

Please find below responses from What Works Scotland. A number of other documents which may be of relevance to this subject are available on the What Works Scotland website [here](#), for example a recent report on community capacity building through a [Community Links project in Aberdeenshire](#); and feedback on a recent [learning journey to Paris](#) for Scottish Community Planning practitioners to learn more about the French experiences of implementing Participatory Budgeting.

1. What does citizenship and civic engagement mean in the 21st century? Why does it matter, and how does it relate to questions of identity?
[Refer to answer to Q7](#)
2. Citizenship is partly about membership and belonging. Are there ways we could strengthen people's identity as citizens, whether they are citizens by birth or naturalisation? Could citizenship ceremonies or events throughout the educational process play a role? Should pride in being or becoming British be encouraged?
3. Civic engagement can be seen as both a responsibility and a right of citizenship. Beyond the existing legal framework, should citizens have additional formal rights and responsibilities? How do you see the relationship between the two? Should they have the force of law individually or be presented as reciprocal duties between citizen and state? How should they be monitored and/or enforced?
4. Do current laws encourage active political engagement? What are your views on changes to the franchise for national or local elections, including lowering the voting age? Should changes be made to the voting process or the voting registration process?
5. What should be the role of education in teaching and encouraging good citizenship? At what stages, from primary school through to university, should it be (a) available, and (b) compulsory? Should there be any exemptions? Should there be more emphasis on political participation, both inside and outside classes? How effective is current teaching? Do the curriculum and the qualifications that are currently offered need amending?

What Works Scotland response:

The Scottish education system has an important role in teaching and encouraging good citizenship across all phases of education. In order to create a responsible inclusive society the teaching of citizen education should be diverse enough to cover issues with sensitivity to a range of perspectives including: religion, race, gender, socio-economic circumstance etc. This is currently achieved through the four capacities of curriculum for excellence which help children and young people to become: successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors. Curriculum for excellence and these capacities tend to be better embedded within the primary phase

while citizenship and political participation are established in some curricula areas in Broad General Education and beyond.

The Education Scotland report, *Scotland's Quality and improvement in Scottish Education 2012-2016* (Education Scotland 2017) draws on inspection evidence and claims that during this period secondary schools “have provided learners with high quality opportunities for personal achievement to develop skills in leadership and citizenship through the life of their school and community” (p. 20). The report also claims that inspectors found that young people were involved in fundraising and voluntary work in their local community as developing global citizenship skills through their participation in twinning arrangements with schools in other countries. The OECD report *Improving schools in Scotland* (OECD, 2015) acknowledges a number of curricular “themes across learning” including sustainable development, global citizenship, enterprise in education and Scotland's culture (p. 42). This report also notes that inspection reports have highlighted improvements in different contexts including including “sport, culture and arts, enterprise, sustainability and citizenships... [and] increasingly these achievements are being accredited through a number of awards” (p. 64). However, the report also cautions against implementing reforms with an intensive focus on literacy and numeracy as these have tended to marginalise the citizenship agenda in other systems (p. 117).

While there is much good practice that has been identified by the system, both in and out of schools our experience suggests this is patchy with variations across the system. Rather than looking at curriculum redesign or new qualifications our advice is to consolidate by further embedding citizen education and political participation within the framework of curriculum for excellence. This should be compulsory and a focus for inspection and school self-review and should also be undertaken through Regional Improvement Collaboratives by moving the best examples of practice around the system to other areas where practice is less secure. It is also worth noting that the independence referendum in 2014 and lowering of the voting age have created a very politically engaged generation of children and young people compared to many other countries.

We need to take on board the caution of an over focus on literacy and numeracy highlighted by the OECD. This is a serious message and compounded by the introduction of national standardised assessments in literacy are likely to further focus teachers minds on these areas rather than on broader agendas such as citizenship education. This is a phenomenon that has been experienced in other education systems that are underpinned by high stakes testing (eg. USA and England).

