recorder (with the participants’ permission), and also took notes. I later transcribed the whole contents of the interviews in Spanish. I did not translate the whole transcripts to English; I only translated specific quotes I included in this document. Once I had transcribed the interviews, I sent them to the participants to review. Participants knew they would have three weeks to respond, and if they did not, I would assume they had no corrections to make. Two teachers told me they agreed

---

\(^{16}\) Time ran out during the second interview with one participant, so she sent me her answers to the last few questions by email. Thus, I had fewer details about her answers regarding what helped her teach the program but I had her exact words and most of what she wrote we had already discussed during the interview, and I had been able to ask follow-up questions. Thus, I do not think this affected the data analysis.
with the transcripts. Four said they had received but not yet reviewed the transcripts when I called to make sure they had received them, approximately a week after initially sending them. I assume they agree, as they had received them and did not contact me with comments.

**Observations.**

As explained by Creswell (2012), multiple observations over time are necessary to best understand a phenomenon. I observed each teacher three times in the classroom. Each observation lasted the duration of a class period, which varied from 20 minutes to 2 hours, but was usually 45 or 50 minutes. My plan was to be a nonparticipant observer in order to cause the least disruption possible in the students’ education, in order to respect the site and participants and focus on learning about the teachers’ approach. I stressed this with both the principals and teachers, but a few teachers asked me questions in class and encouraged students to ask me questions as well. I answered briefly and then said I did not wish to interrupt the class. However, I was mostly able to sit in the back and observe without interrupting the class.

For the observations, I had initially planned to use an observation protocol (see Appendix F), to record descriptive and reflective notes. In practice, I found it more useful to record as much as I could of what the teacher and students said, writing as quickly as possible as they spoke, on blank pages. When there was no speaking, I would take notes on the physical surroundings, noise levels and other aspects I noticed. After each observation –and interview as well– I wrote reflective notes of what I had seen, trying to write down main themes, answers to research questions, other salient issues and remaining questions (based on a guide provided in Schutt, 2011).

The participants were the ones who decided which classes I should observe. I only said I hoped I could observe classes where they focused on the first unit of the curricula (which is on conflict), and asked to observe the same group for the three observations in order to see the progression of the classes and avoid taking class time away in order to explain my presence on three occasions instead of one, to which they all agreed. I was able to observe many classes that focused on the conflict unit of the curricula. However, because obtaining permission to visit schools took longer than expected and because of the time it took to physically visit schools for participant recruitment, I began my observations later than expected, and some teachers were already moving on to the next unit on values. As a consequence, I obtained less data on the conflict unit of the curriculum and additional
unanticipated data on how some teachers are approaching the unit on values. Thus, I have a broader view of how teachers have approached the new curriculum and I chose to also review the values unit of the curriculum as well as the value units of textbooks, and include the observation data from the classes focused on the values unit. This allowed me to broaden my view of conflict in general and in this new program.

**Documents.**

For this study, I analyzed several documents:

- Official curriculum document (MinEduc, 2012a), which I divide into two sections, *EpC* (regarding the whole citizenship education program for high school) and *EpC1* (regarding only the specific course on which this study focuses)
- Guidelines for teachers document (MinEduc, 2012b) (*Guidelines*)
- Curricular and methodological precisions document (MinEduc, 2012c) (*Pedagogical precisions*)
- Units 1 and 2 of a textbook¹⁷ written by Nasim Maldonado (Maldonado, 2012) (*Textbook 1*)
- Units 1 and 2 of a textbook written by Abraham Gutiérrez (Gutiérrez, 2013) (*Textbook 2*)¹⁸

I also analyzed the following documents provided to me by teachers, along with information obtained from interviews and observations, to better understand teachers’ approaches to the new citizenship education program:

- *Lesson plans*: Copies of annual plans (P1), unit plans (P2) and weekly lesson plans (P3).
- *Exams*: A blank copy of a student exam or test (E1), an on-the-spot viewing of exams completed by students (E2) and a sample exam or test from another subject (E3).
- *Student notebooks*: An on-the-spot viewing of student notebooks (N1).
- *Posters*: A photograph of a poster created by a student (P01).
- *Videos*: A DVD that accompanies textbook 1 (V1) (which broke before the analysis).

**Ethical Issues**

In the following subsections I will briefly address the main ethical issues associated with my study. However, a detailed description of the ethical issues is described in an Ethics Form approved by the University of Toronto’s Office of Research Ethics.

**Possible risks and benefits.**

¹⁷ Both textbooks were for students. They did not include a teachers’ guide.

¹⁸ One participant also used a text by Editores Academia and another also relied on a teacher’s guide by Holguín. However, I was not able to obtain these books, and they were not the main ones the teachers used.
Given that this study involved classroom observations, the anonymity of the teacher could not be fully secured. The principal knew the teachers’ identity, as he or she had to give permission for the classroom observations. Some teachers, students and other people at the school probably also learned about this. However, I took great care not to reveal the identity of the teacher to anyone outside the school and I attempted to ensure that this final report would not include information that would make the teacher or the school recognizable (See the confidentiality section below).

The fact that the principal and possibly other school stakeholders know that the teacher is participating in this study represents a low risk. There are no physical or legal risks. There are also no psychological/emotional risks. There is a potential social risk; the school principal or other teachers might read the report, and despite precautions taken by the researcher, identify the participant. They might disagree with the teachers’ approach to the curriculum, and confront the person or change their behavior towards him or her. However, this seems unlikely. Even if someone did manage to identify a colleague, this study does not seek to evaluate teachers’ performance. Although I will attempt to describe the adaptations that teachers make to the new program, I do not seek to determine teachers’ “compliance” with Ministry policy; in fact, the Ministry explicitly asks that schools and teachers adapt the new curriculum policy to their own contexts (MinEduc, n.d.b). Neither the teachers nor their teaching will be judged, evaluated or presented in a negative light.

In terms of the potential benefits to the participants, I will share my findings and resources with them. With the findings, they will have access to the description of their own and of other teachers’ way of understanding and teaching the new EpC1 curriculum, with a focus on conflict. With the resources, they will have additional material that might be of interest to them and potentially be useful for their teaching. I will also offer them a book or a teaching resource as a token of my appreciation. In addition, partaking in the study might give participants a chance to reflect upon their conceptions and teaching practice, which could be seen as valuable to participants.

Finally, the findings of this research –especially the descriptions of the adaptations teachers made to the curriculum mandate– could potentially be useful to other citizenship education teachers in Ecuador. As such, the participants could be aiding their colleagues. Also, with the information participants provide, education leaders might be able to facilitate their work more effectively. Participants were informed of the aim to disseminate the findings with teachers and education leaders and were asked for their permission, on the consent form, to do so (see Appendix D).
Consent.

In the initial short survey I used to obtain general information and to select participants, I explained that by filling in the survey or providing me with the information as I filled it in, the participants were permitting me to use their information to contact them. If they did not wish for me to use the information, they could decline to fill in the survey. If they did not wish for me to contact them, they could leave the contact information section blank. A couple of teachers did.

I also asked the six selected teachers to sign a consent form before beginning the research. This consent form included a request for permission to audio record the interviews (see Appendix D). As the study involves classroom observations, I also asked the principal of each school to sign their consent for me to conduct the study in their school (see Appendix A).

Participant withdrawal.

Participants were informed of their right to withdraw when I initially contacted them and in the consent form as well. I explained that they were free to withdraw at any time up until after they had reviewed and approved the transcriptions of their interviews. After the transcriptions were sent to them, if participants did not respond over the course of three weeks, I assumed that they agreed with the transcriptions. After this point, withdrawing from the study was no longer a possibility. One participant decided not to participate at the beginning of the study, before having begun the first interview. The rest did not state they wished to withdraw.

Confidentiality.

I took several steps to try and ensure confidentiality and anonymity. The names of the schools and participants will remain anonymous; I used pseudonyms in all written text. I kept only one written document linking the participants’ contact information to their pseudonyms on my personal computer in an encrypted file, stored in a location different to the rest of the information. I also restricted the amount of contextual information about the school provided so that nobody could easily recognize the schools where the teachers are working. Similarly, I took great care to avoid including any details that would make the participant easily identifiable. I kept all information – including audio recordings and written records of these recordings– in encrypted files on my
personal computer. When traveling to schools or when in schools, I kept my notes with me at all times. I also took measures such as the use of pseudonyms and codes, unclear handwriting and the use of English to ensure my notes were not easily readable to others.

Data analysis

In this section, I briefly explain how I approached the analysis of data. I also explain the main characteristics of each one of the participants and their contexts, for I used this data to understand and analyze my findings.

Participant and school characteristics.

All located in or near Quito, the capital city of Ecuador, huddled between mountains of the Cordillera Andina, the six public high schools where the teachers worked were relatively large, ranging from approximately 1000 to 7000 students\(^{19}\). Most teachers reported approximately 35 students per class although some had 50, and all said they taught 12 different groups (and 2-4 different subjects). Thus they reported having 300-400 different students that year. The schools, as are all public schools in Ecuador, were secular (Asamblea Nacional del Ecuador, 2011), although Ecuadorians are predominantly Catholic (Ecuadorean embassy, 2014). Although with the new education law of 2011 all schools in Ecuador became co-educational (Asamblea Nacional del Ecuador, 2011), schools that were previously single-sex are still in the transition phase and thus have more male or female students, especially in the higher grades.

Generally speaking, in Ecuador those who can afford it attend private schools, and thus public schools are attended by low SES students (Martínez Novo & De la Torre, 2010). Four of the participants mentioned that they taught low SES students (P1, P2, P3, P5). I did not ask about the ethnic make-up of the student body and in most cases differences in ethnicity are not visible\(^{20}\). However, I was able to see that all the classes had a small percentage (maybe 5%) of students from a minority ethnic group. That proportion was certainly higher with differences that were not visible.

\(^{19}\) As reported by principals.

\(^{20}\) According to 2010 national census data from INE, the Ecuadorian population self-reports as 71.9% Mestizo, 7.4% Montubio (ethnic group from the Ecuadorian coast), 7.2% Afro-Ecuadorian, 7% Indigenous, 6.1% White and 0.4% identified as “other”, although this data is questioned by UNICEF as well as the major indigenous confederation in Ecuador, CONAIE, who say the indigenous population is closer to 30% (González, 2011).
The classes I visited were simple structures: rectangular, tin roofs, cement floors, cement walls painted white stained with use and glass windows in metallic frames. They were usually within a row of classrooms, so hearing noise from other classes was common. With no insulation, some teachers had to make themselves heard above the outside noise at times. Also, and partly due to Quito weather, the classrooms were very warm around noon and quite chilly in the early morning. However, teachers insisted students wear their uniforms properly regardless of room temperature (for example, not taking their sweaters off even if it was hot).

Inside, at the front of the classroom, was a desk and chair for the teacher as well as a whiteboard. The classes were filled with rows of chair with desks attached to them for students, some more crammed than others. Most of these chair/desks were easily moveable, although one teacher said the desks were bolted to the floor (P4). In most classrooms, the only things on the walls were posters of the national anthem, the Ecuadorian flag and the school anthem or rules.

The teachers did not seem to have much access to teaching resources and there seemed to be institutional factors that may have hindered the teachers’ work. For example, with regards to the lack of resources, except for one case, only the teacher had a textbook or photocopies of a textbook. The participants also mentioned a lack of additional resources and equipment; i.e., having no projectors or anywhere to show videos (except for one teacher) and having to either pay for any photocopies themselves or having to charge students for them. The teachers also mentioned a few work condition constraints, such as having to frequently cancel classes due to school meetings or school events. Further details on factors that help or hinder the teachers’ implementation of the program are included in chapter 6.

As previously mentioned, I was able to find six teachers who generously shared their time and experiences with me. Of these, three were women and three were men. In terms of ethnicity, although I did not ask this question, five seemed to belong to the majority ethnic group and one to a visible minority group. All of them were currently teaching EpC1 but none of them had taught EpC1 the previous year. Thus, they were all new to the subject, having only begun to teach it in

---

21 The participants explained that their District had forbidden schools to require students acquire anything at all, as the new education laws stress that public education must be absolutely free to ensure access to all. The Ministry of Education has been expanding its textbook program since 2007 (MinEduc, 2012d). Students now receive free textbooks (and teachers receive teaching guides) up until 10th grade. However, in high school, students only receive textbooks for some subjects. The Ministry still needs to provide textbooks for some missing subjects, such as citizenship education.
September 2013 a couple of months before I approached them. As in many 28 countries around the world (Torney-Purta et al., 2001), the teachers came from a variety of backgrounds, but as Mintrop (2002) noted in seven countries, many of them have backgrounds in History and Social Sciences. This holds true in this same sample (see below). For this study, I assign each a pseudonym and code: Miriam (P1), Ivana (P2), Ma. Dolores (P3), Giovanni (P4), Fausto (P5) and Diego (P6).

Miriam (P1) taught students of an academic program in a large peri-urban high school where she had just begun working at the beginning of the same school year. She has 16-25 years of teaching experience, having taught a large range of subjects (art, social science, science, physical education, philosophy, ethics, psychology, etc.) and age groups. She has also taught in several types of schools, including night school for adults and a juvenile correctional center, and schools in other cities. She has a four-year degree in education with a focus on primary and middle school.

Ivana (P2) taught students of an academic program in an urban high school, and she had also just arrived at the beginning of the school year. She has 10-15 years of teaching experience, having previously taught social studies and related subjects, civics and philosophy, all in private schools. She has a four-year degree in education with a focus on social sciences.

Ma. Dolores (P3) taught students of an academic program in an urban high school. She has 16-25 years of teaching experience, having previously taught accounting and art, all in public schools. She has a four-year degree in education with a focus on commerce and administration.

Giovanni (P4) taught students of an academic program in a peri-urban high school. He also has 16-25 years of teaching experience, having previously taught social studies and related subjects in public and private schools in several different cities. He has a post-graduate degree in history as well as an undergraduate degree in education with a focus on history and social sciences.

Fausto (P5) taught an all-girls class in an urban high school vocational program that trains students to become secretaries. He has over 30 years of teaching experience and was the head of the school’s social sciences department. He had previously taught social studies and related subjects such as philosophy, mostly in military schools but also private schools. He has an educational

---

22 In Ecuador, having a *Licenciatura*, a four year undergraduate degree, is the minimum degree required to be a teacher (Asamblea Nacional, 2011).
administration post-graduate degree and an undergraduate degree in education with a focus on social sciences.

Diego (P6) taught in an urban vocational high school that had recently been boys-only. He had approximately 50 students in his class of students of electronics in which I saw two girls. Although he had obtained his undergraduate degree in education (social sciences focus), several years ago, he spent most of his career working in a government office unrelated to education. He had begun teaching four years ago at that same school, teaching history and philosophy.

**Data analysis.**

For the analysis of data, I attempted to use as many sources as possible for any given assertion, as well as track them, for as Stake (2006) notes,

> triangulation for a multicase study serves the same purpose as in a single-case study: to ensure that we have the picture as clear and suitably meaningful as we can get it, relatively free of our own biases, and not likely to mislead the reader greatly. (p. 71)

In the subsections below, I briefly explain the main points in my attempt to analyze the data.

**Analysis of conceptions, analysis for Chapter 4.**

In chapter 4, I analyzed the conceptions of citizenship education present in (a) official documents from the Ministry of Education, (b) two student textbooks used by teachers and (c) the views teachers shared with me in the interviews. I first read all the data in print from in an exploratory way, with a focus on the first two units in the case of official documents and textbooks, and I took notes. After this, for the introductory statements official curriculum document and for teachers’ views, I created a table reflecting the categories of my democratic citizenship education framework, extracted pieces from the text and placed them along the continuum. This helped me visualize to which extreme of the continuum the conceptions seemed closer. As I engaged in this analysis, I further refined my theoretical framework.

I attempted to use the same strategy with the more specific sections of the documents (for example, lists of aims in the curriculum), but found there were too many examples, making it difficult to visualize in a table. I also then realized it would be helpful to analyze the introductory statements of
documents separately from their specific instructions for learning, as in some cases, these seemed to vary. I thus changed strategy, and for the “instruction sections” of the text, began coding. To gain a sense of to which end of the continuum the texts seemed closer, I counted aspects such as aims, activities and evaluation indicators, and determined how many of them were closer to the transformation end of the continuum.

To do this, I used the more specific components of the transmission and transformation conceptions. For example, I analyzed whether an objective promoted questioning of societal rules and/or focused on injustice. I categorized statements such as “the critical analysis of socially legitimated truths” (MinEduc, 2012a, p. 4) as being closer to the transformative end of the continuum. I then categorized statements such “insert future citizens of our country in society” (Maldonado, 2012, p. 3) as being closer to the transmission side of the continuum because of their content but also because they were surrounded by other statements referring to the transmission of socially accepted knowledge to students. In a similar manner, I also considered whether knowledge as presented “as given” or “as constructed”. Especially for the textbook evaluation activities, it helped to determine whether students were being asked information gathering, interpretive or value questions (examples in Chapter 4).

I also considered how specific items in a document, such as aims, could be understood differently in the light of introductory statements.

**Analysis individual case studies, main analysis for Chapter 5.**

The main objective of this study was exploring different “adaptations” to teaching the new EpC1 program, six examples of “mutual adaptation” (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). As explained by Stake (2006), “… the first objective of a case study is to understand the case. In time, we may move on to studying its functioning and relating it to other cases.” (p. 2). This is why I first analyzed each case separately.

I began by reading all of the data related to one specific case in an exploratory way to “get a sense of the whole” and took reflexive notes, as Stake (2006) suggests. I then explored each piece of data from the case (i.e. the transcriptions of each interview, the notes from each observation and the documents provided by teachers) separately. I read through each piece of data and coded each main
idea using a descriptive coding scheme (see Appendix G) I had developed for separating each type of data into descriptive categories\textsuperscript{23}. Except for a few codes related to CBAM, these codes did not yet relate to the theoretical frameworks used in the study, as initially I had planned to describe the data in a “results” chapter and interpret it in a following chapter.

Once I had finished coding each set of data, I created a table for each case, and in it summarized all the main information and quotes I wished to use, noting which source it came from. After this, I wrote brief five-page summaries attempting to describe the teaching of each participant (each case): what seemed to be their most frequent approaches as well as variations and a description of how they evaluated students, which seemed particularly telling of their approach. In some cases, I also included views or approaches that seemed related to the teaching approach that shed light on to the conflict theme and that were emphasized by teachers. After writing a description of the Quintain and further developing my conceptual framework, I coded my descriptions of cases by determining which items corresponded to one of the dimensions (see four dimensions in literature review section) and sub coding it using my democratically-oriented citizenship education framework (see Figure 1) or CBAM levels of use (described in the following cross-case analysis section). I described the individual cases in terms of the DoCitEd framework in Chapter 2 and the CBAM levels of use.

\textit{Cross-case analysis, analysis for Chapters 5 and 6.}

Once I had created tables summarizing data for each case, I created tables to visually compare the cases, and used them to write a summary description of similarities and differences across cases in three broad categories: conceptions, teaching and implementation. Stake (2006) suggests that analyzing the Quintain (the cases as a group) is especially useful for providing information about a program or policy because it shows “how the program or phenomenon appears in different contexts” (p. 27)… “in some of its situations”, whereas the individual cases help “gain understanding of that particular entity as it is situated” (p. 40).

\textsuperscript{23} In some cases, I had strong emotional reactions while reviewing some aspects of data, similar to the ones I had had in some instances while observing and interviewing. I focused on the task and ignored those reactions, and I do not think the participants noticed my reactions nor did my reactions severely taint my analysis of the data. They did however prompt me to question my role as a researcher and my interest in conducting research.
I used both the tables and the written descriptions for analyzing the Quintain in the light of my DoCitEd framework and the four change dimension and CBAM. I wrote a subsection in Chapter 5 on teachers’ levels of use of the new program (as a group) and on teachers’ concerns (also as a group) in Chapter 6, as a way to provide information for school leaders interesting in facilitating teachers’ work.

In sum, although with a few practical constraints, I attempted to use methods, select sites and participants, collect data and analyze data in the ways most conducive to answering my research questions as well as respecting all involved in this study.
Chapter 4: CitEd Conceptions from Curriculum docs, textbooks and teachers’ views

Such a curriculum is never value free or neutral: it will always reflect current conceptions of the ‘good citizen’ as the ends towards which the curriculum is directed. (Kennedy, 2008, p. 9)

In the conceptual framework I use for this study, I consider four dimensions of change: (a) conceptions, (b) objectives, (c) materials and (d) practices. In this chapter, I briefly analyze the “conceptions” dimension of the change. I analyze conceptions of citizenship education portrayed in the official curriculum and interpreted curricula (the “materials” dimension, in which “objectives” are presented), as well as teachers’ views. I analyze the “practices” dimensions in the next chapter.

Stated Notions of Democratic Citizenship Education: Official curriculum, Textbooks and Teachers’ Views

To analyze conceptions, I use a theoretical framework (see Figure 1) comprised of two extreme conceptions of citizenship at opposite ends of a continuum: a transmission conception (learning about society as it currently stands, following rules enforced by peacekeepers, voting as the main form of citizen participation and generally being “good”) and a transformation conception (questioning society and seeking to redress injustices, participating in joint-governing and improving society - peacebuilding).

I use this continuum to analyze the conceptions of DoCitEd present in the introductory statements of the following three official curriculum documents:

- The official curriculum (MinEduc, 2012a) which, as mentioned above, I divided in two sections for the analysis: (a) the first part, which describes the approach for all citizenship education (EpC) in the high school program and (b) the second part, which describes the approach for EpC1, the specific course on which this study focuses
- The guidelines for teachers (MinEduc, 2012b)
- The pedagogical recommendations, which in this case, only specify recommendations for the first unit (MinEduc, 2012c)

In order to attempt to describe dimensions of change (in this case, the conceptions dimension) in interpreted curricula and curricula-in-use as well as in the official curriculum, I also analyze the introductory statements of the two textbooks and of participants’ statements of what citizenship education, and conflict, meant for them. In this analysis, I do not include other dimensions, such as practices (teaching strategies, evaluation, etc.) suggested in the curriculum or the textbooks, nor
those mentioned or enacted by teachers. I will analyze these further along, and contrast them with the conceptions stated here.

Analyzing the introductory statements of the official curriculum document.

In this subsection, I first briefly analyze the conception of citizenship education presented in the official document’s first introductory section. This introductory section refers to the general conception of citizenship education (EpC) for all of high school, not just the specific EpC1 course on which this study is focused. I then analyze the introductory statements of EpC1 specifically, those stated in the curriculum document, the teacher guidelines and the pedagogical recommendations.

