





The development of citizenship in adolescents: The struggle between the influence of the Family, the peer group and the public school

El desarrollo de la ciudadanía en los adolescentes: la lucha entre la influencia de la familia, el grupo de pares y la escuela pública

Luis Antonio Ramírez Montes¹  

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to show that the differences in the social context in which adolescents live and study, as well as the people with whom they interact, exert different types of influence on their thinking, among other things, about the importance of citizenship, their stance on reporting a crime or abuse, and the reasons for voting for a political party or candidate. To collect the data, a questionnaire of "citizen opinions and attitudes" was designed with multiple-choice answers with a Likert-type scale, which inquires about some topics that arise from the concept of citizenship and are developed during the secondary level of public education in Mexico. A sample of 525 adolescents attending the three secondary school grades at the end of the 2021-2022 school year was studied. The case studies consisted of two public schools of the general modality, which had different academic grades and levels of marginalization. The results showed that the characteristics of the social context and the socializing agents with whom the students lived encouraged ways of thinking that were opposed to the citizenship competencies sought by the educational institution.

Keywords: citizenship, basic education, citizenship education, public education, socialization.

JEL classification: I2; I20; I29

Received: 25-08-2023

Revised: 31-10-2023

Accepted: 20-12-2023

Published: 15-01-2024

Editor: Carlos Alberto Gómez Cano 

¹Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana. Iztapalapa, México.

Cite as: Ramírez, L. (2024). El desarrollo de la ciudadanía en los adolescentes: la lucha entre la influencia de la familia, el grupo de pares y la escuela pública. *Región Científica*, 5(1), 2024251. <https://doi.org/10.58765/rc2024251>

RESUMEN

Esta investigación tuvo la intención de mostrar que las diferencias en el contexto social en el que viven y estudian los adolescentes, así como las personas con quienes interactúan, ejercen distintos tipos de influencia en su pensamiento, entre otras cosas, sobre la importancia de la ciudadanía, su postura frente a la denuncia de un delito o abuso, y los motivos para otorgar su voto a un partido político o candidato. Para recabar los datos se diseñó un cuestionario de "opiniones y actitudes ciudadanas" con respuestas de opción múltiple con escala tipo Likert, que indaga sobre algunos temas que se desprenden del concepto de ciudadanía y se desarrollan durante el nivel de secundaria de la educación pública en México. Se estudió una muestra de 525 adolescentes que cursaban los tres grados de secundaria al final del ciclo escolar 2021-2022. Los casos de estudio se conformaron por dos escuelas públicas de la modalidad general, que tenían grados académicos y niveles de marginación distintos. Los resultados mostraron que las características del contexto social y los agentes socializadores con quienes convivían los estudiantes alentaban formas de pensamiento que resultaban opuestas a las competencias ciudadanas que procuraba la institución educativa.

Palabras clave: ciudadanía, educación básica, educación ciudadana, enseñanza pública, socialización.

Clasificación JEL: I2; I20; I29

INTRODUCTION

Democracy requires the participation of citizens, as well as an appropriate relationship between them and State institutions to function optimally (Cortés-Cediel et al., 2021; Lee & Schachter, 2019; Neshkova & Kalesnikaite, 2019; Wahlund & Palm, 2022). Citizens need to develop a set of motivations, values, skills, and knowledge that facilitate and favor their participation in the public-political sphere (Kuhn et al., 2019; Larson et al., 2020; Schmidhuber et al., 2019; Walker et al., 2021).



Atribución No Comercial Compartir Igual 4.0 Internacional.

This set of capabilities is developed throughout life through formal educational processes and everyday practice and experience. Public education constitutes a pillar to encourage in citizens a set of motivations, knowledge, and values (Aristeidou et al., 2021; Buchholz et al., 2020; Estellés & Fischman, 2021; Roche et al., 2020). In this order, citizenship education consists of a process oriented to the construction of skills and capacities in accordance with the democratic regime, in which the citizen is conceived as a moral being, a subject of rights, and a subject of social and political transformation. Such a process contributes, among other things, to the reconstruction of the social fabric by strengthening and democratizing civil society; hence, a culture of social and political participation is sought (Bedock & Pilet, 2020; Simonofski et al., 2021; Wehn & Almomani, 2019).

The public education system and the citizenship training that the State seeks to stimulate through nationally homogeneous curricula and programs constitutes one of the few variables that can influence a large part of the population during its development¹. The influence that the educational system exerts on society translates, within certain limits, into behaviors and perceptions of the political system, the regime or the government. Kymlicka (2003) states that the nature of the design of compulsory education has at its base, through the public system, the formation of a responsible and literate citizenry. In a very similar vein, Durkheim (2003) indicates the need to promote the communion of ideas and needs as part of educational action and the regulation of educational and social agents.

