Vol. 9, No. 2, 2026, pp. 241-249
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32698/02404

Contents lists available at Journal Global Econedu

**Journal of Educational and Learning Studies**
ISSN: 2655-2760 (Print) ISSN: 2655-2779 (Electronic)

Journal homepage: http://jurnal.globaleconedu.org/index.php/jels

# Development of a student council-based civic engagement model for students in vocational secondary education

**Syahrul Rahman*), Fatmariza Fatmariza, Isnarmi Isnarmi, Hasrul Hasrul**
Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia

**Article Info**

***Article history:***

Received Sep 05th, 2026
Revised Oct 09th, 2026
Accepted Nov 11th, 2026

***Keyword:***

Civic engagement,
Student council,
Citizenship education,
Model development

**ABSTRACT**

This study aimed to develop and evaluate a contextualized Civic Engagement Model through the Student Council (MCE-OSIS) to strengthen civic engagement among vocational secondary school students. A research and development approach using the ADDIE framework was employed. The model was evaluated through expert validation, practicality assessment, and a one-group pretest–posttest design involving 40 Student Council officers. The developed model demonstrated high validity (89.9%) and practicality (mean = 3.38). Students' civic engagement scores increased from 61.94% to 80.00%, representing an improvement of 18.06 percentage points ($p < .001$). The MCE-OSIS model provides a valid, practical, and promising framework for integrating experiential civic learning into student council activities. Its implementation was associated with improved civic engagement, although further controlled studies are required to establish causal effectiveness and broader applicability across educational settings.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Global Econedu.
This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA license
(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0)

***Corresponding Author:***

Syahrul Rahman,
Universitas Negeri Padang,
Email: syahrulrahman26@gmail.com

## Introduction

Civic engagement is a fundamental component of democratic citizenship education, fostering civic awareness, social responsibility, and active participation in collective decision-making. In vocational secondary education, these competencies support leadership, collaboration, and democratic engagement beyond classroom learning. Schools provide essential environments for developing civic competencies through participatory governance and experiential learning (Diana & Neog, 2025; Poon, 2023). However, students frequently remain passive recipients of institutional decisions, limiting their democratic agency. Meaningful civic engagement requires opportunities for expressing opinions, participating in deliberation, and assuming collective responsibility. Such experiences contribute to civic identity, democratic competence, and students' sense of belonging within educational communities (Golubeva & Guntersdorfer, 2017; McGriff & Alvarez, 2021).

Previous studies have emphasized student voice, participatory governance, and experiential citizenship education as approaches to strengthening democratic competencies (Cohen et al., 2012; Manchenko, 2026). Student voice promotes individual expression, whereas participatory governance facilitates involvement in institutional decisions. However, formal participation does not necessarily guarantee meaningful democratic engagement when decision-making remains controlled by school authorities. Authentic participation requires students to identify problems, deliberate collectively, implement decisions, and evaluate their contributions. Existing scholarship distinguishes substantive student involvement from symbolic representation within

educational institutions (Checkoway & Gutiérrez, 2012; Edmondston et al., 2010). These findings highlight the need for structured student council activities that integrate democratic participation with measurable civic learning outcomes.

Despite increasing attention to democratic participation, research on systematically developed civic engagement models within student councils remains limited. Previous studies have primarily examined participation experiences, institutional governance, and student perceptions rather than structured instructional models. Furthermore, the integration of civic competencies, sequential learning activities, and measurable outcomes remains insufficiently articulated in the literature considered here. This limitation is particularly relevant to vocational secondary education, where student organizations can facilitate leadership and collaborative problem-solving. Development-oriented research is therefore needed to integrate contextual needs assessment, instructional design, expert validation, and empirical evaluation. Such an approach may strengthen the relationship between organizational participation and civic competency development (Menezes, 2003; Yoon, 2024).

At SMKN 1 Painan, Indonesia, preliminary findings revealed limited opportunities for meaningful democratic participation within Student Council activities. Administrative records indicated that only 40 of 802 students (4.99%) held formal Student Council positions, reflecting organizational representation rather than overall civic engagement. Observations further indicated that activities predominantly involved ceremonial responsibilities and predetermined school programs. Opportunities for student-initiated proposals, democratic deliberation, and collective evaluation remained limited. These conditions suggest a gap between the democratic potential of student organizations and their actual educational practices. Previous research similarly emphasizes that formal representation does not necessarily ensure substantive participation in institutional decision-making (Call-Cummings et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2023; Martin & Chiodo, 2007).