The introductory statements of EpC say that citizenship education is for students to “understand the world… feel part of this world and feel committed to improve the conditions in which we live together” (MinEduc, 2012a, p. 6). The document states that this includes “the critical analysis of socially legitimated truths” (MinEduc, 2012a, p. 4), as well as studying discrimination, stereotypes, prejudice, injustice and exclusion in order to challenge them. It also explains that students need to learn to make autonomous judgments and decisions, and that “being autonomous can imply publically opposing unjust normative systems and seeking to modify these systems” (MinEduc, 2012a, p. 6). These statements seem closer to a transformation conception, as they focus on components of questioning, challenging injustice and peacebuilding.

The document explicitly states that values education does not mean that a unique and traditional position is to be transmitted to students, but rather students should learn to analyze value issues and argue for their own positions in value conflicts. This seems contrary to the transmission conception and its component of accepting and following rules.

The document also explicitly states that students are meant to embrace democratic values and attitudes such as non-discrimination, tolerance, etc., as well renouncing to violence and instead learning democratic dialogue-based approaches to solve conflicts. Similarly, students are to reject anti-democratic values such as racism, discrimination, or any type of exclusion. The document explains that these basic democratic values transcend religion, culture, etc. and are common to all.
This could be interpreted as a transformation conception, in the sense that, reflecting the component of justice, it may be a way of actively seeking to redress injustice.

However, it still brings up very complex discussions (which are beyond the scope of this study) about whether universal values are in fact an imposition of the majority’s views and/or more powerful countries upon minority groups and/or less powerful countries. Another question it brings up is whether promoting democratic values is in fact an inculcation of values (and therefore, the opposite to questioning, which is associated with a transformation conception) and whether or not that is acceptable in a democratic society.

The official curriculum document seems to suggest students should learn the importance of democracy and of democratic values (and the reasons why anti-values, such as racism, are unacceptable) and conduct their controversial discussions within these parameters. For this study, I will assume this aspect of the curriculum is also closer to the transformation side of the continuum, but this certainly warrants further discussion. However, this discussion is beyond the scope of this study.

The document also explicitly states that citizen participation in a democratic society must not be limited to voting, moving its view away from the transmission side of the continuum (the sub category of participation associates merely voting to a transmission conception). The official curriculum further espouses democracy as a form of government and a way of life, and promotes the view of citizen participation in the joint governing of society as “an activity that intrinsic and inseparable from the development of the qualities specific to human beings” (MinEduc, 2012a, p. 7). This also seems to expand the view of the citizen beyond one that votes and follow rules. Thus, I posit that the introductory statements of the curriculum related to EpC generally are closer to a transformation conception than to a transmission conception.

The introductory statements and general aims for the specific EpC1 course on which this study is focused also seem to be closer to the transformation side of the continuum. However, they seem less close to the transformation end of the continuum than EpC, as they explicitly mention questioning but not justice (although it may be considered implicit). Also, the specific EpC1 statements also

---

24 Although this is not the focus of this study, it is interesting to note the curriculum document mentions both the need for students to value their Ecuadorian identity as well as understand and value difference in society and feel part of the Latin American region, but there is no mention of Global Citizenship.
seem closer to peacemaking (mid-continuum) than peacebuilding (the transformation end of the continuum).

The general aims describe basic knowledge (democratic principles, the Constitution, etc.) that students should analyze and use to become autonomous and participative citizens, the analysis and reflection of different aspects of society (power relations, habits, etc.) as well as the need for students to argue for their own position on conflictual issues. Goals related to conflict resolution (one mechanism for peacemaking), are also mentioned. Although peacemaking is essential to a democracy and also to achieving peacebuilding, the conception of EpC1 should be closer to peacebuilding to be considered closer to a transformation conception.

Thus, the conceptions reflected in the introductory statements EpC1 do seem closer to a transformation conception than a transmission one (for example, analysis and reflection of society is explicit). However, it does not seem as close to a transformation conception as the conceptions of the general EpC did, where mentions to questioning and seeking to redress injustice were more explicit and frequent.

Both the introductory statements of the teacher guidelines and the pedagogical recommendations documents also mention questioning (as in the transformation conception), explicitly advocating the critical analysis of socially legitimate truths (which potentially imply a focus on seeking to redress injustice, but that it not stated explicitly) and the development of critical thinking skills.

Additionally, peacemaking is mentioned, in the form of conflict resolution and students learning to live with others. Thus, although these introductory conceptions may be closer to the transformation side of the continuum, they also seem less explicitly so than EpC.

Analyzing the introductory statements of the textbooks.

The views presented in textbook 1’s introductory statements seem to reflect elements of both transmission and transformation conceptions. Textbook 1 mentions that citizenship education seeks to “insert future citizens of our country in society” (Maldonado, 2012, p. 3). This seems closer to a transmission conception where socially accepted truths are transmitted to students for them to enter society as it currently stands. The textbook also generally speaks of preparing students to be good and responsible citizens. Citizens who can, for example, exercise the values of love and honesty
even when “society celebrates infidelity and corruption” (p. 8). This reflects the participation/virtues sub category related to a transmission conception that seeks “good” neighbors who follow rules and whose participation in governing mainly consists of voting.

On the other hand, and possibly closer to a transformation conception, textbook 1 also mentions the need to develop future citizens of independent thought who fight injustice and seek a more egalitarian society. This seems to reflect the components of questioning and fighting injustice in a transformation conception. Overall, however, it seemed there were more statements associated with a transmission conception in textbook 1’s introductory statements.

The introductory statements of textbook 2 did not explicitly refer to conceptions of citizenship education; they mainly explained processes and what the book contains. The introduction explained that the text contained the principles of citizenship and explains methodologies which teachers should use for students to best acquire this knowledge. The text seemed to assume a view of knowledge-as-given (Apple, 1990), in which knowledge is basically viewed as written in stone, as immutable knowledge to be learned, as it mentioned long lists of conceptions to be “learned”. The author of the textbook explains that it provides a guide for teachers to “reach the very essence of the most current ethical, civic and value knowledge of democracy and the Constitution” (Abraham, 2013, p. 1). This seems closer to a transmission conception, of which the passing of knowledge (as-given) to students is the essence.

Analyzing teachers’ views.

Before describing teachers’ views, it is important to note that teachers only seemed to use the official curriculum document for creating the annual and unit plans submitted to school authorities. These annual and unit plans did not seem to impact their teaching or daily plans in any way. They were stored away in a cabinet or desk drawer. It also seemed quite clear that teachers used the lists of content and objectives to create this paperwork, but none gave any hint of having read the introductory statements of EpC (which seemed closer to a transformation conception).

They did not mention the Ministry’s Teacher Guidelines or Pedagogical Recommendations documents at all or say anything related to their contents either. It seemed their planning was based on the textbooks they used, not the official curriculum documents. Apparently this is not only the
case for these Ecuadorian teachers: Westbrook, Naureen, Brown, Orr, Pryor, Boddy and Salvi (2013) also found a heavy reliance on textbooks in their review of education in resource-limited countries.

The teachers’ answers suggest that they did not distinguish between citizenship education as a general concept and the program of EpC1 they had recently begun teaching. Especially for four teachers (Miriam, Ma. Dolores, Giovanni and Diego), descriptions of the concepts of citizenship education and conflict seem closely related to the conception presented in the textbook rather than the official curriculum document. For example, three of these teachers looked at the textbook [textbook 1] while answering. This, it seemed, was because they had never taught civics or citizenship education before, and were not easily able to say what citizenship education meant. They hesitated and stumbled until looking at the book.

As noted by Mintrop (2002), while analyzing teachers of citizenship education in Chinese Taipei, the Czech Republic, Finland, Italy, Hong Kong, Hungary and the United States, universities do not usually offer majors in “citizenship education.” In Ecuador they do not either. Thus,

knowledge in this field is constituted not by a formalized or codified body of knowledge, but by the informal, personal knowledge, on-the-job craft knowledge and the life experience of the instructor. Civic education content thus is likely to consist of the common-place knowledge, norms and practical wisdom held in those segments of society to which teachers belong. (p. 67)

Four of the participants of this study followed their textbooks very closely, and the other two took ideas from a few sources, but still followed the order and themes of the textbooks. Although teachers seemed to follow the textbook very closely, it seems they also complemented the textbook and gave examples. In giving examples or explaining, at times, some participants did seem to provide informal, personal knowledge not necessarily informed by evidence. Mostly, this was the case of the four participants who had not previously taught civics. For example, one participant told students they must eat a healthy diet: “pollito asado con papitas” (grilled chicken and fries). From another I heard many moral messages, often from popular sources: “Look at Mr. Torso [referring to a motivational speaker that has no arms or legs]… you see! You have everything” (to which students burst out laughing at the highly inappropriate language).
Another participant defined virtues as “those that decorate people’s heart.” Students wrote this down and were probably expected to provide it as an answer on the test, as this was the pattern with everything else that this teacher wrote on the board. Thus, although the main source for conceptualizing citizenship education as well as teaching it seemed to be the textbook, at least for four of the participants, they seemed to complement it with their personal knowledge.

It is also important to note that the teachers had not taught the whole program yet. Most of them had covered the unit on conflict and were just beginning the unit on values. It possibly explains why most of the teachers explained that citizenship education was values education. If I had asked them the same question at the end of the year, for example, as they were finishing the unit on democracy, the answers may have been more related to other aspects of democracy.

With this in mind, I shall briefly attempt to describe teachers’ views. Miriam’s (P1) views seemed to be closer to the transmission side of the continuum (in several aspects of her approach to teaching as well, see next chapter). She explained that education meant transmitting knowledge, and then said that citizenship education (CitEd) meant teaching students principles and knowledge related to citizenship. This relates to the sub category of content, which in the transmission conception is the transmission of knowledge-as-given.

She also said that in CitEd, values were essential and mentioned that the opportunity to inculcate values was the main strength of EpC1. This also relates to transmitting knowledge and to student acceptance, both part of a transmission conception. Values, she maintained, were essential to solving conflicts, which should be solved immediately before they escalated. In her words,

> What does a conflict bring? Death, desolation, sadness, starvation, need and intervention from other countries. That is a conflict. But for it to get to that… What happened? We didn’t use the values that we need to use to solve conflicts… using the nine values they give you [in textbooks], you can solve them [conflicts] quickly.

This view of conflict seems closer to a peacekeeping or transmission perspective. It emphasizes the transmission of the “right” values and the “right” ways to solve conflicts. It expresses an urge to eliminate conflicts, which it seems she generally views as negative. An emphasis on dialogue between legitimately different viewpoints, on the other hand, might have signalled a view closer to peacemaking and peacebuilding, and thus closer to a transformation conception. She later mentioned that a certain good could come of conflicts: learning from mistakes. However, her
general conception seemed much closer to a peacekeeping one. Possibly a little closer to the transformation conception of the continuum, she mentioned that EpC1 allows students to recognize and value other cultures and to dismantle prejudice. Still, what she said mainly reflected a transmission conception.

Ivana (P2) said that for her, the single most important thing was for students to analyze the class system in society and fight to improve their situation. She said CitEd was, hopefully, to make society better and more just. She emphasized that students, despite their disadvantaged background, should set and achieve high goals for themselves (such as aspire to become an astronaut).

She thought CitEd allowed for students to become more conscious, reflective and critical of themselves, their society and their own thinking. In her words: “that young people become conscious of themselves, of their surroundings and of their own thinking… that is citizenship”. She said it was a process of self-criticism and criticism of society through which change might occur. Except for the emphasis on students’ achieving their own high goals regardless of their situation, which is difficult to categorize, these statements seem to refer directly to the components of questioning and justice seeking of a transformation perspective.

She also thought that citizenship education was mainly values education but also economics, sociology, geography and civics. She also mentioned the importance of “rescuing” values or bringing values back into society. She also said, “I know that it is important to teach values but for me values should be taught across subjects. In all subjects we talk and act with values”. As she mainly described teaching values as teaching students to behave properly and follow rules, her conception seems closer to a transmission conception.

Finally, she mentioned that students needed to love their country, feel proud and feel a sense of belonging. She believed those feelings would inspire them to take action to improve their country. This kind of patriotism is also more generally associated with a transmission conception. All in all, her focus on justice and questioning (as well as several aspects of her teaching approach, see next chapter) seem to place her view a little closer to a transformation conception. However, some of her statements also reflected transmission-oriented conception. Thus, her conception could maybe be placed somewhere near the center of the continuum but possibly a little closer to its transformation extreme.
For María Dolores (P3), CitEd is “inculcating values in the kids, because that is what it’s about because they lack moral values, much less spiritual ones. For them, it’s like God doesn’t exist.” She mentioned the need to bring moral values back to society several times, mentioning negative aspects of society and negative attitudes of students, which she said were due to their lack of values. Inculcating values is a form of transmitting knowledge (as-given) which students should accept unquestioningly. Thus, this conception seems to reflect a transmission conception.

When asked about conflict, she said it was important to focus on the conflicts of students, because, as she put it, they were all involved in alcohol, drugs and gangs. This seems to reflect a view of conflict as something negative, something to be avoided, possibly closer to peacekeeping and thus a transmission conception. She also mentioned, briefly, that CitEd was about young people becoming aware of the need to rescue their cultures, as Ecuador is pluri-cultural. As the emphasis seemed to be on each student accepting and embracing their culture (not on understanding other cultures, seeking to redress injustice, etc.), it seems this view is also closer to a transmission conception but it may also reflect a transformation conception. Thus, all in all, it seemed her views are closer to the transmission side of the continuum as were many aspects of her approach (see the next chapter).

Giovanni (P4) did not say very much about his conception of CitEd or views on conflict. He mentioned that CitEd was “making good citizens… It’s introducing individuals to values… human values, democratic values” and mentioned teaching students how to participate to improve society, to be useful to society and to collaborate with the Government.

He focused on democratic values (and note he used “introduce students to” instead of “inculcate”) and on participation. However, he did not show a clear focus on questioning and redressing injustice that would characterize a strong transformation position. Thus, his conception may be a little closer to a transformation conception but closer to the middle of the continuum.

He also emphasized the importance of solving conflicts as quickly as possible, seemingly bringing his views closer to the peacekeeping side of the continuum. However, he also included elements of peacemaking with his mentions of dialogue and conflict resolution. Thus, his conception is difficult to characterize. Possibly it is somewhere around the middle of the continuum. Taken with his approach (described in the following chapter), however, I would characterize his conception as a little closer to a transmission conception than a transformation one.
Fausto (P5) was the only participant who did not describe CitEd as values education. Rather, he emphasized that CitEd was about students learning their rights and their responsibilities. In the case of his specific students, who were all teenaged girls from low SES families studying to be secretaries, he emphasized their learning about their rights. That is, their rights in school, within their families, as mothers (at least 10% were pregnant or already mothers, he reported) and in the workplace (before they did their internships, etc.).

He also emphasized their learning mechanisms to fight for their rights. He said he could not bear injustice and mentioned helping his students in situations in which he said their rights were violated. This clear emphasis on justice, and to a lesser degree on questioning (as well as some aspects of his approach, see next chapter), seem to place his views quite close to the transformation extreme of the continuum.

Finally, Diego’s views (P6) (and several aspects of his approach to teaching, see next chapter), seem to be closer to the transmission side of the continuum. In his words,

> with this subject that we are imparting, we want to rescue the ethical and moral values of society… because it is said that if you have or if you teach an individual values education you are helping to build a better society, because that is what is failing in this decade: values are being lost.

As explained above, “imparting” or inculcating values quite clearly reflects a transmission conception. He also explained that if members of a conflict cannot solve it, not even with the help of a mediator, “then an authority has to arrive so they can help.” This focus on “an authority” seems to reflect the peacekeeping view of ensuring security and controlling situations and peacekeeping is a component of a transmission conception. All in all, it seems Diego’s conception is quite close to the transmission extreme of the continuum.

In sum, I find that the official documents’ introductory statements for EpC reflect a transformation conception. The introductory statements of the EpC1 curriculum and accompanying guidelines and recommendations are less clear. They mention questioning but do not explicitly mention justice. All in all, they seem closer to a transformation conception than to a transmission conception. However, they are less close to the transformation end of the continuum than the introductory statements of EpC are. Textbook 1’s introductory statements mainly reflect a transmission conception. Textbook
2’s introductory statements seem to mainly reflect a transmission conception, although the conception is not clearly stated.

The teachers’ stated views are also varied. Three teachers’, Miriam, Ma. Dolores and Diego, views seemed quite close to the transmission extreme of the continuum. Giovanni and Ivanas’ views could be placed somewhere around the middle of the continuum, with Giovanni being closer to the transmission end and Ivana a little closer to the transformation end. Fausto’s conception seemed closer to a transformation conception.

**The EpC1 Program: Official and interpreted curriculum**

In this section, I briefly analyze the EpC1 program as presented in the official curriculum documents, the ministry guidelines and pedagogical recommendations with a focus on the first two units. I also briefly analyze the first two units\(^\text{25}\) of both textbooks (the interpreted curriculum). That is to say, I am analyzing the “materials” dimension. I analyze teachers’ approaches (the curriculum-in-use, the “practices” dimension) in the following chapter.

In order to analyze the specific EpC1 education program, I analyze the “objectives” and “practices” dimensions using the same transmission/transformation framework (see Figure 1). Here, I will focus more on the objectives/practices dimension of the transmission/transformation continuum. It contains two sub categories. Content shows a continuum from the extreme of knowledge-as-given and non-conflictual (associated with transmission) to the extreme of knowledge-as-constructed and conflictual (associated with transformation).

**Analyzing the EpC1 program as presented in the official curriculum.**

Above, I characterized the introductory statements of the official curriculum (EpC and EpC1 as well as the guidelines and pedagogical recommendations documents) as being closer to a transformation conception, although EpC more so than EpC1. In this section, I analyze the objectives and the practices described in the EpC1 section of the official curriculum, the guidelines and pedagogical recommendations documents.

\(^{25}\) However, I focus on the first two units as defined by the official curriculum. The textbooks also includes norms in unit two, but as the participants in this study had not begun teaching topics related to norms yet, I will focus on first two units as defined by the official curriculum that is to say, on the topics of conflict and values.
The official curriculum presents a list of 27 specific learning aims, 10 in the first two units (pp. 15-17). It also presents a list of 70 items of essential knowledge, 28 in the first two units (pp. 18-21). There is also a list of 32 essential indicators for evaluation, 11 of which are related to the first two units (pp. 22-23). Most of these may seem more aligned with a transmission or a transformation conception, depending on how they are interpreted, although some clearly reflected one conception over the other.

Of the ten aims related listed in the first two units, four seem to have the goal that students come to understand certain ideas, with examples of such aims being for students to “explain social recognition as a vital human need” and “argue about the inevitable character of conflict in human societies” (p. 15). Three aims seem to refer to understanding concepts, such as “distinguish between ethnocentrism, relativism, exoticism and universalism” (p. 16). These objectives seem to aim for the transmission of knowledge-as-given, taken in isolation. However, if used to design and teach a course within a transformation conception, they could be used to reach “transformative” aims and problematized to reflect knowledge-as-constructed.

Another two aims refer to understanding democratic values and rejecting values that go against democracy, such as racism. As explained before, depending on how this is understood, it could be viewed as a transmission of the “right” values or as a more transformative goal of questioning and contrasting different value systems and fighting against injustice. However, as another aim is “argue in favor of their own positions on value issues, beginning with respect for other positions” (p. 16), the above aim should probably be understood within a transformative conception. Another aim refers to conflict resolution, which is closely associated with peacemaking that stands in the middle of the continuum.

The aims in other units seem to mostly relate to learning concepts and how democracy works as well as analyzing different aspects of society. Except for the penultimate example given, which clearly states that students must be critical and establish their own arguments thus relating more to a transformation conception, most of the others seem to depend on the way the aims are approached. The focus could be on the transmission of knowledge-as-given (definitions, types, etc.) to passive accepting students or it could be on engaging students in lively critical discussion and analysis, and using opportunities, such as the discussion of racism, to discuss issues of injustice.
The next pages list 70 items as essential knowledge that students must learn, 28 of which are listed in the first two units. Examples are very similar to those mentioned above. Messages for students to learn, such as “the need to live with others” and “conflict as an essential part of living with others” (p. 18), knowledge related to conflict resolution, and items students are meant to learn, such as democratic values. As explained above, it seems these lists of knowledge could be taught either in a transmission or a transformation fashion.

The essential indicators for evaluation were more specific. Thus, I analyzed them both using the general framework as well as with the questioning patterns framework (information-gathering, interpretative and value questions). Of the eleven indicators, it seemed seven focus on the gathering information to determine if students have learned the desired knowledge or messages, such as “explain, through written essays, why living together is essential to human existence” and “define the concepts of ‘values’ and describe their essential characteristics through concept maps”. Two seem to be tasks that focused on conflict resolution and peacemaking seemed to require interpretation. For example, one task instructs students to: “identify and analyze social conflicts present in the media, [their] social surroundings or in other contexts, recognizing the actors and sectors that are present, as well as different perspectives and interests involved”. Another two seemed to be value questions, such as asking student to “argue in favor of [their] own value position and listen to other positions with respect” (p. 22).

Only the two value questions seem directly relatable to a transformation conception, although their emphasis is more on questioning than on justice. The others may or may not be related to a transformation conception, it seems, depending on how they are approached. However, taken at “face value”, they seem to reflect a transmission approach. For example, the tasks related to students learning desired messages, such as the necessity of living and cooperating with others, may be seen as going against the aim of students becoming autonomous thinkers as students are given the side for which they must argue. Patiño (2013) presented similar findings in her thesis. She studied the official History curriculum for Basic Education level 7. She said the curriculum is ambiguous. It promotes the construction of knowledge and students’ learning of historical methods of knowledge construction. However, she also notes that the evaluation indicators do not include reference to skills related to such knowledge-construction activities.
The teacher guidelines promote learning activities that are more typically related to a transformation conception: analysis of texts, essay writing, student self-evaluation, debates, research projects, etc. The content of the activities, however, do not seem explicitly related either to questioning or to justice, as they focus on, for example, students understanding why humans must live with others through the analysis of the extreme examples of feral children. Some of the contents seemed related to conflict resolution oriented towards peacemaking, but not quite reaching peacebuilding, it seems. While peacemaking is essential for a democracy and an important step towards a transformative conception, a peacebuilding approach would place the guidelines closer to the transformative side of the continuum.

The final section of the guide includes texts on the curriculum topics (living together, recognition, etc.) which do not present controversies or questions, rather answers and explanations. Thus, these appear to be examples of knowledge-as-given type content.

