

# ΣΟΦΙΑ—SOPHIA

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18634/sophiaj.16v.1i.874>

## Literacy in Coexistence and Citizenship. A Documentary Review of Citizenship Education for the Resolution of Violence and Sociocultural Conflicts

Alfabetização em convivência e cidadania. Uma revisão  
documental da educação do cidadão para a resolução  
da violência e dos conflitos socioculturais

### Article information

Received: October 09, 2018

Revised: June 14, 2019

Accepted: Dec 12, 2019

### How to cite:

Garcés, VH (2020) Literacy in citizen coexistence. A documentary review of citizenship education for the resolution of violence and sociocultural conflicts. *Sophia* 16 (1), 4-18.

**VÍCTOR HUGO GARCÉS**

Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas, Bogotá,  
Cundinamarca, Colombia.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2185-5177>

[vhgarcés.edu@gmail.com](mailto:vhgarcés.edu@gmail.com)



ISSN (electronic): 2346-0806 ISSN (printed): 1794-8932



UNIVERSIDAD  
La Gran Colombia

Founded in 1951

Sophia-Education, volume 16 number 1. January / June 2020. English version

## **SUMMARY**

**This article explores the relationships between citizenship training and school coexistence. Based on a documentary tracking, the trends that guide the research on this relationship were defined. As a result of this qualitative methodology, of an interpretative nature, it was possible to trace the different approaches that address education in citizen coexistence.**

**Keywords: Citizenship, citizenship education, school coexistence, school violence, conflict processing.**

## **RESUMO**

**Este artigo explora as relações entre treinamento em cidadania e vida escolar. Com base em um rastreamento documental, foram definidas as tendências que norteiam a pesquisa sobre essa relação. Como resultado dessa metodologia qualitativa, interpretativa, foi possível traçar as diferentes abordagens que abordam a educação na coexistência do cidadão.**

**Palavras-chave: Cidadania, educação para a cidadania, vida escolar, violência escolar, gestão de conflitos.**

## Introduction

In general, school coexistence and citizenship training have been studied separately. It is common for coexistence in school to be understood as a social problem that affects school settings, while citizenship is understood as a legal status that allows participation in state policy. It is common to find studies that are concerned with the ways of massively constituting a subject who knows how to relate to the State and other citizens based on pre-established ethics and / or morals. It is common to understand school violence as a type of conflictive relationship, resulting from the bad habits of students. But, it is very unusual to find comprehensive advances in the encounter, in the school environment, of these two phenomena.

And, hence, in the existing literature, the relationship between the school that educates in coexistence and citizenship is absent. Mentions of citizenship education in school coexistence studies are almost nil, while allusions of coexistence are frequent in research on school citizenship, and, few treaties on this relationship. The ways of relating these two educational phenomena have not been clearly stipulated.

Therefore, it is not the interest of this text to carry out a state of the art of studies on school violence or citizenship training, but rather a trace of practical research that investigates citizenship training in Colombia and mentions school coexistence. Showing that practical studies of citizen training and school violence, the effect of the factual articulation of the two phenomena, allows us to trace the trajectories of research in citizen coexistence. From there, the trends, approaches and paradigms that delineate the panorama of this relationship can be interpretively reconstructed.

## Historical and Retrospective Approaches to School Education in Citizen Coexistence

From a first trend, it is identified that addressing training in citizenship and coexistence from a historical scope, has set the tone for a reconstruction of the ways in which it has been understood from the educational policy, and how it has materialized in the institutions. Both the approaches that define the variables that have determined the design and materialization of this educational practice, as well as the analyzes that seek to identify the characteristics of the historical substrate of educational innovations on the subject, have been interested in defining what the school has done to form citizen coexistence.

Hence, a first perspective identifies that the design of educational policies on citizenship and coexistence in Colombia depended on the contextual power relations of each era (López, 1994; Herrera *et. Al*, 2005; Pinilla, 2006; Caballero, 2015). The history of Colombian political struggles went through and influenced "the way in which educational public policies are designed and implemented" (Caballero, 2015, p.105). Each political group, which has held power throughout history, conceived an approach of what the citizen should be, an image of how citizenship training would be carried out and guidelines for what the projects should be of democracy and coexistence at school.

Thus, the teaching of civic and coexistence values was, in a first period, the result of the historical struggle of Colombian political groups. It was found that, during this period, as a consequence of the dispute between civic-religious formation and secular civic culture, linked to conservative and liberal governments, educational policies in this regard were consecutively designed, repealed or redesigned. The dispute continues between the religious approach, focused on the impulse and the defense

of Catholic doctrine, and, the layperson, interested in training in citizen commitments conducive to participation and the high degree of knowledge of the functioning of the political system marked each educational reform made to education in citizen coexistence and each implementation period since the dawn of the republic until the end of the 20th century (Sáenz, 1988; Sabato, 1997; Valencia, Cañón & Molina, 2012; Caballero, 2015).