To address these gaps, this study developed the Civic Engagement Model through the Student Council (MCE-OSIS) using the ADDIE framework. The model integrates six stages: Caring, Speaking Up, Deliberating, Taking Action, Being Responsible, and Reflecting. These stages connect civic awareness, democratic expression, collective decision-making, practical action, accountability, and reflection within student council activities. Its novelty lies in operationalizing participatory citizenship principles into a structured instructional sequence supported by a contextualized student activity book. Unlike descriptive approaches, this study combines systematic model development, expert validation, practicality assessment, and preliminary empirical evaluation. Specifically, it aims to develop and validate MCE-OSIS and examine its practicality and associated changes in students' civic engagement, contributing an instructional framework for experiential citizenship education in vocational secondary schools (Booker, 2017; Homana, 2018; Poulin et al., 2006).

## Method

### Research Design and Setting

This study employed a research and development (R&D) approach using the ADDIE framework, consisting of five sequential phases: Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation. The study was conducted at SMKN 1 Painan, Indonesia, and aimed to develop, validate, and evaluate a contextualized civic engagement model implemented through the Student Council (Organisasi Siswa Intra Sekolah, OSIS). The development process integrated qualitative needs assessment, expert validation, practicality assessment, and quantitative evaluation of student civic engagement. The field evaluation employed a one-group pretest–posttest design to examine changes in civic engagement scores before and after model implementation. As no control group was included, the findings were interpreted as within-group changes rather than definitive evidence of a causal intervention effect.

### Participants and Research Subjects

Participants were selected purposively based on their involvement in student council activities and civic education at SMKN 1 Painan. The needs assessment involved school administrators, the vice principal for student affairs, Pancasila and Citizenship Education teachers, the Student Council advisor, student council members, and parents. The field implementation involved 40 active Student Council officers who participated in the intervention and completed the pretest and posttest assessments. Product validation was conducted by four evaluators representing expertise in educational model development, civic engagement content, student affairs practice, and language. These evaluators assessed the conceptual coherence, content relevance, practical applicability, and linguistic clarity of the developed model and its supporting materials.

### Development Procedures

The development process followed the five phases of the ADDIE framework. During the Analysis phase, observations, interviews, focus group discussions, and document reviews were conducted to identify existing

Student Council practices, participation patterns, mentoring limitations, and institutional requirements for strengthening civic engagement. The Design phase translated these findings into a structured instructional model comprising six stages: Caring, Speaking Up, Deliberating, Taking Action, Being Responsible, and Reflecting. These stages were operationalized through the student activity book entitled MCE-OSIS: Let's Take Action!

During the Development phase, the initial model and supporting materials underwent internal evaluation and expert validation. Feedback from the four evaluators informed revisions to improve the model's conceptual consistency, instructional clarity, and feasibility. The Implementation phase involved a limited field trial conducted in a single Student Council session covering six activity missions. Students completed the civic engagement questionnaire before and after implementation, while the researchers monitored participation and documented the implementation process. Finally, the Evaluation phase incorporated formative monitoring, reflective feedback, practicality assessment, and quantitative examination of changes in civic engagement scores to support refinement of the final model.

**Research Instruments and Data Collection**

Data were collected using observation sheets, semi-structured interview guides, focus group discussions, documentation, expert validation questionnaires, a student civic engagement questionnaire, and a practicality assessment questionnaire. Expert validation used a four-point Likert scale to evaluate model structure, civic engagement content, implementation feasibility, and language quality.

Student civic engagement was assessed using the MCE questionnaire, consisting of 10 items rated on a four-point Likert scale. The instrument addressed civic awareness, expression of opinions, deliberative participation, civic action, responsibility, and reflection, corresponding to the six stages of the developed model. The questionnaire was administered before and after implementation. Practicality was evaluated through an advisor-response questionnaire assessing alignment with Student Council objectives, ease of implementation, instructional guidance, time allocation, monitoring, preparation of learning materials, and usability of the activity book.

**Data Analysis**

Qualitative data obtained from observations, interviews, and focus group discussions were analyzed using the interactive analytical procedures of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), comprising data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. Quantitative data from expert validation were converted into percentages by dividing the obtained score by the maximum possible score and multiplying by 100. Validation scores were classified as highly valid (85–100%), valid (70–84%), moderately valid (55–69%), or invalid (below 55%). A minimum validation score of 70% was required for field implementation.