Thus, some aspects of the teacher guidelines seem to point towards a transformation conception, and other more towards a transmission conception. However, it is only the methods the guidelines stated should be used that seemed more transformation-oriented. Activities such as essay writing and research projects could easily be used for transmission purposes. Thus, given this and that the other aspects of the guidelines seem closer to a transmission conception, the guidelines should probably be placed closer to the transmission side of the continuum. However, the peacemaking approach to conflict could be considered to move the guidelines closer toward the center of the continuum.

The pedagogical recommendations document is similar: it promotes types of activities that are seemingly more related to transformation, while the content seems more focused on understanding concepts, acquiring knowledge and acquiring conflict resolution skills. One activity may promote questioning, as it asks students to “interview religious and non-religious people, compare their answers and explain their different ways of understand what values are” (p. 3). However, the rest do not seem explicitly focused on questioning or redressing justice issues. Thus, it seems that the pedagogical recommendations should also be placed closer to the transmission end of the continuum. In this case as well, the peacemaking approach to conflict could be considered to move the guidelines closer toward the center of the continuum.
In sum, the introductory statements of EpC and EpC1 seemed closer to a transformation conception of DoCitEd, with EpC clearly being closer than EpC1. However, it is difficult to place the specific aims, evaluation indicators and activities of EpC1 along the continuum, as most depend on how they are enacted. This may be another example of mutual adaptation, as it seems that the interpretation of the policy guidelines by the teacher (or the textbook authors) is a critical factor. Still, it should be noted that very little of the program contents explicitly focus on questioning or justice issues, and thus it seems that, at least as presented, the program could be placed closer to a transmission approach.

**Analyzing the EpC1 program as presented in the interpreted curriculum.**

As previously mentioned, the general conception of DoCitEd present in the introduction of textbooks 1 and 2 in general seemed closer to a transmission conception. The dimensions of objectives/content and practices (at least for units 1 and 2) also seem to be closer to the transmission side of the continuum.

**Textbook 1**

In terms of its objectives/content, textbook 1 mostly seems to reflect the component of knowledge-as-given under a transmission conception. For example, it focused on the Latin origin of words such as “responsible” and provided of a sole definition and explanation of concepts (even contested ones such as liberty) rather than exploring their contested nature. It included lists of positive and negative attitudes and values needed to solve conflicts. However, it did not explore the possibility of other values being involved, who decided those were the right values, what happens when two of those values come into contradiction with one another in an ethical conflict, etc.

In addition, the textbook seems to include many moral messages. The text highlighted the golden rule, used many fables and stories to convey moral messages (for example, one shows animals dying unless they cooperate, another shows animals dying for not helping a friend and another illustrates the value of solidarity), asked students to reflect on quotes with moral messages and clearly stated that religious values were above any other type of value: “Religious values, [sic] comprise the sacred and the divine; [sic] constitute a supreme category” (Maldonado, 2012, p. 32).
This may be better understood as reflecting the component of “being a good neighbor” under a transmission conception. Moral messages are transmitted to students, and spaces for questioning or analyzing these messages do not seem to exist. As will be shown later, the teachers who used this textbook (Miriam, Ma. Dolores, Giovanni y Diego), when I observed their teaching, seemed to enforce these messages as morals not to be questioned.

I will attempt to categorize the activities that textbook 1 offers for students (only in units 1 and 2) using the questioning patterns described by Dull and Murrow (2008) (see Literature Review chapter) to shed further light on the matter. It was difficult to classify all activities, as a few refer back to videos in a DVD to which I do not have access (but was able to briefly scan). However, it seems safe to say that many of this textbook’s activities are focused on what I would call “moral messages” (not questions).

The textbook also includes a few information-gathering questions (i.e. What are the types of conflict in a problem?) and interpretative questions (i.e. reflect on the following quote from Albert Einstein: “My political ideal is democracy. Everyone must be respected as a person and none must be divinized”, p. 17). Finally, although there are very few, textbook 1 also includes value questions. Some may seem leading “When you do your school work or take exams do you think it is honest to copy. Why?” (p. 25). Others seem to be ethical dilemmas, such as “Imagine you are a judge and present before you is a person who has stolen because of hunger. How would you judge him?” (p. 25). Despite the few interpretive and value questions, in quantity and in emphasis the textbook mostly focuses on transmitting knowledge (as given), and especially moral messages, to students.

Textbook 2

I mentioned before that, at least in its introductory statements, textbook 2 seemed more aligned to a transmission conception. The objectives/contents and practices dimensions of its units 1 and 2 also seemed closer the transmission side of the continuum.

Each page (except for the evaluation at the end of each unit) of this textbook presented a concept that was divided into four subsections. Each of these subsections presented types, categories, processes and the like related to that concept. For example, page 18 is on “socialization” and has four subsections (a) what is socialization, (b) primary socialization, (c) secondary socialization and
(d) processes of socialization. Each of these subsections contains an explanation of the title. Many begin with Latin or Greek definitions of words and include citations from famous, synonyms for the term, examples, etc.

The texts I reviewed (units 1 and 2) do not present the material as conflictual; rather, they seem like clear examples of knowledge-as-given. At the bottom of each page is a short biography of a famous thinker (mostly men of European descent). Some examples, in order of appearance, include Aristotle, Parsons, Weber, Dilthey and Erikson. These are clear examples of non-conflictual knowledge-as-given, which is closely associated with a transmission conception.

At the end of each unit is a similar test. All tests have the same three parts: (a) “definition of concepts”, (b) “comprehension test” and (c) “application and reflection test”. The “definition of concepts” section includes 10-12 terms from the previous text for students to define in two lines, such as “solidarity”, “cultural anthropology”, “socialization”, “Heidegger”, “hedonism”, “eudemonism”, “social expectations”, “axiology” (pp. 20, 36 & 67).

The next section asks for an explanation of terms previously presented in the text, such as “meaning of the term co-existence and of its main synonyms” and “main ideas about community and communitarian integration”. The final section asks students to “reflect and apply”, with instructions such as “write a brief composition about gender identity” and questions such as “What are the relationships of the social being with regards to social conscience?” (pp. 20-21).

In some cases it was difficult to determine, as some instructions were confusing to me. For example, “essay about the counter value interaction of dialogue” (ensayo sobre la interacción contravalorativa del diálogo) (p. 80). Still, most questions were understandable and the vast majority of them seemed to serve the purpose of “information-gathering”, thus determining whether or not the students knew the previously presented content (definitions, mainly). A few seemed to be interpretive questions, and none seemed to be value questions, unless general instructions such as “personal comments on academic freedom” (p. 37), are implicitly value questions. Thus, it seemed most questions were information-gathering questions, closely associated with a transmission conception.

In sum, it seems that the objectives/contents and practices of both textbooks (in units 1 and 2 at least) are more closely aligned to the transmission side of the continuum. One seems to focus on
transmitting moral messages and the other to focus on transmitting concepts and terms related to citizenship.

In this chapter I presented the analysis of the official curriculum, the interpreted curricula and teachers’ conceptions. I first analyzed the conception dimension, focusing on the documents’ introductory statements. I began with the introductory statements of the official curriculum. I divided these into two: (a) the introductory statements that reflected the goals for citizenship education for all grades (EpC) and (b) the introductory statements for the specific program on which this study focuses (EpC1). I found that both introductory statements seemed closer to the transformation side of the continuum, but EpC was clearly closer to a transformation conception than was EpC1.

I also analyzed the introductory statements of textbooks 1 and 2. I found they were both closer to the transmission side of the continuum. I then analyzed the teachers’ stated views. Miriam, Ma. Dolores and Diegos’ views seemed closer to a transmission conception. Giovanni’s conception also seemed to lean towards a transmission conception but seemed much closer to the middle. Ivana’s conception also could be placed in the middle, although a little more towards the transformation side. Final, Fausto’s conception seemed close to a transformation conception. I then analyzed the objectives/contents and practices dimensions present in the documents (teachers’ practices are analyzed in the following chapter). This was more complex. The program presented could be interpreted either in a transmission or transformation light and taught accordingly. However, in all of the documents (curriculum, teacher guidelines, teacher recommendation, textbook 1 and textbook 2), the program was mainly presented in a way that suggested a transmission approach. Still, the transmission conception was a lot more evident in the textbooks.

I now attempt to analyze teachers’ approaches, mainly the “practices” dimension.
Chapter 5: Approaches to and levels of use of the new program

Indeed, as a result of the power of pedagogical custom, teaching in new subjects such as commercial education frequently came to resemble instruction in traditional fields. (Tyack & Cuban, 1995, p. 57)

In this chapter, I explore each teacher’s approach to the new EpC1 curriculum. To do this, I will use the same continuum going from the extreme conception of transmission to that of transformation (see Figure 1). As I mentioned above, teachers’ conceptions of citizenship education varied along this continuum. Miriam, Ma. Dolores and Diego seemed to be closer to the transmission end of the continuum. Giovanni’s conception seemed to be a little closer to the middle of the continuum, but still leaning toward the transmission conception. Ivana’s conception also seemed closer to the middle, but leaning towards the transformation conception. Fausto’s conception seemed closer to the transformation side of the continuum.

As I will explain in this chapter, their approach to the new EpC1 curriculum (content and pedagogy) seems to mirror their conceptions. At the end of this chapter, I will also describe the teachers’ level of use (LoU) of the new program using the scale providing by the CBAM framework (see first section of chapter 2).

Mutual adaptation: Different cases, different adaptations

Miriam.

Miriam had just been teaching the new EpC1 course for a few weeks when I observed her. She had begun the school year with a different set of courses and had just recently been asked to switch her whole course load and take on the schools’ EpC1 courses (approximately eight or ten different groups of 30-35 students). The last time I observed her class, more than half of her students had a textbook of their own, as she had managed to obtain permission from the District for her to be able to require students to buy the books.

When I interacted with her, Miriam’s approach seemed closer towards the transmission end of the continuum. In terms of the content sub category, it seemed she generally regarded the textbook she used (textbook 1) as containing the content students had to learn. She seemed to view this knowledge as given, as non conflictual and as something she had to transmit to students.
From my observations and from what she told me during the interviews, it seemed that most classes consisted of her summarizing the contents of one page of the textbook for students, usually by creating a concept map on the board. As she explained the contents, she would ask students information-gathering questions such as “What is liberty?”, “Give me an example of an act of kindness” and “How many universal values are there?” (“12!” students answered in chorus) (O1). She tended to ask these questions before, to test them on the previous class, or after, to test them on what she had just explained. As she asked questions, it seemed she expected quick and few-word responses as she quickly moved from one question and student to the next. Both in the subcategories of content and pedagogy, this practice is closer to the transmission end of the continuum.

The teacher explained that students always had to have the previous classes’ contents written in their notebooks. If they didn’t finish this in class, “they already [knew] they [would] have to complete their notebook and bring it in” (I2). Mostly students were asked to write graphic organizers in their notebooks: “I try and do organizers so it [the contents] is as compressed as possible” (I2) she said. Students’ notes had to follow tight guidelines, it seemed, given the way the teacher evaluated them.

She emphasized how the work was presented: “the presentation must be spotless, very good” (I1). Most of the notebooks I saw had neat handwriting, used colors to design the text and had carefully crafted drawings to illustrate certain words (N1). The all had almost exact the same words: they replicated what was on the board, no more, no less. The teacher also explained she took off marks for any mistakes in Presentación; for example, students were penalized if they had used white out and penalized even more for smudges or crossing anything out.

As she wrote on the board, summarizing the textbook contents, she would sometimes give students instructions for note-taking: “Hierarchical values, write that in red” (O3), “Leave a space and draw a chalice, a cross or a church” (O1) or “Kids, don’t write yet. I haven’t told you that you can write yet” (O3). This practice also seems to reflect the sub categories of content and pedagogy focused on the transmission of knowledge-as-given (in this case, exactly “as given”).

---

26 Quotes obtained from observations (O) and informal interviews (I) are an approximation of the participant’s exact words, as these quotes are based on the researcher’s notes. The quotes from interviews (I) are the participant’s exact words. All quotations have been translated from Spanish by the researcher, who is fluent in both English and Spanish.
In addition to evaluating students’ notebooks, the teacher had students take written tests. The tests I saw also seemed to reflect a transmission conception. They seemed to include only closed-responses, information-gathering questions (multiple choice, sentence completing, true/false, etc.) about the textbook contents, such as “The word “value” comes from…” (answer: the Latin *valere*). (I1, E1, E2, D1, D4).

Another comment from the teacher seemed to reflect this viewed of knowledge (as given) transmission. For the second class period, the teacher sometimes either (a) gave the student the period off to study for another class (O2, O3) or (b) played basketball with them (I1, ii). As she explained: “What use is it to [have more time]? Kids won’t retain what I tell them….” (I1). It seems she assumed that having another period meant she had to “transmit” the summary of another page of the textbook, and that students would not be able to focus on another summary.

Her pedagogy, as illustrated in the above paragraphs, seemed to be close to the transmission end of the continuum, as it seems to be teacher-centered and focused on the transmission of knowledge. However, in the interviews, she mentioned using other types of instructional strategies. For example, she mentioned *Talleres* (which translates to “workshop”), which meant placing students in teams and giving them a copy of a page from the textbook. They then had to highlight the important parts of the text, create a graphic organizer and present it to the class (I1). Although this may be student-centered, the goal is still transmitting non conflictual knowledge-as-given content from the textbook. The main approach seemed thus to remain transmission-oriented.

The teacher also spoke of conducting debates (i.e. one reflecting a current national debate on whether petroleum should be extracted from a national reserve in the jungle). She mentioned that debates took time away from covering the content, but she said they were worth it: “I don’t mind losing a class; I know when the best time to cover content is.” (II)

While the teacher may have used more student-centered instructional strategies at times (some of which still seemed to focus on acquiring the textbook content), mainly her approach seemed close to a transmission conception of citizenship education. It almost seemed as if the teacher’s goal was for students to replicate summaries of the textbook in the exact way she summarized it for them, both in their memories and in their notebooks.
Gaining students’ trust and ensuring that the students liked her seemed to be important to Miriam. For example, she said she felt good about the new course because students liked her: “I see… the feelings… or the regard they have for me, and I feel very good!” (I2) and she explained that she played basketball with students to get to know them better and gain their trust (i1). She reported that some students came to her to speak about personal issues and sometimes even showed her their physical self-inflicted injuries. She explained:

They come and say “Teacher Miriam, can you give me a minute?” “Of course, all the ones [minutes] you need”. It’s not a problem for me. I can lose class time. I let the inspectorate know I’m in a meeting and tell them to send someone else. I can’t close the door in their faces. You have to listen right then. You can’t say tomorrow. If someone comes to talk to you it’s because they need your support, they need you to guide them. They need, most of all, to know they have someone they can count on. That’s what they tell me. To listen. To help. (I2)

Establishing a good relationship with students is important in citizenship education. For example, as mentioned in chapter 2, in order to be able to conduct discussions of conflictual issues in the classroom, there has to first be a safe and inclusive classroom climate. However, a safe and inclusive classroom climate requires building good relationships among students too, and work in this area was less evident during the observations conducted for this study.

In our conversations, Miriam mentioned having the same approach with other subjects, other grade levels and other students (I1, I2). It seems she had always summarized textbook content for students to copy in memory and in their textbooks, regardless of the subject. She reports having been a popular teacher ever since she had begun teaching due to her good relationship with students. It seems thus that Miriam changed her approach very little with the new curriculum. In terms of dimensions, she definitely had to change materials: she followed a new textbook. However, it did not seem like she changed her conceptions, broad objectives for students or practices.

Ivana.

Ivana said she was new to the school, having only arrived a few weeks ago when the school year began. She said she was very enthusiastic with finally being able to teach students of her own social

---

27 “Inspectors” in Ecuador are school personnel in charge of ensuring everyone, mainly students and teachers, follow the rules. For example, they make sure teachers begin and finish classes on time, take student attendance, etc.
class, having previously always taught middle and upper class students in private schools. She explained how the elite class had always dominated the country and her enthusiasm to “fight” the social order along with her students.

In general, her approach seemed a little closer to the transformation side of the continuum than to the transmission side, as she expressed wishing for students to question and think for themselves, and hoped they would transform society (she especially mentioned wishing they would improve their own situation, as they came from low SES families). For example, she spoke of skills she wanted students to learn, such as “formulate value judgments, for example, analyze, reason….” (I1).

She tried to get her students to feel proud of being Ecuadorian and seemed very passionate about getting students to set high goals for themselves and achieve them (I1, O1, i). In the first interview she said: “Becoming an astronaut, why not? That is what these kids lack; much bigger goals, objectives they maybe think are unachievable” (I1). She did not only emphasize helping students grow and improve; she also mentioned the need for society to change, to become more just, to break from the oppression of the elite class and also for Ecuador to break free from the oppression of rich countries. She told them things to motivate them in class. For example, she told them that Picasso’s father had said: “If you’re going to be a soldier, you’ll have to become a general. If you’re going to be a priest, you’ll have to become the pope” and Picasso said “I decided to be a painter and I am now Picasso”. Students listened attentively and then laughed (O1). She also told students that she expected them to change the country (O1).

It is difficult to categorize the way she approached content with students. Many of the things she did seemed to be closer to the transmission of knowledge-as-given, but others, and her general focus, seemed closer to a transformation conception. In the first interview, she said she told students they should speak up and they shouldn't always agree with her: “Ideas emerge when there are differences…. [T]here can be consensus, there can be advances, there can be progress” (I1). I observed her telling students this in class. However, I only observed students complain when she gave them assignment they did not like: I did not observe students contradicting an idea. I did not observe instances where the participant presented various different points of view to students or different sources or ways that knowledge was constructed. In the three classes I observed, she seemed to present them with a coherent, “given” version of knowledge.
She also had planned strategies for students to participate, such as what she explained during the first interview:

… I always, always, always write a quote on the board. A significant quote from an author or an anonymous source or graffiti. Always. What do I achieve with this? Having kids speak. Well, actually, it is one thing just to speak and it is another to express their thoughts in an orderly fashion, and maybe also infer a message from the quote. (I1)

In the classroom, I observed this. Also, during the quote analysis as well as during in class in general, the teacher sometimes asked students to build upon what the previous one had said, with phrases such as: “Mr. Juanez28, add to that idea” (O1). These are what Hess (2004) calls “uptake” questions, which can facilitate discussion. This activity facilitated a little discussion and interpretation among students. However, did not seem to fostering questioning, reflecting on value questions or on injustice.

As other teachers, she also introduced students to content, asking them about it as she did so, and also asking them to take notes. It seems she complemented this transmission approach with more student-centered instructional and evaluation strategies. For example, I observed a student-centered strategy that lasted the whole of the third class. In a task she assigned, Ivana instructed: “You need a secretary in charge of presenting. Each group has a type of conflict [each group had a copy of a textbook page]. You have to create a concept map based on the text, present it and act out an example” (O3). This can be considered an example of an interpretative question, though it is still focused on the knowledge-as-given in the textbook. Students seemed engaged and interested, reading the text out loud to each other, exchanging ideas about how to create the concept map and designing their skit. While one group explained their concept map (which they copied on the board) and acted out the skits, the other students listened and paid attention.

Ivana said she evaluated class participation, in-class activities such as student presentations as well as work students did at home, such as essays, projects and homework. An example of homework is the following: “Bring an example of a text in which the Government tries to motivate us [i.e. positive messages of Ecuadorian products] and underline the ‘motivation’” (O1).

---

28 Throughout the text, I use variations of “Juan” as pseudonyms for students. This does not mean that the same student always participated. I simply used variations of “Juan” to make it easier to identify students.
From what she told students, it seemed like the next class they were going to critically analyze Governments’ messages, which seems closer to a transformation conception. Perhaps it is also important to note that during the interviews, the teacher explained to me that her students were not used to participating or to student-centered activities. She said they were shy but she was attempting to motive them to participate.

Finally, and also important in a transformation type of citizenship education, it seems the teacher tried hard to make her classes fun and engaging, always planning ways to catch students’ attention. During the three classes I observed, she moved around the room enthusiastically, teasing students, giving students big smiles and “high fives” for good answers, and telling jokes and stories. For example, during the second observation, she began the class with a fake announcement designed to create a conflict, which she then had students reflect upon. She announced that all students had two days to manually copy their entire notebook contents, word by word, into pages in a blue folder (she stressed it had to be blue several times). “It’s not my idea!” she claimed: “it’s an order from the administrators”.

Students protested and complained loudly until finally the teacher said: “Right, Mr. Juanez. What do you think the class topic is today? Did I or did I not manage to create a conflict?” “What!!!” students exclaimed (laughing, shouting, groaning and gesticulating), “it was a lie!” The teacher laughed with them and then had them reflect on the conflict, their responses to her demands, etc. (O2). It is also important to note that Ivana did not only focus on conflict resolution (peacemaking). She also asked students whether confronting conflict was necessary, saying: “If slaves had not rebelled… conflicts are necessary to evolve, to develop, for ‘dialectic’” (she then played hangman with the students, trying to get them to remember the meaning of “dialectic”) (O2). These messages might be closer to a peacebuilding conception, as it speaks to challenging and transforming injustice. Thus, as with her conceptions, Ivana’s approach should probably be placed somewhere along the middle of the continuum, possibly a little closer to the transformation end of the continuum.

As with Miriam above, from conversations with Ivana, it seemed that her approach had been this way for a long time. For example, she sometimes described practices with other students from other grades and other subjects to illustrate her practice in the CitEd course, and spoke of her general approach to teaching to describe her approach to the new CitEd course (I1, I2). As with Miriam, it
seems she changed materials; she had to follow a different education program. However, there did not seem to be major changes along the other three dimensions of change: her conceptions, her broad objectives for students or her practices.

María Dolores.

Ma. Dolores seemed strained when I met her, saying that she had to prepare four different new classes for this school year, none of which were in her area of expertise. As previously mentioned, she conceptualized EpC1 as values education. However, she also said that parents were the only ones who could really teach students values, and thus teachers could not make a big difference (I2). Also, she mentioned that teaching EpC1 was very difficult because most students had “not learned” values at home. It seems she meant that, given their behavior, what they had learned was wrong.

She emphasized her concern about students, mainly their moral character and also, though to a lesser degree, their capabilities. She mentioned that “they’re involved in alcohol, drugs and gangs” (I1, also I2, iI) and also lamented that “ethical, moral values are what young people these days have lost, not to mention spiritual values” (I1, also I2, iI). Linked to this perception seemed to be a view of many students as irresponsible, uninterested and not very capable (I1, O1, O2, O3, I2, iI): “Young people today are very irresponsible…” (I2) and “they fail a lot in reading. Sometimes they read without caring whether they understand. ‘Did you understand?’ ‘I don’t know’” (I1).