6. Do voluntary citizenship programmes such as the National Citizen Service do a good job of creating active citizens? Are they the right length? Should they be compulsory, and if so, when? Should they include a greater political element? Should they lead to a more public citizenship ceremony? Are they good value for money? What other routes exist for creating active citizens?

7. How can society support civic engagement? What responsibility should central government, devolved and local governments, third sector organisations and the individual have for encouraging civic engagement? What can the Government and Parliament do to support civil society initiatives to increase civic engagement?

What Works Scotland response:

The current spread of democracy around the world is unprecedented, and so is the level of civic aspiration, expectation and discontent with current institutional practices and notions of citizenship (Dalton, 2004; Norris, 2002, 2011). Democracy is an idea that has been continuously constructed, contested, fought over, implemented and revised (Saward, 2003, p. viii). In a forthcoming article (**Pluralism and democratic participation: What kind of citizen are citizens invited to be?**) Escobar explores and unpacks three different (but overlapping) theoretical models of democracy: *representative democracy*; *participatory democracy*; and *deliberative democracy*

The key differences between them are their emphases, assumptions and aspirations with regard to democratic life:

- The notion of democratic participation that underpins each model. That is, what does it mean to participate in democracy?
- How are publics constructed? Publics and communities are not simply pre-existing entities, but get made through the ways in which they are imagined, summoned, assembled and mobilised (Barnett, 2008).
- The role of citizens. Different understandings of democracy imply different assumptions about citizenship, and shape the opportunities that people get to participate. Therefore, for each model, we must ask: What kind of citizen are citizens invited to be?
- Institutional mechanisms. The emblematic mechanism for participation in representative democracy is the electoral contest. However, there are a range of democratic innovations that illustrate the contribution of participatory and deliberative practices (e.g. participatory budgeting, mini-publics).

Table 1. Three (overlapping) models of democracy

	Representative democracy	Participatory democracy	Deliberative democracy
Notion of democratic participation	Voting in elections to choose between competing elites	Taking part in collective action and decision-making in civic and/or official spheres	Engaging in deliberation about public issues and policies

How are publics made?	By aggregating individual preferences through electoral contests and interest groups	Through processes of collective association, collaboration, struggle and civic education	Through public deliberation that transforms individual preferences into public reasons
What kind of citizen are citizens invited to be?	Occasional voter; member of interest group	Ongoing participant in civic and official processes	Considered deliberator
Examples of institutional mechanisms	Elections	Participatory Budgeting	Mini-publics

In isolation, none of the three models are fully satisfactory. Representative democracy can be an easy target for criticism. However, as Saward (1998, p. 64) argues, participatory and deliberative democracy can't fully substitute representative democracy, and indeed they often require aggregative mechanisms for resolution and decision-making. Nonetheless, participatory budgeting and mini-publics are good examples of how different understandings of democracy can coalesce into one process that involves participation, deliberation and voting—the core constitutive practices of the three models. Accordingly, these practices can be combined in productive ways. For instance, voting after a deliberative process can combine two important democratic goods: informed and considered decision-making through deep deliberation, and legitimate decision-making through large-scale expression of popular preferences using the ballot.

Therefore, these three ways of understanding democracy overlap and can be enacted in complementary ways by combining and sequencing their constitutive practices. However, it is important to acknowledge their distinctiveness. For example, there can be deliberative democracy without participatory democracy and vice versa. Deliberation can take place amongst political or policy elites (e.g. Steiner, 2004), which is normatively desirable but doesn't fulfil broader participatory ideals of inclusion. By the same token, participation can take place without deliberation, for instance, when citizens engage only with the like-minded, interact on the basis of interest-based bargaining, or take part in protests and boycotts. These different forms of participation can play different functions, and therefore their combination may offer new options that realise a broader range of democratic goods. This is exemplified in the case of participatory budgeting—with citizens and elected representatives engaging in both aggregative and deliberative modes of collective decision-making as part of a process that mobilises people to generate legitimacy, inclusion, transparency, scrutiny and problem-solving. Nonetheless, at the moment, elitist narratives of representative democracy can too easily overhaul participatory and deliberative counter-narratives in practice (Escobar, 2014, pp. 213-242). This much has been learned from ambitious processes like the crowd-sourcing of the new

Icelandic constitution, halted in the end by political and interest group elites (Gylfason, 2013).