Citizen training or education is a field of study that is developed mainly from pedagogy, to which disciplines such as political science, law, psychology, and sociology contribute, whose objectives have expanded considerably in recent decades (Ghosn-Chelala, 2020; Chiba et al., 2021; Jara et al., 2021; Ruiz & Herrera, 2021). This research recovers interdisciplinary elements to delve into a problem with political implications, which consists of how to procure in adolescents a set of attitudes, opinions, and knowledge that promote active, participatory, and informed citizen behaviors within the framework of democracy. This issue not only concerns the public school but must also be addressed externally in society in general.

This study was conceived from the assumption that the social and economic environment that takes place in a specific context, as well as the socializing agents found in it, encourage different types of influence. The influence exerted by socializing agents possesses certain similarities and typifications that are gestated and shared within a particular socioeconomic context.

The influence of parents and the peer group is believed to encourage a view on citizenship that hinders the internalization of the knowledge sought by the educational institution, with mixed results exhibited in the literature (Narmaditya & Wibowo, 2021; Wamsler et al., 2020; Weiss, 2020). Although public education is fundamental in the process of citizenship development, the formal portion is supplemented or counterbalanced by external influences. The public school constitutes only one of the socializing agents with which citizens interact throughout their lives. The analysis presented below seeks to obtain an approximation of the type of influence exerted on high school students by parents, the peer group, and the public school, in two cases with different levels of marginalization, academic performance, and social problems.

Theoretical analysis

The socialization process influences the way in which people understand reality and position themselves in relation to it, as well as the particular context in which their biological and psychological development occurs (Esau et al., 2019; Hickey & Pauli-Myler, 2019; Saud, 2020). In the first stage of the socialization process, infants interact mainly with their parents or those who are in charge of their care, so they present and legitimize a certain stance towards reality, which in turn depends on the specific characteristics of their position in the social scale and the particular context. According to Berger and Luckmann (2003), the socialization process is defined as a coherent, complex, and wide-ranging process, the purpose of which is the incorporation into a given social and historical context.

Therefore, during the first years of life, human beings develop a base of knowledge, appreciations, or attitudes from which they will judge reality, at least until they form their own perspective. Children identify with their parents through emotional bonds that contribute to the internalization of knowledge, opinions, or attitudes: when they appropriate the meanings and interpretations surrounding them and consider them part of themselves. Primary socialization culminates when the child possesses self-awareness, is in subjective possession of a world, and recognizes the existence of a society outside the family nucleus (Berger & Luckmann, 2003).

1 In Mexico, the plans and study programs of public schools are homogeneous at the national level during basic education (preschool: three years, primary: six years and secondary: three years).

In the following years of people's lives, the socializing agents diversify and can be formed by the peer group, authority figures, the media, and educational, religious, social, political, or civil institutions, among others (Bañales et al., 2021; Esau et al., 2019; María et al., 2022; Terriquez et al., 2020). The secondary socialization process consists of the internalization and knowledge of other underworlds, different from the initial one, more properly, in relation to the specialized knowledge of roles, determined in turn by the social division of labor. In the words of Berger and Luckmann (2003), it is the process that consists of incorporating the individual or through which the individual autonomously integrates into new groups or social sectors.

Socialization is permanent, and even though an individual possesses a certain subjective understanding of reality, he or she can modify it to different degrees throughout his or her life; just as reality is internalized through social processes, it is also maintained in the consciousness through them. Subjective reality depends on the existence of a social base and the consequent social processes that maintain the individual's self-identification through the balance between subjective and objective reality. Crisis situations, derived from the absence of these maintenance structures, lead to the possibility of radically transforming subjective reality (Vygotsky, 2000). When individuals find themselves in a problem of coherence between objective and subjective reality, this will be solved by modifying the internalized reality or relationships with others to maintain their current reality (Berger & Luckmann, 2003).

From the psycho-pedagogical approach, Piaget (2014) proposed that human beings understand their environment through processes of assimilation and adaptation. The assimilation process consists of molding new information to fit and/or reorganize it within their mental schemas. In order to assimilate new information, it may be necessary to transform and adapt it to the mental schemas. An equilibrium is reached again once it is compatible with what is already known. The adaptation process occurs inversely since it implies the modification of mental schemas to make the new discrepant information coincide with the old schemas and thus achieve equilibrium.