As a result of this bipolarized political culture, "a difficulty was generated to consolidate a strong and organized civil society" (Caballero, 2015, p.103). Authoritarian, hierarchical, paternalistic and intolerant state projects, which denied conflict and cultural differences, prevented the design of a citizen educational policy that would supply the need to strengthen citizenship and public virtues. During these periods, education did not offer an alternative to the inadequate treatment of cultural differences nor did it influence the violent mentality that solved conflicts with force. Nor did it combat the apathy towards political participation that the authoritarian practices of political parties spread in society, the instrumentalization of interaction with the State and the manipulation of social interest groups. Despite the fact that, in the country, at the beginning of the 20th century, it was proposed that "training should focus on peaceful coexistence and not on partisan education based on hatred towards the opponent" (Saldarriaga and Sáenz, 1999, p. 84), during this last period, citizens did not learn to recognize and adequately deal with cultural and political conflicts.

From this perspective, this historical reality is capable of being traced both in the progress of official texts (Muñoz, 2013), and in normative changes (Caballero, 2015). On the one hand, each book offered to teachers, to guide their civic and civic teaching practices, contains a historical discourse generated by a specific socio-political

context. In each analysis and subsequent contrast with the fields of application of these contextual discursivities, there is the delimitation and reconstruction of the moments of discursive change. While, on the other hand, the regulations and educational guidelines show the influence of periods of party hegemony and their impact on the repeal of the principles of the previous supremacy. Comparing the historical periods that the country's politics has lived with the laws and educational documents, it is possible to recognize the continuities, displacements, annulments and permanence of the doctrines of formation of citizenship and coexistence.

And yet, in the middle of the second half of the 20th century, says Caballero (2015), a new political actor entered this struggle: the pedagogical movement. The teachers became builders and diffusers of alternative proposals. They opened, from their political work, the space for participation and the construction of citizenship. From their social function they began to create, spread and enable reflection on new ideas; From their intellectual role, they sowed doubts and uncertainties (Cárdenas and Boada, 1999). In addition to instructing in "specialized, political (inputs) and administrative (outputs) orientations" (Almond and Verba, 1993, p.190), they began to promote a civic culture. They made an effort to complement the construction of a participatory culture consistent with the structural norms and the promotion of a citizen who feels involved and becomes an active part of politics. He will act rationally, guided by reason and not by feeling; and, kept informed of the multiple worldviews, in order to be able to make decisions -for example, on the way to vote- according to a meticulous calculation of the benefits and principles that he wishes to see favored (Almond and Verba, 1993).

Hence, a similar perspective affirms that the educational policy imposed had to come into conflict with the power relations that the school contains. The movements

against hegemonics, unusual practices and new educational experiences began to enter into opposition or reinforcement dynamics, both with the implementation of state educational policies and with traditional educational practices. The old authoritarian, vertical and exclusive practices began to be confronted with innovative forms and processes that, within the school setting, allowed to resolve conflictive relationships and establish their own ways of self-government. Some teachers, resisting the imposed visions, began to build democratic experiences that opposed the promotion of submissive citizens, committed to politics only with functional participation and the exercise of voting.

Guerra (2008) affirms that, with these transformations, they began to move from a hierarchical school political culture, expressed in silence, order, composure, obedience and submission, to a more democratic expression. In some school spaces, there was a transition to a school system that began to make visible and solve conflicts, to recognize opinions, differences and divergences. They began to arbitrate antagonistic interests, to build their own rules and laws, to recognize multiculturalism and to oppose intolerance. While in other instrumental democratic environments they continued to settle the conflictive relationships with the adjustment of society and those subject to compliance and compliance with the rules and laws of others and imposed hegemonically.

The new practices, promoted by the pedagogical movement, began to generate, in some spaces, the conditions to facilitate access to a solid, strong and critical political formation (Guerra, 2008). These projects began to promote participation processes based on public deliberation and the construction of a more representative school leadership. As a result of this commitment, practices of educational resistance that founded new forms and ways of approaching school administration and administrative organization materialized. School environments of coexistence and citizenship

that allowed providing political status to the school actors were built.

From this point of view, it is suggested to trace the history of the pedagogical trace in citizen coexistence from the recognition of the struggle for educational policy carried out by pedagogical movements and its relationship with the current palimpsest of their school practices (Martín, 2004). It thus becomes pertinent to ask how the policies imposed as well as the struggles and achievements of teacher resistance have influenced the ways in which educated citizens designed initiatives and participated in educational innovations in citizenship and coexistence. But it is also important to visit the schools and reconstruct the evolutionary processes of the non-violent citizen training projects, from the decoding of the discursive influences in the different accumulated substrates. Capture their structures, interpret their purposes, recognize their intentions. Trace the cartography of their manifestations. Then, reconstruct the history to which it has been subjected: its blurs, overlaps, continuities, displacements and replacements. This, in order to be able to define their state, their traditions and their trajectories.