Ma. Dolores also explained that nowadays it was more difficult to control the class and to ensure students did their work. Because of new laws, she said: “You can’t even look at them wrong because they can say you’re harming them psychologically” (I1, also I2). Therefore, she said:

I apply [the part of] the Constitution… that says “Ama killa, ama llulla, ama shwa”… [which she said meant] “do not lie, do not be lazy and to not steal”. So, I say: “you are there, not complying. I don’t say it, the Constitution of the Republic does”. “Why…”, I say, “are you being lazy? Because you’re absent. You don’t fulfill… your responsibilities as a student. And you’re a liar, why? Because you invent, to escape your responsibilities, that you’ve been sick or you’ve had to do other things or you forgot or I left my notebook at home and didn’t bring it”… and I say: “you know what stealing is?” I say: “it’s not only stealing objects or things” I say: “stealing is time. You know why? Because time you cannot recover it. You are stealing that time... you shouldn’t be lazy, nor be a liar, nor steal.” (I1, also mentions this in I2 and tells students this in O1)

29 The Constitution is based on the principle of “Good Living” for all. This comes from the indigenous “Sumak Kawsay”, which includes those rules for living with others.
She reported several times she was glad to have found this article because she said it gave her grounds to demand students work and behave properly.

As mentioned in the literature review section, a transformative approach requires an education approach similar to Freire’s critical model of education. Freire (1999) stresses that to facilitate significant learning, teachers must truly respect and love their students. They must view their students as subjects (not objects, receptacles that receive knowledge) and truly believe in their capacities. Teachers must view their students as “critical co-investigators” (p. 62). Given Ma. Dolores’ constant emphasis on her concerns about students’ moral fibre and capacities (who, as far as I could observe, were not very different as a group than the students of the other five participants), it seems she was quite far from a transformative conception.

Ma. Dolores seemed to focus on (attempting to) transmit knowledge (and values) to students, while attempting to control the class. It seemed this is what she understood she had to do: cover the content of the textbook. In her words “all of the topics are detailed there, even the objectives…. You can’t skip any topic, nor invent anything or transmit however you want.”

When describing her typical class, she said that after taking attendance and refreshing students’ memories regarding the previous class, “you announce the topic. Yes, it’s just that you put it on the board. Today we’re going to go over this topic” (I1). In the third class observed, the teacher announced the topic was democratic methods of conflict resolution, and wrote it on the board (O3). Then, as she described,

> Sometimes we have [students] read, and from there have them determine the important parts. Seeing that they do not structure well, then as the teacher I have to structure the topic, it’s like this… then I give them the actual content, I go over the topic… but I do that explanation on the board, in a graphic organizer…. (I1)

Something similar happened in the third class: students were told to read sections from the teacher’s textbook (they had no textbook of their own). The teacher summarized the content on the board and students were told to take notes (O3). However, many students did not seem to do so and the noise level made it difficult to follow what was being read out loud.
Also, the teacher would sometimes interrupt the activity to rebuke students. For example, after a student read a section on conflict mediation, the teacher asked “What did you understand?” and the student answered “That both parties must arrive at an agreement”. The teacher replied, seemingly quite annoyed, “Do you realize that you’re simply reading out loud and you’re not realizing what it says!?” She then asked another student to read the same section “well” (O3). This may be considered an attempt, though not very successful, of transmitting the textbook contents to students. These kinds of comments may inhibit future student participation and learning. In this example, Ma. Dolores’ approach was very far from a transformation approach.

The teacher also used instructional strategies and tactics\(^{30}\) that were more student-centered. However, these also seemed to focus on the transmission of basic knowledge from the textbook, without opportunities for questioning it. For example, during the first observation, she tried to set up an activity where individual students began a sentence for others to complete. One student said “Most of the riches are received by” and another answered “the elites”\(^{31}\). Sometimes, seemingly when she considered answers not adequate, the teacher would call for other volunteers: “someone who can do it well” or comment on the student’s answer: “It’s too long” (O1). This practice could also be considered closer to a transmission conception than a transformation one.

During this activity, many students spoke amongst each other, making it difficult to hear what the students or teacher were saying (O1). The teacher would try to get students to be silent: “¡Juanito! Stop talking. Answer two major economic powers of the elite” (O1) or “Now, miss Juanita, this concerns you too. If you’re not interested, leave!” (O3). The noise usually continued immediately after. It seemed she rebuked some students more frequently than on others, even if many were all doing the same thing. If this is so, then it would also place her approach further away from a transformation approach, which emphasizes justice.

The teacher also had students prepare presentations for a class I observed. However, when we arrived, the door was locked and two students said the rest were rehearsing for a dance show. After going to see the inspector, and much tension and confusion, the teacher simultaneously reproached the few students who attended class and tried to have them reflect on the conflict and on the values involved in it. For example, she said, “What value is that?” to which students answered

\(^{30}\) Activities similar to strategies, but less complex, such as Think, Pair, Share (Anderson, 2002).

\(^{31}\) The topic was resource distribution.
“Disrespect”. (“This is how you are – disrespectful!” the teacher interjected). “Value or counter value?” the teacher asked; “Counter value”, students answered (“You see how you don’t care about your education!” the teacher interjected).

Then she asked, “Who made posters? Let’s make use of the little time we have left” (O2). Three students attached a poster to the board, and began explaining/reading what was written on it. The presentation was hard to follow due to constant very loud noises and interruptions. Student after student banging on the door to be let in, students inside calling “don’t open it!” Ma. Dolores opened the door only after several minutes of banging, reprimanded those who entered, and finally, the inspector entered to discuss the problem. Ma. Dolores also waiting before allowing him in, and a lot more banging ensued.

After the class Ma. Dolores lamented that for presentations, students simply copied a paragraph or two from the textbook onto a large sheet of paper and read it out loud (O1). This seemed to be an attempt for students to transmit knowledge-as-given from the textbook to others, and for the teacher to determine whether students “knew” the content. As a plan, it would be closer to a transmission conception. However, given the chaos that ensued, it is difficult to determine what actually got “transmitted”: probably different messages for different students. This would probably require a detailed analysis of the hidden curriculum over a longer period of observations, which is beyond the scope of this study. Thus, for the purposes of this study, I will consider it an attempted transmission approach.

In all three observed classes, in addition to attempting to go through the textbook content, the teacher elicited examples from a few students about their own lives (from the three observations I did, it seemed to me these two or three students, all boys, were often called upon to share and were comfortable doing so). For example, a student from Colombia was called on a few times to talk about the situation there, which he did to great length and seemed to enjoy. Sometimes, when these few students spoke about their experiences or views, the noise level went down and students seemed to be interested in others said (O1, O2, O3).

Having students share their stories and concerns might be considered a little closer to a transformation approach. However, in this case, it was only two or three students who seemed invited to do this and the questions the teacher asked did not often relate to the class topics. From
what I observed, more than anything, it seemed to be a break from the quite difficult moments of attempting to transmit textbook content.

In the third class, students mentioned an issue with which they were discontent. The teacher told me later, informally, that it had to do with school festivities; students were not happy with what was organized, but there were budget issues. To the students, in class, she said:

You, feeling so dissatisfied, you will never be able to agree amongst yourselves, not even within this class. I also have to do what the authorities say. We have to comply and obey. I, about your complaints, can do nothing. We have authorities, whether we like it or not. We are working in an authoritarian system. You have to obey; whether you agree or not, you have to conform. (O3)

The discussion did not go further, at least not during that class. This seems like another example of an extreme transmission conception, with an emphasis on acceptance of what authorities rather than on questioning and working in collaboration to solve problems. The teacher characterized the school system as authoritarian and urged students to obey and conform: clearly a transmission conception.

Finally, Ma. Dolores mentioned having changed her approach since the beginning of the year. In her words:

In September I began as always, presenting the topic, delivering the subtopics… that. But as classes have been developing, seeing that kids don’t respond, so it’s been necessary to adapt… [now I try] to minimize it as much as I can…. (P3)

The phrase “minimize it as much as I can” referred to the content, and she explained that she had to summarize it as much as possible, and skip a few topics, to be on schedule and in hopes that students would learn it. However, she reported that she has not had success so far, as:

In this subject, you see, for the evaluation I have not had good results because they’ve obtained the worst marks. Having them memorize… forget it. They don’t memorize…. The majority got… the maximum mark was six, five [the highest being 10]. So I said, I said, what is it that they learned? Where were their minds, what were they thinking?

The participant’s description of summarizing content above also seems to reflect a knowledge-as-given transmission conception, as does the evaluation focused (apparently) on students remembering the transmitted knowledge. In sum, it seems that Ma. Dolores’ approach, at least in the way she plans or attempts to teach, is closer to a transmission conception.
As with Miriam and Ivana, in terms of dimensions of change, it seems like what changed in Ma. Dolores’ case was also only the materials. Her conceptions, objectives for student learning and practices did not seem to have changed.

**Giovanni.**

Giovanni had been teaching at the same school for several years. Although he said at first he found the new program confusing, two months later, he said he understood it better. As mentioned above, it seems his conception of citizenship education was closer to the middle of the continuum, but leaning towards the transmission side. His approach to the new program, the content he teaches students and the way he teaches it, seemed to reflect his conception.

Generally, Giovanni’s approach seemed to be the following: “I do the concept map [on the board]; they also do it in their subject notebooks. They do the same. After, I explain the topic but also asking them, interacting” (I1 and observed in O1, O2 and O3). It seemed students had become accustomed to this. At the beginning of the third class, a student reminded the teacher that they had not finished a concept map from the previous class.

Figure 3 depicts a recreation of the concept map the teacher had written on the board in the second class observed. He explained as he created the map. For example, he explained that “attitude” has three components, and then listed them on the board. On a written test, students would later be asked list these three components (E1). The concept map is a close summary of the first part of page 35 of textbook 1. In all classes I observed, he would write one section, pause to describe or ask students information-gathering type questions and then continue with another section. This practice seems close to a transmission approach, as the focus seems to be transmitting knowledge-as-given (from the textbook) to students.
This teacher’s evaluation strategies also seemed close to a transmission conception, as the main types of evaluation Giovanni used were tests and exams (I1, i1). The tests/exams were closed-response (E1, O2, I1), with questions focused on knowledge-as-given such as: “The most important civic value is…” (answer: Patriotism) (E1, O2). Other marks came from activities in class and homework. One example of homework is the following: “You have to look up information about ‘attitude’; look up its definition and its parts. It has to be hand-written, with a cover page, graphics and a bibliography” (O1).

Possibly closer to a transformation conception, although I did not observe these activities so it is difficult to determine, Giovanni also mentioned student-centered activities, such as students working in groups to create a skit and then act it out for the class, which he said they did enthusiastically. (Students had to act out a type of conflict resolution (I1) or a value, i.e. respect) (O3). He explained: “…what I want is for them to practice. Not have it only be theory” (I1). Still, if students had to illustrate, through a skit, what a word or concept meant, this practice might also be closer to a transmission approach with its emphasis on knowledge-as-given.

The participant also reported doing Dinámicas. As an example, he explained,

One dinámica that I did… only with their hands. Tapping. Tapping on their left had with their baby finger, then with two fingers, then three, then four until five. To capture their attention that was. Until we got to the three applauses. (I1)
This does not really seem to relate to either transmission or transformation. It seems to be some kind of tactic for giving students a break or refocusing their attention.

Another activity Giovanni reported using was Talleres (but I did not observe this). As he explained:

*Talleres* are groups… they bring for the next class paper, a large sheet of newspaper type paper, markers and assign a coordinator. Then on many occasions I tell them you are going to look up information about such a topic or else, I bring them copies for each group to work with. Then I tell them to create a concept map… but first reading and underlining, highlighting what’s most important of what they’ve read… then… they have to present. (I1)

This practice seemed common among all teachers. If students had to summarize a page from the textbook or any other source that presented information as-given on topics not related to justice, then the practice is probably closer to the transmission side of the continuum, though at students have a more active role in the transmitting. If they look up information, they could potentially construct knowledge from various sources, question what they read and/or look up information related to justice.

Students mostly seemed to pay attention, take notes and answer when called upon. They also called out jokes, “sassed” and made the whole class laugh. The teacher sometimes ignored them and sometimes laughed along (O1, O2, O3). Sometimes the noise level went up a little as students started talking amongst each other. The teacher would serenely say something like “Ok, pay attention” (O1) and the room would quieten.

When speaking about the classroom climate, the Giovanni explained:

At the beginning of the year, we create what is called a social contract. So you know that in a contract you include rights and obligations from both parties, right. So I make social contract where there must be rights and obligations for the student and the teacher. So we write down a word, for example, about respect. So I say look: there must be respect between you first. You can’t give each other nicknames, you have to treat each other well. And also, respect the teacher. And the teacher also has to respect you… they help… they say me, teacher. I want there to be solidarity, for example. So together we create the contract. Then that contract is the guideline for the whole school year. (I1)

He says it seems to work “in the courses I have, I haven’t had problems. There is respect”. This approach to rule setting seems closer to a transformation conception than to a transmission conception focused on rule acceptance.
All in all, Giovanni’s approach seemed to be a little closer to a transmission approach, as his main focus was the transmission of the textbook material. However, as noted above, a few aspects of his approach also seem transformation oriented. Thus, his approach could be placed near the middle of the continuum but closer to the transmission side. As with the previous three participants, it did not seem he had changed his conceptions, his objectives for student learning or his practices. He referred to other subjects, grades levels and previous courses to describe his approach. It seemed it is only the material that changed.

**Fausto.**

Fausto, as previously mentioned, conceptualized citizenship education as rights and responsibilities education. He explained that this citizenship education course, “is based on the new Constitution… which proclaims *Sumak Kawsay*, which is the Good Living… and part of the Good Living is every person knowing the rights and responsibilities that we have” (I1). Thus, he said, he tells students, “this is why we’re learning this subject. So you can inform yourselves about your rights” (I1). He explained that he teaches them about their rights and responsibilities in the workplace, especially before their practicum. As approximately 10 percent of students in grades 10, 11 and 12 were pregnant or already mothers, he explained he also talked about children’s rights and their rights of mothers:

> The rights they have, being mothers, the rights their little babies have because many of the girls that are pregnant or that are already *mamitas*[^32] don’t demand their rights from the fathers of the babies. They simply got them pregnant and then disappeared from the map. (I2)

He also taught them about their rights as adolescents, and reported: “There are situations in which, sometimes with tears in their eyes, the girls… tell us about how their rights are not respected at home” (I2). He says sometimes students manage to solve the issue, by for example, talking to a member of the family they trust, which he recommends as a first step. Or, he gave one case as an example: “I spoke with the counselor… with the social worker… and the situation was solved” (I2).

He also spoke of teaching them about their rights as students, as some “suffer psychological violence… as they live under constant threats from their teachers” (I1, also I2, iI). He said: “I tell them,

[^32]: What is used as an endearing term for mother in Ecuador, especially in the Highlands.
girls, speak up. Girls, don’t keep quiet… with civility, with politeness… Let them know that they are infringing upon your rights” (I2). He also told how he interceded on their behalf and solved a problem they were having with a teacher.

He explained how injustices upset him: “So for me… it is a total success because the girls start realizing what their rights are… know how to stand up for their rights”, and how this subject allowed him to help students understand their rights (I2). With this strong emphasis on justice, it seemed his general conception and practice was closer to a transformation conception than to a transmission conception. As I will describe in the following paragraphs, it seems his view of content as well as his pedagogy may also be closer to the transformation side of the continuum.

In terms of contents, it seems that when planning, Fausto used textbooks as well as other sources and his own previous knowledge. Thus, at least for his own planning, it seems his view of knowledge is closer to knowledge-as-constructed than to knowledge-as-given. He also gave me examples of how he linked the content to current events, seemingly encouraging students to consider different viewpoints:

I tell them to bring in a cut-out from the newspaper, magazine, of a conflict… Between the ten of them [groups of ten] they analyze the conflicts they brought… they decide which is more important… they present it… to the whole class… And I also put them in the position of leaders to see what they’d do… What would you do if you were the President? What would you do if you were the External Relations Minister? What would you do, in the case of a religious conflict, if you were a cardinal, a priest in a village, etc. etc.? (I1)

He also explained his students are not used to following the news and said: “I make them see that it is extremely important to be aware of what is happening” (I1). He reported that students started becoming interested in current events: “so I’m extremely happy because they bring in cut outs, even outside of class they catch you for a moment [and say]… ‘What do you think of this? I thought it was extremely interesting, and this is why I brought it for you’” (I1). From this example, and others mentioned below, it seemed he tried for his students to learn more than the contents of the textbook. It also seemed he promoted an analysis of different viewpoints, thus close to a view of knowledge-as-constructed and conflictual.

As mentioned in the previous quote, Fausto seemed to encourage dialogue in his classroom, a practice closer to a transformation approach. Although the classroom discussion I observed was not
originally about a conflictual issue, at least several students seemed to feel free to state ideas different from others or from what the teacher had said. They also seemed comfortable to address each other and not only the teacher. For example, in one class, a student read a paragraph titled “generational conflict.” The teacher provided a brief description and then asked students for examples. Many participated, at times answering the teacher and at times building upon each other’s answers. Then Fausto said:

Before, mothers stayed only with their children. Before, the problems that there are now didn’t exist because they were taken care of by their mothers.... Now parents don’t see their children, don’t have meals together. What would you prefer? To live as we do now or to live as our grandparents did? (O3)

Many students called out “Like our grandparents!” and some then gave examples of why, such as “there no longer is any communication…. Now we spend our time on Facebook” (O3). After a while, however, one student said: “I don’t think it was better before. I don’t think women should have to stay at home.” The teacher replied: “No, I didn’t say that. I’m not saying that women should stay at home, no, no. We were just analyzing the situation of our grandmothers....” (O3) and a short discussion on feminism and chauvinism ensued, some more supportive of women staying at home with their children and some more supportive of women working and making their own choices.

It soon turned into another discussion, again with students expressing opposite points of view (some quite strongly), about whether parents who “did not have values” could teach values to their children or not. Various times the teacher asked students to repeat what they said, louder, so that the whole class could hear: “We can hardly hear you, mija33” (O3). The teacher also told students to listen to each other and called on a couple for not paying attention, but mostly students seemed engaged. Less than a quarter of the students participated various times, and approximately half participated once or more. In three observations, I did not determine possible reasons for some participating more than others. I also saw this teacher question students in a “Socratic” manner a few times. For example, in one class, the teacher said, “…the definition of conflict; what is it?” One student said: “It’s a problem.” Fausto then asked, “so all of the exercises that you do in mathematics are a conflict?” The student sometimes tried to explain their answer, and sometimes other students helped (O3).

---

33 An expression that roughly translates to “my child”.
The type of dialogue that took place seemed closer to the transformation end of the continuum. Diverse points of view were considered, students spoke with the teacher and amongst each other and social conventions and beliefs were (briefly) analyzed. The Socratic-type method also seems closer to a transformation conception as it invited students to question their answers.

This is not to say that the teacher did not also require students to acquire knowledge from textbooks. For example, during the second class, he had the students take a test. He dictated instructions, such as

Write the definition and the elements of personality. Leave a space. If you want, you can draw an image…, write a list of the four aspects that are recognizable in a school environment… Argue what civil liberty is and write an example…. Create a list… of four example of transcending…. Write four examples of freedom of expression. (O2)

These questions mainly seemed to be information-gathering questions. However, by asking the students for examples, some questions could also be considered interpretive questions. This would place the test closer to a transformation conception, although not as much as a test that included value questions would be.

During class, students also asked specific knowledge questions without prompt from the teacher, such as “What does antagonism mean?” Some also asked other types of questions, such as how workers who had worked in the same institution for more than 30 years could demand their rights. The teacher explained how the retirement system worked and the differences between retirement in the private and public sector.

It seemed that the teacher had managed, in the two months since classes started, to create a classroom environment where students felt free to ask questions that mattered to them. The questions such as the one about how retirement worked may be one of the ways the teacher helps to redress injustice, a component of a transformation approach. Again, he tried to offer the students information about their rights (or in this case, probably about the rights of their relatives). There were times of the class that were student-centered and there was dialogue, both components of a transformation approach. Thus, Fausto’s approach generally seemed closer to a transformation conception than to a transmission one.
Fausto explained to me that he had always taught this way and that he had always treated students this way, as much as possible. However, he also said that with other courses, he was forced to spend most of the time addressing other goals. He said the EpC1 program was perfect, because it allowed him to focus on students’ rights and on current affairs that truly mattered to students. He mentioned that with this class, he could help students ensure their rights even more. Thus it seemed that, in terms of dimensions, the main change was with materials as it was with the other participants. It did not seem he changed his conceptions. However, it did seem he changed his objectives and practices, at least to take advantage of the new program’s potential to achieve his overarching goal for students.

**Diego.**

As previously mentioned, Diego taught a class of approximately 45 adolescents (two girls, 43 or more boys), all in a technical program focusing on electronics. As most other participants, he seemed to think of citizenship education as values education and his conception seemed to be a little closer to the transmission side of the continuum than the transformation side. His practice also seemed closer to the transmission side, as I explain in the following paragraphs.

Diego mentioned having changed his approach since the beginning of the year:

> Yes, we’ve had to change methodologies because sometimes the students don’t assimilate the class that one dictates to them so then we have to change methodologies… Yes, at the beginning we were doing a critical reading of the text, we were developing a dialectic method, conversation, a dialogue. But the students weren’t taking the subject well. So now what we do is we have them investigate the topic… Once they’ve looked up information they come with a knowledge base. So what we do is help them, help them with examples, explaining the subject further. (P6)

When I asked him to describe the “critical reading of the text,” he said that either he or a student read out loud from the textbook, and the other students were meant to extract the main ideas from the text for him to write on the board, and discuss these ideas. My hunch is that this was difficult to do with textbook 1, as the contents did not seem to easily lend themselves to discussion because of the way they tended to be written. The writing of the two textbooks analyzed presented information “as given” in an encyclopedic way, emphasizing definitions and types rather than questions, debates and examples that would more easily stimulate discussion.
When I observed the classes, it seemed that Diego followed the textbook (textbook 1) closely, summarizing the contents of each page, having students complete the exercises at the end of each unit and also showing students the videos in the DVD that came with the textbook. He seemed to transmit the textbook content as the knowledge; I did not see instances of contesting or questioning the textbook content, and, as previously mentioned, textbook 1 mostly presented knowledge as given.

