Active Citizenship Project (ACT)

Quantitative Final Report

Simon Briole[1], Marc Gurgand[1], Laura López-Torres[2], Éric Maurin[1], Sandra McNally[3,4], Jenifer Ruiz-Valenzuela[3], Daniel Santín[5], Luis Schmidt[3], Gabriela Sicilia[6], Rosa Simancas[7], and Yannis Tsirbas[8]

[1]Paris School of Economics and J-PAL, France
[2]University of Alcala, Spain
[3]London School of Economics, UK
[4]University of Surrey, UK
[5]Complutense University of Madrid, Spain
[6]Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain
[7]University of Extremadura, Spain
[8]University of Athens, Greece

May 31, 2020

Abstract

This report presents the quantitative evaluation of the experimental "Active Citizenship Project" (ACT) that was implemented during the 2018-2019 school year in four countries: England, France, Greece and Spain. A total of 312 middle-schools were involved in the experiment, of which 430 teachers and almost 9,000 grade 8 or 9 students enrolled in the research protocol. Half of the 312 schools, randomly chosen within each country, effectively implemented the program, the other schools serving as a control group. The program aims to foster teaching practices that promote openness, inclusion and engagement with the aim of developing students' "active citizen" knowledge and skills; it was jointly built by the Public Authorities of the four countries. In the treatment schools, teachers received a two-day training at the beginning of the school year, and then defined and implemented a project over the year, stimulating the initiative and active participation of their students. We surveyed students and teachers at the beginning and end of the school year, using a vast number of instruments to measure students' civic attitude, democratic participation and social integration, and teachers' teaching

practices. In France, we also collected administrative data on student discipline over the year. Comparing teachers in treated and control schools, we find that teaching practice tends to become more student-centred, a central theme of the training scheme. By contrast, we find little evidence of change in students' average outcomes, except in France, where we observe a significant improvement in our indexes of civic attitude and (administratively measured) behavior, in treated compared to control schools. A possible interpretation is that student engagement into the project was on average stronger in France than in other countries.

We pre-declared a number of dimensions of impact heterogeneity to explore, most of which proved not to be relevant (gender, social origin, sibship size, birth order). In France only, we observe that the impact of the program is entirely concentrated on students that have European origins; students with non-European origins are not affected. But the main, and most consistent dimension of impact heterogeneity, relates to students who have ever been a student representative in the past (around 30% of students, the most civic-minded in each school according to our data): they do benefit from the program along the dimensions of civic attitudes and democratic participation, whereas we find negligible effects on non-representative students. This basic result, which fits with observations from the qualitative reports, is consistent with the literature that emphasizes that skills beget skills: those students that were trained into citizenship earlier (being student representative) participate more in the project – in a context where a subset of students seem to become little interested as time goes – and are more influenced by it. This may draw the limit of an approach that does not take into account the very unequal levels of civic maturity of adolescents, and illustrates how it can further raise inequalities along that dimension.

1   Introduction

A committed and strong civic society is necessary for the well functioning of a democratic society (Putnam et al. (2000)). In particular, the good health of a democracy lies in the promotion of active citizens involved in the community and committed to an open-minded society, to solidarity, and to social equity. However, the past decade has been characterized by changes in political polarization[1], greater visibility of extremist views and populism, and terrorist attacks around the globe. In response to the Paris terrorist attacks of 2015, ministers in the European Union signed the *Declaration on promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education* in an attempt to call for policy intervention to increase social capital (Active Citizenship Project (2018)).

The Active Citizenship Project (ACT) aims to foster teaching practices that promote openness, inclusion and engagement with the aim of developing students' "active citizen" knowledge and skills. This

---

[1]For instance, Boxell et al. (2020) show increasing polarization in four OECD countries, and a decrease in other five.

is implemented through a cross-country concept of active citizenship, which focuses on universal values of equality, fairness, solidarity and inclusion, and less so on national identity. In this program, students are initiated in both the theory and practice of democratic procedures, such as voting and debating, they implement a field project, and they are supported by an open-classroom climate and horizontal teaching practices. Students are expected to acquire civic knowledge and capabilities that enable them to participate and engage in class, at school and outside their school environment (Active Citizenship Project (2018)).