These models encompass not only different understandings of democracy, but also different democratic aspirations. Therefore, there may be a sense of incompatibility if we simply focus on the ideas and assumptions that underpin them –i.e. the different conceptions of the role of citizens (see Table 1). However, if we focus on practices and mechanisms, then combination seems feasible –i.e. political parties could be more participative, and interest groups could engage more deliberatively. **Accordingly, there seems to be potential to develop a representative democracy that is more participatory and deliberative in its mechanisms, and where elections, political parties and interest groups are only one part of a more vibrant ecology of democratic participation.** The challenge ahead is to imagine how these three ways of thinking about democracy can be brought together by combining their core practices to enrich political life and co-create better collective futures.

n.b. More information about deliberative mini-publics can be seen in Elstub & Escobar's response to this consultation being submitted separately by Stephen Elstub

8. What are the values that all of us who live in Britain should share and support? Can you identify any threats to these values, which affect the citizenship of, for instance, women or various minority groups? If so, how can their citizenship be strengthened?
9. Why do so many communities and groups feel “left behind”? Are there any specific factors which act as barriers to active citizenship faced by different communities or groups - white, BME, young, old, rural, urban? How might these barriers be overcome?

What Works Scotland response:

This warrants a call for participatory processes, physical and virtual, where citizens can meaningfully engage with those who are different from them –those “others” that can be easily dismissed or despised when they remain faceless stereotypes (Escobar, 2011, p. 23). The absence of such forums in the public sphere can have profound consequences because a lack opportunities to be exposed to, and challenged by, difference, can diminish citizens' capacity for engaged pluralism (e.g. Sunstein, 2009), and the narrower pluralism of elite-driven democracy may seem the only option. According to Dewey (1937, p. 467), that option that does little to ensure the sustainability and development of democracy: “unless democratic habits of thought and action are part of the fiber of a people, political democracy is insecure”. From this perspective, elitism and populism can be seen as two sides of the same coin –one predicated on the creation of committed followership, rather than engaged citizenship. In this sense, the future of democracy may depend greatly on the kind of citizen that citizens are invited and enabled to be.

10. How do you see the relationship between citizenship and civic engagement on the one hand and social cohesion and integration on the other? What effect does the level of diversity in schools and workplaces have on integration in society as a whole? How can diversity and integration be increased concurrently?

11. How important are levels of English proficiency for first and second generation immigrants and what could be done to increase them, including through support for ESOL classes? Are there particular barriers faced by newcomers to Britain? Could the naturalisation process, including the citizenship test, be improved and if so, how?
12. Can you give examples of initiatives and role models that have helped promote a positive vision of British Citizenship within a tolerant and cohesive society?

What Works Scotland response:

Local community-owned organisations provide an important focus for supporting, developing and extending civic engagement, citizenship and social cohesion. These organisations are community-led (democratic governance), not-for-profit bodies committed to local communities of place and/or interest and developed around community ownership of assets; often as community hubs/centres, housing, community shops, land, community renewables. These assets can provide a core income-stream distinct from larger local bodies – the state, public sector, large local employers and property-owners. This mix of community governance, independent stable income, and long-term commitment from local people provide key opportunities to build skills in citizenship and a civic engagement and partnership-working on a more equal footing to larger local bodies; for instance, acting as local community advocate and ‘critical friends’. And also to support social cohesion built around respect and understanding for local diversity.

Examples of such organisations include: community anchors or multi-purpose community organisations such as community development trusts and community housing associations – see Henderson (2015) and Baker et al. 2011; other community-owned (community sector) organisations who own an asset and then provide services and advocacy – for example in relation to: poverty, race, faith/belief, disability, gender and other inequalities; environmental, health-related, employment issues/objectives and so on. Government has a key role through in the development of these organisations through actively supporting the development of community asset ownership e.g. suitable finance and funding; organisational support; legal and policy frameworks.