According to Vygotsky (2000), in the developmental process of people, it is possible to distinguish two qualitatively distinct lines: the processes of biological origin and, on the other hand, the higher psychological functions of sociocultural origin. Any function appears first at the social level, and its development arises from interaction in a sociocultural context, just as any function takes place first at the social level (interpersonal) and then within the individual (intrapyschological). The construction and internalization of knowledge does not refer to a linear view of reproduction, transmission, or imitation, but rather, the process of internationalization of social influence consists of the (internal) reconstruction of externally perceived experience, knowledge, or meaning.

According to Bourdieu (2007), there is a certain link between social structures and the practices of agents that influence their social performance. Through the concept of "habitus" the author explains that object knowledge is constructed as a structure that, in turn, conditions the new structures and objects of reality. The "habitus" originates from a set of conditioning factors associated with a particular class of circumstances of existence and refers to the set of semi-permanent dispositions generated by exposure to certain conditions, which lead individuals to internalize the needs or limitations of the social environment, through the appropriation of external tensions. There are perceptions or attitudes linked to a social condition or class that, arbitrarily, tend to be shown as necessary or natural because they are presented at the beginning of the schemes of perception and appreciation through which they are apprehended (Bourdieu, 2007).

Therefore, it is reasonable to maintain that, in trying to influence students' thinking, the public school faces this complex panorama of influences and actions of reconstruction and internalization. An important part of the problem consists of procuring, during childhood and adolescence, a set of attitudes and knowledge that may be contrary to those perceived in everyday life or to those shared with other socializing agents, i.e., that although the school procures from theory, they have no place in everyday life or there is no social counterpart to support them. This research identifies with constructivism since it considers that knowledge is not transmitted, it is encouraged or sought, and the construction and internalization of attitudes, opinions, and perceptions is an individual process of reinterpretation and reconstruction, in which influences external to the subject have an impact.

METHODOLOGY

Context

In Mexico, the education system is made up of basic, middle and higher education levels. Basic education consists of preschool (three years), primary (six years), and secondary (three years). The public education system at the basic level concentrates most of the population: 85 % of the enrollment in preschool education and 90 % in primary and secondary education (INEE, 2019). Basic education constitutes the level chosen to conduct the empirical research because: 1) an important part of the population has only completed basic education since the

The development of citizenship in adolescents: The struggle between the influence of the Family, the peer group and the public school

national educational average is 9.7 years (INEGI, 2021), and 2) in basic education the development of citizenship is encouraged with curricula and programs generalized at the national level, through the subject “Civic and Ethical Education” (hereinafter FCE); which does not necessarily occur at later educational levels, since education begins to specialize.

Conceptual apparatus and operationalization

The operationalization was carried out based on the concept of “citizenship” from an encompassing and integrating position based on participation as a concretization of citizen action and expression of the right (INE-COLMEX, 2015). This conception recognizes that citizens live in a context of structural inequality, in which there are real differences in power and a lack of institutionalized equality. Furthermore, it conceives that those who live in disadvantaged situations elaborate and execute strategies to seek change through processes of complaint or struggle. According to Mindus (2014), from a sociological perspective, there is a dichotomy between the citizen and the marginalized since the de facto impediments or restrictions in living conditions limit or hinder the full insertion of citizens in the public-political sphere. In order to analyze and systematize the concept, two dimensions of citizenship were used:

1. Rule of law and access to justice: interaction between citizens and government, or the state, is necessary for democracy to function. This dimension addresses citizens’ attitudes towards compliance with the rules, justifications for non-compliance, reasons for compliance, and denunciation.
2. Political life: in order to improve and monitor its functioning, democracy needs a citizen counterpart committed to public-political affairs. Although the electoral vote constitutes only a partial indicator of citizen activity (INE-COLMEX, 2015), it was considered that this may be the political participation mechanism closest to the experience of adolescents (comments and observation of the process, through parents or guardians).

Data collection and analysis

The data were collected in two general public secondary schools located in Iztapalapa, Mexico City. In order to integrate localities with different socioeconomic characteristics, Iztapalapa became a favorable territorial demarcation because: a) it concentrates a large population in relation to the rest of the municipalities of Mexico City; b) it has the largest number of general public secondary schools; and c) it presents important socioeconomic differences, as well as different degrees of marginality. Based on the dimensions presented, indicators and variables were established to analyze:

1. The influence of socializing agents.
2. The differences in the thinking of adolescents.

A questionnaire of “citizen opinions and attitudes” was designed with multiple response options and a Likert scale. Said scale was used since it is an instrument that can provide useful information on the attitudes of the study population (Anjaria, 2022; Jebb et al., 2021; Matas, 2018). Two positive and two negative responses were presented, with no intermediate option to avoid central tendency bias. The information was systematized with Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Microsoft Excel.