We report on the findings from a large international experiment that was conducted during the 2018-2019 school year, in a total of 312 middle-schools located in four countries (England, France, Greece, Spain). In these schools, a total of 430 teachers (one or two per school) and almost 9,000 grade 8 and 9 students agreed to enroll in the ACT experiment. Out of the participating schools, half were randomly chosen within each country to effectively implement the program. Teachers from treatment schools first attended a two-day training program at the beginning of the year, then implemented the project with their students. Students had to democratically elicit a project, then run it over the school year. The projects had to refer to discrimination, social inclusion or cultural diversity. In practice, they targeted the close environment (the school itself, close-by primary schools, elderly people at retirement homes, etc.). Generally, teachers report to have followed the protocol, although there is variation across countries in the extent to which they complied to every single feature. Actual student participation was less systematic: low engagement and reluctant behavior from a subset of students is more apparent in Spain, but it affects all countries.[2]

In all schools, treatment and control alike, we were able to clearly identify volunteer students and teachers prior to the random assignment. They were surveyed at the beginning and end of the school year in the four countries, using a vast number of instruments borrowed from the literature and adjusted using a pilot survey and interactions with the qualitative evaluation teams. In France, we also collected administrative data on student discipline over the year. By comparing volunteer students in treatment and control schools in each country, we can measure the effect of the program on their level of civic attitude, democratic participation and social integration. Similarly, by comparing volunteer teachers in treatment and control schools, we can measure the effect of the program on the teaching practices in each country.

Consistent with the aim of the training sessions, the comparison of teachers in treated and control schools show that teaching practice tends to become more student-centred, requiring more student par-

---

[2]The qualitative reports confirm that projects often end-up being carried by a subset of students in the long-run.

ticipation. By contrast, we find little evidence of change in students' average outcomes, except in France. In this country, we observe a significant improvement in our indexes of civic attitude and behavior: at the end of the year, treated students display more tolerant and altruistic values than control students, and are less likely to be absent from school or be punished for their misbehavior. We observe no such shift in students' average outcomes in Greece or Spain, whereas the UK results are difficult to interpret because attrition was strong at end-line surveys, and much stronger so in the control group, resulting in systematic differences between the two groups. A possible reason for this contrast in average impact is that student engagement into the project was on average stronger in France than in other countries. And this may result in part from the fact that project-based civic education is less common in this country; and from the stronger implementation of teacher training than in some other countries of the panel, also documented in the qualitative reports.

Within all four countries, our baseline surveys confirm the existence of strong pre-treatment inequalities between adolescents in terms of civic attitudes or democratic participation. A simple way to measure these inequalities is to compare students who have already been a student representative in the past (around 30% of students, a priori the most civic-minded in each school) with other students. At the beginning of the year, in every single country, the index of civic attitudes of (former) student representatives appears to be very significantly higher than that of other students (on average +20% of a SD); the same holds for the index of democratic participation (around +30% of a SD). On the starting line, pre-treatment, student representatives are thus ahead of the others in all dimensions: they display more tolerant values, show more trust in others, are more committed and better integrated. One of the most striking results of our experiment is that the ACT program does not induce any significant catch-up effect. As a matter of fact, the gap in civic attitudes and democratic participation between (former) representative and non-representative students even tends to increase as a result of the intervention in the three countries where the data is reliable. When France, Greece and Spain are considered together, we find that the program increased the civic attitude index of student representatives by +17% of an SD, while it had a negligible effect on non-representative students. In these three countries, the average effect on the democratic participation index is also twice as strong for representatives as for non-representatives, even though the difference between the two estimated effects is not significant at standard level. In the country where we have access to independent measures of civic behavior, based on administrative school data (France), the program is followed by a +18% of a SD improvement in this index for representative students versus only +13% of a SD for other students.