One example of this is he mainly asked information questions such as, “What does “polarity” refer to?” (and students answered “Positives and negatives”) or “Hierarchy. Superior and…” (and students answered in chorus “inferior [values]”). Another example is the way he provided definite answers (from the book), even though there could be multiple valid answers to the questions. For example, he asked students, “What are attitudes?” to which a few individually gave replies such as “behavior” and “way of acting”. The teacher gave them the answer: “It is the way of communicating values towards other people”. This definition was very similar to the textbook definition given on page 35: “Attitude is the way that people communicate their values to others” (T1). The closed-response type tests he used are another example of his emphasis on transmitting the contents of the textbook to students (who did not have a copy of the textbook).

In addition to the lecture-type class, Diego also organized other types of activities. For example, he had students conduct presentations in front of the class and individually fill in the exercises at the end of the unit of the textbook (which he introduced by saying “we’re going to do a workshop; we need grades”). Even though those activities might be a little more student-centered than the lecture-type class (at least in the narrow sense that students are active), these instructional strategies did not seem very aligned to a transformation conception as they still seemed to focus on the transmission of knowledge-as-given with no emphasis on questioning or justice.

For the presentations, students were assigned a value or a counter value to present on (i.e. respect or racism). The students seemed to know what their presentations should include, even though I did not hear the teacher give them any instructions. For example, all presenters had posters. All included descriptions, definitions and examples of the word. Most included the Latin or Greek origin of the word. Thus, although it was a student speaking instead of the teacher speaking, the focus still seemed to be on the transmission of knowledge.
The activities from the textbook that students completed in class (using photocopies the teacher paid for himself) seemed mainly focused on transmitting moral messages through quotes, stories and fables. Thus, as it reflected the “being a good neighbor”, knowledge-as-given, acceptance and rule following components, this practice also seemed closer to a transmission conception.

Similarly to Ma. Dolores, Diego sometimes used the class topics as an opportunity to give students advice or to reprimand them, which he reported was a way of teaching them values. For example, while reviewing an exercise in students’ worksheets related to caring for those less fortunate, he said:

In this century, we are forgetting about people. We’re using technology to fill our own pockets. We’re losing our values. We have to regain our values, be optimistic, be positivistic. That way, you’ll have your reward. You’ll pass the year with no problems. You’ll be good high school graduates, friends and later on, husbands. (O2)

These types of speeches could be characterized as the transmission of what I have called “moral messages”. They seem closer to a transmission conception, emphasizing being “good”.

In one class, when students did not bring their homework, he seemed annoyed and said:

We’ve been over values with you guys. It seems like you don’t care about anything… that you find it difficult to apply what you’ve learned…. The ones who have good grades did the extra-credit work. The others didn’t do it. You don’t help yourselves… What else do you want? (O2)

With this type of reprimanding (he also reprimanded them for their attitude while singing the anthem in one class), from what he said, he was transmitting values, encouraging them to behave ‘better’ (O1, O2, O3).

Diego’s approach thus seems much closer to the transmission side of the continuum. As with the first three participants, it did not seem as though he had changed his conceptions, his objectives for student learning or his practices. It seemed like the only change was in the materials, and that he taught as he always had, except he transmitted different content.

The Quintain: The participants as a group
In this sub section, I will first compare the different approaches, the different adaptations, of the six participants along the four dimensions of change. Next, I will analyze the participants’ level of use of the new program using the CBAM LoU framework and explore the meaning of the results of the analysis.

In table 1, I attempt to summarize the participants’ different conceptions and approaches using the conceptions, objectives, materials and practices dimensions. Within conceptions, I jointly analyze the sub categories of “general attitude” and “participation/virtues.” However, I separate the conception of conflict to highlight it. I disaggregate the practices dimension into “approach to content,” “activities,” “evaluation” and “classroom climate/relationship with students.”

As explained in more detail in chapters 4 and 5, teachers’ conceptions were varied and generally reflected their approach. Miriam, Ma. Dolores and Diegos’ conceptions were closer to the transmission end of the continuum (see Figure 1). In terms of conflict, as described in chapter 4, it seemed that their views were closer to a peacekeeping conception, which I related to a transmission conception.

Giovanni’s conception also could be placed somewhere close to the middle of the continuum but seems closer to the transmission side. Similarly, his views of conflict seemed to reflect a peacekeeping conception while including elements of a peacemaking one. Ivana’s conception seemed to be somewhere near the middle of the continuum but closer to the transformation side. Her view of conflict also seemed closer to peacebuilding, as she emphasized the role of conflict in redressing injustice and changing the status quo.

Fausto’s conception seemed the closest to the transformation side. As mentioned in the individual cases, none of the participants seemed to have changed their conceptions because of the new official curriculum. His views of conflict also seemed closer to a peacebuilding conception (related to a transformation conception), as it seemed he attempted to transform “underlying relationship injustices” (Bickmore, 2011a, p. 43) with his focus on rights education and his fights to solve unjust situations his students faced. With his students, it seems he emphasized the analysis of conflicts from newspapers, etc. in class with an emphasis on questioning and dialogue.

In terms of the objectives, for Miriam, Ma. Dolores, Giovanni and Diego, the main objective seemed to be transmission the contents of the textbook to students. Ivana seemed to have a more
transformative objective, wishing for her students to understand and fight against social classes and injustice. She also wanted to give them the tools to do so, emphasizing their learning higher reasoning and academic skills than she said were normally expected in public schools. Fausto’s objective even more clearly transformative, as he fought hard against any injustice his students faced and emphasized teaching them to question their situation and fight for their rights in all areas of their lives (home, school, work, etc.). As previously mentioned, none of the participants seemed to have really changed their objectives for students because of the new program. Only Fausto mentioned how this new curriculum because it allowed him to spend most of the time (rather than only a fraction in other subjects) on teaching students about their rights and how to fight them, as well as on topics that were truly useful to them.

In terms of materials, as mentioned before, this was the only dimension that really changed: all teachers have new content in new textbooks. Miriam and Diego seemed to follow the textbook most closely. Giovanni did too, but he also mentioned using another book on teaching social sciences for some topics. Ma. Dolores had two or three textbooks she used to plan her classes. Ivana used various sources to plan her lessons and also used contents from newspapers, etc. in class. Fausto had two textbooks he used to plan his lessons, seemed to draw a lot upon his own studies and knowledge and seemed to be the one that incorporated the news (on TV, newspapers, etc.) and real life situations most in class.

I divided the practices dimension into approach to content, activities, evaluation and classroom climate and relationships with students. As mentioned in the individual cases, Miriam, Ma. Dolores, Giovanni and Diego seemed to have a transmission-oriented approach to content. They mostly transmitted or attempted to transmit the content of the textbook as non conflictual knowledge-as-given. The main textbooks they used, textbook 1, also presented content in this manner.

Ivana seemed to create her own summaries of the content and then transmitted that to her students. However, she did foster interpretation in some cases. Thus, her approach to content could be placed somewhere near the middle of the continuum. Fausto also transmitted content to his students. However, I also observed questioning and dialogue around the content, and thus would place his approach closer to a transformation conception.
Miriam, Giovanni and Diegos’ activities/teaching strategies seemed close to a transmission conception, as most focused on transmitting the content of the textbook as given. Ma. Dolores attempted to the same. Ivana also focused on transmitting her interpretation of the textbook topics, but also had other types of activities that seemed to allow for more interpretation and participation from the students’ part. Fausto’s activities also transmitted knowledge, but allowed for student interpretation, questioning and dialogue, placing his approach closer to a transformative approach.

Possibly partly due to Ministry rules, the most common form of evaluation was test and exams. In the case of Miriam and Giovanni, the questions on the tests that I saw were information-gathering questions requiring the recall of the board content. I did not see the tests of Ma. Dolores and Diego, but, from what they explained, their tests were similar. The other activities they evaluated, such as student presentations, also seemed more focused on knowledge transmission.

Fausto also used tests but it seemed there was a little bit more room for student interpretation on the tests he used (at least the ones I saw). He also evaluated student homework and activities in class which seemed to foster interpretation and questioning a little more. Ivana said she evaluated essays and projects, student presentations, homework and activities in class. I did not see examples of most of these evaluation activities. Some of the ones I saw in class seemed more focused on interpretation (closer to the middle of the continuum) and one seemed to foster questioning (the analysis of a government message from the newspaper), possibly closer to a transformation conception.

Miriam, as mentioned before, seemed to actively seek a good relationship with students. For some students, it seemed she was the “go to” person. Having a good relationship with students is certainly important for any kind of learning, citizenship education included. However, this relationship, at least when I observed the class, did not seem to translate to an open and inclusive classroom environment that fostered questioning, dialogue and fighting against injustice.

Ivana seemed to have an engaging and fun classroom climate. Students mostly seemed comfortable participating and Ivana encouraged them to listen to and build upon each other’s answers. I did not observe instances of dialogue oriented towards questioning and justice but it seemed the classroom climate could be appropriate for such dialogue.

In the three instances I observed, as described above, the climate in Ma. Dolores’ class did not seem very conducive to learning in general or to dialogue oriented towards questioning and justice. It
seems changes would have to be made to foster learning and to pursue an approach closer to a transformation conception.

Giovanni described writing a contract at the beginning of the school year. This practice would seem closer to a transformation conception than simply informing students of the rules. However, in the classes I observed, the interactions consisted of the teacher asking students questions. Sometimes the students joked though, which broke this pattern a little. There did not seem to be instances of dialogue. Thus, the classroom climate seemed closer to a transmission conception, possibly closer to the middle of the continuum.

As previously described, in Fausto’s class, I observed students contradicting each other and contradicting the teacher. There were instances of dialogue that questioned societal conventions. I also witnessed a student asking a question unrelated to the class topic, but related to justice and their own information needs. The classroom climate generally seemed conducive to a transformation approach.

In Diego’s classroom, I also observed mostly one-way communication, with Diego talking and asking short-answer questions to individual students. Alternatively, a student presented in front of the class, but I saw no dialogue during or after the presentations. There was also quite a lot of noise and students not listening to each other at times. Again, it seems changes would have to be made to pursue an approach closer to a transformation conception.

Table 1. The participants as a group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ma. Dolores</th>
<th>Diego</th>
<th>Miriam</th>
<th>Giovanni</th>
<th>Ivana</th>
<th>Fausto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptions</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>Middle, TM&lt;</td>
<td>Middle, &gt;TF</td>
<td>&gt;TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Conflict</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>Middle, TM&lt;</td>
<td>Middle, &gt;TF</td>
<td>&gt;TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>TxB</td>
<td>TxB</td>
<td>TxB</td>
<td>TxB</td>
<td>&gt;TF</td>
<td>&gt;TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>TxB</td>
<td>TxB</td>
<td>TxB</td>
<td>TxB &amp; B</td>
<td>TxB &amp; more</td>
<td>TxB &amp; more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Approach to content</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>Middle, TM&lt;</td>
<td>&gt;TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Activities</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>Middle, &gt;TF</td>
<td>&gt;TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evaluation</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>TM&lt;</td>
<td>Middle, &gt;TF</td>
<td>Middle, &gt;TF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be expected when teachers begin using a new program, it seems all participants’ level of use of the program could be characterized as being at an LoU III – Mechanical Use (where teachers struggle day-to-day while trying to learn how to apply the new program), even though they all have a different approach. However, as explained below, in some aspects, teachers seemed closer to a level four IVA – Routine Use. It seemed that the implementation of this program was strongly shaped by teachers’ prior orientations and pedagogical expertise, and in many aspects, teachers continued doing what they had always done – thus the routine. It seemed that although teachers struggled a little with the new “content” (Mechanical Use), they inserted it into their established approach (i.e. concept maps, tests, etc.) (Routine Use).

Some teachers’ established approaches seemed a little closer to a transmission conception (Miriam, Ma Dolores, Diego), some seemed a little closer to the middle with one closer to a transmission conception (Giovanni) and another closer to a transformation approach (Ivana) and one seemed a little closer a transformation conception (Fausto). If one considers a transformation approach to be closer to the essence of the official curriculum, then one could say that Fausto (and possibly, though to a lesser degree, Ivana), while still at a LoU III or IVA in terms of implementation, were implementing something closer to the essence of the program. Miriam, Ma Dolores, Giovanni (although less so) and Diego, while at the same LoU III or IVA, might be implementing something less related to the official programs’ original intent.

It is worth noting that being teachers’ level of use being closer to LoU III and/or IVA does not mean that teachers do not care about the impact of the program on student learning, which is emphasized in higher levels of the scale. This simply suggests that, at the time I spoke with them, the participants were more concerned with how to teach the new program than with evaluating its impact (based on clarification from Anderson, 2010). In fact, many participants mentioned it was too early to measure any impact. Also, Hall, Dirksen and George (2006) note that most teachers require 2-3 years of experience to move beyond a mechanical use when implementing complex innovations, and the participants only had approximately 2 months experience.
With regards to the subcategories CBAM uses to describe the level of use (Hall, Dirksen, & George, 2006), in terms of knowledge, most teachers seemed to have an idea of what they needed to do in the short term, mirroring LoU III – Mechanical use. With regards to information, participants mostly mentioned seeking information to plan their next classes, which seems characteristic of a LoU II – Preparation. Even though LoU II usually refers to teachers who have not yet implemented a new program, and are preparing to do so, the descriptor for this level seemed to best describe the type of information-seeking in which the participants in this study engaged, even though they had already begun to use the new program. Participants also seemed at a LoU II with regards to sharing, as when asked about their discussions with colleagues, they mostly mentioned exchanging information to plan the next topics of the program.

In terms of assessment, when I visited them, most participants seemed to be evaluating students as administratively required (LoU IVA – Routine use), paying little attention to using the findings for changing their approach. However, it is possible some had conducted evaluations and changed their approach before (as some mentioned above), and were now only just trying a different approach and had not yet evaluated it, at least formally.

Planning seemed to be mostly related to the immediate ongoing use of the new program (LoU III – Mechanical use), as may be expected in the first phase of approaching a new program. When reporting on their status, most said they were doing well and everything was running “smoothly”, which reflects a LoU IVA – Routine use, but also mentioned a few logistical issues, which reflects a LoU III – Mechanical use. Finally, in terms of performing, most participants in this study seemed to be at a LoU III – Mechanical use, still uncertain and still struggling a little to apply the new program, although in some aspects of their approach, they seemed to have established routines (for example, summarizing the contents of a textbook page and presenting it as a concept maps to the class).

All in all, participants seemed to be closer to a LoU III – Mechanical use, as may be expected at these initial stages of approaching the new program. It is important to note that the teachers’ approaches described above are their initial approaches to the new program. CBAM studies suggest that teachers often approach the programs differently as they become more familiar with them, and, at later stages, may come to focus more on the effect of the program on students and on refining
their approach to increase the positive effect. This, of course, depends on the support teachers may receive, along with other factors.

It is also important to consider what type of approach teachers will come to establish as a routine, and what types of impact on students they emphasize. As Anderson (2010) mentions, “some CBAM researchers, however, note that implementers may routinize the use of new programs and practices at sub-optimal levels of expertise” (p. 5). For example, routinizing a transmission approach may be considered sup-optimal if the goal is transformative citizenship education. Although it is understood that each teacher adapts new policy/curricula in their own way, and in this case, the Ecuadorian Ministry explicitly asked that schools and teachers adapt the new curriculum policy to their own contexts (MinEduc, n.d.b), it is also clear that not any “adaptation” will reflect the spirit of the new program.34

For example, if a teacher spent every class teaching students to sing popular romantic songs (with no subsequent analysis of the pieces and no community building goal), it seems clear he or she would not be teaching democratic citizenship education but singing techniques and/or song lyrics. This would not be an example of what is meant by a “mutual adaptation,” as the teacher would not be “adapting” but rather doing something entirely different. In doing so, in this case, the teacher could be depriving less-privileged students of the opportunity to learn powerful knowledge that could enable them to further participate in the governance and improving of their society. As Anderson (2010) says, citing Hall and his colleagues, “There can be a point of ‘drastic mutation’ beyond which so much modification has occurred in the program or practice as initially presented that it is no longer appropriate to claim that the original innovation has been implemented” (p. 11).

In the case of the participants of this study, it seemed all were teaching some kind of citizenship education program and not singing or something entirely different. However, one might question whether they were all reflecting the essence of the program as intended by the Ecuadorean government and education stakeholders, depending on how extensive the discussion of this curriculum was, especially with regards to its conflict aspects.

34 Of course, one could reasonably ask why it is the Ministry of Education that must define the essence of new programs that teachers must then follow. While this is an essential discussion, it is beyond the scope of this study.
If the “spirit” of the program is understood to be that which is described in the introductory statements of the official curriculum, then possibly only Fausto, and maybe Ivana, were approaching the new curriculum in ways that reflects its main intent. Although they seemed to have had different approaches from one another (reflecting a mutual adaptation perspective) – Fausto, who focused on transforming society by teaching his female students from low SES families about their rights and how to stand up for them, and Ivana, who focused on changing Ecuador by getting her students from low SES families to set high goals for themselves and helping them meet those goals, both seemed to be closer to the transformation end of the continuum.

If all official curriculum documents are considered for determining the spirit of the new program, however, the focus is a little less clear, and it might be argued that transmission-type approaches such as those of other participants in this study also reflect the spirit of the new program. However, as mentioned in Chapter 4, most of the contents of the official documents, when considered in the light of the transformation-type oriented of its introduction, could be closer to a transformation conception. The two textbooks considered in this study, which teachers used for guidance to determine how to approach the new program, reflected a transmission-type conception.

Furthermore, as previously mentioned, the Ministry of Education explicitly asked teachers to adapt the program to their contexts. However, I was not able to find explicit guidelines or parameters for adaptation. Thus, almost anything can be said to be context “adaptation.” For example, one participant resorted summarizing the textbook even further, presenting only a few terms for students to memorize, given her “context” and the way she perceived students’ attitudes and abilities. Others could also adopt a transmission approach because of they are adapting the program to the context.

This analysis raises complex questions. For example, what is the “essence” of new programs and who should define them? Are teachers are meant to respond to the “essence” of new programs? If so, then to what does “mutual-adaption” refer? To modifications in methods and approaches in so far as they still point towards the essence of the program? What does “adapting programs to the context” mean? What types of contextual factors should be considered? These are essential questions for discussion.
Chapter 6: Program implementation, the Quintain

... teachers’ most urgent needs for improving civic education revolve around core concerns of content, namely better materials and more subject-matter training. (Torney-Purta et al., 2001, p. 158)

This chapter gives voice to teachers’ concerns, and explores changes in their concerns during a very initial part of the early program implementation period. The chapter also attempts to convey the factors that teachers said help or hinder their work, as well as a few factors that researchers mentioned as important to consider in any change process.

Teachers’ concerns and feelings before beginning to teach

Before beginning to teach, when the six participants in this study just found out they were going to teach the course, they said they had many concerns. As Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) explain, change is usually characterized by feelings of anxiety, struggle, ambivalence and uncertainty. Miriam said: “I was stunned. Why me?” and also mentioned feeling that she might not know enough about the subject, being worried “that I didn’t know! I know… I don’t know. I knew but… well, the basic that every human being knows, right?” Ivana said she felt bad enough to want to cry. She said: “I felt a little bad when I was told and when I saw the topics that mostly refer to values, to civics. I actually never liked it”.

Ma. Dolores wondered what it was about and had doubts about teaching it, especially because of her colleagues’ negative views on the program. “They don’t like it?” I asked and she replied: “But who could like it? It is a lot of theory. Pure theory. Not even the kids like it”. Giovanni said at first he didn’t think it was an important or valuable subject, found it confusing and said “I felt a little upset, even.” Fausto also wondered what it was about and whether it matched his expertise. Diego said at first he refused to take the class and then accepted, but still had concerns. He also mentioned concerns about his level of knowledge of the new subject:

Look, what was difficult at the beginning practically was knowledge about the themes practically because it is a new subject; it is a new subject that comes with new units. So the difficulty I had was the knowledge practically of the topics. (P6)

Thus, it seems that before beginning to teach, the participants’ concerns could generally be placed at stage 2 of the Stages of Concern (SoC) scale proposed by CBAM. At SoC 2, most concerns are
personal, reflecting “anxieties about the teacher’s ability to implement the change, the need for change, and the personal costs of getting involved” (Anderson, 2010, p. 2).

**Teachers’ concerns and feelings once they had begun to teach**

Once they began teaching, at the beginning of the school year, as could be expected by the CBAM framework, it seems the focus of teachers’ concerns shifted slightly. They moved towards *management* concerns (Soc 3), which are concerns related to logistics concerning to the new program. For example, teachers reported the following as concerns and/or as factors that hindered their teaching at the beginning of the school year:

- Starting to teach EpC1 after the school year had begun *(P1, P2)* (Miriam’s classes were switched a month and a half after classes had begun and Ivana began the school year a little late due to delays in the hiring process).
- Not being able to consult with the previous EpC1 teacher *(P1, P6)*.
- Time and effort trying to obtain permission for students to buy a textbook *(P1)*.
- Not having a salary and thus not being able to pay for photocopies, etc. (salaries were paid three months late) *(P1)*.
- Lack of information, including a textbook as a teaching guide (which he later borrowed from a colleague) *(P4)*.
- Difficulty in obtaining bibliography and material *(P2)*.
- Having 50-60 students at the beginning until they were redistributed to other classrooms *(P6)*.

Once things became more stable, although the concerns changed slightly, they still generally remained at stage 3, still mostly reflecting management concerns, as shown below.

**General concerns and factors that teachers reported were hindering their teaching**

Teachers also mentioned concerns and factors that were hindering their teaching at the time we spoke, approximately two months after classes had started. Two personal-type concerns were mentioned *(SoC 2)* as well as two concerns that seem to closer reflect SoC 4, a concern for the impact of the new program on students. However, most of the concerns (or factors that hindered their work) mentioned still focused on SoC 3, management concerns. As mentioned above, this does not seem surprising, as (a) most of these had not been resolved and (b) CBAM related research finds that a majority of teachers remain focused on *how* to implement complex new program for 2-3 years, depending on their particular contexts. Again, this also does not mean that teachers are not
concerned with student learning. It just suggests that, at the time, they had more immediate concerns.

With regards to the concerns and factors that teachers mentioned hindered their work, at the time we spoke, closer to SoC 2 (personal concerns), Ivana and Ma. Dolores pointed out that they specialized in other subjects:

One prepared in other subjects and not precisely in this one. (P2)

Because none [of the subjects I teach] coincide with my… in the area in which I have my degree. It has nothing, nothing to do with it… but I’ve picked things up as here and there, I’ve adapted. (P3)

Others did not mention this, but as mentioned before, none of the teachers had studied citizenship education. However, four did have teaching degrees in history and social sciences.