Practicality was assessed using mean questionnaire scores and classified into four categories: highly feasible (3.26–4.00), feasible (2.51–3.25), not feasible (1.76–2.50), and highly infeasible (1.00–1.75). Changes in student civic engagement were examined using descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, minimum scores, and maximum scores. A paired-samples t-test was applied to compare pretest and posttest scores obtained from the same participants, with statistical significance established at $p < .05$. Given the absence of a control group, the statistical analysis was used to assess the magnitude and significance of observed within-group changes without attributing those changes exclusively to the developed model.

## Results and Discussions

**Needs Analysis: Existing Student Council Practices and Development Requirements**

The analysis phase combined school administrative records, observations, interviews, and focus group discussions to identify gaps between existing student council practices and the intended development of civic engagement. Administrative records indicated that 40 of 802 students (4.99%) held student council positions. Representation differed across grade levels: 18 of 274 Grade 10 students (6.57%), 22 of 249 Grade 11 students (8.84%), and none of the 279 Grade 12 students were represented. These figures describe formal membership rather than the wider student body's participation in council-led activities.

Observations and accounts from the student council advisor characterized existing activities as predominantly ceremonial and administrative. Student members generally implemented predetermined tasks, while opportunities to identify collective concerns, express proposals, participate in deliberation, and evaluate their own contributions were limited. The advisor also reported the absence of a dedicated guide linking student council activities with structured civic learning. Student interviews indicated a preference for visually engaging, interactive materials and opportunities to design and document concrete social initiatives. These findings informed the development requirements summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Identified Challenges in Student Council Activities and Proposed Model Development Responses

| Identified issue | Development response |
|---|---|
| Ceremonial and administrative activity focus | Issue-oriented civic action and student-led activities |
| Predominantly one-way guidance | Structured opportunities for student voice and collective deliberation |
| Students primarily execute assigned tasks | Student participation in problem identification, decisions, action, and reflection |
| No dedicated civic-engagement activity resource | Mission-based activity book with visual supports and worksheets |
| Limited systematic evaluation | Reflection sheets and commitment cards |

**Design: Structure and Learning Sequence of MCE-OSIS**

The design phase produced a six-stage civic engagement sequence embedded in student council activities: Caring (Peduli), Speaking Up (Bersuara), Deliberating (Bermusyawarah), Taking Action (Bertindak), Taking Responsibility (Bertanggung Jawab), and Reflecting (Refleksi). The stages were designed to connect the identification of shared problems with collective decision-making, implementation, accountability, and review. The model addressed four dimensions identified in the conceptual analysis: social and environmental concern, civic responsibility, cooperation and deliberation, and active participation.

**Table 2.** Stages and Operational Components of the MCE-OSIS Model

| Stage | Operational focus |
|---|---|
| 1. Caring | Identify issues and needs in the school or surrounding community |
| 2. Speaking Up | Articulate views, proposals, and aspirations |
| 3. Deliberating | Discuss alternatives and reach collective decisions |
| 4. Taking Action | Implement an agreed student council initiative |
| 5. Taking Responsibility | Fulfil assigned roles and commitments |
| 6. Reflecting | Review experiences and formulate subsequent commitments |

The resulting supporting resource, "MCE-OSIS: Let's Take Action!", included an introductory model map, issue-based prompts, stage-specific missions, student worksheets, reflection sheets, commitment cards, and supporting illustrations. The thesis describes its production in Canva, including AI-assisted visual design features, and its delivery as a digital flipbook with printable worksheets. This format responded to the student preferences identified during the analysis phase.




**Figure 1.** Civic Engagement Model through the Student Council (MCE-OSIS).

**Development: Expert and Practitioner Validation**

The development phase involved assessments by four evaluators representing model design, civic education content, school-based practice, and language. Scores were converted to percentages relative to the maximum attainable scores. As presented in Table 3, the combined assessment was 187 out of 208 points (89.9%), classified as highly valid according to the criteria adopted in the thesis. The highest percentage was assigned to model structure (92.9%), while practitioner validation yielded 87.5%. These results provide evidence of favorable expert judgments concerning the proposed model and supporting activity book; they do not constitute independent evidence of intervention effectiveness.