Now, a somewhat inverse perspective, affirms that it is not the educational policy nor the opposition to these, which is responding to the demand of the subjects who face change, become participants in the decisions and become aware of the equal rights and the need for peaceful coexistence. It is the innovative experiences proposed by teachers and educational institutions that are responding to the educational change that socio-cultural conditions are demanding. It is the school circumstances that began to force the creation of educational social spaces that have been facilitating learning and the exercise of the capacity for dialogue and debate necessary to solve the diversity of conflicts that affect society (Puig and Morales, 2010).



For this perspective, beyond instruction, the school has been metamorphosing into an environment that teaches for life, citizenship and coexistence. As a result of their conditions, they have become school environments that favor development and social progress through the promotion of participation, cohesion and peace (Barcena, 1996). Innovative projects have begun to emerge in them that have been constituting educational institutions in a space suitable for living and practicing democracy and coexistence. They have begun to enable democratic spaces that have been developing skills, abilities and attitudes that contribute "to forming democrats, determined to resolve conflicts peacefully through dialogue, negotiation and cooperation on the basis of mutual respect" (UNESCO preface, published in Harber, 1997).

Hence, for this perspective, reconstructing the real educational policy is more a task of founded theory than of cataloguing or locating the experiences with respect to the place they occupy in normative history. It is due to identify the most innovative educational projects; to then codify the conceptions and actions that guide them in a categorical framework that allows to account for the concepts, processes and practices advanced. This will allow "to know in greater depth the way in which this initiative has been developing and to establish the links between it" (Puig and Morales, 2010, p.36) and to build a general historical testimony of how a given society is taking distance from political apathy and conflictive relations.

The teaching of citizen coexistence: from the teaching of knowledge and cognitive processes to the appropriation of democratic logic in school scenarios. A second tradition has been interested both in the investigation of the duty to be of education in citizen coexistence and in the didactic design of its consequent processes and educational scenarios. It has been framed in a critical approach to the ways in which traditional education has solved education in coexistence and citizenship, and then, then, propose new pedagogical models.

In this context, a first approach affirms that the materialization of training in citizen coexistence should not be simple civic and behavioral instruction. It also implies a cultural change in the way we live and interact in society (including with the State). The teaching of peaceful coexistence and political participation must not only impart cognitive content and procedures, but is also expected to recognize, in the curriculum, social complexity, the exercise of social conflicts, individual violations and the precariousness of the precepts. At the same time, it develops citizen habits and customs that promote the acceptance of the existence of individual and singular diversity, of the multiplicity of identities and personalities, of the different ways of understanding reality and of the multiple roles that are adopted in society (Huertas, 2016).

From this approach, the student must not only acquire knowledge and cognitive, critical and contextualized processes in the classroom, but also must learn to participate citizenly in the construction of school coexistence, while extending these behaviors to extracurricular areas. It is assured, then, that, in order to train the new generations in coexistence and citizenship, at first it is possible to instruct in the discussions, conflicts and crisis situations that may arise and that make it possible to open closed identities. Then, the learner must put into practice, both in scenarios such as the mediation of school conflicts and in their usual school relationships, the techniques and procedures learned, to subsequently use these logics, through everyday life, in the reconstruction of the social and community fabric.

However, from another approach, it is affirmed that, based on school stimuli, printed by the educational experience and / or intersubjective dynamics in school contexts, the senses of citizen coexistence can be reflected in the discursive consciousness of the subject. In environments of education and intercultural coexistence, the influence of teaching on subjectivity allows students to accept, or not, the difference (Fernández, 2003). This, as a result of the schooled subjects, always exposed to the intersubjectivity designed by the curriculum, can learn to coexist in diversity.

Hence, from this perspective, it is stated that education in citizenship and coexistence should be responsible for promoting scenarios of subjective otherness, either from teaching or from school experience (Muñoz *et al.*, 2014). It would be the duty of the school to encourage subjective discourses, which are more or less shared: the notions of citizen duty and the appropriation of cultural diversity. As well as creating and promoting scenarios of learning and intercultural and differential dialogue, which achieve the recognition of the cultural and subjective other. In short, to recognize the intercultural and citizen difference from coexistence and agreements with the cultural other.

Finally, in the final approach, it affirms that training in and for citizen coexistence must be based on education for Peace. Peaceful coexistence must be achieved with a cultural change promoted mainly by the school. The passage of a culture of violent resolution of social, cultural and political conflicts must go through not only the coexistence of knowledge, values, representations and opinions in the schooled curriculum, but also through the construction and constitution of habits and customs related to coexistence in peace.

This pedagogy for peace would suppose an educational process crossed not only by teaching

and recreation of contents appropriate to the construction or stimulation of cognitive and communicative processes, but also by the participation of spaces for discussion and the definition of initiatives in the face of these political dimensions (Bogoya & Santana, 2013, p.27). That is, on the one hand, it would be instructed in the capacity to treat conflicts while, on the other, scenarios of "cultural negotiation" would be experienced.

