

Theoretical and Emergent Citizenship Conceptions and its Relation with the Cognitive Complexity and Political Participation Experiences

Pedro Ferreira & Isabel Menezes¹

Introduction

Citizenship's concept revival and relevance

Especially in the 90's, and after some decades of discontinuous relevance, the concept of citizenship appeared useful again and many were those who stated and promoted its revival. As Beiner (1995) pointed, the topic seems to be growing larger everyday and is now considered one of the key concepts in contemporary political theorizing and analyzing (Heater, 1990; Ignatieff, 1995; Janoski, 1998; Kymlicka & Norman, 1995; Mouffe, 1996b; Steenbergen, 1994; Turner, 1993).

More than just revived, the citizenship vocabulary became so attractive that political parties, policy makers and applied disciplines often use it: «People sense that there is something in citizenship that defines the needs of the future — in this they are right — but proceed to bend the term to their own predilections» and between the «ideological abuses» and the «vacuous label» one «begins to wonder if it can be rescued» (Dahrendorf, 1994, p.12-13). When regarding the concept of citizenship, we must not, therefore, ignore the tensions it comprehends, as we must not consider its true meaning as fixed or attainable: as Foucault points, definitions don't reflect any natural or objective order in reality, they are produced, not discovered (Foucault, 1980, in Davidson, 1997). Discourse operates «as a strategic field, as a field of battle and not simply as a reflection of something already constituted and pre-existent» (Davidson, 1997, p.4). Creating new uses to key terms and using them in new language games turn possible new ways of life (Clarke, 2000; Mouffe, 1996a) as excludes others.

¹ Faculty of Psychology and Education, Porto University. For questions and comments regarding this paper please contact the authors, pferreira@psi.up.pt or imenezes@psi.up.pt

The citizenship theme appears to be transverse to nowadays reproblematic political issues (Águila, 2000). It is also interesting to note that this revival accompanies a broader interest in the political dilemmas and challenges of today, as in the crisis of the meaning of democracy itself (Trend, 1996). By commenting some of the questions, in the contemporary debate, that prompted «something of a renaissance in the political theory of democracy» (Held, 1996, p. 237), we intend to show the centrality and the underlying tensions of the citizenship concept as also some of the distinctions being made around the meanings of citizenship.

In the western countries, in the post-war period before the late 60s and 70s crisis, the prevailing opinion asserted the Marshallian perception that the extension of social rights marked «the 'end of history' or at least 'the end of the history of citizenship'» (Steenbergen, 1994, p.3). The welfare state, the Keynesian interventionist and expanding state, was seen as capturing the best of both liberal and civic ideals: economic efficiency and «a polity formally neutral on what constitutes the good life, yet committed to providing the collective necessities requisite for the attainment of that good life, however individuals conceive of it» (Ignatieff, 1995, p. 66). These ideas, that social and political conflict would progressively wear away and that neutral criteria could be found to organize the polity, did not survive long though. Many attacks on the liberal democratic welfare regime followed the late 60s period. These were mostly centered on: (i) the consequences of the welfare state expanding bureaucracy; (ii) the structures of domination reproduced within the (abstract and universalistic) liberal ideal (of neutrality).

State's bureaucracy was either seen as a threat to individual freedom due to excessive state interference (Hayek, 1976) promoting a culture of passive, dependent, and irresponsible citizenship (Águila, 2000) or as a threat to democracy by being «only partially accountable to elected officials» and turning citizenship a «bureaucratic rather than a democratic reality» (Ignatieff, 1995, p. 71) where citizens were powerless and isolated (Águila, 2000) and became mere consumers of rights and privileges.

Seen as a matter of «overpolitization» (Lipset, 1963) by liberals, neo-liberals and classic pluralists, the bureaucracy's extension is considered threatening to individuals' freedom (Hayek, 1976). These authors advocate for less interference from the state in the citizens' (private) businesses. Regulatory functions, in their view, should be left to the market, or the interest groups balancing their powers in the civil society, ways seen as more efficient and respectful of the right to choose for him/herself, natural to every citizen. So, nowadays, they end stressing individual rights, personal liberty to pursue self-chosen ends and respect for procedural rules of democratic functioning but also responsible choices, self-restraint and balanced self-interests not to threaten the regulatory possibilities of governments (Kymlicka & Norman, 1995).

When seen as a problem of what Marcuse labeled as «depolitization», «the eradication of political and moral questions from public life by an obsession with technique, productivity and efficiency» (Held, 1996, p. 239), the attack on the consequences of bureaucracy and its opacity and of the distancing of the moral and political domains from the reach of the ordinary person implies reinforcing and extending, in various realms, the citizens' democratic control over their lives and therefore reducing the unaccountable areas and the reproduced inequalities. By acknowledging that the «right to have rights» is «constructed and exercised in a participated way» it is argued that only through involvement liberty (and equality) can be secured (and inclusion in structural equality be achieved) and also citizen's concern and judgment (about the shared reality) can be fostered (Águila, 2000, p. 14). Some social conditions of equality that assure real opportunities of participation are seen as essential (Dahrendorf, 1994; Twine, 1994).