The initial levels of civic attitude and democratic participation appear to be the main source of heterogeneity in the effect of the program in the three countries. This basic result is consistent with the literature that emphasizes that skills beget skills, be they cognitive or not, so that the inequalities that develop during childhood are very difficult to reduce during adolescence (see e.g., Carneiro & Heckman (2003)). Stronger civic skills may characterize those who apply to be a student representative. But it may also be a formative experience: for many of those involved, being a student representative is actually a period of intense training in citizenship, in the importance of gaining the trust of one's peers, of tolerating diverging views, of taking the time to talk with others, even when they are not among one's close friends. The fact that this initial experience enables adolescents from all social background to take better advantage of a citizenship training program suggests that it would probably be beneficial to provide a similar initial experience to an even greater number of students, so that they would be able to take even greater advantage of the cumulative effect of citizenship experiences and accumulate a larger amount of "citizenship capital". As much as some students are less ready in maths or history, some may not have enough of this "citizenship capital" to take advantage of a pedagogical approach that relies on students' initiative and autonomy.

In France, we further observe significant heterogeneity across students with European and non-European origins (23% of the French sample, a higher ratio than in other countries, mostly originating from former French colonies). Specifically, the positive effect of the program on French students' average outcomes appears to be entirely driven by students with European origin. It may suggest that students from minorities, although they have civic indexes at baseline comparable to that of other students, mistrust the school system of their parents' host country and are little influenced by its effort to change students' civic attitudes.

Eventually, it should be emphasized that the effect of the ACT program is not particularly strong for students from privileged backgrounds. The fact that the program primarily benefited students with experience as representatives did not entail any increase in inequalities between children from different social origins. Every year, throughout the whole school system, all classes must elect student representatives, in advantaged as well as disadvantaged neighbourhoods. They are recruited in a balanced way from all backgrounds. At the end of the day, the experience as a student representative benefits students from all social backgrounds, and so does the program.

This experiment thus shows that in a variety of national contexts, a similar civic education program focused on active acquisition of skills, is well received and has the potential to influence students' attitudes. But it has a differentiated effect that is common to all countries: those students that are more involved

in society to start with participate more in the project – in a context where a subset of students seem to become little interested as time goes – and are more influenced by it. This may draw the limit of an approach that does not take into account the very unequal levels of civic maturity of adolescents, and illustrates how it can further raise inequalities along that dimension.

The rest of this report is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the institutional framework in the four countries; Section 3 describes the ACT program and its implementation; Section 4 presents the experimental design and section 5 the data produced for this research; Eventually, section 6 checks on the quality of the design and the data collection, then gives the evaluation results.

2 Institutional Framework

2.1 Citizenship education in England, France, Greece and Spain.

While promoting citizenship education has long been at the core of the European cooperation,[3] the development of equity, social cohesion and active citizenship lists among the top priorities of the current European political agenda (European Commission (2017)). In spite of these common objectives, notable differences exists across European countries as regards citizenship teaching. This section outlines the differences that are salient across the four countries of our study. Appendix B further provides a brief description of each national system.

Historical perspective. Greece and France show a long tradition in teaching citizenship education, having introduced it in their curriculum for the first time in 1931 and 1945 respectively. In England and Spain, citizenship education has been introduced much more recently, being in the national curriculum in 2002 in both countries. The curricula has evolved over time and all the four countries implemented reforms between 2010 and 2015. Citizenship education in England is now compulsory in many state schools (although it is not mandatory in schools that have the autonomy to dis-apply the national curriculum). In Spain the curriculum has been permitted to vary across autonomous communities.

Instruction time. Consistent with the long tradition of teaching citizenship in Greece and France, these countries devote more time to this subject in lower-secondary education. The average yearly hours recommended for teaching citizenship education are 18 hours in France and 18.7 hours in Greece, while

---

[3]In 2006, the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union identified social and civic competences as part of the 8 key competences that are essential for citizens living in a knowledge-based society (*Source: Recommendation 2006/962/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December on key competences for lifelong learning, OJ L 394, 30.12.2006.*)

the Spanish curriculum recommends approximately 11.7 hours a year[4] (European Commission (2017)). Besides, France is the only country where citizenship is continuously taught as a separate subject every year during primary and secondary education. In Spain, it is not taught in upper-secondary grades, and in Greece, the full middle-school load is concentrated in one year (European Commission (2017)).