As Schujman (2004) mentions in the context of Latin America, citizenship education can involve content from philosophy, psychology, law, political science, education, cultural anthropology, history and more. Reflecting findings from civics education in 24 countries, Torney-Purta et al. (1999) state that teachers “are uncertain about their own adequacy when several disciplines are connected in a teaching program” (p. 33). These feelings would surely be aggravated in the case of teachers such as Ma. Dolores or Miriam whose degrees are not in an area related to citizenship education such as history and social sciences.

More related to SoC 3 (management), four teachers mentioned the lack of textbooks for students as an issue (P3, P4, P5, P6). In the words of Fausto:

The Ministry has not obtained books for this subject. There are books from publishers or individual authors but which regrettably the District has not given us permission [to ask students to buy textbooks]…. Having them understand that it is the instrument, the instrument for students…. If you are learning mechanics, whichever type of mechanics, and they don’t allow you to buy a screwdriver, a wrench…. How are you going to learn mechanics only theoretically?

With regards to textbooks (which were designed for students - they were not teacher guides) that the participants had been able to acquire, Miriam mentioned that they did not have enough information for her to plan adequately. Three other participants, during informal interviews, said they did not think the textbooks they had seen or used were very good. They mentioned others existed, which
they said were better, but were too costly. Although not referring to citizenship education textbooks published recently, several researchers in Ecuador have noted that textbooks in tend to be pedagogically poor (Landázuri, 1993; Mena, 1998; Samaniego, 1992; Terán, 2004 cited in Patiño, 2013) and have poor content (Salazar, 1991 cited in Patiño, 2013).

Miriam, Ma. Dolores and Diego said the lack of textbooks limited their approach to teaching:

I have to have content in their notebooks to be able to derive questions for the tests from there. Don’t you see that they don’t have books? I have no choice but to do things this way [she said this before she obtained permission for her students to buy textbooks]. (P1)

This year they didn’t give us [textbooks] so I had to adapt myself to my own way through graphic organizers, through concept maps, through posters. (P3)

No, they don’t have textbooks because education now is free. So the government doesn’t want them [students or parents] to spend on texts. So we have to do it this way. We do a comprehensive reading, extract the main ideas, write them on the board. (P6)

Ivana, on the other hand, said that she preferred that students not have a textbook because it only contains one perspective and tends to limit teaching to covering the textbook.

In addition to concerns regarding textbooks, teachers mentioned the lack of material and bibliography (P1, P2, P4, P5, P6) as factors that hindered their teaching. Although all teachers had to charge students for photocopies or pay for the photocopies themselves, only three mentioned it as an issue (P1, P2, P3).

Researchers have also noted the lack of material and resources available for citizenship education. Torney-Purta et al. (2001) and Hughes et al. (2010) mentioned this about countries around the world and Villegas-Reimers (1996) about Latin America. Samaniego (2008) mentioned this about Ecuador, though referring to material and resources for high school in general, not just for citizenship education.

Possibly closer to SoC 2 (Personal concerns), Ivana and Ma. Dolores noted that students are not interested in citizenship education as a subject, which they mentioned was demotivating for them as teachers. Studies covering many countries across the world, including Latin America, also note that citizenship education is generally considered a low-status subject, and not only by students (Hebert & Sears, 2004; Mintrop, 2002; Reimers, 2007; Torney-Purta et al., 1999).
Four teachers said students’ attitudes and/or lack of adequate study habits hindered their teaching…

Lack of interest… “who cares” attitude, lack of responsibility; they don’t have study habits… [or] the will. (P1)

The only problems we solve here is the lack of study habits. (P6)

Miriam also mentioned parents’ lack of interest in their children’s education. Three teachers mentioned students’ backgrounds as having a negative impact. Ma. Dolores and Ivana noted that values are taught primarily at home, making it difficult for them to have an impact on students. As Ma. Dolores said: “What can we do? Orient, guide… because we can’t do more because those values are inculcated [at] home”.

Reflecting SoC 3 type concerns, three teachers mentioned their classes were frequently cancelled by teacher meetings or school-wide events for students. As Fausto put it:

Interruptions to the classes. They take time away! And I become desperate because I cannot progress normally with the work then, miña. That’s it…. But here if for A or B reason they cut class… We have to comerse cebollas and lose classes, ha ha ha.

Several researchers (i.e. Anderson, 2010; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991) mention that adequate work conditions are necessary for successfully implementing changes in education. Participants in this study seemed to have difficult work conditions. These are a few they mentioned hindered their work:

- Work overload, low salary, school authorities’ favoritism for some teachers and regulations, such as the code of children’s and adolescent’s rights and the education bylaw, with which “it is no longer possible to be demanding” (P3).
- Inability to hold student competitions in class since colleagues complain about the noise (P2).
- Having one short class period (22 minutes), being assigned different subjects every year and needing additional time for planning with new subjects (P4).
- Not having enough time to cover all of the content (P5).

Also, as previously mentioned, the teachers had approximately 300-400 students in 12 different classes, which made it difficult to dedicate time to evaluation and feedback. Additionally, Fausto communicated his frustration with what he said was a top-down system that imposes regulations and does not receive feedback from teachers regarding these regulations, takes weeks to give an answer,

35 An expression that literally means “eat onions” which he uses to explain he has to accept his classes being frequently cancelled and swallow his frustration.
does not allow his students to buy textbooks (see above quote) but allows teachers in other districts to do so and, furthermore, did not allow him to take his students on an outing:

Last year I had planned two activities but they did not allow these activities because it was necessary to ask [students] for money. Only for the bus, *miña*, because I did… the paperwork with the Provincial Council and they were going to allow the girls to enter for free. So it was the cost of the bus, the way there and back. But they didn’t allow it. I got really upset and told Juanito, the principal of that time, I told Juanito those who lost out are the students. *Las guaguas*, the students… So one remains frustrated.

Other teachers also mentioned how difficult it was to take students on outings, although they all expressed a wish to do so. Other difficult work conditions are those already mentioned above, such as having all classes changed one month and a half after classes started or waiting three months for a pay check.

Closer to SoC 4 (impact on students), although more precisely an expression of concern for a *potential* impact, Diego worried about how to “reach students with those topics” and how to then to improve society. Fausto mentioned his current challenge was helping students who did not do their school work because of various family situations.

Even with all these concerns, and their serious misgivings before beginning to teach the new program, when I spoke with the participants, they seemed to have clarified their doubts, to have changed their minds or at least to have found aspects that they valued in the program. Three said they feel good at the time we spoke (*P1, P4, P6*). Miriam said that she felt excited, happy and comforted as well as honored and proud of authority’s trust in her, and loved working with students (I witnessed her enthusiasm every time we met).

Ivana also said she loved working with the students, which I witnessed too, but said that she wished she could teach the subjects in which she had specialized in university. Ivana also found some of EpC1’s topics tedious and said “in the future, I hope not to impart this subject”. Ma. Dolores expressed a personal interest in learning the content a few times, but did not seem to feel happy with regards to work conditions. She also expressed she thought it was especially difficult to teach her particular students. Giovanni said as he learned about the program he realized how important it was. He no longer found it confusing and said “Now I feel good”. Fausto seemed the most enthusiastic:
... I love this subject, I love its contents and I love working with the young ladies from the higher grades because they have a view that is a little more mature... I love philosophy, economy, sociology and this is why I took this in undergrad. This subject allows me to employ, to use all those subjects that were, that are my specialty... I’m made for this subject! Yes, Yes, Danielita, ha ha ha, yes, yes.

When I visited him, Diego knew more about the program than at the beginning. He said... “At least me, I feel good. I’m fine, I’m happy and I like the subject”.

Factors not directly mentioned as hindrances by participants

One factor that the participants of this study did not mention was professional development related to the new citizenship education program, which had not yet been provided by the government. However, reflecting the core concept that change is learning, professional development is essential in assisting teachers with the implementation of new programs (Anderson, 2010; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall et al., 2006). Peer coaching and access to consultants and colleagues with more advanced expertise in the program and associated pedagogical methods are especially important for moving towards levels of refinement (focus on increasing student learning) and integration (focus on increasing student learning in collaboration with colleagues) (Hall et al., 2006). Also, several authors emphasis the need for subject-matter training in citizenship education (Arthur, Davies & Hahn, 2008; Hughes et al., 2010; Kerr, 2002; Schwille & Amadeo, 2002; Tibbitts & Torney-Purta, 1999; Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2004; Torney-Purta et al., 2001).

Something else the teachers in this study did not mention explicitly as a factor that hindered their work was the evaluation system. From what the participants described, it seemed the Ministry of Education has given precise instructions as to how evaluations are to be conducted, which are the same for all teachers regardless of the level or subject. In the words of Fausto: “Evaluation is directed by the Ministry…. Let’s see… it’s written homework, oral tests… and written tests… [There are] five marks. From the five marks we have to obtain an average for each period.”

Completing the list of five, Giovanni added individual work and group work. He also said that at the end of each period, there was a written exam. He said tests and exams should be “objective” (closed-response).

These general instructions for evaluation (such as the use of closed-response tests) may not be compatible with citizenship education, at least not a transformation conception of citizenship
education. Even the official curriculum suggests essays, research projects, debates, etc. as evaluation instruments, not closed-response tests. Furthermore, findings from Alviar-Martin et al.’s (2008) research suggest that “examination-driven systems not only relegate the importance of exploring public issues but also inadvertently deprive students of democratic dialogue” (p. 186).

Finally, participants did not mention all of the simultaneous changes occurring in the education system as a factor that hindered their teaching. However, as noted by Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991), the implementation of new program can be affected by a number of other demands competing for teacher’s limited time.

**What teachers report helps or could help them teach the new program better**

When asked what support they had received in implementing the new program at the beginning or what helps them now, five of the teachers mentioned they did not have support from anyone and/or that they did not have support from the school authorities (P1, P2, P3, P5, P6). However, they did not mention it when I asked them what hindered their work. Perhaps they were not accustomed to receiving help from school “authorities”. Villegas-Reimers (1996) also found this in her studies of ethical and democratic values education in Latin American countries, including Ecuador. However, support from school leaders in educational change is essential (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2011; Hall et al., 2006; Schwille & Amadeo, 2002).

In reporting what helped them, teachers mentioned the personal motivations of finding the program interesting/important (P1, P3) and needing to work (P1); working with their students motivated them (P1, P4); their own previous knowledge and experience (P2, P5); resources such as textbooks, the internet, the MinEduc website and books (P2, P6) and colleagues (All), with whom they planned classes as well as exchanged material and advice. As the quality of relationships with colleagues is strongly related to the implementation of new programs (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall et al., 2006), it is possible that this support among colleagues facilitated their teaching of the new program.

When asked what would help them teach better, participants mentioned several “wishes”, all listed below:
• **More resources.** Two teachers mentioned having more audio-visual material would help (P1, P6) and two mentioned material in general (P4, P6). Two also mentioned the need for additional material in the school libraries (P5, P6).

• **More equipment.** Three teachers wanted a place to show videos or other visual material (P1, P2, P4). Fausto mentioned better equipped classrooms, including technology. Samaniego (2008), writing in the context of high school education in Ecuador, also mentioned the need for making technology more available to students.

• **Improved work conditions.** Ma. Dolores said having a reduced workload and also being able to work in a school closer to where she lived would help. Fausto mentioned having his suggestions heard at District and Ministry levels and receiving rapid answers, as well as enduring fewer cancelled classes would help. Diego mentioned needing more teaching time to cover the content.

• **Other.** Miriam also mentioned having students’ more willing to learn and Ivana thought that having kids do work experiences would help them gain new perspectives.

In sum, when the teachers in this study found out they had to teach the new EpC1 program, most of them had strong personal concerns (SoC2). Once they began to teach, their concerns seemed to move towards management-type concerns (SoC3), related more to how they could approach the new program and obstacles in their way of doing so. Once I met them, approximately two months after classes had begun, although a few personal-type concerns (SoC2) remained, and they also mentioned a few related to student learning, most of their concerns were still related to management issues.

Among others, the factors that teachers mentioned hinder their teaching included the lack of textbooks for students (except for one participant, students had no textbooks) and other resources (such as photocopies, projectors, reading material), being in charge of many students (300-400, approximately) and the frequent cancelling of classes. Five teachers also mentioned having no support from school leaders.
Chapter 7: Concluding and suggesting new starting points

Replacing explicit education about the political system with attempts to encourage individual harmony values, for example, could easily leave students ill-equipped to handle actual social/political conflicts and leave the currently unjust social order unshaken. (Bickmore, 2010, p. 158)

In this final chapter, I briefly explore a few of the limitations of this study, main conclusions, recommendations for different stakeholders and suggestions for future research. At the end, I include a few concluding remarks.

Limitations

With regards to the sites and participants, the first possible limitation is there were only six participants in this study, and none were outside of the area of the capital city of Quito. This certainly does not allow for generalizing how teachers are approaching the new curriculum. However, the information from six cases can allow us to see some of the complexities involved in this process and does provide at least leads on which to follow up if one wishes to facilitate teachers’ work in this area.

As mentioned in the methodology chapter, the Ministry helped me select the schools to visit and a few school principals determined which teachers I should invite to participate. Within the criteria I established, which they respected, the Ministry may have chosen the schools that they thought were “better off” - although I have no proof of this. Thus, it is possible, but not certain, that teachers in other schools face additional or more severe constraints. As I explained in the methodology section, although some principals seemed to ask me to speak with teachers they thought were doing well, others seemed to ask me to speak with teachers they thought were struggling. Therefore, this may not be a limitation at all. It may have contributed to further variation in the sample. The fact that principals were involved may have pressured participants speak of their situation in a more positive light. However, I did explain their answers were confidential, and as teachers did mention negative aspects of their situations, maybe this was not a large limitation.

As previously mentioned, when I asked about what citizenship education meant for them, a few teachers looked at the textbook before giving their answers. As I reviewed the textbooks later, I could see their answers were close to the textbook conception. This could have been avoided, for example, by asking them to please give their own answer and not to look at the textbook. However,
I doubt the answers I would have obtained would have been very rich. The participants who clearly did have their own definition of citizenship education gave it without looking at any other materials. For the other participants, the concept seemed very new and it did not seem like they had their own definition.

Another possible limitation is the fact that I began the data collection later than expected, and thus some teachers were moving on from the unit on conflict to one on values. Thus, I had less data on the conflict unit. However, I obtained a broader view of teachers’ approach to the new curriculum in general as well as of the conflict and controversy aspects (or lack thereof) of the curriculum in another unit.

An additional limitation is this was not a longitudinal study. I was only able to obtain a snapshot of one moment of the teachers’ long process, approximately two months after they had begun teaching the new curriculum, as well as hints of how they felt at the beginning of the school year. If I had been able to learn from them during the entire school year, the findings would probably be very different. For one, maybe at the end of the school year, the teachers’ descriptions of citizenship education would be closer to democracy (as that is the final unit) than to values. I also could have obtained hints of how they learned about the program over the course of the year or years. However, this study does provide a snapshot of the initial situation, and the complications involved. Keeping these limitations in mind, I discuss the main conclusions in the next subsection.

**Main conclusions**

The main research question for this study is *How are teachers approaching the new democratically-oriented citizenship education 1 official curriculum (EpC1), especially its conflict theme, in high schools in Ecuador?* A simple answer is that the six teachers in this study were not “approaching” the new official curriculum. Instead, teachers used the lowest-cost available textbooks, written for students, as their main guide to implementing the new program. They did not seem to have changed their conceptions, objectives for student or practices – only the materials they used. This is not surprising given the constraints they faced.

It seemed that for teachers, the textbook was the official curriculum. In many cases, it was their only material. This may not be so uncommon, for as previously mentioned, Westbrook et al. (2013) also
noted that in resource-limited countries, a textbook was “often the sole resource used by teachers” (p. 12). Also, as noted by Werner (1991), “texts may become the de facto curriculum for teachers and students, providing them with the content and sequence for instruction, the major source of homework, and the focus of examinations” (p. 109). Even though some mentioned they did not think the textbooks were very good (they choose them because of the low cost or because it was all they were able to obtain), participants said they had to follow the textbook. Some said that their supervisors checked their progress to make sure they had “covered” all of the topics they should have covered in the week.

As previously mentioned, some teachers explained to me, and others showed me, how they used the official curriculum to create an annual plan. However, it did not seem as though they read the whole curriculum; it seemed they extracted from it the pieces they needed for their annual plan (goals, evaluation indicators, lists of content). The plan seemed to be a formality; they kept it stored in a cabinet or drawer. Their actual lesson plans for class, in most cases, seemed to be covering a certain page of the textbook or, in a few cases, a lesson built around the topics the textbook established.

The mutual adaptation framework used for this study highlights the interaction between policy and teachers’ approaches. Initially, I had not planned to analyze textbooks. However, it quickly became apparent that, at least in this study, a key intervening element was textbooks. I thus included “moments” of curriculum in my literature review, labelling textbooks “interpreted curriculum.” I thus analyzed how the first two units of the two textbooks most used by the participants “interpreted” the official curriculum and how participants “adapted” the textbooks.

As discussed in Chapter 4, at least in terms of its introductory statements, the official curriculum seems to be closer to the transformation side of the continuum (see Figure 1), which aims at sharpening students’ questioning abilities as well as enabling and encouraging their participation in the governing and transformation of their societies, in redressing injustice and in building peace. The statements for the whole citizenship program (EpC) seemed closer to transformation than the statements of the program analyzed in this study (EpC1). The type of citizenship education promoted in specific instructions of the official curriculum, however, such as aims and evaluation indicators, were less clear. Taken at “face value,” most seemed closer to a transmission conception. However, they could potentially also be used in a transformation approach.
It seemed as though the authors of the two textbooks analyzed had taken the curriculum program at “face value.” The focus of the two textbooks (interpreted curriculum) that teachers used, at least in their first two units, were more closely aligned to the transmission side of the continuum (also see Figure 1), which emphasizes transmitting socially established knowledge and values to students for them to become “good citizens” in society as it currently stands, as well as keeping and making peace. The textbooks were clearly based on the list of aims, contents, evaluation indicators, etc. that the official curriculum provided. They added descriptions, definitions, sub types, etc. The textbooks did not seem to reflect the transformation conception outlined in the introductory statements of the curriculum, except perhaps for a brief mention to justice in textbook 1’s introductory statements.

Perhaps this can be attributed to the pull of tradition as well as to the way the program (aims, evaluation indicators, etc.) was presented in the official curriculum documents. As explained in the introduction, it seems in many countries citizenship education tended to be teacher-centered and focused on delivering information (Torney-Purta et al., 2001), and Latin America is no exception (Tibbitts & Torney-Purta, 1999; Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2004; Villegas-Reimers, 1996). More specifically, many have described education in Ecuador as being teacher-centered and memoristic (i.e. Albuja, 2012; Bustos, 1997; Cobo, 2008; Coyachamin, 2012; De la Torre, 2000; Fernandez, 2006; Landázuri, 1993; MinEduc, 2013; Morales, 2011; Ortiz, 2010; Palacios, 2012; Samaniego, 2008; Sinardet, 1999; Terán, 2004; Whitman, 2004). As mentioned in the introduction and described by Bustos (1997), “There is a belief that what is appropriate is to provide the student with a ‘good summary,’ as exhaustive as possible, adjusted to the contents of the official program” (p. 103). It does not seem surprising then that describing all of the contents of the official curriculum in a manner that would allow teachers to “cover” the “topics” would be what many would feel compelled to do when creating a textbook for a new subject.

It seemed that generally teachers were also “pulled” towards more transmission-type approaches. As mentioned above, it seems like a transmission-type approach is and has been common in Ecuador. Also, as described in chapter 5, participants did not seem to have changed in relation to conceptions, objectives or practices dimensions. It seemed they incorporated the new material into their previous beliefs and practices. In most cases, their previous beliefs and practices reflected a transmission conception.
As mentioned above, the textbooks, teachers’ main (sometimes only) guide for implementing the new program seemed to be closer to a transmission conception. Also, teachers said they had to cover the textbook contents. They said their supervisors would check to make sure they not get behind in the program. They also mentioned checking with colleagues to make sure they were all “on the same page” (quite literally, in many cases). Also, teaching approximately 12 different groups of 30-40 students certainly made things more difficult for teachers. Additionally, as described in chapter 3, it seems the physical layout of classrooms also fostered a transmission-type approach. Typically, there was a board and teacher’s desk at the front, desks/chairs in rows and nothing on the walls except the Ecuadorian flag, anthem or the school anthem.

As mentioned in chapter 6, it seemed the Ministry of Education had established norms regarding evaluations. At least as interpreted by teachers, these norms obligated them to mainly use written closed-response tests or oral tests. The oral that test I witnessed was an oral version of a written closed-response test. The forms of evaluation that I observed (written tests, oral tests, student presentations) mostly focused on the checking whether students “knew” the information transmitted. Only some required a little more interpretation from the students’ part but still did not include value questioning.

Another regulation seemed to “pull” teachers in transmission direction: the law that education must be entirely free for students. While this is an admirable goal, in practice, it seemed there were issues that still had not been solved. First of all, the textbook issue. The participants’ students did not have textbooks or access to any other material (except for Miriam’s students who were asked to buy a textbook). Some teachers said this obligated them to summarize the textbook content for students to have access to it in their notebooks.

Second, there was the photocopies issue. Teachers could no longer ask students to photocopy material and schools did not provide photocopies for teachers. Thus, worksheets, reading material, etc. were almost never used. Teachers sometimes spent their own money on photocopies, but they had relatively low salaries and many students for whom to obtain photocopies (many times more than 300). For tests, it seems there was a tactic agreement with students. I saw them pay for the test copies (5 cents a page). This would certainly constrain the amount of student-centered work a teacher could do in a class.
Third, there was the field trip issue. Some teachers said they wished to take their students on field trips. For example, Fausto mentioned a trip to the National Assembly to observe a debate for the passing of a new law. Miriam wanted to take her students to visit the court so that they could observe a civil trial. Before, it seems, teachers asked students to pay for their transportation to and from these events: 25 cents, round trip (the minimum salary in Ecuador is around USD 340 a month). When I visited them, teachers were no longer allowed to ask students to pay but were not given money to pay for their transportation either. This certainly has less impact on everyday practice, but still serves to reduce the chances that students will experience something other than transmission-type activities in class.

Also, as mentioned in chapter 2, changes in education involve the teacher gaining a new understanding and learning how to do something in a different way (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2011). In her synthesis of research related to professional development, Timperley et al. (2007) find that providing teachers with time and resources for them to construct their own learning is rarely effective. Significant learning usually requires professional development over an extended period of time, led by experts and which challenges teachers’ former beliefs and practices. Unfortunately, teachers in this study had not had access to any type of professional development. They only received, or had to look for, a copy of the student textbook and the official curriculum documents. Thus, the finding that, along dimensions of change, it was only materials that had changed (not conceptions, objectives for student learning or practices) is not surprising.