Case studies

This paper addresses three questions derived from citizenship, namely: 1) the importance that students assign to citizenship education (FCE subject) in comparison with other subjects; 2) their opinion regarding the reporting of a crime or abuse, as well as the influence they perceive their parents and friends have on this issue; and 3) the main reasons they consider for voting for a party or candidate, as well as the influence exerted by parents and peers in this regard.

The case studies are comprised of two public secondary schools of the general modality, located in different neighborhoods of Iztapalapa, with different levels of marginalization and academic performance. The degree of marginalization was obtained from the Secretariat of Inclusion and Social Welfare, while the level of academic performance was obtained from the tests applied during the National Plan for the Evaluation of Learning (PLANEA). The information was collected anonymously, and in order to protect the confidentiality of the students and administrative personnel, the names of the schools or the neighborhoods in which they are located are not

mentioned. The study population consisted of students who were about to conclude the 2021-2022 school year, and the information was collected during the last weeks of classes (June 2022).

The daytime secondary school “A” is located in a neighborhood with a “medium” degree of marginalization according to the Social Development Information System (SIDESO, n.d.). The locality’s population is 7,986 inhabitants: of which 62.54 % of the population lives in independent houses, 30.10 % in apartments in buildings, and 3.62 % in dwellings within neighborhoods. The population with access to public health services is 50.84%, and that without is 47.67%. Housing with access to sewage services corresponds to 98.70 %, of which 82.77 % have piped water services inside the house, and 16.09 % have piped water inside the property they live in. In this locality, only 8.42 % of the dwellings have roofs made of light, natural, or precarious materials. Case “A” has a level II academic performance, according to PLANEA tests, whose tabulation is level I: 30 %, level II: 43 %, level III 10: % and level IV: 18 % (SEP, 2017) .

The day secondary school “B” is located in a colonia with a “very high” degree of marginalization. The population is 64,312 inhabitants; homes with access to drainage services occupy 96.21 %; 57.46 % have piped water services inside the home, and 38.25 % have water inside the property where they live. In addition, 31.41% of the houses have roofs made of light, natural, or precarious materials. 84.77% of the population in the neighborhood lives in independent houses, 6.79% in apartments in buildings, and 2.31% in housing within neighborhoods (SIDESO, n.d.). The population with access to public health services comprises only 34.86%, and the majority, that is, 65%, are not entitled to them.

The neighborhood in which case “B” is located presents different social problems and therefore represents one of the three localities with the highest levels of risk in Iztapalapa: the presence of criminal organizations, the incidence of criminal violence, crime, and governance problems. Between 2015 and 2019, the colony was one of the three in the Iztapalapa municipality in which the highest number of family violence crimes were reported. Between 2016 and 2020, the colony also stood out for concentrating crimes of rape, femicide, harassment, and sexual abuse (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2021). The Iztapalapa Risk Map 2018 identified that several serious illicit actions take place in this colony, such as executions, assaults, and drug dealing (Lantia Intelligence, 2018).

The academic performance of the students in this case was placed in the lowest level of the PLANEA tests, namely, level I: 74 %, level II: 25 %, level III: 2 %, and no student in level IV (SEP, 2017). The research considers that the socioeconomic differences of the localities and the socializing agents with whom adolescents relate encourage different ways of understanding reality, among others, around the importance and exercise of citizenship. The study prioritized obtaining a sample of the largest possible number of third-grade students, considering that they are those who are close to concluding basic education, while a smaller sample of second and first-grade students was recovered to compare the differences in thinking between them.

In school “A” a sample of 25 first-grade students was recovered out of a population of 172 (5.01 %); 44 second-grade students, out of a total of 166 (8.82 %), and 93 third-grade students, out of a total of 161 (18.64 %). In school “B” a sample of 36 first-grade adolescents was obtained out of a total of 262 (5 %); 28 second-grade students, out of a total of 264 (3.6 %), and 97 third-grade students, out of a total of 259 (12.4 %).

RESULTS

In order to know the importance that students assign to the competencies related to the knowledge and exercise of citizenship, they were asked how significant the FCE subject is compared to others, such as Spanish, mathematics, and history. In general, the picture is not very optimistic since, on average, only 37% of the total are completely convinced that it has a similar importance. There are important differences between the cases, since in case “A”, 43% of the adolescents consider FCE to be as important as others, and in case “B”, only 31% are convinced.