Intending to go beyond the «abstract universalism of Enlightenment, the essentialist conception of a social totality and the myth of the unitary subject» (Mouffe, 1996a, p. 36) and connected to the heritage of the ideas and social movements that gained relevance in the late 60s, some authors claim that while common formal rights are universal they actually work on reproducing basic structural inequalities, keeping certain groups excluded from actually enjoying them — e.g. women, non-whites, gays and lesbians (Dhaliwal, 1996; Euben, 1996; Mouffe, 1996a; Pateman, 1985). More than inclusion, they argue for a context of diversity (Clarke, 2000), of plurality of positions (Arendt, 2000c; Silva, 2000), for the affirmation of differences (Clarke, 2000; Mouffe, 1996a) and the recognition of the particular, the heterogeneous and the possibility of all groups to have equal access to participation in the political (and social) realms of life (Benhabib, 1996; Dhaliwal, 1996; Mouffe, 1996a), to be able to take part in a community of shared discourse (Mouffe, 1996a; Tenzer, 2000). Radical democrats and neo-pluralists defend that this should imply combining participation in chosen, formed and reformed associations with a renewed focus on political agency, on new opportunities to democratic, responsible, involvement in the state and market (Euben, 1996; Mouffe, 1996b; Walzer, 1995) permitting articulation and also an enlargement of perspective of all those taking part (Benhabib, 1996; Clarke, 2000).

The contemporary debate and discourse on citizenship is positioning the concept in a process of reappropriation. Framing disagreements and antagonisms it permits the encounter of different perspectives and distinctions, it creates an intermediary space where shared argument and action concurs (Arendt, 2000a; Silva, 2000; Tenzer, 2000) then making political the (discussions) meanings (and practices) of citizenship. It is, in fact, a political discussion entering the «social imaginary significations, created by that society, and incarnated by its institutions» and having its part on «the global, explicit, institution of the society and the decisions concerning its *avenir*» (Castoriadis, 1996, p. 159-162).

Admitting that using the citizenship concept entails an attempt to turn ways of life meaningful and instituted is especially necessary when we consider the context of a democratic regime. In modern democracies, there is an unlimited openness to interrogation, a never-ending transformation of its terms (Castoriadis, 1996), therefore meanings can never be completely enclosed (Clarke, 2000; Mouffe, 1996a, 1996b; Silva, 2000; Walzer, 1995) and legitimacy of the agreements always rests (as the sovereignty) in the people itself (Águila, 2000; Mouffe, 1996a; Skinner, 2000).

So, democracies, and specially as societies become more complex, depend on the acceptance of the instituted ways of life, of the adherence by its citizens to its democratic principles and practices (Heater, 1990; Ichilov, 1990; Kymlicka & Norman, 1995; MacIntyre, 1995; Pocock, 1995; Trend, 1996); they depend on the possibility of some shared reflection between the singular individuals, of creating common interest that makes political action possible (Arendt, 2000b, 2000c; Benhabib, 1996; Silva, 2000; Tenzer, 2000); they depend of the capacity of its citizens to make autonomous judgments regarding the shared issues, judgments that depart from the specific, practical context in consideration and that bridge the understanding to the perspective of others (Arendt, 2000c; Beiner, 1995; Benhabib, 1996; Clarke, 2000; Kymlicka & Norman, 1995; Silva, 2000; Walzer, 1995).

The understanding of what is to be a citizen, of what that entails, is therefore placed at the core of a confrontation field where, considering that a «tradition is the set of discourses and practices that constitute us as subjects» (Mouffe, 1996a, p. 32), discursive traditions' dialogue result in variety of meanings of citizenship that intimates us to take all of them as significant and none of them as objective, neutral or even *naïve*. To study how these meanings relate to those of human development and its promotion is a task of major importance in political psychology.

Life-experiences and Human Development

It is nowadays widely accepted that it is a combination active individuals in active environments (bi-directional interactions) what shapes the course of human development. Development is then a fully relational happening between the individual agent in a certain active environment (Brandstädter & Lerner, 1999; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Bronfenbrenner & Evans, 2000; Lerner, 1986; Sameroff, 1982), a «dynamic process of mutual shaping and influence» (Strange, 1999, p. 579). As a consequence, researchers are now paying more and more attention to contexts and transactions between contexts and individuals (Flanagan & Sherrod, 1998; Lerner & Galambos, 1998; Steinberg, 2001; Strange, 1999) as important to understand psychological development. This «pronounced shift toward studying the contexts in which these developments

take place» (Steinberg, 2001, p. 97) is, nowadays and mostly, striving to identify particular dimensions within contexts like the family, the school, the peer group or the workplace that can be shown relevant. Within such an understanding of development, the concept of life-experience is important because it refers to the transaction situation, to the *interaction* between individuals and their contexts, an interaction where, meaning is constructed and development may occur. It is therefore useful as a general concept when searching for more transversal features of contexts in what concerns their developmental qualities. By turning to *what in experiences* might promote and support, might build the conditions for structural change, the focus here is on the opportunities life-experiences provide for involvement in situations where usual ways of making-meaning are set in conflict or contradiction (where differentiation is thus possible) and whether or not the context also provides the atmosphere for these to be productive in generating more stable and complex ways of doing so (with the occurrence of opportunities for reflection and consequent integration).

Several theorists and researchers highlight these general elements of adequate action and integration. For Piaget, peer interaction and the exposure to feelings and attitudes of others are considered important sources of development (1977) by confronting the individuals with the reasoning of others and promoting the rise of cognitive conflict, internal contradictions in the reasoning structures (Lickona, 1976). For example, in a research with children, interactions with peers and debates produced heightened awareness of the rights of others, especially of those actively engaged in the debates (Damon, 1998). Piaget used the concept of reflective abstraction to refer to the mechanism enabling the cognitive system to overcome the conflict situation by unifying «a series of actions and their results into a new structure that removes conflicts and inconsistencies generated earlier» (Demetriou, 1998, p.198). Kohlberg (1976) also considered opportunities for social interaction and reciprocal communication as a source of cognitive conflict and therefore as stimulating development. He referred to them as role-taking opportunities (Kohlberg, 1976), favoring development when they provide problems that defy subject's reasoning and expose it to the perspectives of others in «an atmosphere of interchange and dialogue» of different views (Kohlberg & Wasserman, 1980, p. 563). Damon and Colby (1996; Lind, 2000) argue that «direct engagement with moral issues, in a context that provides several different but integrated sources of guidance and support» is required to promote integrated moral development (Damon & Colby, 1996, p. 36). Studies from learning environments' role-taking curricula, combining real and significant experiences with their examination and discussion, show a positive impact on the developmental level of students and professionals that actively engage in them, from adolescents to adults (King & Kitchener, 1994; Lind, 2000; Reiman & Peace, 2002; Sprinthall, 1991; Sprinthall & Hall, 1992; Sprinthall