Thus, students, in the classroom, in the first instance, would develop a series of cognitive abilities: "learning for individuation, learning from the different, learning for transformative action, learning to learn, learning from conflict, learning to change in the midst of change, learning to empower oneself by producing knowledge" (Bogoya and Santana, 2013, p.26). While, in school scenarios designed by the teacher, they would advance negotiations between cultures and mediations between "senses, representations, technical knowledge, institutionalities and the internal logic of learning" (p.26).

Hence, this perspective insists on the idea that to train in citizenship should go beyond, on the one hand, the simple fact of learning content, and, on the other, the restriction of student citizen participation to the performance of protocol acts, such as the election of the student representative. It affirms that it is necessary, then, to articulate these educational practices, with processes and spaces that are experienced and participatory, that allow you to apprehend the logics and democratic and convivial instruments, while building a cultural and peaceful coexistence in the school environment.

### **From the School to the Educating City: Participatory Citizenship and the Collective Construction of Coexistence**

For this last tradition, the construction of school citizen coexistence must be articulated with the educational efforts of the context. It is

necessary to combine different pedagogical strategies of training in citizenship and coexistence, in and for different areas of daily life. It is no longer enough just for the school to teach content and design learning scenarios, it is also necessary that students, as citizens, complement what they have learned in the classrooms by participating in spaces of public management and construction of the social fabric.

Thus, from the perspective of the team Institute for Pedagogy, Peace and Urban Conflict Ipazud (2009) it is affirmed that the school must weave a culture of difference and law that extends to society. It is necessary, from the school, to build and extend a series of democratic habits that guarantee both the enforceability of rights and the practice of tolerance and cultural diversity in all areas of life. Learners must learn to understand and practice the participation of public policy design spaces as tools for the defense of rights and the guarantee of State obligations. At the same time, they must assimilate the necessary capacities to recognize differences, solve conflicts and live in coexistence and peace. For this approach, it is not enough to learn citizen coexistence in school, we must also strengthen the public culture that crosses it and expands to the extracurricular environment.

Meanwhile, from another perspective, it is ensured that factual citizenship training, or political education, is learned by building together, living between difference and transforming society both in the school and extracurricular environment (Restrepo et al., 2002). Only by carrying out the permanent exercise of civic virtues, the ethics of service to the community and the practice of participation can the actions, activities and practices of citizen coexistence be acquired and extended to all the roles that are occupied in society. Only with the commitment to the achievement of peaceful coexistence and the protagonism in the political dynamics of all

social life is that the subject in formation can develop the organizational, dialogical and enjoyment capacities of democratic society.

It is affirmed. then, that it is only in doing with others that the practical consciousness of citizens develops (Harber, 1997, Gómez and Cabrera, 2005). The subjects, when meeting and attending the spaces of participation, both school and extracurricular, learn to interact and coexist with the community. By consulting the media and receiving academic speeches, they feed their ethical assessments and refine and appropriate participation in public trials and deliberations. By achieving common goals, both with the educational community and with the society to which they belong, it is that they achieve high levels of community trust. And, by interacting with the school administration, social groups and the State, they learn to transform democratic society.

While, for a final perspective, the subjects acquire cognitive competences both in democratic school life and learning from the educating city (Sáenz, 2007). In this way, the instructive and experienced processes lived in the school are complemented by a series of programs, strategies and events developed in the urban space. In this way, students experience the conditions of construction of urban culture offered by the educating city and articulate them with school scenarios and knowledge, in a permanent pedagogy of citizenship and coexistence. They strengthen the legal dimension of citizenship by being exposed, in both areas, both to the teaching of the objectives of the norms, the knowledge of the ways in which they are built and the appropriate ways of applying them, and to the socialization of the sanctions that entail not complying with them. They appropriate the institutional and political dimension by participating in the mechanisms and ways in which it makes the government and the educational administration represent their reasons, interests and proposals.



And, they learn to participate citizenly in politics, by defining and evaluating policies and reforming norms, both public and school. In such way, they acquire and practice the ability to clarify differences, settle conflicts and enter into government agreements that allow them to live in peace with their conscience and with the law (Mockus, 2001).

## Training in Citizen Coexistence and its Paradigms

Indeed, training in citizen coexistence can be defined as the teaching of knowledge and the development of the skills necessary for the development and promotion of a democratic and peaceful society. It includes both the design of the school system or environment, the mechanisms of mediation, the ways of balancing power relations and practice scenarios, as well as theoretical, technical and procedural knowledge, didactic forms, modes of communication, ways of solving school conflicts and the means of participation in school decisions.