The highest percentage of students, that is, 50% in both cases, are not completely convinced that the competencies and skills developed in this subject have the same importance as those encouraged by other subjects. The option “disagree” was chosen by 11 % of the students in case “B” and only 2 % in case “A”. The lack of importance that students assign to this subject constitutes an impediment for them to internalize citizenship competencies. The differences between cases suggest that the negative influence of the extracurricular environment is greater in case “B”.

The students were then asked how they would react to a crime or abuse and what they think their father, mother, and friends would do. The results indicate that the influence of the socializing agents has a greater negative charge in case “B”. Regarding what their father would do in case of a crime, in case “A”, 75% of the students believe that

he would denounce and in case “B” only 58%. Students who think that their father would only report if the crime affected him were 22% in case “A” and, on the other hand, 31% in case “B”. Although the lowest percentage of the population in both cases chose the option “would not care and would pretend not to see”, in case “A” this response obtained 3% of the total, and in case “B” it amounted to 8%.

Regarding the mother’s influence, in case “A”, 71% of the students believe that she would report a crime or abuse, while only 63% in case “B”. It is necessary to mention that, for this case, a directly proportional relationship is observed between the increase in the responses in the option “I would report no matter who it is” and the school career, both in the father and in the mother; in comparison with the case “A”, the influence of both on reporting is lower. And in both cases, 23% of the students believe that their mother would only report if the crime or abuse affects her. The percentage of students in case “B” who believe that their mother would not care and would pretend not to see (8 %) was higher than in case “A” (5 %).

As for how the adolescents believe their friends would react to witnessing a crime, the picture became somewhat discouraging. The results show that the peer group has a greater negative influence: in both cases, only 38% believe that their friends would report a crime. While in case “A”, 44% believe that their friends would only report if the crime affected them, in case “B”, 37% chose this option. Those who indicated, in case “A”, that their friends “would not care and would pretend not to see” reached 18%, while in case “B”, 20%. The influence within the peer group is opposite to that of the educational institution and even, to a large extent, to that of the parents.

Knowing that the institution denounces, when the students were asked what they would do, in terms of denouncing any crime or abuse, only 72% of the adolescents in case “A” affirmed that they would denounce, and 65% in case “B”. In this question, an inversely proportional relationship is observed between the percentage of students who would report a crime and the school career in case “A”, which suggests that the influence of the extracurricular environment influences their thinking with greater weight than the school. On the contrary, in case “B” the percentage of students who said they would report a crime increased proportionally to their school career, so in this case, it would seem that the influence of the school was able to bring about a favorable change in their thinking, although perhaps not enough.

Adolescents who would only report a crime or abuse if it affected them accounted for 23% in case “A” and 21% in case “B”, while those who said they would not care and would pretend not to see it accounted for 5% in case “A” and 8% in case “B”. In general, about 30% of the student body is not convinced that reporting is the best alternative.

The third question addressed was the type of influence that adolescents perceive from their parents and friends on the motives for voting for a political party or candidate, as well as those they would consider appropriate. In case “A”, 47% of adolescents believe that their father would vote for the “best government program” and, in case “B”, only 33% chose that option. The results of both cases coincide in that 41 % of the students believe their father would vote for the party or candidate that “provides social supports”. Only 1 % of the students in case “A” believe that their father would vote for the one who “offers money or gifts”, while in case “B” this option obtained 7 %. In addition, those who affirmed that their father does not mind voting reached 10 % in case “A” and 17 % in case “B”.

As for the mother’s influence, 43% of adolescents in case “A” believe that they would vote for the best government program, and, in case “B”, only 34%. The results in both cases were similar among students who affirmed that their mother would vote for the party or candidate who “provides social support” (43 %), and also in the option “offers money or gifts” (5 %). In case “A”, 11% believe that their mother does not mind voting, and in case “B”, 14%. In short, the greatest influence that parents exert on students’ thinking is voting for whoever provides social support.

Regarding the peer group, only a quarter of the students in both cases believe that their friends would vote for the best government program. Twenty-six percent of adolescents in both cases believe that their friends would vote for the party or candidate who provides social support. The differences between cases are observed in that, in case “A”, students consider it more likely that their friends do not mind voting and, in case “B”, that they are more likely to vote based on the offer of money or gifts. While the school tries to get adolescents to critically analyze electoral options, parental influence tends to privilege social supports, and the peer group increases the likelihood of not voting or voting for whoever offers money or gifts.