Still, within this context, teachers’ conceptions and approaches varied quite considerably. This may be related to their different backgrounds. Table 1 summarizes participants’ different conceptions and approaches. As described in detail there, it seems that Ma. Dolores, Diego and Miriam were closer to a transmission conception. Giovanni seemed closer to the middle of the continuum, but also seemed to be closer to a transmission conception. Ivana could also be placed closer to the center of the continuum, but probably closer to the transformation side of the continuum. Fausto seemed closer to the transformation conception.

Ma. Dolores, Diego and Miriam seemed to have some commonalities in their backgrounds. None of them had previously taught civics. Neither Ma. Dolores nor Miriam had degrees related to the teaching of social sciences; Ma. Dolores’ degree was in accounting and business education. Diego did, but he had only begun teaching four years ago and had obtained his degree many years before.
Ma. Dolores and Miriam had both previously taught subjects mostly unrelated to citizenship education. Diego had taught social sciences and philosophy, but he only had four years of experience. Ma. Dolores and Diego had only ever taught in public schools, and Miriam had mostly taught in public schools. In Ecuador, private schools tend to be quite different, with more resources, more opportunities for teacher training, etc.

Giovanni did not have experience teaching civics either. However, he had both an undergraduate and a graduate degree in related areas (social science education and history, respectively). He had many years of experience teaching subjects related to social sciences (history, geography, etc.). He had taught mainly in schools outside the province and public schools (many schools outside of the capital city in Ecuador are also disadvantaged).

Both Ivana and Fausto had previously taught civics; Ivana for 1 to 3 years, and Fausto for 7 to 9 years. Both had previously taught subjects in the social science field and also, both of them had previously taught philosophy courses, which are potentially more open to questioning and dialogue. Fausto had more than double the teaching experience than Ivana had and also was the academic coordinator for social sciences at his school. Both had degrees in social science education and Fausto had a postgraduate degree in education. Both had only recently joined public schools; they had spent most of their time teaching in private schools, and in the case of Fausto, in military schools as well. Also, both Ivana and Fausto used textbook 2, not textbook 1 like the rest of participants. Finally, they both communicated their own personal overarching goal related to social justice for students, and seemed to use the topics mentioned in the textbooks to achieve these goals. Fausto was intent on helping his female students from low SES families learn about and fight for their rights, while Ivana was focused on helping her students from low SES families elevate their goals in life, and achieve them (part of which was having high expectations of their academic performance and supporting them in achieving those expectations).

Possibly then, having little experience or preparation in the teaching of civics, social sciences and philosophy made it difficult for participants. The participants with less preparation and experience seemed to rely more closely on the only material they had: a textbook for students (the lowest cost option), textbook 1. They incorporated this into their previous beliefs and practices, which it seemed, were quite transmission-oriented (possibly in part due to having mostly taught in public school).
The conceptions and approaches of Fausto, and to some degree, Ivana, and perhaps also Giovanni in certain aspects, were closer to a transformation approach. It did not seem as though this was because of the new program at all; it seemed these had always been their approaches. Thus, although the official curriculum conceptions presented in the introductory sections and the conceptions of these teachers were closer to a transformation conception, it seemed there was no relation between the two.

However, in the literature review chapter, it was clear that most sources supported a type of citizenship education closer to a transformation conception. For example, many researchers describe the various benefits of classroom discussion of conflictual issues. Is it possible that both the curriculum developers of the initial introductory statements and Fausto (and possibly Ivana and maybe Giovanni) had learned more about teaching citizenship education and related subjects and are thus both closer to a transformation conception?

Fausto did mention having learned about the Constitution and rights and responsibilities in his studies. However, it does not seem likely that Fausto had a strong justice-oriented approach solely because of what he learned in his studies. He also mentioned personal beliefs: he repeatedly said he could not stand injustice and told several stories of how he fought injustice. Ivana also had strong beliefs around class injustice. So possibly, this combination of personal beliefs with a stronger preparation and experience in teaching civics, social sciences and philosophy lead to an approach closer to a transformation one.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations derived from this study are pretty straightforward and directly mainly towards the ministry of education and school leaders due to its focus. I make the recommendations assuming that a transformation conception is goal. I make this assumption because this was the goal of the official curriculum’s introductory statements and it seemed that this goal was previously discussion by many education stakeholders nation-wide (see introduction). However, the main reason is because a transformation conception seems closer to a type of education that can facilitate significant learning, that can facilitate peacebuilding rather than merely eliminating temporary conflicts, that can potentially lead to democracy where all citizens have the opportunity to
participate in the governing of society and that can potentially lead to citizens building a more just society for themselves rather than simply accepting the current order.

I describe the main recommendations in the following list:

For the ministry of education

- Provide teachers and students with at least the most basic resources necessary for learning: access to photocopies, textbooks for students and teacher guide books and/or learning materials.
- Ensure that textbooks and materials available are compatible with a transformation conception.
- Review evaluation policies to ensure they are compatible with a transformation conception of education. Allow for evaluation activities such as essays, community projects, community service research projects, case analysis, debates, deliberation fora, participation in student government, mock trials, mock councils, analysis of debates in the national assembly, policy proposals, etc. In sum, as mentioned by Ecuadorian scholars, foster an education that teaches students “how to think, not what to memorize” (Patiño, 2013; Samaniego, 1992; Zaragoza, 1995).
- Provide professional development opportunities for citizenship education teachers, preferably ones that follow the recommendations of Timperley et al. (2007) and other researchers in the field of professional development. They should also help teachers build an understanding of the proposed change. As stated by Hall and Hord (2011), “many change efforts fail because the participants do not share mental images or pictures of what classroom and/or school practice will look-like when an identified change is implemented to a high quality” (p. 148). However, they should also include many opportunities for teachers to give people working in policy feedback and ideas for the program as well. This would enable the “mutual adaptation” of policy; it would enable the Ministry to change and improve the program based on the feedback they receive from teachers. It would also improve the working conditions for teachers such as Fausto, who expressed his frustration with the top-down system and not having his suggestions heard.
- Revise the number of classes that teachers are expected to teach a year. Having 12 different classes with 30-40 students a class makes it difficult for teachers to have the time to attend to each student’s learning and use evaluation instruments more conducive to learning.
- Provide resources (even 25 cents per student a year might make a difference) for students to be able to go on field trips.

For school leaders

- Review policies regarding lesson plans to ensure they are more conducive to a transformation conception.
- Assign teachers with experience and preparation in civics, social sciences and philosophy to teach the program, if possible. Further research should be done before reaching any conclusions,
but those subjects are the most related to the new curriculum, and thus it makes sense for that kind of teacher to be assigned to that class.

- Support teachers with the implementation of new programs. Hall and Hord (2011) explain how even just briefly asking teachers how it is going with the new program and what they see as advantages and disadvantages in the hallway can be a way to show support and also find out what other types of support are needed.
- None of the participants related the course with student government, student elections, the 200-hour community service program for high school students or any school wide initiative. Helping to connect the work of different school educators around democratic citizenship could make the program more meaningful to students and provide teachers with opportunities to enhance the program without having to do all of the work on their own.
- Speak to the people in the Ministry to ask for the items mentioned above to facilitate the work of teachers.

For teachers

- Speak to school leaders and to the Ministry to attempt to obtain the necessary resources and support for implementing the new program.
- Review the official curriculum documents. The documents have a specific suggestions and online resources that might be helpful.
- Incorporate an objective related questioning and justice and seek to implement more student-centered practices and value discussions if wishing to be closer to a transformation conception.

Suggestions for future research

There have been relatively few studies on education conducted in Ecuador, much less in citizenship education; thus, there are many areas of research to mention. I shall only mention a few. For example, as mentioned in limitations, this study only observes a very initial period implementation. Studies conducted over a period of two or three years, especially with a larger number of cases across the country, could yield richer information.

Also as previously mentioned, Ecuador is comprised of a variety of ethnic groups, and as in many countries, it seems persons from minority groups are subject to discrimination (De la Torre, 2000; Martínez Novo & De la Torre, 2010). In what different ways might citizenship education be approached in different schools with a majority of people from a minority ethnic group? What might the students’ views be? What might citizenship education mean to students from an indigenous nationality within Ecuador? Also, what might citizenship education mean to students who are
refugees, immigrants or have other nationalities? Are these various citizenships and their potential implications discussed in official curriculum documents?

Several authors write about the importance of hidden curriculum (i.e. Apple, 1990; Cevallos-Estarellas & Sigurdardottir, 2000; Crick et al., 2004; Osborne, 2001; Werner, 1991). As Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta and Schwille (2002) ask, “What does it mean, for example, when students are taught in, say, an authoritarian, dull and teacher-centered way about the importance of critical thinking, political participation and civil action for democracy?” (p. 3). This is another potential area for future research in citizenship education.

In Chapter 2, I mentioned that studying the curriculum-as-learned by students was beyond the scope of this study. It is certainly an area of study with potential. Just as teachers do not implement curriculum exactly as policy-makers intended, nor do students learn exactly what educators teach. As Freire (1998) insists, students are not merely passive recipients, and even if their teachers espouse a banking method, students can still be critical and resist it.

Finally, this study also raises fruitful questions for philosophical inquiry, such as to what degree and under what circumstances teaching students democratic values should be or should not be considered an imposition of a majority view or an inculcation of values. Another example is how education aims (such as transformation-oriented democratic citizenship education) should be defined in a society and what decisions should be left to individual schools, individual teachers or other education stakeholders.

Concluding remarks

From his study of civics education in seven different societies across the world (Chinese Taipei, the Czech Republic, Finland, Italy, Hong Kong, Hungary and the United States), Mintrop (2002) suggests it is possible to develop a model depiction of the civics classroom, which he describes as follows:

In this classroom, student are not all that interested in the content, the teacher is not particularly well trained, and civic education as a subject, if at all distinguished form the subject of history, is of secondary concern for ‘the assigned’ teacher. The type of knowledge dispensed is heavily weighted towards facts and the common every-day wisdom of the instructor. With the exception of a few activities, most notably mock elections, class
discussions, and perhaps a rare simulation, the instructional format is teacher-centered. The atmosphere in the class is on the dull side due to the students’ lack of interest and the teacher’s uncertainty over the advisability of holding discussions on lively and controversial topics. (p. 77)

Do the findings of this study, shared with me by six teachers, reflect this dreary picture? One big difference is that, as mentioned in the introduction, the Ecuadorian high school curriculum now has three core subjects obligatory for all students related to citizenship education, which are assigned a similar number of hours as the traditionally “high-status” subjects of math and literacy. Still, some participants in this study did mention their students’ lack of interest in the subject and the fact that their majors were not in citizenship education. Also, at least some of the teaching I observed was focused on the transmission of knowledge.

However, Mintrop’s picture does not mention all of the constraints faced by teachers of citizenship education, which, at least in the case of the participants in this study, were many and severe: having no materials, including no textbooks for students and no access to photocopies; having approximately 12 classes with up to 45 students each and having no support for implementing the new program (not even professional development opportunities). It also does not mention all of the constraints faced by those policy-makers attempting to relieve the constraints teachers face and improve the education, with a complicated history, for students of a whole nation.

Furthermore, the picture offers no information about the ways, large and small, that teachers manage to break that dreary scenario, in spite of all of the constraints they face. For example, it does not mention teachers’ relationships with students, and the fact that teachers such as Miriam may be the “go to” person for students in distress. It does not mention teachers such as Fausto, who seems intent on helping his group of all-girl students from low SES families understand and fight for their rights or Ivana, who encourages her students from low SES families to achieve high learning goals, as well as set high goals for themselves and struggle to achieve them, to improve their situation.

Much of the research I have reviewed for this study describes what ideal democratic citizenship education should look-like and/or explains how much of the practice does not live up to these expectations. In the area of gender studies, Deutsch (2007) noted that many studies focused on the description of “going gender;” on describing gender inequities. She says, “My plea is that we shift our inquiry about ongoing social interactions to focus on change” (p. 114) and asks researchers to focus more on how to challenge these inequities, rather than describe them.
Given all of the injustice in the world, it does seem we are morally bound to “take actions to create just and democratic multicultural communities and societies” (Banks, 2008, p. 135), which probably implies helping students, especially those who are most disadvantaged, understand the structures of society so they might participate in transforming them. If citizenship education focused on transformation is one way to do this, then many questions remain, such as what types of transformation-oriented programs currently exist? In what countries or regions are these programs functioning? What do students learn in these programs? In what ways can students gain a more in-depth understand of society and its current structure? In what ways might students participate in its transformation and how might they learn to do this? More importantly, what types of transformation-oriented citizenship education really do help different disadvantaged students gain a better understanding of society and gain the skills to participate in its transformation?

As I mentioned before, I understood this new EpC1 program to be one of the ways in which those with the least power (many of whom attend public schools) could gain knowledge and skills that could enable them to participate more fully in decisions that affect them and in the construction of a more just society. This research has shown me there is still a lot to be done but that there are spaces where this is already happening. This gives me hope that more students can have a similar experience and gives me the motivation to work towards this goal.
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Appendix A. Letter Requesting Administrative Consent

<OISE/UT LETTER HEAD>

Octubre, 2013

Investigación sobre el curso de Educación para la Ciudadanía I

Estimado Rector/a:

Mi nombre es Daniela Bramwell y soy estudiante de posgrado de la Universidad de Toronto en Canadá. Busco trabajar en colaboración con aproximadamente seis docentes (cada uno de una institución educativa diferente) que enseñen el curso de Educación para la Ciudadanía I en un proyecto de investigación para mi tesis de maestría.

El propósito de la investigación es compartir ideas y recursos para enseñar educación para la ciudadanía con otros docentes en el Ecuador, al describir las diferentes maneras en que cada docente implementa el nuevo curso. Adicionalmente, espero explorar las concepciones e inquietudes de los docentes, así como los factores que ayudan o inhiben su enseñanza, a fin de ofrecer ideas a los líderes educativos para facilitar la labor docente.

A los docentes que quieran participar en la investigación les pediría lo siguiente:

- realizar dos entrevistas de aproximadamente una hora cada una,
- observar tres de sus clases (yo observaría en silencio desde una esquina a fin de evitar interrumpir las clases) y
- ver ejemplos de sus planificaciones, instrucciones para tareas de los estudiantes y materiales, si fuere posible.

Es importante notar que tomaré todas las precauciones posibles para proteger el anonimato y confidencialidad del docente. En ningún momento se harán juicios de valor (esto no se trata de una evaluación) y en ningún momento habrá riesgo de daños a las personas o a la institución. Además, es importante notar que usted como Rector está completa libertad de decidir si autoriza o no que esta investigación se realice en su institución educativa. La participación del docente en la investigación también es completamente voluntaria. Además, el docente podrá retirarse en cualquier momento y pedir que su información sea eliminada del estudio, al menos hasta el momento en que él o ella hayan revisado y aprobado las transcripciones de sus entrevistas.

Los beneficios para el docente serían los siguientes:

- estará proveyendo información que podría ser de ayuda para sus colegas docentes así como para rectores, supervisores y funcionarios del Ministerio de Educación,
- tendrá una interesante oportunidad para profundizar su reflexión sobre su propia enseñanza,
- recibirá copias mis resultados, publicaciones y materiales, y
- recibirá un libro o un material de enseñanza que yo le entregaría para demostrar mi aprecio por su colaboración.

Además, como rector, si desea, también le puedo enviar copias de los resultados de la investigación, publicaciones y materiales.

El primer paso, si está usted de acuerdo, es que me permita conversar con los docentes del curso de Educación para la Ciudadanía I acerca de la investigación, y si les interesa la posibilidad de participar, pedirles que llenen una pequeña encuesta (que no tomará más de 5 minutos). Después de revisar los datos de las encuestas, me contactaré con los docentes interesados y seleccionados para confirmar su interés en participar, y si lo confirman, le pediré autorización de manera formal para iniciar la investigación en su institución educativa.

Le agradezco anticipadamente por su colaboración. Por favor no dude en contactarme si tiene alguna pregunta.
| Daniela Bramwell |
|------------------|------------------|
| Candidata al M.A. en Educación Administrativa, OISE/Universidad de Toronto |
| 098-126-0939 |
| 6013288 |
| daniela.bramwell@mail.utoronto.ca |
Appendix B. Survey used in recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;OISE/UT LETTER HEAD&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encuesta para investigación sobre Educación para la Ciudadanía 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Enseña el curso de Educación para la Ciudadanía 1 en Quito o sus alrededores? ¿Le interesaría colaborar con una investigación de la Universidad de Toronto de Canadá?

Si usted está interesado en participar en una investigación sobre educación para la ciudadanía (ver carta adjunta para detalles), por favor llene la encuesta que se encuentra a continuación. Se requieren menos de 5 minutos para completarla.

Por favor nótese que al completar la encuesta no está comprometiéndose a participar en el estudio; solo está mostrando interés. Yo lo contactaré próximamente para confirmar su interés y atender cualquier duda que pueda tener.

Le recuerdo que utilizaré la información que incluya en la encuesta para determinar quién está interesado en participar, recolectar datos de contacto y seleccionar aproximadamente seis docentes para la investigación. Solamente conservaré la información de estos docentes; eliminaré el resto de la información. Si usted es seleccionado para participar en el estudio, también utilizaré la información que provea para (a) contactarlo e invitarlo a participar en el estudio y (b) reportar características generales de los participantes en el estudio, pero ningún detalle que pueda relevar su identidad. Tomaré todas las precauciones posibles para proteger su anonimato y confidencialidad a partir de la información que incluya en la encuesta. Si después de enviar sus respuestas decide que no desea que yo utilice esta información en la investigación y/o que no desea que lo contacte, por favor escribame en el transcurso de dos semanas después de haber completado la encuesta y yo eliminaré su información de la base de datos.

Si no le interesa participar en la investigación, no desea completar la encuesta y/o no desea proveer sus datos de contacto, por favor, no continúe. Si desea colaborar en la investigación, por favor, continúe llenando la encuesta.

**ENCUESTA**

Por favor marque las respuestas según su caso particular:

Género:  ○ Masculino  ○ Femenino

¿En este año lectivo se encuentra enseñando el curso de Educación para la Ciudadanía 1?  ○ Sí  ○ No

¿Enseñó el curso de Educación para la Ciudadanía 1 el año lectivo anterior?  ○ Sí  ○ No

¿Enseñó educación para la ciudadanía o cívica antes de la reforma del Bachillerato del año 2011?

○ Sí  ○ No
Si su respuesta fue “sí”, ¿por cuántos años?  ○ 1-3  ○ 4-6  ○ 7-9  ○ 10+

¿Está enseñando o ha enseñado otras asignaturas?  ○ Sí  ○ No
Si su respuesta fue “sí”, ¿cuáles?

○ Artes
○ Ciencias sociales
○ Ciencias naturales
○ Matemáticas
○ Lenguaje
○ Educación física
○ Otros (por favor describa cuáles): ______________________________________

¿Cuántos años de experiencia docente tiene en total?  ○ 1-3  ○ 4-6  ○ 7-9  ○ 10-15  ○ 16+25  ○ 25+

Usted enseña a estudiantes del bachillerato:  ○ Técnico  ○ Académico  ○ Ambos

Si usted está interesado en participar en la investigación, por favor escriba a continuación sus datos de contacto.
Recuerde que esta información será confidencial y que al proveer su información de contacto, asumo que usted me está dando permiso para contactarlo (si no desea que lo contacte, por favor no complete esta sección).

Por favor, llene la sección a continuación con letra **muy clara**.

Nombre(s):

Apellido(s):

Número de teléfono celular:

Número de teléfono del domicilio:

Dirección de correo electrónico:

Nombre de la institución educativa en la cual trabaja:

Número de teléfono de la institución educativa en la cual trabaja:

Si tiene preguntas sobre la investigación, puede preguntarme ahora o escribirlas aquí y yo le contestaré vía email (si es que me ha provisto con esta información).

---

Muchas gracias por llenar esta encuesta y mostrar su interés en colaborar en esta investigación.

Atentamente,

Daniela Bramwell
Candidata al MA en Educación Administrativa de la Universidad de Toronto
098-126-0939 / 601-3288
daniela.bramwell@mail.utoronto.ca
Appendix C. Brief informative letter for teachers

Información básica sobre la investigación

¿Enseña el curso de Educación para la Ciudadanía 1 en Quito o sus alrededores? ¿Le interesaría colaborar con una investigación de la Universidad de Toronto de Canadá?

Soy estudiante de maestría de la Universidad de Toronto
Mi nombre es Daniela Bramwell y soy estudiante de posgrado en el Instituto de Estudios Educativos de Ontario (OISE, por sus siglas en inglés) de la Universidad de Toronto en Canadá. Busco trabajar en colaboración con seis a diez docentes (cada uno de una institución diferente) que enseñen el curso de Educación para la Ciudadanía 1 en un proyecto de investigación para mi tesis de maestría que estará bajo la supervisión del Dr. Stephen Anderson de la Universidad de Toronto.

La investigación busca proveer información útil para docentes y líderes educativos
El propósito de la investigación es compartir ideas y recursos para enseñar educación para la ciudadanía con otros docentes en el Ecuador. Adicionalmente, espero explorar las concepciones e inquietudes de los docentes, así como los factores que ayudan o inhiben su enseñanza, a fin de ofrecer ideas a los líderes educativos para facilitar la labor docente.

Colaborar implicaría poco tiempo para usted
Yo le pediría lo siguiente:
- realizar dos entrevistas, de aproximadamente hora y media cada una, a las horas y el lugar que a usted le convenga (Espero poder grabar el audio de las entrevistas para luego poder transcribirlas, pero usted puede decidir si desea ser grabado o no),
- observar tres de sus clases cuando sea más conveniente para usted y
- ver ejemplos de sus planificaciones, instrucciones para tareas de los estudiantes y materiales, si fuere posible.

Colaborar implicaría varios beneficios para usted
Los beneficios para usted serían los siguientes:
- estaría proveyendo información que podría ser de ayuda para sus colegas docentes así como para rectores, supervisores y funcionarios del Ministerio de Educación,
- tuviera una interesante oportunidad profundizar su reflexión sobre su propia enseñanza,
- recibiría copias mis resultados, publicaciones y materiales, y
- recibiría un libro o un material de enseñanza como muestra de mi agradecimiento.