This integral education in coexistence and citizenship is a phenomenon that has emerged from the encounter of the formation of the citizen and of the ways to solve violence and achieve coexistence. Both policies have constituted an integrated learning process that has had multiple materializations in diverse school scenarios. And yet, they also expand their functionality by extending and articulating themselves with the other processes of formation (interest groups, the family, religion, the media, the city that educates...). They are processes of permanent education that start from different designs and come from dissimilar sources, but that are integrated into the reinforcement or modification of mental schemes and daily practices of the student.

It can be traced in two major paradigms of education in citizen coexistence. The first, which starts from the premise of the school is a violent scenario that reflects and is a strategic space for the solution of the social and political violence that the country is

experiencing. It is mainly supported by the psychological vision of citizen education, which seeks to solve the crisis of values and prevent aggressive behaviors. These studies have addressed, from psychology, the treatment of school violence as a psychic and social disorder that oscillate, in levels of severity, between physical aggressions (Abramovay, 2005; Morales et al., 2014; Gamboa, Ort and Mu, 2017), going through the disciplinary conflicts of the classroom (Cubero, 2013), until discursive violence (Murcia, 2005). They have addressed from psychoeducational analysis, indiscipline as a conflictive relationship between the teacher and the student; but it has also found its origin in the relationship between psychological disorders and violent peer behaviors (Álvarez et al., 2012). They have mainly devoted to the study of the elimination of behaviors that alter the educational process (MacKechnie, 1974, Cubero, 2002) and the use of "negative sanctions, referring to punishments, and positive sanctions, if they are rewards" (Stenhouse, 1974, p. 41) in the restriction of the possibility of rejection of norms and indications (Forero, 2012).

But complementarily permeated by the studies of the jurist notion of the citizen That defines citizenship as a status that is acquired at the time of accrediting age to be able to "participate in the administration of justice and in government" (Aristotle, 1997). Although a territory is inhabited before, it is with the recognition of the political-state sphere, as a nationality, that it is integrated as members of the community and is assured of due security (Lechner, 2000), while upon acquiring the age of majority civil, political and social rights and duties are granted that allow participation in the processes of political decision, as a relationship with the State and the political system. Before such maturity, the subject is under the tutelage of the elderly citizens and society (parents, guardians, teachers and the State). They are not allowed to participate in

State decisions; except in cases of consultation or school democratic microsystems, they do not have you or vote in the political system. And yet, it is their responsibility to recognize themselves as members of the nation, to respect authority, hierarchy, and to abide by laws and regulations, among other duties and rights.

Thus, while this status is acquired, children, young people and adolescents must be educated ethically-politically, in order to avoid violent behaviors. They need to learn to act as "beings useful to the family, society and the homeland, who are correct in the way they behave, of good character, of will to always do good, so that they become respectable and respected people in society" (Duarte, 1946, p.17, quoted in Muños, 2013, p. 2019). But, also, to avoid the culture of violence and illegality, minors must be taught (so that they become good citizens in the future) the harmony of their relationships "with their moral convictions, with legal norms and with their cultural identity" (Gómez and Cabrera, 2005, p. 42.).

But, for this paradigm, it is not only necessary for the school to build in the learners' notions of personal and legal moral regulation through the understanding of its objectives, the recognition of its importance and the legitimization of its forms of application. It is also prudent to give importance to the interpersonal cultural regulation at school and after school. Both the educational instructions (included in these, the family, the church, state institutions, the media) and the educating city, through the pedagogical instrumentalization of guilt, recognition and social rejection, should join forces to promote the development of civic culture based on admiration for the law, legal sanction, self-gratification of conscience. The student with the daily exercise of juridical (legal), cultural (collective, variable from context to context) and moral regulation (one's own consciousness) must learn to overcome the difficulties of coexistence (violence and

corruption), to disapprove of the cultural and / or moral of illegal actions and to approve the moral or cultural of legal obligations (Mockus, 2001).

A second paradigm sees the school as a conflictive school environment. It focuses on how the experimentation of the organization, the power relations and the contents of schooling affect the learning and behaviors of students. This approach has been supported by educational psychologists, addressing conflictive and violent relationships between students as a psychosocial phenomenon. The genesis and overcoming of violence in the behavioral influence that exchanges with different environments have on the student's psyche has been found (Lewin, 1936; Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Attention has been paid to how the influence of the school climate generates aggression, exclusion and intimidation (Forero, 2012). Efforts have been put on investigating how to identify, categorize and intervene in situations of bullying (Olweus, 1998, p. 25) and cyberbullying (Ardila, Marín and Pardo, 2014): that is, the study of environmental and social conditions (including those that link subjects through social networks) that allow someone, intentionally, causes harm, injury, or inconvenience to another person.

And yet, this psychological vision is perfected by visions of the citizenship of politics, from where it has been addressed how the emergence of civil society, as minority interest groups, fighting for the recognition of their rights and demands (García, 1995; Young, 1996; Rosaldo, 1998), have shifted the political action of citizens towards new citizenships. Changes in the political environment have stimulated the emergence, on the one hand, of instrumental citizenship: a citizen who "disbelieves in politics and believes in administration" (Lechner, 2000, p.4); and, on the other, it has given the emergence of the citizenization of politics: a mode of political action that describes not so much participation in the political regime "as to the collective

action of citizens" (Lechner, 2000, p.4).