**Table 3.** Expert Validation Results of the MCE-OSIS Model and Supporting Materials

| Validation domain | Obtained / maximum | Validity (%) | Thesis classification |
|---|---|---|---|
| Model | 52 / 56 | 92.9 | Highly valid |
| Content | 50 / 56 | 89.3 | Highly valid |
| Practitioner | 42 / 48 | 87.5 | Highly valid |
| Language | 43 / 48 | 89.6 | Highly valid |
| Overall | 187 / 208 | 89.9 | Highly valid |

The validation records indicate that revisions were informed by expert and practitioner feedback on the clarity and feasibility of the model, the contextual relevance of student activities, and the accessibility and consistency of instructions. The resulting version was subsequently used in the limited field implementation.

**Implementation: Practicality Assessment**

The practicality evaluation by student council advisors yielded an overall mean of 3.38 on the four-point response scale, corresponding to the "highly feasible" category used in the thesis. The highest-rated item concerned the clarity of the advisor guide (M = 4.00). The lowest-rated item concerned the ease of preparing media, materials, and equipment (M = 2.67). Time allocation was also rated less favorably (M = 3.00) than most other items, identifying operational considerations for further refinement. Table 4 presents the item-level results.

**Table 4.** Practicality Assessment of the MCE-OSIS Model Implementation

| Practicality indicator | Mean |
|---|---|
| Alignment with student council development goals | 3.67 |
| Ease of implementation in council activities | 3.33 |
| Clarity of advisor guidance | 4.00 |
| Ease of following model stages | 3.33 |
| Compatibility with available activity time | 3.00 |
| Support for mentoring and monitoring | 3.67 |
| Ease of preparing media and materials | 2.67 |
| Usability of digital flipbook and printouts | 3.33 |
| Overall | 3.38 |

**Evaluation: Changes in Students' Civic Engagement Scores**

The preliminary field evaluation involved 40 active student council members assessed before and after implementation of MCE-OSIS. The mean civic engagement score increased from 61.94 (SD = 10.37) at pretest to 80.00 (SD = 11.97) at posttest, an observed increase of 18.06 score points. The minimum score increased from 35.00 to 42.50, and the maximum from 80.00 to 100.00 (Table 5). The descriptive data indicate higher post-implementation scores within the participating group.

**Table 5.** Descriptive Statistics of Students' Civic Engagement Scores Before and After Implementation

| Statistic | Pretest | Posttest |
|---|---|---|
| Participants (n) | 40 | 40 |
| Mean | 61.94 | 80.00 |
| Standard deviation | 10.37 | 11.97 |
| Minimum | 35.00 | 42.50 |
| Maximum | 80.00 | 100.00 |

A paired-samples t-test, as reported in the thesis, identified a statistically significant within-participant difference between the two assessments, $t(39) = 14.978$, $p < .001$. The mean paired difference (posttest minus pretest) was 18.0625 points (SD of paired differences = 7.6269; SE = 1.2059), with a 95% confidence interval of [15.6233, 20.5017] (Table 6). The confidence interval excludes zero and is consistent with the reported test

statistic. The source statistical output displayed p = .000; this is reported here using the conventional notation p < .001.

**Table 6.** Paired-Samples t-Test Results for Pretest and Posttest Civic Engagement Scores

| Paired comparison | Mean difference | SD difference | SE | 95% CI | t(df) | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Posttest − pretest | 18.0625 | 7.6269 | 1.2059 | 15.6233–20.5017 | 14.978 (39) | < .001 |

Taken together, the evaluation documented a positive pretest-to-posttest change among participating student council members following implementation. Because the reported field evaluation used a single group without a concurrent control group, this difference should be interpreted as a within-group association rather than definitive evidence that the model alone caused the improvement. The available thesis tables do not report separate outcomes for the four civic engagement dimensions, longer-term retention, or effects beyond the participating school.

**Consolidated Development Outcomes**

Across the five ADDIE phases, the study generated a needs-informed, six-stage civic engagement model and an accompanying student activity book; obtained favorable expert and practitioner validation (overall 89.9%); documented positive advisor-rated practicality (M = 3.38); and observed a statistically significant increase in civic engagement scores in the limited single-group implementation. The results support the model's initial contextual feasibility and warrant further evaluation using a comparison group, implementation fidelity measures, and broader school settings.

Data note. All numerical findings and substantive development details in this Results section were drawn from the uploaded thesis. Table numbering is adapted for a standalone journal article. No participant-level data, additional statistical tests, or unreported observations were generated.