& Scott, 1989; Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1980; Thies-Sprinthall, 1984; Thies-Sprinthall & Sprinthall, 1987)¹. A reference to «optimal discrepancy» (Lickona, 1976; Sprinthall, 1991; Strange, 1999) needs to be made. The support and reflection, the action opportunities and the exposure to difference must be present and balancing «developmental matching and mismatching», these depending on the initial levels of development (Lind, 2000; Reiman & Peace, 2002; Sprinthall, 1991; Strange, 1999). A balance between reflection and practices embedded in a variety of immediate engagement experiences in communities and institutions appear as lying at the core of integrated development.

The Present Study

Research on life-experiences has not considered the developmental quality of life-experiences in non-intentional² settings. The present study assumes that, due to their differential features, some everyday life-experiences may also present those who engage in them with a variety of conditions that may be opportunities for development. Especially this study researches how the broadly political participation, the involvement in civil society's movements and associations of various kinds (political parties of course included) can provide with opportunities for experiences having continuity, personal significance, and appeal for several different tasks of varying complexity. So, the elements of challenge and support, of action and reflection may be an important part of experiences such as getting involved in political parties, unions, social movements, volunteer work in the community, religious or recreational associations. These may (at least for some of those involved) have the high quality social interaction features that seem to prompt development in both intellectual and moral domains.

This study intends to investigate how real-life, broadly political, involvement experiences within the communities (e.g. participation experiences in political parties, social movements, associations, etc) can, depending on their developmental quality, be related to more complex modes of thinking about politics and to different ways of conceiving citizenship.

¹ These investigations on the of impact of the conditions of role-taking and inquiry on the development of students and professionals continues presenting results and an account of what today is called *learning-teaching framework* (LTF) can be found at Reiman & Peace (2002).

² Non-intentional settings are considered those not explicitly designed as deliberate interventions, educational or others.

Method

Instruments

The *Scale of Politic (Escala da Política, EP, Ferreira & Menezes, 2001)* is an adaptation to political contents of one of the scales of the Portuguese version of the Parker Cognitive Development Inventory (PCDI, Parker, 1984; Portuguese version by Ferreira & Bastos, 1995). Items were rewritten (in order of acquiring a political content) — adolescent and adult cognitive/ intellectual developmental theories were reviewed in order to build a framework capable of providing the underpinnings for the rewriting procedures maintaining the items' developmental meaning. The EP presents to the subjects items representative of the three major modes of thought described by Perry in his works: *dualism*, *relativism* and *commitment within relativism* conceived as an evolving sequence of complexity of thought. Each of these modes of thought is represented by a set of items — a subscale. The subject has to rate his/her agreement to each item.

In factor analysis, three factors were found. This result is consistent with the expected instrument structure for this instrument: factor_1 (hereafter called *dualism*) representing dualist sub-scale ($\alpha = .6596$), factor_2 (hereafter called *relativism*) representing the multiplicity/ relativistic sub-scale ($\alpha = .6560$), and factor_3 (hereafter called *commitment*) representing the commitment within relativism sub-scale ($\alpha = .6486$). Reliability values are not very high but still acceptable for an instrument tapping cognitive complexity. Taken together these factors 35,814% of total variance.

Score is found per subscale and represents the mean agreement to the items in the corresponding subscale. In the used version, complete disagreement equaled 1 and complete agreement equaled 7. By this reason, the higher the score, the higher the agreement expressed to the items of the particular subscale.

The *Participation Experiences Questionnaire (Questionário das Experiências de Participação, QEP, Ferreira & Menezes, 2001)* has been designed in order to be a simple, paper and pencil, instrument that could tap subjects' participation experiences in associations and other civil society structures and the developmental quality of those experiences. It is theory-guided and follows the remarks made by Lind (2000) aiming to collect both objective and subjective information on the experiences' developmentally important features. The basic logic of this instrument has been, in fact, inspired in and abstracted from Lind's ORIGIN/u questionnaire (Lind, 2001).

The QEP has two distinct parts. In the first one, the subject is asked to report if he had or not the experience of participating in several civil society's structures (e.g., political parties, students associations, social movements, religious associations, etc) and how enduring how that participation (only punctual, less than six months, six months or more). In the second part, subjects are

told to rate their degree of involvement and to, thinking about their most significant experience (in their personal perspective), report how certain aspects related to the experience's quality had been present. This second part is divided in two major components: (a) the opportunities to actively engage in different types of relevant real actions (e.g., looking for information, participating in activities, organizing activities, decision making, etc) and (b) the frequency of opportunities to share and confront their perspectives in an acceptant, challenging and reflexive environment (e.g., your opinions were accepted and respected, there were several different points of view in discussion, elements were concerned with justifying their views, different views were analyzed and reflected upon, etc). Both of these components are considered as factors and the factor analyses are consistent with this assumption. Two factors — qep_1 and qep_2 — emerged representing, qev_1 (hereafter called *action*), the first component and, qev_2 (hereafter called *reflection*), the second. Reliability values supports the factorial structure of this second part of QEP: *action* $\alpha = .8964$; *reflection* $\alpha = .8833$. The two factors together explain 70,195% of total variance.