This approach has affirmed that, the citizenship of politics, in turn, has made institutionalized politics no longer represent the computerized verticality of the social pyramid (Lechner, 2000); that citizens, rather than delegating representatives and using consultation channels, prefer to demand solutions to intentionality and to carry out collective actions that make up for their absence. It has generated that minority movements, such as the disabled, do not try to direct the progress of the country or participate in decision-making, but seek to demand an efficient management of the services that the State must provide. However, it has also managed to resize national politics by adapting to international regulations or undergoing the globalized transformations of society. It has produced events such as civil communities, such as human rights defenders, carrying out media actions (such as the advertising reflection of human rights on the Internet), unprecedented, which pressure the national political system to such an extent that it harmonizes its action with the rights inherent in all human beings.

Nevertheless, for this paradigm, the changes in the environment that are happening to institutional politics are now happening to the school environment and school citizenship. Thus, the empowerment, from the State, of a democratic decision-making mechanism (such as school government, participation in the definition of the coexistence manual) and the integration of the right to veto of teachers (MEN, 1989) or institutional opinions under specific conditions (Huertas, 2010) (as is the case of the integration of teacher evaluations or the reinstatement of a student expelled for having long hair), have made hierarchy and authoritarian order a resource less applicable to school power relations. Students with the constitution of an environment of juridicality, promoted by the integration of

human rights to the school, have overcome authoritarian conceptions and the existence of inflexible regulations of the school (MEN, 1989). But, also, it has used its increasing margins of autonomy to fight politically against the disciplined hierarchical system that forms it to obey and act according to the imposed norms (Willis, 1988).

In this way, the citizen exercises of the students and the new pedagogical proposals of visibility and resolution or peaceful and creative processing of school conflicts (MEN, 1989) have displaced the citizen practices of the authoritarian and inflexible regulatory culture (the anti-democratic school climate) (MEN, 1989). Thus, the integration of experiences of school democracy and the recognition and enforceability of rights have allowed students to exercise both an instrumental citizenship, as well as to carry out school political actions typical of the citizenization of politics. Cases such as the arbitration of a directive, the citizen exercise of collective criticism respectful of the way a teacher directs the class, the defense of the listening that the teacher can offer them and the alternatives that can be agreed between all, allows the construction of peace and school political coexistence. While the recognition in the curriculum of the knowledge of a culture different from the majority or of an urban subculture allows teachers and classmates to recognize in the ethnic other both a cultural citizen, minority, and originating from a worldview that has contributed and has to contribute from a multicultural coexistence.

Thus, from this perspective, schooling must not only make the school environment a democratic practice that stimulates change in the social behavior of students, but must also teach the student cognitive schemes that allow him to create epistemological bridges and face various situations of coexistence. Curricula should not only create "epistemological windows" with the minority cultures (Dietz, 2012),

but also, such knowledge would tend to cease to be the object of study, mere programmatic contents (Zafra, 1988; Martínez and Martínez, 1988). The classroom must be a space for the construction of a school and political climate, not a space for repetition. The curriculum must begin to be a space that is democratized both in the civilized coexistence of the diversity of positions and political opinions, and from the coexistence of the various cultural worldviews (Suárez, 1988).

## Conclusion

The above allows us, in the first instance, to have a pedagogical, investigative and proactive panorama of the relationship between citizen training and school coexistence. In the first instance, it sets the tone for addressing the innovative background of education in citizenship and coexistence. Then, it opens the didactic discussion of the approach to the constitution, in the school environment, of a citizen who lives in peace and cultural harmony. It expands the horizon of training in citizen coexistence, which bets on thinking about a theoretical-practical and participatory teaching that extends and articulates with the local political context. Finally, it synthesizes a theoretical substratum that articulated the studies of school violence and the approaches of citizenship in the education of citizen coexistence.

Then, from this documentary tool, it can be inferred, the call for pedagogical innovation of citizen coexistence. It is identified, on the one hand, that citizen training not only has to impart knowledge and disseminate practices necessary to interact with State institutions, but must also include the teaching of ways to exercise citizenship; overcome perspectives that recognize that the subject of politics is only that belonging to the political class; understand political participation in an area of action broader than the simple exercise of the

right to vote, the repetitiveness and enforceability of rights; and, recognize the existence of the new forms of citizenship that are materializing in the school and social scenario. But, also, it is inferred that education in coexistence needs to overcome the perspectives that seek to deny and eliminate social conflict. It needs to integrate positive conflict and design new pedagogical strategies that teach how to rebuild the social fabric and coexist with the other different ones. Design curricula and democratic school and extracurricular environments that allow to build together, from peaceful coexistence and participation in human affairs, a society in peace and just.