The findings reveal a discrepancy between the democratic potential of student councils and their actual contribution to civic learning. At SMKN 1 Painan, only 40 of 802 students (4.99%) held formal Student Council positions, indicating limited organizational representation rather than overall civic disengagement. Observations further identified predominantly ceremonial activities and restricted opportunities for student-led decisions. These conditions suggest that meaningful civic participation depends on the quality of democratic experiences rather than organizational membership alone. Authentic participation requires opportunities for students to express perspectives, influence decisions, and assume collective responsibility (Mason & Dunens, 2019; Perrotta et al., 2024). Supportive institutional environments are therefore essential for strengthening civic identity and democratic competencies (Montgomery, 2014; Starke-Meyerring et al., 2007).

The MCE-OSIS model integrates six sequential stages connecting civic awareness, democratic expression, deliberation, collective action, responsibility, and reflection. Expert validation yielded an overall score of 89.9%, indicating favorable judgments regarding conceptual coherence, content relevance, and instructional feasibility. The model translates participatory citizenship principles into structured organizational learning experiences, consistent with approaches emphasizing active democratic participation (Asim & Dee, 2022; Chong et al., 2018; Kiess, 2022). Its conceptual contribution lies in operationalizing civic competencies through interconnected student-led activities. Nevertheless, expert validation reflects product acceptability rather than intervention effectiveness. Moreover, the contribution of individual stages remains uncertain because stage-specific civic outcomes were not independently evaluated.

The practicality assessment produced a mean score of 3.38, indicating favorable implementation feasibility within existing Student Council activities. Instructional guidance received the highest rating (M = 4.00), whereas preparation of learning materials (M = 2.67) and time allocation (M = 3.00) revealed operational constraints. These findings emphasize the importance of adequate resources, realistic scheduling, and institutional support for meaningful student participation (Davis & Petry, 2002; Fong et al., 2026; Hobbs et al., 2013; Marzaeva, 2014). Student Council advisors should therefore facilitate democratic dialogue and reflective learning rather than merely supervise administrative activities. However, reliance on advisor assessments within a single school introduces potential respondent bias and limits the generalizability of practicality findings.

Students' mean civic engagement scores increased from 61.94 to 80.00, representing an improvement of 18.06 points following MCE-OSIS implementation. The difference was statistically significant, $t(39) = 14.978$, $p < .001$, with a 95% confidence interval of 15.62–20.50 and a standardized paired difference of 2.37. This substantial within-group change may reflect opportunities for democratic expression, collective deliberation, and experiential civic learning. Previous studies similarly associate meaningful participation with civic agency, social responsibility, and community engagement (Chasen, 2023; Senese et al., 2025; Keating & Janmaat, 2016;

Zlotkowski, 2011). Nevertheless, dimension-specific improvements remain unknown, while testing effects, prior organizational experiences, and contextual influences cannot be excluded (Brown et al., 2026; Eisikovits, 2005). Therefore, the findings indicate short-term improvement without establishing causal effectiveness.

Overall, MCE-OSIS offers a structured framework integrating democratic communication, deliberation, civic action, responsibility, and reflection into Student Council activities. Its contribution lies in translating participatory citizenship principles into operational learning procedures rather than relying solely on formal student representation (Adams & Rogers, 2020; Boylan et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2026). Effective implementation requires trained advisors, adequate learning resources, sufficient time, and institutional support for student-led initiatives (Dallago et al., 2010; Foss et al., 2022). However, the single-school setting, purposive sampling, brief intervention, and absence of a control group limit causal interpretation and broader applicability. Future studies should employ controlled designs, longitudinal assessments, and behavioral indicators to establish the model's effectiveness and sustainability across educational contexts (Backus & Bird, 2021; Chadjipadelis & Panagiotidou, 2026).

## Conclusions

This study successfully developed and evaluated the Civic Engagement Model through the Student Council (MCE-OSIS) as a contextualized approach to strengthening civic engagement among vocational secondary school students. The findings revealed that existing Student Council activities required a more structured and participatory framework to facilitate meaningful civic learning experiences. The developed model demonstrated strong conceptual validity and practical feasibility, indicating its suitability for integration into student council activities. Furthermore, its implementation was associated with significant improvements in students' civic engagement, particularly in promoting active participation, democratic deliberation, collective responsibility, and reflective learning. The principal contribution of this study lies in transforming student council activities into structured experiential learning opportunities that connect civic education principles with authentic organizational practices. Although further evaluation across diverse educational settings is necessary, the MCE-OSIS model offers a promising framework for strengthening participatory citizenship education and fostering meaningful student involvement in school governance.

