

Review of: "The Young Pioneers of Cuba: The Formation of Cuban Citizens through Civic Education"

Lars Stojnic¹

¹ Pontifical Catholic University of Peru

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Although the topic addressed in the manuscript is very interesting, I consider, in general, that it requires more work to seek its publication in the future. Next, I will point out some aspects that I consider important to work on.

Regarding the introduction, although it presents the Cuban context clearly enough, the justification and relevance of the article is not discussed. In that sense, it would be important that, among other aspects, the authors could explain what they consider the main contributions of the work to be; for example, with respect to current debates on civic and citizenship education. And, in relation to the above, it is important to explain the reasons for choosing Cuba as a case study. This point is key so that, from the beginning of the text, the reader can understand the importance of the analysis and reflections that follow.

In relation to the theoretical framework that is proposed, although it is clear that for the authors the contrast between the GCE and CGCE approaches is important, on the one hand, both approaches are presented in a very general and superficial way. I recommend delving into the debate between the two, placing emphasis on connecting how they consider that this contrast connects with broader and more current debates on citizenship education. Along these lines, it is important to explain -and this connects with what was pointed out before about highlighting why the Cuban case was chosen- why they consider relevant the analysis of how civic education is promoted in Cuba, from the perspective of the debate posed between both perspectives. On the other hand, I consider that an effort can be made to present a brief state of the art on some aspects associated with civic and citizenship education, for example, the effect of school experience -both curricular and institutional- on the development of political attitudes. Particularly, reviewing literature on the Latin American context, which would allow a contrast with what has been analyzed in the region. I recommend reviewing the following texts:

- https://www.academia.edu/32027992/Democratic_Citizenship_Education_Research_across_multiple_lanscapes_and_contexts
- <https://researchers.unab.cl/es/publications/ciudadan%C3%ADa-convencional-y-no-convencional-y-su-relaci%C3%B3n-con-la-au>
- https://revistas.uam.es/riejs/article/view/riejs2020_9_2_003

Likewise, with respect to the theoretical elaboration of the text, there are concepts that are briefly pointed out in the discussion section, but that would greatly enrich the article if they were worked as conceptual frameworks of reference from the beginning. Concepts such as 'ideological state apparatuses' (by Althusser), or the approach to the notion of political socialization and the role of various actors and social institutions (which are only mentioned at the end of the manuscript), would contribute if they were presented and developed - as frames of reference - in the theoretical section.

Regarding the methodological section - and having read the full text - I consider that the purpose of the manuscript should be

clarified. Although the analysis of the Cuban case is highlighted in light of the contrast between the GCE and CGCE approaches, it is not clearly developed how said analysis will be approached. What is also more confusing is the fact that said analysis is given separately from the results section; and, more than being read as facts supported by the results collected, it seems more like an opinion exercise of the authors.

Also, in methodological terms, it is important that some decisions made can be explained and/or clarified. Firstly, why it was considered important to conduct interviews with three different actors (teachers, students, and leader of a pedagogical institution), and why it was decided to collect information through interviews and classroom observations. To what extent is it considered that the intersection, or complement, of said opinions could be valuable? Also, it would be important to give a description that allows the reader to understand how these methods were deployed in the field. Secondly, as already noted, it is important to explain the selection of the case of Cuba and its analytical value in relation to the debate between the GCE and the CGCE. Thirdly, it is important to explain why schools were selected, what criteria were used, and for what reasons it is considered that they could provide a relevant overview of the Cuban situation. Finally, what aspects associated with civic education and citizen training -and why- were prioritized in the collection of information and subsequent analysis, and give an account, even briefly, of how this was addressed in the information collection instruments. The latter is important to explain because it will allow the reader to have a clear idea of what they will find in the results section.

With respect to the results section, I recommend further developing the elaboration and analysis of each of the ideas that are presented. In many cases, currently, the description of the idea is very similar to what is included in each testimony. In this sense, a recommendation is to take advantage of more testimonies per idea, which would allow to find in diverse voices greater support and possibilities of describing the aspect addressed. The latter will also provide greater validity to the findings presented, while it would account for a common sense identified in the interviews with the various actors. The section in which there is greater and better development, in relation to the elements indicated, is that of "Formation of (wo)man as citizens"; in this sense, it can be used as a reference to work on other aspects.

Something that could be worked on better is the use of the information collected through various methods and informants. With respect to the first, the observations developed are only used in one case, and with respect to the second, the majority of the testimonies used are from the teachers, leaving the voices of students and the leader of the pedagogical institution relegated. Furthermore, it is important to give space in the analysis to possible differences in opinions of the informants, since this could lead to a more in-depth analysis. For example, when a student's voice is used for the first time (page 10), their testimony contradicts, in some way, the line of description previously proposed (based on the teachers' voices); however, this remains as a statement, and this difference of opinion is not addressed in the analysis.

Likewise, although the emphasis placed on the topics that are transmitted in classes (nationalism, socialist ideas, etc.) is interesting, I wonder why other aspects are not covered, such as what strategies are used for the transmission of said topics or knowledge, or how the participation of students in pedagogical processes is promoted? Although it is not mandatory to expand the spectrum of aspects addressed in the analysis, it is very important that the focus of attention placed on a single aspect can be justified in terms of relevance and pertinence.

Finally, I recommend reviewing the "Challenges in presenting values" section because it feels disconnected from the rest and, furthermore, being so short and with little development, it is not very clear why it is addressed.

Regarding the final sections, an aspect to be developed further, particularly at the level of discussion (in analytical terms), is to get out of a commonplace that is repeated on several occasions but is hardly developed. It is repeatedly pointed out that civic education does not only occur in the classroom space; however, it is developed little or not at all, in which other school spaces this happens and how each of them would influence. This elaboration, which would contribute a lot to framing the limits of the work, could be addressed, in principle, in the theoretical review section, which would allow us to understand the existence of different areas in which civic education occurs and the authors' decision to focus on the transmission of topics and content in the classrooms. And then, it could be taken up again in the discussion section as a reflection - from a broader perspective - on civic education in school.

Finally, much more work must be done on the approach to how what was identified in the research - in the Cuban case studied - would relate to the GCE and CGCE debate. On the one hand, the reading of that section is perceived as very disconnected from the rest of the manuscript, and, on the other hand, the approaches indicated there, rather than being clearly supported by the evidence collected, give more the impression of being an exercise in the opinion of the authors.