And it is from there that the need to deepen the investigation and design new educational models that guarantee adequate training in citizen coexistence emerges. A new field of inquiry and educational innovation that sets the tone to restore the theoretical and practical integrity to these two school phenomena that extend beyond the school scenario. A line of research and practice that promotes new bets to build a permanent pedagogy, which builds and constitutes citizen coexistence from all areas of everyday life. The challenge of thinking and training in integral and multimodal citizen coexistence.

## REFERENCES

- Abramovay, M. (2005). Victimización en las escuelas. Ambiente escolar, robos y agresiones físicas. *Revista mexicana de investigación educativa*, 10(26), 833-864.
- Almond, G. & Verba, S. (1993). La cultura política. In A. Batlle (coord.), *La cultura política. Diez textos básicos de ciencia política* (pp. 171-201). Barcelona, Spain Editorial Ariel.



- Álvarez, D., Menéndez, S., González P. & Rodríguez, C. (2012). Hiperactividad-impulsividad y déficit de atención como predictores de participación en situaciones de violencia escolar. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 12(2), 185-202.
- Ardila, C., Marín, H., & Pardo, S. (2014). Cyberbullying y Facebook: realidad en la virtualidad. *Revista Nodos Y Nudos*, 4(37).
- Aristotle (1997). *La Política (libro III)*. Madrid, Spain: Editorial Centro de Estudios Constitucionales
- Barcena, F. (1996). La formación de la competencia cívica: bases teóricas y conceptuales. *Revista interuniversitaria de formación del profesorado*, (25), 85-101.
- Bogoya, N. & Santana C. (2013). Hacia una pedagogía para la ciudadanía. *Revista Infancias Imágenes*, 5(1), 24-27.
- Cárdenas M. & Boada, M. (1999). El Movimiento Pedagógico 1982-1998. In O. Zuluaga (Main Researcher), *Historia de la Educación en Bogotá. Volume II* (pp. 125-229). Bogotá D. C., Colombia: IDEP
- Caballero, L. (2015). La formación ciudadana en la "Bogotá Humana" (2012-2014) en el contextodelas políticas públicas nacionales de educación. *Revista Ciudad Paz-ando*, 8(2), 101-123. <https://doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.cpaz.2015.2.a06>
- Cubero. C. (2002). Niveles de intervención en el aula para la atención de estudiantes con trastornos de atención. *Actualidades Investigativas en Educación*, 2(1), 0.
- Cubero, C. (2013). Comportamiento docente y disciplina escolar. In María Madrigal (Comp.), *Investigación, reflexión y acción de la realidad socio-educativa a principios del siglo XXI*. Vol. I (pp. 151-172). San Pedro, Costa Rica: INIE Editorial.
- Dietz, G. (2012). Reflexividad y diálogo en etnografía colaborativa: el acompañamiento etnográfico de una institución educativa "intercultural" mexicana. *Revista De Antropología Social*, 21, 63-91.
- Duarte, E. (1946). *Instrucción cívica para la enseñanza primaria*. Bucaramanga, Colombia: Imprenta del departamento de Santander.
- Fernández, M. (2009). *Humanismo para el siglo XXI. Propuesta para el congreso internacional*. Bilbao, Spain: Universidad de Deusto.
- Forero, O. (2012). La violencia escolar como régimen de visibilidad. *Magis, Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación*, 4(8). <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.m4-8.vcep>
- Gamboa, A., Ort, A. & Mu, P. (2017). Violencia en contextos escolares: percepción de docentes sobre manifestaciones de violencia en instituciones educativas en Cúcuta-Norte de Santander. *Revista Psicogente*, 20(37), 89-98. <https://doi.org/10.17081/psico.20.37.2420>
- Gómez, J. & Cabrera, M. (2005). Las competencias ciudadanas en el contexto de Bogotá como ciudad educadora. *Revista Enunciación*, 10(1), 40-46.
- Guerra, L. (2008). Prácticas democráticas en la escuela. *Ciudad Paz-ando*, 1(1), 33-44.
- Harber, C. (1997). *La eficacia de la enseñanza y la educación para la democracia y la no violencia*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Herrera, M., Pinilla, A., Díaz, C. & Infante, R.