Tomaré todas las precauciones posibles para proteger su anonimato y confidencialidad
Utilizaré pseudónimos, no incluiré ningún detalle que pueda relevar la identidad de ninguno de los participantes o instituciones educativas que participen en el estudio y tomaré varias medidas para guardar la información en lugares seguros. Sin embargo, usted debe considerar que tendrás que pedir el permiso del rector de su institución educativa para poder realizar las observaciones de clases; y por lo tanto, él o ella sabrán que usted está participando en la investigación. Dicho esto, le aseguro que no compartiré ninguna información sobre usted o nuestras comunicaciones con el rector, ni tampoco con ninguna otra persona. Todo será confidencial.

Le agradezco anticipadamente por su colaboración. Por favor no dude en contactarme si tiene alguna pregunta.

Daniela Bramwell
Candidata al M.A. en Educación Administrativa, OISE/Universidad de Toronto
098-126-0939 / 601-3288
daniela.bramwell@mail.utoronto.ca
Appendix D. Consent letter for teachers

<br>

**Carta de consentimiento informado para participar en la investigación**

Octubre/Noviembre, 2013

Estimado XXX:

**Soy estudiante de maestría de la Universidad de Toronto, Canadá**

Mi nombre es Daniela Bramwell y soy estudiante de posgrado en el Instituto de Estudios Educativos de Ontario (OISE, por sus siglas en inglés) de la Universidad de Toronto en Canadá. Busco trabajar en colaboración con docentes que enseñen el curso de Educación para la Ciudadanía 1 (EpC1) en un proyecto de investigación para mi tesis de maestría que estará bajo la supervisión del Dr. Stephen Anderson de la Universidad de Toronto.

La investigación busca proveer información útil para docentes y líderes educativos

El propósito de la investigación es compartir ideas y recursos para enseñar el nuevo curso de EpC1, y en especial su componente de conflicto, con otros docentes en el Ecuador al describir las diferentes maneras en que cada docente implementa el nuevo curso. Además, espero explorar los documentos oficiales así como las concepciones e inquietudes de los docentes y los factores que ayudan o inhiben su enseñanza, a fin de ofrecer ideas a los líderes educativos para facilitar la labor docente.

La investigación se llevará acabo con seis a diez docentes (cada uno de una institución educativa diferente). Se buscan docentes que enseñen EpC1 en Quito o en sus alrededores. Entre los participantes se buscará un balance de género, de experiencia docente en general y experiencia docente en educación para la ciudadanía específicamente así como un balance entre instituciones educativas que estén en áreas urbanas o rurales y con enfoques técnicos o académicos. Los datos se recolectan para propósitos de la tesis de maestría y tal vez para reportes, publicaciones y presentaciones.

**Colaborar implicaría poco tiempo para usted**

La razón por la cual le contacto específicamente a usted es porque expresó un interés en participar en el estudio a través de una encuesta para la recolección de datos básicos.

Para participar en la investigación, yo le pediría lo siguiente:
- realizar dos entrevistas, una de aproximadamente una hora y otra de aproximadamente hora y media,
- observar tres de sus clases y
- ver ejemplos de sus planificaciones, instrucciones para tareas de los estudiantes y materiales, si fuere posible.

**Su colaboración se programará a su conveniencia**

Las entrevistas se harán a las horas y en el lugar que a usted le convenga. Durante la primera entrevista, yo le preguntaría qué entiende por educación para la ciudadanía y por conflicto. También le preguntaría acerca de su práctica docente. Durante la segunda entrevista, le preguntaría acerca de su experiencia con la implementación del curso de EpC1. A medida que progre la entrevista, podría hacer preguntas para clarificar o profundizar, pero mi rol será escucharlo hablar sobre sus perspectivas y experiencias. Mi intención es grabar el audio de la entrevista para poder luego transcribirla, pero usted puede negarse a ser grabado. Además, después de la entrevista escribiré breves notas que me asistirán en recordar el contexto de la entrevista. Yo le enviaré la transcripción de la entrevista para que usted pueda agregar información y/o realizar correcciones.

En cuanto a la observación, usted decidirá qué clase desea que observe (es decir, cuando sea más conveniente para usted), ojalá una en donde se aproxime el tema curricular de conflicto. En clases, yo observaría en silencio desde una esquina a fin de evitar causar alguna interrupción o distracción.

**El colaborar implicaría varios beneficios para usted**

Los beneficios para usted serían los siguientes:
- estaría proveyendo información que podría ser de ayuda para sus colegas docentes así como para rectores,
supervisores y hacedores de política, 
• tuviera una interesante oportunidad profundizar su reflexión sobre su propia enseñanza, 
• recibiera copias mis resultados, publicaciones y materiales, y 
• recibiera un libro o un material de enseñanza que yo le entregaría para demostrar mi aprecio por su colaboración.

**Tomaré todas las precauciones posibles para proteger su anonimato y confidencialidad**

Tomaré todas las precauciones posibles para proteger su anonimato y confidencialidad. Le asignaré un número para identificar las entrevistas, transcripciones, notas de observaciones y documentos. Solo yo tendré acceso a los datos. La información se guardará en estricta confidencialidad y será resguardada en manera segura en archivos de computador encriptados y gabinetes bajo llave. Utilizaré pseudónimos y no incluiré ningún detalle en las publicaciones que puedan revelar su identidad o la de su institución educativa o comunidad. Destruiré todos los datos base (ej. transcripciones, notas de observación) cinco años después de que haya sido completado el estudio. Sin embargo, dado que debo obtener el permiso del Rector para poder acceder a la institución educativa, él o ella sabrá que usted está participando en el estudio. Dicho esto, le aseguro que no compartiré ninguna información sobre usted o nuestras comunicaciones con el rector, ni tampoco con ninguna otra persona. Todo será confidencial.

También es importante notar que en ningún momento se harán juicios de valor sobre sus respuestas, esto no se trata de una evaluación de su efectividad como docente y en ningún momento habrá riesgo de daños a su persona.

**Su participación es voluntaria**

Es importante notar que su participación en la investigación es voluntaria. Usted está en completa libertad de tomar la decisión de no participar. Además puede decidir retirarse en cualquier momento y pedir que cualquier información, ya sea en formato escrito o de grabación de audio, sea eliminada del estudio hasta el momento en que usted ha revisado y aprobado las transcripciones de sus entrevistas. Después de que le envíe las transcripciones, si no las aprueba dentro de un plazo de tres semanas (yo le llamaré para confirmar que las haya recibido), yo asumiré que usted está de acuerdo con su contenido. Después de este momento, o después del momento en que usted aprueba las transcripciones, a no será posible retirarse como participante. Sin embargo, si desea retirarse en cualquier momento antes de eso, puede contactarme a mí o contactarlo a mi supervisor. No habrá ninguna consecuencia de retirarse; todavía le enviaré los resultados de la investigación así como mis recursos y materiales, si así lo desea, y también le entregaré el libro o material de enseñanza como muestra de mi apreciación.

**Si tiene dudas o preguntas por favor contáctenos**

Por favor no dude en cualquier pregunta sobre la investigación, ya sea antes o durante su participación. Puede contactarse conmigo escribiendo a daniela.bramwell@mail.utoronto.ca o llamando al 0981260939. Si desea, también puede contactarse con mi supervisor, Dr. Stephen Anderson, escribiendo a steve.anderson@utoronto.ca o llamando al 00-1-416-978-1156 (él es fluido en el idioma español). Finalmente, si tiene preguntas relacionadas a sus derechos como participante en este estudio o si tiene quejas o inquietudes acerca de cómo fue tratado durante la investigación, por favor contacte a la Oficina de Ética de la Investigación, ethics.review@utoronto.ca o 00-1-416-946-3273.

Le agradecemos por adelantado por su participación.

Daniela Bramwell
Candidata al MA en Educación Administrativa
OISE/University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario – Canada
M5S 1V6
098-126-0939
daniela.bramwell@mail.utoronto.ca

Dr. Stephen Anderson
Profesor en Leadership, Higher & Adult Education
OISE/University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario – Canada
M5S 1V6
00-1-416-978-1156
steve.anderson@utoronto.ca

**Por favor complete y firme la siguiente sección**

Al firmar a continuación, usted está confirmando que desea participar en la investigación, que ha recibido una copia de esta carta y que está en pleno conocimiento de lo que aquí se describe.
Nombre: __________________________  Institución educativa: __________________________

Firma: ___________________________  Fecha: ______________________________

Por favor sumille si está de acuerdo que grabe el audio de las entrevistas: ______
Por favor sumille si quiere recibir copias de recursos que genere durante la investigación: ______
Por favor sumille si quiere recibir un resumen de los resultados de la investigación: ______

Además, siempre podrá acceder al reporte final que estará en la colección de tesis de OISE de la Universidad de Toronto a través del portal electrónico University of Toronto Research Repository (T Space) en https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/9944

Nota: Por favor guarde una copia de esta carta para su archivo personal.
Appendix E. Guides for conducting the interviews

Entrevista 1: Enseñanza de educación para la Ciudadanía y su componente de conflicto

Tiempo: 1 hora y media
Fecha:
Lugar:
Entrevistador:
Entrevistado:

[TEXTO INICIAL]

Hola, ___________.

Gracias por colaborar con esta investigación. Mi nombre es Daniela Bramwell y soy estudiante de posgrado en el Instituto de Estudios Educativos de Ontario (OISE, por sus siglas en inglés) de la Universidad de Toronto en Canadá.

Solo para hacerle acuerdo, el propósito de esta investigación es explorar cómo los docentes de Educación para la Ciudadanía en Quito están implementando este nuevo curso. Para hacerlo, espero entrevistarlo dos veces; la primera vez por una hora y media (hoy) y la segunda vez por una hora, observar tres de sus clases y además revisar documentos tales como sus planificaciones, instrucciones para trabajos de los estudiantes y materiales. Hoy quisiera preguntarle sobre qué significan para usted “Educación para la Ciudadanía” y “conflicto” así como sobre sus prácticas de enseñanza.

Como dice en la carta de consentimiento, yo le enviaré una copia transcrita de la entrevista para que pueda agregar detalles o hacer cambios. También le puedo compartir los resultados de la investigación.

Solo quisiera hacerle acuerdo que estoy tomando todas las medidas posibles para asegurar su anonimato y que toda su información personal se mantenga confidencial. El Rector del colegio sabe que usted está participando en este estudio, pero no compartiré ninguna información con él o ella exceptuando el informe final, el cual no incluiré ningún detalle que permita a alguna persona identificarlo. También recuerde que puede retirarse de la investigación en cualquier momento. Si desea que elimine su información del reporte final puedo hacerlo, al menos hasta el momento que usted revise y apruebe las transcripciones de sus entrevistas. Después de esto, por razones prácticas, no será posible retirarse como participante.

[Pedir la carta de consentimiento firmada. Si no la ha firmado todavía, entregar una copia y pedir que la firme ahora]  
[Revisar la grabadora para asegurar su funcionamiento]

[Si es apropiado, pedir al participante apagar su teléfono y hacer lo mismo]

¿Está listo para empezar? ¿Está de acuerdo con que yo grabe la entrevista para que después pueda transcribir la entrevista? ¿Puedo empezar a grabar y a hacer preguntas ahora? Y por favor, no dude en hacer preguntas usted en cualquier momento.

[PREGUNTAS DE ENTREVISTA]

Preguntas generales
1. ¿Me puede contar por favor un poco acerca de su experiencia como docente? ¿Qué estudió?
2. ¿Cómo supo acerca del nuevo curso de EpC1?
3. ¿Cómo fue que usted empezó a enseñar este nuevo curso?  
   ¿(Lo eligieron? ¿Usted aplicó?)
4. ¿Me puede contarme un poco acerca del nuevo curso de EpC1?
“Educación para la ciudadanía” y “Conflicto”

5. ¿Qué significa “educación para la ciudadanía” para usted como docente?
   (¿Cómo lo describiría? ¿Cuáles son sus conocimientos y creencias acerca de este tema? ¿Qué piensa que los estudiantes deberían aprender acerca de educación para la ciudadanía (conocimientos, destrezas, actitudes)?)

6. ¿Qué significa “conflicto”, en el contexto de educación para la ciudadanía, para usted como docente?
   (¿Cómo lo describiría? ¿Cuáles son sus conocimientos y creencias acerca de este tema? ¿Qué relación tiene el “conflicto” con educación para la ciudadanía? ¿Qué piensa que los estudiantes deberían aprender acerca de educación para la ciudadanía (conocimientos, destrezas, actitudes)?)

7. Si usted enseñó EpC1 el anterior año lectivo, ¿cómo ha cambiado su comprensión de “educación para la ciudadanía”? ¿De “conflicto”?

8. Si usted enseñó educación para la ciudadanía o cívica antes de la reforma curricular de Bachillerato del 2011, ¿cómo ha cambiado su comprensión de “educación para la ciudadanía”? ¿De “conflicto”?

Enseñanza-aprendizaje

9. ¿Cuánto tiempo tuvo para planificar el nuevo curso?

10. ¿Me puede describir cómo planificó para el nuevo curso? ¿Cómo planifica semanalmente?
   (¿Por dónde empezó? ¿Qué hizo después? ¿Cómo encontró materiales? ¿Cómo decidió en qué áreas profundizar?)

11. ¿Cuáles son los temas de educación para la ciudadanía en los que usted se enfoca más en su curso?
   (¿Cuáles son los posibles temas en educación para la ciudadanía? ¿A cuáles les dedica más tiempo? ¿A cuáles no les dedica tiempo? ¿Sobre cuáles temas evalúa a los estudiantes?)

12. ¿Qué hizo en su curso de EpC1 de la semana pasada? ¿Por favor me puede describir cómo fue la clase con el mayor detalle posible?
   (¿Cuáles fueron los objetivos de aprendizaje? ¿Qué métodos de enseñanza utilizó? ¿Cuáles fueron las actividades de aprendizaje? ¿Qué materiales de aprendizaje utilizó? ¿Cómo estructuró el ambiente de aula? ¿Si realizó alguna evaluación, cuál fue? ¿Realizó alguna actividad fuera del aula?)

13. ¿Puede describir por favor su curso de EpC1 en general?
   (¿Cuáles son los objetivos de aprendizaje espera que alcancen sus estudiantes? ¿Cuáles son los métodos de enseñanza utilizada? ¿Cuáles son las actividades de aprendizaje que programó? ¿Cuáles son los materiales de aprendizaje que utilizó? ¿De qué maneras estructura el ambiente de aula? ¿Cómo evalúa a los estudiantes? ¿Realiza alguna actividad fuera del aula? Por ejemplo, ¿existe alguna conexión entre el curso de EpC1 y consejo estudiantil o el programa de participación estudiantil?)

14. ¿Puede describir por favor cómo enseña el aspecto de “conflicto” de este curso?
   (¿Cuáles son los objetivos de aprendizaje espera que alcancen sus estudiantes en relación al tema de “conflicto”? ¿Cuáles son los métodos de enseñanza utilizada? ¿Cuáles son las actividades de aprendizaje que programó? ¿Cuáles son los materiales de aprendizaje que utilizó? ¿De qué maneras estructura el ambiente de aula? ¿Cómo evalúa a los estudiantes? ¿Realiza alguna actividad fuera del aula? Por ejemplo, ¿existe alguna conexión entre el curso de EpC1 y consejo estudiantil o el programa de participación estudiantil?)

15. Si usted enseñó EpC1 el anterior año lectivo, ¿qué cambios ha hecho para este año lectivo?

16. Si usted enseñó educación para la ciudadanía o cívica antes de la reforma curricular de Bachillerato del 2011, ¿en qué se diferencia su enseñanza del curso de EpC1 de su enseñanza de educación para la ciudadanía o cívica antes del 2011?

[TEXTO FINAL]
Muchas gracias por compartir todo esto conmigo. No se preocupe, que todo se mantendrá confidencial. ¿Podemos programar la próxima entrevista y las tres observaciones de aula?

Entrevista 2: La implementación de EpC1
Hola, ___________.

Gracias nuevamente por colaborar con esta investigación y también por esta segunda entrevista.

En la última entrevista, hablamos sobre el significado de “educación para la ciudadanía” y de “conflicto” así como su enseñanza. Esta vez, durante una hora, espero que podamos hablar de su experiencia con la implementación de este nuevo curso.

Al igual que con la anterior entrevista, espero que esté dispuesto a revisar lo que escribo para asegurarse de que esté de acuerdo con el texto final. Además, puedo compartir el reporte final de la investigación, así como materiales e recursos, con usted una vez termine la investigación.

[Revisar la grabadora para asegurar su funcionamiento]

[Si es apropiado, pedir al participante apagar su teléfono y hacer lo mismo]

¿Está listo para empezar? ¿Está de acuerdo con que yo grabe la entrevista para que después pueda transcribir la entrevista? ¿Puedo empezar a grabar y a hacer preguntas ahora? Y por favor, no dude en hacer preguntas usted en cualquier momento.

[PREGUNTAS DE ENTREVISTA]

Relacionadas a la observación de clase

17. ¿Dónde aprendió sobre “lecciones, talleres, auto o co evaluaciones, exposiciones, mapas conceptuales”? (Me decían que antes se hacía dictado, pero que ahora se enseña de otra manera. ¿Dónde la aprendieron?)

18. ¿Qué criterios utilizó para la evaluación de las exposiciones/dramatizaciones/collage? ¿Se las comunicó a los estudiantes?

Inquietudes

19. Cuando piensa en el nuevo curso de EpC1, ¿qué inquietudes le surgen? ¿Cuáles son las tres principales? (¿Me puede dar detalles? ¿Tiene otras inquietudes acerca de este curso?)

20. ¿Cómo se siente en relación al nuevo curso de EpC1? (¿Cuál es su reacción frente al curso?)

21. ¿Hay algo que se pregunta acerca del nuevo curso? (¿Tiene dudas sobre el nuevo curso?)

Si usted empezó a enseñar el curso de EpC1 el año lectivo anterior, ¿cuáles fueron sus inquietudes en ese momento? (¿Me puede dar detalles? ¿Tiene otras inquietudes tuvo acerca de este curso? ¿En qué se diferencian las inquietudes que tuvo al inicio con las que ahora tiene?)

Nivel de uso

El Ministerio de Educación, cuando lanzó la reforma curricular de Bachillerato en el 2011, especificó que la
implementación sería flexible, que cada colegio y docente tendría la libertad de implementar el nuevo currículo a su manera, adaptándolo a su contexto y a las necesidades específicas de los estudiantes.

Por eso, me da curiosidad saber cómo ha hecho usted la adaptación a su contexto.

22. ¿Qué piensa del nuevo curso? (¿Fortalezas? ¿Debilidades?)

23. Según su parecer, ¿cuáles son los efectos de este nuevo curso de EpC1? ¿Qué tal está funcionando? (¿Por qué ha llegado a concluir esto? ¿Ha realizado alguna evaluación, ya sea formal o informal, de su implementación del nuevo curso de EpC1? ¿Ha recibido alguna retroalimentación por parte de los estudiantes? ¿Qué ha hecho con la información que ha recibido?)

24. ¿Actualmente se encuentra buscando información sobre el curso? ¿Qué tipo de información? ¿Para qué?

25. ¿Usted conversa con otros acerca del nuevo curso de EpC1? ¿Acerca de qué conversa?

26. ¿Usted está coordinando su uso del nuevo currículo con otros docentes? (¿Está trabajando con otros para implementar este nuevo curso? ¿Ha realizado cambios en su uso del nuevo currículo basado en este trabajo colaborativo? ¿Cómo trabajan en conjunto? ¿Con qué frecuencia? ¿Cuáles son las fortalezas y las debilidades de este trabajo colaborativo?)

27. ¿Ha realizado algún cambio o adaptación en la manera en la que dicta el curso? (¿Cuál fue? ¿Por qué? ¿Hace cuánto? ¿O está considerando hacer algún cambio?)

28. ¿Ha hecho algún cambio mayor al curso recientemente? (¿Cuál fue? ¿Por qué lo hizo? ¿Cuán recientemente? ¿Está pensando hacer algún cambio?)

29. Cuando usted se visualiza más adelante en el año escolar, ¿qué planes tiene en relación a este nuevo curso?

Factores que facilitan o dificultan su implementación de este nuevo curso

30. ¿Qué lo ayudó a implementar este nuevo curso al principio?

31. ¿Qué lo ayuda a enseñar este curso ahora?

32. ¿Qué es lo que le ayudaría a mejorar su enseñanza de este nuevo curso?

33. ¿Qué es lo que dificultó la implementación de este nuevo curso al principio? ¿Cómo lo sobrellevó?

34. ¿Qué es lo que dificulta enseñar este curso ahora? ¿A qué retos se enfrenta?

35. ¿Qué cree que se le dificultará en el futuro?

Copias de sus recursos

36. ¿Qué libro de texto utiliza?

¿Copias de sus planificaciones? ¿Copias de trabajos de estudiantes? ¿Videos? ¿Libros? ¿Cómo puedo llevar copias?
## Appendix F. (Planned) Observation protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Length of the observation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer:</td>
<td>Role of the observer:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Learning goals/themes/topics and how they are introduced

Descriptive notes:

Reflective notes:

### Teaching methods/approaches used

Descriptive notes:

Reflective notes:

### Activities students engage in

Descriptive notes:

Reflective notes:

### Teaching material used

Descriptive notes:

Reflective notes:

### Classroom environment

- Participation patterns (e.g. Which students speak? How much and in what sequence? How do various students appear to listen to [and] or ignore or disrespect] one another’s input? Do some students remain silent or become silenced or withdraw from the dialogue? How comfortable do different students seem to feel to participate? How do sticking points and awkward moments in the dialogue evolve, and how are they addressed? How are diverse participants’ expressions of emotion, disagreement, and/or disrespect handled?)

Descriptive notes:

Reflective notes:

- Physical environment (e.g. content on walls, desk patterns and layout)

Descriptive notes:

Reflective notes:
**Assessment**

Descriptive notes:

Reflective notes:

**Observer questions, concerns, or insights for follow-up**

Source: Adapted from Figure 7.4 (Creswell, 2012), appendix 9 of a study currently being conducted by David Ast and Kathy Bickmore on Global Citizenship Education and an observation protocol from Evans (2006).
### Appendix G. Coding scheme for describing data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Experience as teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CitEd</td>
<td>Citizenship education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFCT</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sk</td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/A</td>
<td>Topics/Adaptations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>School programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Concerns (Soc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Feelings (Soc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Doubts (Soc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/W</td>
<td>Strengths/Weaknesses of the program (LoU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Effects (LoU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Information (LoU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Sharing (LoU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>Adaptations (LoU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Major changes (LoU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Future plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>Help, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeB</td>
<td>Helped, beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeN</td>
<td>Helps, now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeF</td>
<td>Would help, future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiB</td>
<td>Hindered, beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiN</td>
<td>Hinders, now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiF</td>
<td>Might hinder, future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>