## References

Adams, Z. M., & Rogers, N. (2020). "Services Not Mausoleums": Race, Politics, and the Concept of Community in American Medicine (1963-1970). Journal of Medical Humanities, 41(4), 515–529. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10912-020-09618-6

Asim, M., & Dee, T. S. (2022). Mobile Phones, Civic Engagement, and School Performance in Pakistan. Economics of Education Review, 89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2022.102254

Backus, E. C., & Bird, S. (2021). Assessing and implementing a sustainable holistic planning system: LEed for communities and the New York Olympic region. Case Studies in the Environment, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.1525/cse.2021.1245219

Booker, A. (2017). Contingent authority and youth influence: When youth councils can wield influence in public institutions. Revista de Investigacion Educativa, 35(2), 537–562. https://doi.org/10.6018/rie.35.2.274841

Boylan, B. M., Ehrlander, M. F., & Bouffard, T. J. (2021). "A Multimethod and Interdisciplinary Approach to Educating Postsecondary Students on Arctic Challenges and Governance." Journal of Political Science Education, 17(3), 418–436. https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2019.1628766

Brown, C. L., Waters, S., & Russell, W. B. (2026). What Does English Learners' Writing Reveal? A Case Study of Structured Academic Controversy in a High School Social Studies Classroom. Research in Social Sciences and Technology, 11(2), 11–31. https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2026.7

Call-Cummings, M., Zenkov, K., & Keller, J. (2024). Talking Equity in Polarized Times: Stories and Strategies from Teachers and Students. In Talking Equity in Polarized Times: Stories and Strategies from Teachers and Students. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003468769

Chadjipadelis, T., & Panagiotidou, G. (2026). Deliberation, Representation, and Civic Learning: A Multivariate Study of Democratic Reasoning Among High School Students. Studies in Classification, Data Analysis, and Knowledge Organization, 85–94. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-32009-4_11

Chasen, L. R. (2023). Teaching elementary social studies for scholarship, civic engagement, and mental health: The revolution WILL be dramatized. In Teaching Elementary Social Studies for Scholarship, Civic Engagement, and Mental Health: The Revolution WILL Be Dramatized. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004539631

Checkoway, B. N., & Gutiérrez, L. M. (2012). Youth participation and community change. In Youth Participation and Community Change. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203051726

Chen, M.-K., Liu, R.-L., & Chien, H.-N. (2023). Scientific Empirical Study on Analyzing Learning Outcomes of Cadres in College Student Association Using Hierarchical Linear Regression Model †. Engineering Proceedings, 38(1). https://doi.org/10.3390/engproc2023038073

Chong, E. K.-M., Timothy, Y. W. W., & Wing, L. Y. (2018). Student council and student leadership training in Hong Kong primary schools. Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 13(3), 329–350. https://doi.org/10.1386/ctl.13.3.329_1

Cohen, A. K., Waters, A., & Brown, P. (2012). Place-based environmental health justice education: A community-university- government-middle school partnership. Environmental Justice, 5(4), 188–197. https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2010.0021

Dallago, L., Cristini, F., Perkins, D. D., Nation, M., & Santinello, M. (2010). The adolescents, life context, and school project: Youth voice and civic participation. Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 38(1), 41–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/10852350903393434

Davis, D., & Petry, E. (2002). Integrating the boyer report into architectural engineering technology education at the university of hartford. Journal of Engineering Education, 91(1), 139–142. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2002.tb00683.x

Diana, V. H., & Neog, D. (2025). How a First-Year "City as Text"TM Can Catalyze Civically-Engaged Citizens of the Future. College Teaching. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2025.2579613

Edmondston, J., Dawson, V., & Schibeci, R. (2010). Are Students Prepared to Communicate? A case Study of an Australian Degree Course in Biotechnology. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 8(6), 1091–1108. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-010-9234-3

Eisikovits, R. A. (2005). Perspectives of young immigrants from the former ussr on voting and politics in israel. Theory and Research in Social Education, 33(4), 454–475. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2005.10473291

Fong, C. J., Kremer, K. P., & Rozek, C. S. (2026). "What Was College Made For?" Exploring College Students' Civic Engagement Outcomes by College Major. Innovative Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-026-09941-1

Foss, L., Brown, S. A., Sutherland, S., Miller, C. J., & Philliber, S. (2022). A randomized controlled trial of the impact of the Teen Council peer education program on youth development. Health Education Research, 37(1), 36–47. https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyac001