- (2005). *La construcción de cultura política en Colombia: proyectos hegemónicos y resistencias culturales*. Bogotá D. C.: UPN.
- Huertas, O. (2010). El Discurso y la práctica de los derechos plenos frente al libre desarrollo de la personalidad en la Escuela. *Revista logos ciencia y tecnología*, 2(1), 10-24. <https://doi.org/10.22335/rlct.v2i1.64>
- Huertas, O. (2016). Incidencia de la educación desde un paradigma complejo en la formación de ciudadanos/as. *Revista Ciudad Paz-ando*, 8(2), 125-139. <https://doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.cpaz.2015.2.a07>
- Ipazud, E. (2009). Derechos y Deberes Ciudadanos: entre la ciudad y la escuela. *Revista Ciudad paz-ando*, 2(2), 79-98.
- Lechner, N. (2000). Nuevas Ciudadanías. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, (5), 25-31. <https://doi.org/10.7440/res5.2000.03>
- Lewin, K. (1936). *Dinámica de la personalidad*. Madrid, Spain: Morata.
- López, F (1994). *Izquierdas y Cultura Política. ¿Oposición Alternativa?* Bogotá: Editorial CINEP
- MackKechnie, William I. (1974). La disciplina en un marco educacional. In Lawrence Stenhouse (Comp.), *La disciplina en la escuela. Orientaciones para la convivencia escolar* (pp. 3-36). Buenos Aires: El Ateneo.
- Martin, J. (2004). Una escuela ciudadana para una ciudad-escuela. *Revista Educación Y Ciudad*, (6), 97-124.
- Martínez, H. & Martínez, E. (1988). Los derechos humanos en la escuela: Infracción continuada. *Revista Educación Y cultura*, 16, 34-37.
- MEN (1989). *Educación en y para la democracia*. Bogotá: Ministry of National Education
- Mockus, A. (2001). Divorcio entre ley, moral y cultura. *Magazín Aula Urbana*, (32), 12-13.
- Morales, M., Álvarez, J. Ayala, A. Ascorra, P. Bilbao, M. & Carrasco, C. (2014). Violencia escolar a profesores: conductas de victimización reportadas por docentes de enseñanza básica. *Revista de Estudios Cotidianos*, 2(2), 91-116.
- Muñoz, M. (2013). El ciudadano en los manuales de historia, instrucción cívica y urbanidad, 1910-1948. *Historia y Sociedad*, (24), 215-240.
- Muñoz, P., Gamboa, A. & Urbina, J. (2014). Deberes ciudadanos y diversidad cultural: comprensión de los discursos de estudiantes y docentes desde la alteridad y la subjetividad. *Revista Infancias imágenes*, 13(2), 23-32. <https://doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.infimg.2014.2.a02>
- Murcia, E. (2005). Palabras que dejan huella: violencia en la escuela a través del discurso. *Revista Iberoamericana de educación*, (37), 49-54.
- Olweus, D. (1998). *Conductas de acoso y amenazas entre escolares*. Madrid, Spain: Morata.
- Pinilla, A. (2006). *De la educación para la democracia a la formación ciudadana: una década de incertidumbres*. Bogotá: UPN - IDEP.
- Puig, M & Morales, J. (2010). Los proyectos de innovación educativa y el desarrollo de la educación para la ciudadanía. *Revista Infancias imágenes*, 9 (1), 29-39.
- Restrepo, G., Ayala, C., Rodríguez, J. & Ortiz, J. (2002). La Educación cívica en Colombia: una comparación internacional. *Revista Educación Integral*, 11 (15), 44-57.
- Rosaldo, R. (1998). Ciudadanía cultural y minorías latinas en Estados Unidos. In Rosalía Winocur (Comp.), *Culturas políticas a fin de siglo. Mexico* (pp. 242-264). México: Juan Pablos Editor, FLACSO.
- Sabato, H. (1997). *Ciudadanía política y*

*formación de las naciones: perspectivas históricas de América Latina*. Mexico City, Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Sáenz, J. (1988). El currículo oculto: democracia y formación moral en la escuela. *Revista Educación Y Cultura*, (16), 14-20.

Sáenz, J. (2007). *Desconfianza, Civilidad y Estética: Las Prácticas Formativas Estatales por Fuera de la Escuela en Bogotá, 1994-2003*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.

Saldarriaga, O. & Sáenz, J. (1999). La Escuela Activa en Bogotá en la primera mitad del siglo XX: ¿un ideal pastoril para un mundo urbano? In O. Zuluaga (Inv. Principal), *Historia de la Educación en Bogotá. Volume II* (pp. 67-94). Bogotá D. C., Colombia: IDEP

Stenhouse, L. (1974). *La disciplina en la escuela. Orientaciones para la convivencia escolar*. Buenos Aires: El Ateneo.

Suárez, H. (1988) Editorial. Educación y derechos humanos. *Revista Educación Y cultura*, 16, 2-3.

Valencia, G., Cañón, L & Molina, C. (2012). Educación cívica y civilidad: una tensión más allá de los términos. *Revista Pedagogía y Saberes*, (30), 81-90. <https://doi.org/10.17227/01212494.30pys81.90>

Willis, P. (1988). *Aprendiendo a trabajar*. Ediciones Akal.

Young, I. (1996). Vida política y diferencia de grupos: una crítica del ideal de ciudadanía universal. In C. Castells (Comp.), *Perspectivas feministas en teoría política* (pp. 99-126). Barcelona, Spain: Paidós.

Zafra, D. (1988). La educación y los derechos humanos. *Revista Educación Y cultura*, 16, 31-33.