Results from the first part of the instrument were not used in this particular study. For the second part results are the scores in the factors — *action* and *reflection* — and their combination.

The *Citizenship Conceptions Questionnaire (Questionário das Concepções de Cidadania, QCC, Ferreira & Menezes, 2002)* was constructed using a framework of dimensions that are usually clustered in the citizenship conceptions of several political philosophies and that can be used to differentiate between traditions of thought on citizenship. In the QCC respondents have to position themselves, in an agreement likert scale ranging from 1 (complete disagreement) to 7 (complete agreement), regarding statements that illustrate various positions in each of the dimensions.

Factor analysis provided sets of items that organize the ideas of particular conceptions. As it was expected the emerged factors (conceptions) are sometimes partial and not necessarily as coherent as their theoretical pairs but still they subsume ideas that are important in describing the ways in which these subjects conceive citizenship. Six factors emerged and together they explain 47,879% of the total variance. Each factor has been indexed in a single variable that represents the mean agreement to the items in that same factor. Reliability is generally high or acceptable for all the factors.

Factor 1 ($\alpha = .7979$) groups items valuing involvement in common interests or in integrating personal and common interests through argumentation and negotiation made in the contexts of the public and public/private (civil society) spheres. It will be hereafter called *neo-pluralist conception*.

Factor 2 ($\alpha = .8373$) organizes together items regarding a defensive and effective involvement, both instrumental and final. Involvement here is related to the promotion, protection and expansion of citizens' autonomy (I), this

autonomy understood as being part of those who decide in the political community, participant in the making of the laws by which he/she lives. This factor is considered to represent a *participative conception*.

In Factor 3 ($\alpha = .7793$) the items comprise a view where involvement aims to the transformation of personal and common interests through negotiation in the public/private and private contexts. Taken together these items can be considered a form of *pluralist conception*.

The items in Factor 4 ($\alpha = .8110$) portray citizenship involvement as final in value and citizens as acting through direct decision aiming to the promotion of their autonomy (I) regarded as being involved and free to decide while protecting and expanding their autonomy (II) understood as a possibility who choose for themselves. This configuration can be taken to map some form of *protective-republican conception*.

Factor 5 ($\alpha = .5650$) sees involvement as final and valuing citizens' direct ruling. This ruling though implies involvement in the promotion and expansion of citizens' autonomy (II) of choice for themselves and connected to the surpassing of common interests. Drawn like that is a form of *neo-liberal conception*.

Factor 6 ($\alpha = .5892$) is the only factor that focuses in citizenship as a status, formal in its nature. Involvement is seen only as defensive. This form of minimal conception is a type of *minimal conception*.

Administration

Instruments have been administrated in schools and workplaces as a battery, when possible with the presence of a research assistant. All subjects are from Porto's region.

Sample

Table 1
Sample's Main Demographic Characteristics.

<i>Demographic variables</i>	Number of subjects	Percentage of total sample
Age		
Late adolescents	220	35.4
Young adults	231	37.2
Adults	70	11.3
Older adults	100	16.1
Total	N=621	100%
Gender		
Male	216	34.5
Female	410	65.5
Total	N=626	100%
Educational level		
Less than 9 years	31	5.0
Between 10 and 12 years	262	42.4
College students	220	35.6
College or post-graduate degree	105	17.0
Total	N=618	100%

A total number of 626 subjects participated in this study. Subjects were *late adolescents* (from 15 to 18), *young adults* (19 through 24), *adults* (from 25 to 35) and *older adults* (36 or higher) with the following educational levels: *nine years of formal schooling or less, between 10 and 12 years of formal schooling, some years college education, or a college or post-graduate degree*. Sample's distribution across the main demographic variables accounted — gender, age and educational level — is presented in Table 1.

Variables

In order to analyze collected data several variables were defined and computed. They're presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Description of the Variables Used in the Study.

Instruments	Variables
Political Scale (EP)	<p><i>Dualism</i>: Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in the Dualism factor.</p> <p><i>Relativism</i>: Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in the Relativism factor.</p> <p><i>Commitment</i>: Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in the Commitment within Relativism factor.</p>
Participation Experiences Questionnaire (QEP)	<p><i>Action</i>: Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in the <u>Action factor</u>.</p> <p><i>Reflection</i>: Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in the <u>Reflection factor</u>.</p> <p><i>Action-Reflection</i>: Independent variable that has four different categories: <u>Null</u>: no reported action or reflection; <u>Low</u>: both action and reflection scoring below or in the mean of the sample; <u>Unbalanced</u>: scoring above the mean in one and below or on the mean on the other of the action and reflection variables. <u>High</u>: scoring above the mean of the sample in both action and reflection.</p>
Citizenship Conceptions Questionnaire (QCC)	<p>Neo-pluralist conception: <i>Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in Factor 1</i></p> <p>Participative conception: <i>Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in Factor 2</i></p> <p>Pluralist conception: <i>Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in Factor 3</i></p> <p>Protective-republican conception: <i>Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in Factor 4</i></p> <p>Neo-liberal conception: <i>Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in Factor 5</i></p> <p>Minimal conception: <i>Dependent variable computed from the scores (mean of the ratings of the items) in Factor 6</i></p>

Results and Discussion

The results regarding the effects of the participation experiences and their quality on the measures of the diverse modes of thinking and on the diverse emerged conceptions of citizenship; b) results showing the correlations between the action and reflection opportunities, the modes of thought and the citizenship conceptions.

The alpha value of .05 was used for all statistical tests. Eta² and Cohen's *d* were, when considered adequate, calculated so effects sizes could be estimated.