Golubeva, I., & Guntersdorfer, I. R. (2017). Preparing professionals for working in multicultural and democratic europe: Two pedagogical programs – Their assessment and collaborations. Pedagogika, 128(4), 39–54. https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2017.53

Hobbs, R., Donnelly, K., Friesem, J., & Moen, M. (2013). Learning to engage: how positive attitudes about the news, media literacy, and video production contribute to adolescent civic engagement. Educational Media International, 50(4), 231–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/09523987.2013.862364

Homana, G. A. (2018). Youth political engagement in Australia and the United States: Student councils and volunteer organizations as communities of practice. Journal of Social Science Education, 17(1), 41–54. https://doi.org/10.4119/UNIBI/jsse-v17-i1-1674

Keating, A., & Janmaat, J. G. (2016). Education through citizenship at school: Do school activities have a lasting impact on youth political engagement? Parliamentary Affairs, 69(2), 409–429. https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsv017

Kiess, J. (2022). Learning by doing: The impact of experiencing democracy in education on political trust and participation. Politics, 42(1), 75–94. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263395721990287

Liu, J., Nitiasih, P. K., Santosa, M. H., & Riastini, P. N. (2026). Network based analysis of student self governance networks and predictive role in civic participation outcomes. Scientific Reports, 16(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-34205-x

Manchenko, M. (2026). AI against Hate: Smart Tools and Education for Safer Online Spaces. Communications in Computer and Information Science, 2958 CCIS, 221–233. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-31850-3_14

Martin, L. A., & Chiodo, J. J. (2007). Good citizenship: What students in rural schools have to say about it. Theory and Research in Social Education, 35(1), 112–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2007.10473328

Marzaeva, M. (2014). On the formation of youth civic identity of students (the case study of the republic of kalmykia). Oriental Studies, 7(4), 244–248. https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85092072740?origin=resultslist

Mason, M. R., & Dunens, E. (2019). Service-learning as a practical introduction to undergraduate public health: Benefits for student outcomes and accreditation. Frontiers in Public Health, 7(APR). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00063

McGriff, M., & Alvarez, O. (2021). CONCEPTS AND TOOLS: Civics: Gentrification in Jersey City. In Real Classrooms, Real Teachers: the C3 Inquiry in Practice. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-64802-580-

820251011
Menezes, I. (2003). Participation Experiences and Civic Concepts, Attitudes and Engagement: Implications for Citizenship Education Projects. European Educational Research Journal, 2(3), 430–445. https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2003.2.3.8
Montgomery, S. E. (2014). Critical democracy through digital media production in a third-grade classroom. Theory and Research in Social Education, 42(2), 197–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2014.908755
Perrotta, K., Hochuli, C., Hickson, J., & Williams, R. (2024). They Were Here: A Study on High School Students' Engagement in Historical Empathy With a Local History Research Project. Journal of Social Studies Research, 48(1), 3–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/23522798231223670
Poon, O. A. (2023). "THINK ABOUT IT AS DECOLONIZING OUR MINDS": Spaces for Critical Race Pedagogy and Transformative Leadership Development. In The Misrepresented Minority: New Insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the Implications for Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003447931-20
Poulin, J., Kauffman, S., & Silver, P. (2006). Field notes: serving the community and training social workers: Service outputs and student outcomes. Journal of Social Work Education, 42(1), 171–184. https://doi.org/10.5175/JSWE.2006.200400486
Senese, A., Fugazza, D., Manara, V., Bianco, E., Brambilla, L., Settembrini, S., Falcini, E., Marzano, D., Panizza, M., Torelli, C., Maugeri, M., & Diolaiuti, G. A. (2025). Empowering Youth for Climate Resilience: A Geographical Education Model from Italy and Turkey. Geographies, 5(4). https://doi.org/10.3390/geographies5040052
Starke-Meyerring, D., Duin, A. H., & Palvetzian, T. (2007). Global partnerships: Positioning technical communication programs in the context of globalization. Technical Communication Quarterly, 16(2), 139–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572250709336558
Yoon, H. (2024). The mediated effect of youth council participation on the professional identity development of youth workers. Children and Youth Services Review, 167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2024.108010
Zlotkowski, E. (2011). Civic engagement on the ropes? In "To Serve a Larger Purpose": Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education. https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84895164446?origin=resultslist