When students were asked what influences them to vote for a party or candidate, 49% of adolescents in case “A” expressed that they would vote for the best government program, while in case “B” only 38% chose that option. Students in both cases mentioned that they could vote for whoever provides social support (38%), and those who, in case “A” indicated that they would vote for whoever offers money or gifts was only 5%; but it went up to 12% in case “B”. Finally, students who indicated that they were not interested in voting were 8% in case “A” and 11% in case “B”.

The students' responses regarding the reasons they consider for casting their vote show how different influences affect their thinking: the school in 44% of those who would vote for the best government program, parents in 38% who mainly consider social supports, the peer group in 8% who state that they would vote based on the offer of money or gifts, and 9% who express that they do not care about voting. The results suggest that the greatest types of influence that are appreciated are that of the educational institution and that of the parents. They also indicate that the out-of-school context that takes place in case "B", as well as the socializing agents with whom the adolescents interact, procure and encourage a much more negative influence that causes perceptible differences in thinking.

DISCUSSION

The above results show that differences external to the school context, as well as the socializing agents with whom adolescents interact, encourage different perspectives on reality. In particular, the influence on citizenship can be seen. Socioeconomic limitations and social problems hinder the insertion of citizens in the public-political sphere from the point of view that they give rise to attitudes, ideas, and opinions opposed to those that the educational institution tries to develop. It is also observed that there is a set of subjective predispositions that develop within social subgroups, which constrain people's perceptions and are reproduced, up to a certain limit, through social interaction.

However, by no means was it intended to affirm that there is a linear development or that social origin determines the thinking or destiny of adolescents, but rather that the set of influences that surround them procures and legitimizes a certain perspective of thinking. The construction of individual thought is a highly complex process, and students should be encouraged to interact with different agents that encourage and legitimize divergent conceptions, and from there, a progressive or sudden change in their attitudes and opinions may occur.

Perceptions of reality are constructed and maintained through social interaction, and, on this occasion, the data collected suggest that the struggle for constructing attitudes, knowledge, and citizenship opinions takes place between the educational institution and the parents or guardians. In this research, the adolescents studying in case "B" showed that the limitations in their living conditions, parents, peer group, and social problems that surround them negatively influence their thinking.

Additionally, there is a need to seek alternative strategies to encourage a set of attitudes, opinions, and knowledge that seek the development of citizenship in society, which contribute to the competencies encouraged by educational institutions to find a place in the out-of-school context. In this task, the support and involvement of democratic institutions, including political parties, the powers of the Union, and electoral institutions at the local and national levels, is essential. The dissemination or public communication of science is an alternative that apparently has little development in the social sciences.

The exact sciences carry out, under the denomination of scientific popularization or public communication of science, a set of activities (papers, stories, workshops, videos, among others) with the purpose of encouraging the knowledge or progress of their disciplines in the non-specialized public. Broadly speaking, the task of popularization consists of reconstructing knowledge or scientific progress that is generated within a specialized field and presenting it to the non-specialist public in a common and understandable language.

The aim is not to turn citizens into specialists, but to bring them closer to knowledge that can be of practical use in their daily lives. Thus, the aim is to democratize science by integrating the citizenry into decision-making. Thus, political science and other social sciences can contribute greatly to the development of democracy to the extent that they make available to citizens different knowledge of practical use in public decision-making.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings highlight the importance of directing greater attention and resources to citizenship education. In particular, they highlight the need to sensitize students, parents, and social agents to the importance of issues related to the construction of an autonomous, strong citizenship committed to social change. Thus, it is evident that the consolidation of processes in students depends on the active participation of all the agents of the educational process, both endogenous and exogenous.

The social sciences must make use of strategies for citizenship education and scientific dissemination. Tools such as elaborating and disseminating short texts with a common language, organizing workshops for specific audiences, or publishing informative messages in digital media can encourage the development of knowledge and citizenship skills. The support of various public and academic institutions is also essential to carry out this task

The development of citizenship in adolescents: The struggle between the influence of the Family, the peer group and the public school since it is necessary to create spaces that receive, publish, and disseminate materials with the aim of encouraging different types of knowledge. Based on the results obtained, responsible citizenship and its adequate representation, the exercise of rights, forms, and mechanisms of social and political participation, and the functioning of democracy, among others, could be promoted.