The effects of participation experiences

Taking together the variables representing the modes of thought (*dualism, relativism, commitment*) and those regarding the citizenship conceptions as dependent variables and *action-reflection* as independent, the GLM multivariate analysis results (see Table 3, Appendix A) show that *action-reflection* ($F = 2.493$; $p = .0001$; $\eta^2 = .036$) produces statistically significant and relevant effects.

Although «Tests of Between-Subjects Effects» (see Table 4, Appendix A) only reach statistical significance on *commitment* ($F = 10.099$; $p = .0001$; $\eta^2 = .048$) we consider the results regarding *protective-republican conception* ($F = 2,235$; $p = .083$; $\eta^2 = .011$), *participative conception* ($F = 2,387$; $p = .068$; $\eta^2 = .012$), *neo-pluralist conception* ($F = 2,327$; $p = .074$; $\eta^2 = .011$) and *relativism* ($F = 2,446$; $p = .064$; $\eta^2 = .012$) to be worth of note. Post hoc tests (Tukey HSD; see Table 5, Appendix A) reveal that those subjects who had high developmental quality participation experiences (group marked as 3) score clearly higher on *commitment* than all other groups being all these differences statistically significant and effect size values (as calculated using Cohen's *d*) indicative of a moderate (group 3 scores higher than group 0, $p = .002$; $d = .4583$; group 3 scores are higher than group 1 scores, $p = .0001$; $d = .5403$; group 3 scores higher than group 2, $p = .0001$; $d = .4156$). It was also found that no other effects meet the criteria for statistical significance ($p < .05$) and that effect sizes are between small and moderate ($.2 < d < .5$). Yet the results on *relativism* (group 3 scoring lower than group 0, $p = .096$; $d = .2756$; group 2 scoring lower than group 0, $p = .054$; $d = .3222$; i.e., groups having high developmental quality participation experiences, and those having participation experiences where opportunities for action and reflection are unbalanced are less relativistic in their modes of thought than those in the group of no participation experiences at all), *neo-pluralist conception* (group 3 scoring higher than group 0, $p = .104$, $d = .2747$; those having high developmental quality participation experiences score higher in neo-pluralist conception than those having no participation experiences), *participative conception* (group 3 scoring higher than group 1, $p = .064$; $d = .2577$; those having

high developmental quality participation experiences scoring higher in participative conception than those having low developmental quality participation experiences) and *protective-republican conception* (group 3 scoring higher than group 1, $p = .075$; $d = .2599$, those having high developmental quality participation experiences scoring higher in protective-republican conception than those having low developmental quality participation experiences) all show the same trend suggesting the importance of high developmental quality participation experiences in moving beyond relativist modes of thought and assuming citizenship conceptions more committed to action in the community.

Mostly this study found *commitment within relativism* as a differentiating mode of thought when analyzing the impact of non-intentional and real-life experiences of different developmental qualities, in what can be called, broadly, civic participation. This is in fact consistent with the *commitment within relativism* theoretical accounts. By merging together elements of ethical, identity and intellectual development (Hofer & Pintrich, 1997; Perry, 1970) this mode of thought may be also grasping in a more complete way the developmental outcomes achieved in complex relational settings and multidimensional experiences such as the civic/political ones. The consideration of higher developmental quality to the experiences combining action and reflection opportunities, when contrasted to others not providing the same contextual conditions, also results reinforced by the results obtained.

Although to be interpreted with caution, the effects are only of small to moderate sizes and statistical significance is not reached, the results regarding the relation between the emergent citizenship conceptions and the involvement in participation experiences providing opportunities for action and reflection are relevant enough to be worth commenting. In fact the general trend is quite coherent showing that the engagement in experiences of high developmental quality seems related to favoring citizenship conceptions that stress commitment to action within the community either as seeking to integrate personal and common interest through negotiation in the public or private/public realms of action as in the neo-pluralist conception, or as promotion and expansion of direct involvement in democratic decision-making within the social sphere and its institutions as in the participative conception, or finally as in combining a promotion of direct democratic involvement with the protection and expansion of the guaranties of individual choice as in the protective-republican conception. The civic/political experiences that could become meaningful and growth promoting tend to reinforce visions of citizenship where involvement is seen as positive and central.

It is important to note that civic/political participation experiences can provide individuals with opportunities for engaging in real and meaningful actions that, especially when balanced with an environment that promotes open reflection, interchange and dialogue, concur to develop more complex and integrated modes of thought in individuals — at least when these regard

political content. These findings, consistent with those from intentional settings, clearly indicate that in domains such as political development more attention should be granted to the self-sought spontaneous experiences and their developmental quality.

It is also important to note that these engagement experiences, when of high developmental quality, seem to be related to citizenship conceptions favoring involvement within the community. Given the current emphasis on formal citizenship education and service-learning projects within educational policy documents (Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999) and educational research (Battistoni, 1997; Morgan & Streb, 2001; Youniss, McLelland, & Yates, 1997) it seems particularly relevant to consider how experiences in voluntary associations and community projects could be organized, and made integrated, in order to promote adolescents' and young adults' political development.