REFERENCES

- Anjaria, K. (2022). Knowledge derivation from Likert scale using Z-numbers. *Information Sciences*, 590, 234-252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2022.01.024>
- Aristeidou, M., Herodotou, C., Ballard, H., Young, A., Miller, A., Higgins, L., y Johnson, R. (2021). Exploring the participation of young citizen scientists in scientific research: The case of iNaturalist. *Plos one*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245682>
- Bañales, J., Hope, E., Rowley, S., y Cryer-Coupet, Q. (2021). Raising justice-minded youth: Parental ethnic-racial and political socialization and Black youth's critical consciousness. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(4), 964-986. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12486>
- Bedock, C., y Pilet, J. (2020). Who Supports Citizens Selected by Lot to be the Main Policymakers? A Study of French Citizens. *Government and Opposition*, 56(3), 485 - 504. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2020.1>
- Berger, P., y Luckmann, T. (2003). *La construcción social de la realidad*. Amorrortu.
- Bourdieu, P. (2007). *El sentido práctico*. Siglo XXI Editores.
- Buchholz, B., DeHart, J., y Moorman, G. (2020). Digital Citizenship During a Global Pandemic: Moving Beyond Digital Literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 64(1), 11-17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1076>
- Chiba, M., Sustarsic, M., Perriton, S., y Edwards Jr., D. (2021). Investigating effective teaching and learning for sustainable development and global citizenship: Implications from a systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102337>
- Cortés-Cediel, M., Cantador, I., y Bolívar, M. (2021). Analyzing Citizen Participation and Engagement in European Smart Cities. *Social Science Computer Review*, 39(4), 592-626. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439319877478>
- Durkheim, E. (2003). *Educación y Sociología*. Ediciones Península.
- Esau, M., Rondganger, C., y Roman, N. (2019). Family Political Socialisation and its Effect on Youth Trust in Government: A South African Perspective. *Politikon*, 46(1), 122-137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02589346.2018.1525927>
- Estellés, M., y Fischman, G. (2021). Who Needs Global Citizenship Education? A Review of the Literature on Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 72(2), 223-236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487120920254>
- Ghosn-Chelala, M. (2020). Global citizenship education in conflict-affected settings: Implications of teachers' views and contextual challenges for the Lebanese. case. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103078>
- Hickey, A., y Pauli-Myler, T. (2019). The constraints of youth: young people, active citizenship and the experience of marginalisation. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 40(3), 372-385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2017.1351920>
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI). (2021) *Promedio de escolaridad de la población de 15 años y más de acuerdo con el Censo de Población y vivienda 2020*. México: Comunicado de prensa no. 24/21. https://www.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/saladeprensa/boletines/2021/EstSociodemo/ResultCenso2020_Nal.pdf
- Instituto Nacional Electoral (INE), Colegio de México (COLMEX). (2015). *Informe País sobre la Calidad de la Ciudadanía en México*, México.

- Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación (INEE). (2019). *La educación obligatoria en México. Informe 2019*, INEE, México: INEE. https://www.inee.edu.mx/medios/informe2019/stage_02/index.html
- Jara, C., Sánchez, M., Cox, C., y Montecinos, M. (2021). Socialización política y formación ciudadana en el contexto escolar chileno: un análisis desde el enfoque de género. *Calidad en la educación*(54). <https://doi.org/10.31619/caledu.n54.932>
- Jebb, A., Ng, V., y Tay, L. (2021). A Review of Key Likert Scale Development Advances: 1995–2019 . *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.637547>
- Kuhn, D., Feliciano, N., y Kostikina, D. (2019). Engaging Contemporary Issues as Practice for Citizenship. *The Social Studies* , 110(5), 207-219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2019.1625856>
- Kymlicka, W. (2003). *La política vernácula: nacionalismo, multiculturalismo y ciudadanía*. Paidós.
- Lantia Intelligence. (2018). *Mapa de riesgos Iztapalapa 2018*, México. <https://lantiaintelligence.com/storage/document/9/Mapa%20de%20riesgos%20Iztapalapa%202018,%20Lantia%20Intelligence.pdf>
- Larson, L., Cooper, C., Futch, S., . . y Takekawa, J. (2020). The diverse motivations of citizen scientists: Does conservation emphasis grow as volunteer participation progresses? *Biological Conservation*, 242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108428>
- Lee, Y., y Schachter, H. (2019). Exploring the Relationship between Trust in Government and Citizen Participation. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 42(5), 405-416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2018.1465956>
- María, L., Aliagas, C., y Rutten, K. (2022). Youth's literary socialisation practices online: A systematic review of research. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2022.100628>
- Matas, A. (2018). Diseño del formato de escalas tipo Likert: un estado de la cuestión. *Revista electrónica de investigación educativa*, 20(1), 38-47. <https://doi.org/10.24320/redie.2018.20.1.1347>
- Mindus, P. (2014). *Hacia una teoría funcionalista de la ciudadanía* . Marcial Pons.
- Narmaditya, B., y Wibowo, A. (2021). Family economic education, peer groups and students' entrepreneurial intention: the mediating role of economic literacy. *Heliyon*, 7(4), e06692. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06692>
- Neshkova, M., y Kalesnikaitė, V. (2019). Corruption and citizen participation in local government: Evidence from Latin America. *Governance*, 32(4), 677-693. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12401>
- Oficina de las Naciones Unidas contra la Droga y el Delito (México). (2021). *Reporte Iztapalapa 2021. Enfoque de la gobernanza de la seguridad en los entornos urbanos para ciudades seguras, inclusivas y resilientes*, México: Naciones Unidas.
- Piaget, J. (1964). *Seis Estudios de Psicología*, España, Editorial Labor.
- Piaget, J. (2014). *Seis estudios de psicología*. Labor.
- Plan Nacional para la Evaluación de los aprendizajes (PLANEA). (2017). Resultados PLANEA México: SEP. <http://168.255.121.151/PLANEA/Resultados2017/Basica2017/R17baCCTGeneral.aspx>
- Roche, J., Bell, L., Galvão, C., . . y Taraba, P. (2020). Citizen Science, Education, and Learning: Challenges and Opportunities. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2020.613814>
- Ruiz, A., y Herrera, M. (2021). El desafío de la formación ciudadana: reflexiones a partir de una experiencia de acompañamiento escolar. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 26. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782021260004>