REFERENCES

- ÁGUILA, R. d. (2000). Política, cidadania, consciência (S. Cruz, Trans.). In Rafael del Águila, Paul B. Clarke, Augusto S. Silva & N. Tenzer (Eds.), *A política: ensaios de uma definição* (p. 1-17). Madrid: Sequitur.
- ARENDT, H. (2000a). Labor, work, action. In P. Baehr (Ed.), *The portable Hannah Arendt* (p. 167-181): Penguin Books.
- ARENDT, H. (2000b). The perplexities of the Rights of Man. In P. Baehr (Ed.), *The portable Hannah Arendt* (p. 31-45): Penguin Books.
- ARENDT, H. (2000c). The public and the private realm. In P. Baehr (Ed.), *The portable Hannah Arendt* (p. 182-230): Penguin Books.
- BATTISTONI, R. M. (1997). Service learning and democratic citizenship. *Theory into Practice*, 36(3), p. 150-169.
- BEINER, R. (1995). Introduction. In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing Citizenship* (p. 1-28). New York: State University of New York Press.
- BENHABIB, S. (1996). From Identity Politics to Social Feminism. In D. Trend (Ed.), *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship and the State* (p. 27-41). New York: Routledge.
- BRANDSTÄDTER, J., & Lerner, R. (1999). Introduction: Development, action, and intentionality. In J. Brandstädter & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Action and self-development: Theory and research through the life span* (p. ix-xx). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- BRONFENBRENNER, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- BRONFENBRENNER, U., & Evans, G. (2000). Developmental science in the 21st century: emerging questions, theoretical models, research designs and empirical findings. *Social Development*, 9(1), p. 115-125.

- CASTORIADIS, C. (1996). *La montée de l'insignifiance: les carrefours du labyrinthe IV*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- CLARKE, P. B. (2000). A política e o político: Consciência e mito, mística e praxis (V. Gil, Trans.). In Rafael del Águila, Paul B. Clarke, Augusto S. Silva & N. Tenzer (Eds.), *A política: ensaios de uma definição* (p. 19-58). Madrid: Sequitur.
- DAHRENDORF, R. (1994). The Changing Quality of Citizenship. In B. v. Steenbergen (Ed.), *The Condition of Citizenship*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- DAMON, W. (1998). Political development for a democratic future: a commentary. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), p. 621-627.
- DAMON, W., & Colby, A. (1996). Education and moral commitment. *Journal of Moral Education*, 25(1), p. 31-37.
- DAVIDSON, A. (1997). Structures and Strategies of Discourse: Remarks Toward a History of Foucault's Philosophy of Language. In A. Davidson (Ed.), *Foucault and his interlocutors*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- DEMETRIOU, A. (1998). Cognitive Development. In A. Demetriou, W. Doise & C. Van Lieshout (Eds.), *Life-span developmental psychology*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- DHALIWAL, A. K. (1996). Can the Subaltern Vote? In D. Trend (Ed.), *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship and the State* (p. 42-61). New York: Routledge.
- EUBEN, J. P. (1996). Taking it to the streets. In D. Trend (Ed.), *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship and the State* (p. 62-77). New York: Routledge.
- FLANAGAN, C., & Sherrod, L. (1998). Youth political development: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), p. 447-456.
- HAYEK, F. (1976). *The Road to Serfdom*. London: Routledge Kegan and Paul.
- HEATER, D. (1990). *Citizenship: The civic ideal in the world History, Politics and Education*. New York: Longman.
- HELD, D. (1996). *Models of democracy* (2nd ed.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- HOFER, K., & Pintrich, P. (1997). The development of epistemological theories: Beliefs about knowledge and knowing and their relation to learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 67(1), p. 88-140.
- ICHILOV, O. (1990). Dimensions and Role Patterns Of Citizenship in Democracy. In O. Ichilov (Ed.), *Political socialization, citizenship Education and Democracy*. Columbia: Columbia University Teachers College Press.
- IGNATIEFF, M. (1995). The Myth of Citizenship. In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing Citizenship* (p. 53-77). New York: State University of New York Press.
- JANOSKI, T. (1998). *Citizenship and Civil Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- KING, P., & Kitchener, K. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- KOHLBERG, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior: Theory, research, and social issues* (p. 31-53): Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- KOHLBERG, L., & Wasserman, E. (1980). The cognitive-developmental approach and the practicing counselor: An opportunity for counselors to rethink their roles. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 58(9), p. 559-567.
- KYMLICKA, W., & Norman, W. (1995). Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory. In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing Citizenship* (p. 283-322). New York: State University of New York Press.
- LERNER, R. (1986). *Concepts and theories of human development* (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.
- LERNER, R., & Galambos, N. (1998). Adolescent development: Challenges and opportunities for research, programs and policies. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, p. 413-446.
- LICKONA, T. (1976). Critical issues in the study of moral development and behavior. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior: Theory, research, and social issues* (p. 3-27): Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- LIND, G. (2000). *The importance of role-taking opportunities for self-sustaining moral development*. Retrieved February 12, 2003, from University of Konstanz, Department of Psychology, Moral — und Demokratie-Psychologie in Bildung und Weiterbildung Web site: http://www.uni-konstanz.de/ag-moral/pdf/Lind-1996_Selfsust.pdf
- LIND, G. (2001). *Moral development and learning environments (MODLE). Invitation to an international research cooperation*. Retrieved April 30, 2003, from University of Konstanz, Department of Psychology, Moral — und Demokratie-Psychologie in Bildung und Weiterbildung Web site: http://www.uni-konstanz.de/ag-moral/mu_role.htm
- LIPSET, S. (1963). *Political Man*. New York: Doubleday.
- MACINTYRE, A. (1995). Is Patriotism a Virtue? In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing Citizenship* (p. 209-228). New York: State University of New York Press.
- MORGAN, W., & Streb, M. (2001). Building citizenship: How student voice in service-learning develops civic values. *Social Science Quarterly*, 82(1), p. 154-169.
- MOUFFE, C. (1996a). *O regresso do político* (A. C. Simões, Trans.). Lisboa: Gradiva.
- MOUFFE, C. (1996b). Radical Democracy or Liberal Democracy. In D. Trend (Ed.), *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship and the State* (p. 19-26). New York: Routledge.
- PATEMAN, C. (1985). *The Problem of Political Obligation: A Critique of Liberal Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Perry, W. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- PIAGET, J. (1977). *Problemas de psicologia genética* (4ª ed.). Lisboa: Publicações D. Quixote.
- POCOCK, J. (1995). The Ideal of Citizenship Since Classical Times. In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing Citizenship* (p. 29-52). New York: State University of New York Press.
- REIMAN, A., & Peace, S. (2002). Promoting teachers' moral reasoning and collaborative inquiry performance: A developmental role-taking and guided inquiry study. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(1), p. 51-66.
- SAMEROFF, A. (1982). Development and the dialectic: The need for a systems approach. In W. Collins (Ed.), *The concept of development: Minnesota symposium on child development* (Vol. 15, p. 83-104). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- SILVA, A. S. (2000). A ação política, um ensaio de teoria e perspectiva. In Rafael del Águila, Paul B. Clarke, Augusto S. Silva & N. Tenzer (Eds.), *A política: ensaios de uma definição* (p. 77-116). Madrid: Sequitur.
- SKINNER, Q. (2000). *La liberté avant le libéralisme* (M. Zagha, Trans.). Paris: Seuil.
- SPRINTHALL, N. (1991). Role taking programs for high school students: New methods to promote psychological development. In B. P. Campos (Ed.), *Psychological intervention and human development 2*. Porto and Louvain-La-Neuve: Instituto de Consulta Psicológica, Formação e Desenvolvimento and Academia.
- SPRINTHALL, N., & Hall, J. (1992). Peer counselling for middle school students experiencing family divorce: A deliberate psychological education model. *Elementary School Guidance & Counselling*, 26(4), p. 279-295.
- SPRINTHALL, N., & Scott, J. (1989). Promoting psychological development, math achievement, and success attribution of female students through deliberate psychological education. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 36(4), p. 440-446.
- SPRINTHALL, N., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1980). Educating for teacher growth: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Theory Into Practice*, 19(4), p. 278-286.
- STEENBERGEN, B. v. (1994). *The Condition of Citizenship*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- STEINBERG, L. (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, p. 83-110.
- STRANGE, C. (1999). Student development: the evolution and status of an essential idea. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), p. 570-586.
- TENZER, N. (2000). A política e a filosofia política: Contributo para uma conceptualização conjunta (S. Cruz, Trans.). In Rafael del Águila, Paul B. Clarke, Augusto S. Silva & N. Tenzer (Eds.), *A política: ensaios de uma definição* (p. 59-76). Madrid: Sequitur.

- THIES-SPRINTHALL, L. (1984). Promoting the developmental growth of supervising teachers: Theory, research programs, and implications. *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXXV(3), p. 53-60.
- THIES-SPRINTHALL, L., & Sprinthall, N. (1987). Experienced teachers: Agents for revitalization and renewal as mentors and teacher educators. *Journal of Education*, 169(1), p. 65-79.
- TORNEY-PURTA, J., Schwille, J., & Amadeo, J.-A. (1999). *Citizenship education across countries: Twenty-four Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- TREND, D. (1996). Democracy's Crisis of Meaning. In D. Trend (Ed.), *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship and the State* (p. 7-18). New York: Routledge.
- TURNER, B. (1993). Contemporary Problems in the Theory of Citizenship. In B. Turner (Ed.), *Citizenship and Social Theory*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- TWINE, F. (1994). *Citizenship and Social Rights: The interdependence of self and society*. London: Sage Publications.
- WALZER, M. (1995). The Civil Society Argument. In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing Citizenship* (p. 153-174). New York: State University of New York Press.
- YOUNISS, J., McLelland, J., & Yates, M. (1997). What we know about engendering civic identity. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(4), p. 620-631.

Appendix A

Table 3
Multivariate Analysis Results for Action-reflection.

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig	Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	986	4611.250	9.000	5999.000	.000	.986
Action-reflection	Pillai's Trace	108	2.493	27.000	1803.000	.000	.036

Table 4
Relevant Results Selected from the Tests of Between-Subjects Effects.

Source	Dependent Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig	Eta Squared
Intercept	minimal c.	1	11136,921	8893,432	,000	,936
	neo-liberal c.	1	7173,889	6780,106	,000	,918
	protective-repub. c.	1	16553,722	14673,699	,000	,960
	pluralist c.	1	13381,364	13266,258	,000	,956
	participative c.	1	15894,461	20301,184	,000	,971
	neo-pluralist c.	1	11116,228	10814,381	,000	,947
	dualism	1	5516,705	4437,469	,000	,880
	relativism	1	12941,869	14175,800	,000	,959
	commitment	1	14741,220	20723,924	,000	,972
Action-reflection	minimal c.	3	1,986	1,586	,192	,008
	neo-liberal c.	3	,854	,807	,490	,004
	protective-repub. c.	3	2,522	2,235	,083	,011
	pluralist c.	3	,859	,851	,466	,004
	participative c.	3	1,869	2,387	,068	,012
	neo-pluralist c.	3	2,391	2,327	,074	,011
	dualism	3	1,190	,957	,413	,005
	relativism	3	2,233	2,446	,063	,012
	commitment	3	7,183	10,099	,000	,048

Table 5
Post-hoc Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons' Results.