- The development of citizenship in adolescents: The struggle between the influence of the Family, the peer group and the public school
- Saud, M. (2020). Civic engagement, youth socialisation and participation in public spheres in Indonesia. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 119, 105669. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chidyouth.2020.105669>
- Schmidhuber, L., Piller, F., Bogers, M., y Hilgers, D. (2019). Citizen participation in public administration: investigating open government for social innovation. *R&D Management*, 49(3), 343-355. <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12365>
- Secretaría de Educación Pública (SEP). (2011). *Programas de estudio 2011 Guía Para El Maestro*, Educación Básica Secundaria, Formación Cívica Y Ética, México: SEP.
- Simonofski, A., Vallé, T., Serral, E., y Wautelet, Y. (2021). Investigating context factors in citizen participation strategies: A comparative analysis of Swedish and Belgian smart cities. *International Journal of Information Management*, 56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.09.007>
- Sistema de Información del Desarrollo Social (SIDESO). (s.f.). México: Secretaría de Inclusión y Bienestar Social. <http://www.sideso.cdmx.gob.mx/index.php?id=63>
- Terriquez, V., Villegas, R., Villalobos, R., y Xu, J. (2020). The political socialization of Latinx youth in a conservative political context. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2020.101188>
- Vygotsky, L. (2000). *El desarrollo de los procesos psicológicos superiores*. Crítica.
- Wahlund, M., y Palm, J. (2022). The role of energy democracy and energy citizenship for participatory energy transitions: A comprehensive review. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.102482>
- Walker, D., Smigaj, M., y Tani, M. (2021). The benefits and negative impacts of citizen science applications to water as experienced by participants and communities. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1488>
- Wamsler, C., Alkan-Olsson, J., Björn, H., . . . y Zelmerlow, F. (2020). Beyond participation: when citizen engagement leads to undesirable outcomes for nature-based solutions and climate change adaptation. *Climatic Change*, 158, 235-254. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-019-02557-9>
- Wehn, U., y Almomani, A. (2019). Incentives and barriers for participation in community-based environmental monitoring and information systems: A critical analysis and integration of the literature. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 101, 341-357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2019.09.002>
- Weiss, J. (2020). What Is Youth Political Participation? Literature Review on Youth Political Participation and Political Attitudes. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2020.00001>

FUNDING

This paper is part of a doctoral research project for which we received a full-time scholarship from the National College of Humanities, Sciences and Technologies (CONAHCYT)

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION

Conceptualization: Luis Antonio Ramírez Montes.

Formal analysis: Luis Antonio Ramírez Montes.

Research: Luis Antonio Ramírez Montes.

Methodology: Luis Antonio Ramírez Montes.

Writing - original draft: Luis Antonio Ramírez Montes.

Writing - revision and editing: Luis Antonio Ramírez Montes.