Dependent Variable	(I) acção reflexão	(J) acção reflexão	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
commitment	,00	1,00	7,508E-02	,1063	,895	-,1980	,3482
		2,00	-6,1558E-03	,1076	1,000	-,2826	,2703
		3,00	-,3663*	,1010	,002	-,6257	-,1069
	1,00	,00	-7,5078E-02	,1063	,895	-,3482	,1980
		2,00	-8,1233E-02	9,727E-02	,838	-,3311	,1687
		3,00	-,4414*	8,987E-02	,000	-,6723	-,2105
	2,00	,00	6,156E-03	,1076	1,000	-,2703	,2826
		1,00	8,123E-02	9,727E-02	,838	-,1687	,3311
		3,00	-,3601*	9,143E-02	,000	-,5950	-,1253
	3,00	,00	,3663*	,1010	,002	,1069	,6257
		1,00	,4414*	8,987E-02	,000	,2105	,6723
		2,00	,3601*	9,143E-02	,000	,1253	,5950
protective-republican conception	,00	1,00	,1531	,1339	,662	-,1908	,4970
		2,00	9,431E-02	,1355	,899	-,2539	,4425
		3,00	-,1195	,1272	,783	-,4462	,2072
	1,00	,00	-,1531	,1339	,662	-,4970	,1908
		2,00	-5,8802E-02	,1225	,964	-,3735	,2559
		3,00	-,2726	,1132	,075	-,5634	1,810E-02
	2,00	,00	-9,4314E-02	,1355	,899	-,4425	,2539
		1,00	5,880E-02	,1225	,964	-,2559	,3735
		3,00	-,2138	,1151	,247	-,5096	8,195E-02
	3,00	,00	,1195	,1272	,783	-,2072	,4462
		1,00	,2726	,1132	,075	-1,810E-02	,5634
		2,00	,2138	,1151	,247	-,5096	8,195E-02
participative conception	,00	1,00	,1012	,1115	,801	-,1853	,3877
		2,00	5,752E-02	,1129	,957	-,2325	,3476
		3,00	-,1319	,1059	,598	-,4041	,1403
	1,00	,00	-,1012	,1115	,801	-,3877	,1853
		2,00	-4,3695E-02	,1020	,974	-,3059	,2185
		3,00	-,2331	9,428E-02	,064	-,4753	9,090E-03
	2,00	,00	-5,7521E-02	,1129	,957	-,3476	,2325
		1,00	4,370E-02	,1020	,974	-,2185	,3059
		3,00	-,1894	9,592E-02	,197	-,4358	5,699E-02
	3,00	,00	,1319	,1059	,598	-,1403	,4041
		1,00	,2331	9,428E-02	,064	-9,090E-03	,4753
		2,00	,1894	9,592E-02	,197	-,5699E-02	,4358
neo-pluralist conception	,00	1,00	-9,7981E-02	,1278	,869	-,4263	,2303
		2,00	-5,2471E-02	,1294	,977	-,3848	,2799
		3,00	-,2760	,1214	,104	-,5878	3,589E-02
	1,00	,00	9,798E-02	,1278	,869	-,2303	,4263
		2,00	4,551E-02	,1169	,980	-,2549	,3459
		3,00	-,1780	,1080	,352	-,4555	9,954E-02
	2,00	,00	5,247E-02	,1294	,977	-,2799	,3848
		1,00	-4,5510E-02	,1169	,980	-,3459	,2549
		3,00	-,2235	,1099	,176	-,5059	5,885E-02
	3,00	,00	,2760	,1214	,104	-3,5891E-02	,5878
		1,00	,1780	,1080	,352	-9,9544E-02	,4555
		2,00	,2235	,1099	,176	-5,8852E-02	,5059

Based on observed means

* The mean difference is significant at the ,05 level.

Appendix B

Table 6:

The Framework's Positions and their Meaning.

The F column refers to the distribution of the positions within the emerged factors (Citizenship Conceptions).

Positions	F	Meaning
status nature; formal	6	legally defined nature of rights and duties
status nature; practical		actual exercise of the considered rights and duties
status origin; inherent		bearing rights and duties comes from being a person, from human nature itself
Status origin; resultant		when the rights and duties one bears depend of the society's ways of instituting itself and of recognizing its members
involvement's value; final	2;4	considered good in itself
involvement's value; instrumental	2	as good as what it helps to accomplish
type of involvement; effective		involvement in determining the community's conditions of existence, or his/ her own as citizen
type of involvement; defensive	5;6	involvement that protects individuals, groups, classes or institutions against the actions or decisions of other individuals, groups, classes or institutions
purpose of involvement; ruling	2; 4;5	direct control and participation in collective rule-making activities
purpose of involvement; preference	2	indirect control through participation in selection oriented activities

purpose of involvement; promotion (i.e. enhancing the application)	(I): 2; 4 (II): 5	autonomy (I): autonomy of persons who are free to question and decide of autonomy (II): autonomy of those who are free to choose and to know
purpose of involvement; protection (i.e. safeguarding the exercise)	(I): 2 (II): 4	
purpose of involvement; expansion (i.e. extending the application to new contexts)	(I): 2 (II): 4; 5	
purpose of involvement; surpass personal interests	1	common interest should prevail over personal interests
purpose of involvement; surpass common interest	5	common interest is as sum or by-product of personal interests
purpose of involvement; integrate personal and common interests	1	giving importance to both personal and common interests, combining them at the personal level
purpose of involvement; transforming personal and common interests	3	combining personal and common interests is searched and pushed to the group or social levels
form of involvement; discussion, deliberation and decision	1	involved in face-to-face interactions where views and arguments may be exchanged and decisions emerge; opinions are equally valued
form of involvement; negotiation, pressure and influence	1; 3	ways of effectively pushing decisions in a certain preferred direction, whether or not being directly involved in decision making; interests have, a priori, all the same value
form of involvement; competition, contract and choice	3	competition for contract and choice, and in contracting and choosing, the best way of assuring the best decisions; each vote is one vote
context of involvement; public	1	common issues and concerns are the object
context of involvement; private/public	1;3	place for particular interests but also for exchange and influence
context of involvement; private	3	setting of needs and wants and their satisfaction and also privacy and happiness