Content. The Eurydice report (European Commission (2017)) undertook a qualitative analysis of all the national curricula from European countries including the four in our study. They divided competencies in four large groups: a) interacting effectively and constructively with others; b) thinking critically; c) acting in a socially responsible manner; and d) acting democratically. Appendix Tables B1 and B2 show each of the groups' competences and whether they are present in the national curriculum for lower secondary pupils. There are competencies that are common across most countries: responsibility, cooperation, communicating and listening, critical thinking, exercising judgement, understanding the world, solidarity, respect for other humans and human rights, respect for rules and participation. The English system seems to put more emphasis in critical thinking and democracy, whereas the Spanish and Greek curricula offer a broader set of competencies, though not as complete and broad as the French curriculum.

Countries also differ in recommendations for extra-curricular activities related to citizenship education, but not for student or parental engagement. France, Spain and Greece offer a broad set of activities, ranging from Environment, Sports, Arts, International networking and political life. Spain and France go further and recommend voluntary work. England emphasizes environment, political life and voluntary work, but does not include sports or arts in its curriculum. All four countries provide recommendations in their curriculum with regard to student engagement in student councils and parent's engagement in school governing boards (European Commission (2017)).

2.2 Teaching practices

Educational scientists has long emphasized the role of student-centered teaching practices in improving student learning. In a recent review, Muijs et al. (2014) shows that teaching practices requiring strong student-teacher interactions as well as active student engagement are systematically associated with gains in student learning. Comfortingly, a growing body of evidence in the economic literature supports the view that such teaching practices are more effective in raising both student learning and positive school attitudes (Angrist & Lavy (2001), Machin & McNally (2008), Kane et al. (2011), Aslam & Kingdon (2011), Blazar (2015), Araujo et al. (2016), Briole (2019)). Recent reviews further suggest that this result

---

[4]The Spanish data is based on Extremadura. There is no data from England because it is not the normal practice to specify the instruction time for any curriculum area

also applies to citizenship and moral education in secondary schools.[5] In particular, Print (2012) argue that many research works support the view that "participatory approaches such as class voting, group inquiry, simulations, fieldwork and cooperative learning" are particularly effective in raising student civic values and engagement.

Teaching practices greatly vary across European countries (Isac et al. (2015)). These variations are also observed across the four countries in our study. In particular, France is one of the countries where teachers put the highest emphasis on teacher-centered practices (like teacher lectures) as opposed to student-centered practices and practices implying strong interactions with students (OECD (2019)). In contrast, student-centered practices are more prevalent in Greece, Spain and Great Britain, with British teachers putting the highest emphasis on these practices. Generally speaking, this pattern is consistent with our data, as French teachers have the lowest score on the index that we created to measure the prevalence of student-centered practices (Table A39).

Differences in citizenship teaching practices also arise across countries. The English curriculum does not provide guidelines on classroom assessment, whereas Greece provides general guidelines, and Spain and France provide specific guidelines. Among these guidelines, France, Greece and Spain recommend written tests and essays, oral assignments, teacher observation and self and peer assessment. In France and Greece, the recommendations go further and include project-based assessment. In France, this includes portfolios.[6] Regarding national exams, England and France offer examinations leading to a certification at the secondary level. In Spain and France there are examinations for monitoring purposes, whereas in Greece there is no national test on citizenship education (European Commission (2017)).

Consistent with our survey, teachers in the four countries are not specialized only in citizenship education (Table A38). In France, Greece and Spain teachers are specialised in subjects other than citizenship, whereas in England, there is a citizenship-specific qualification but most prospective teachers do not take it up. Teachers in France and Spain are offered career professional development activities to deliver and implement citizenship education, but in England, there are not such activities accessible to teachers (European Commission (2017)).

---

[5]See for example Geboers et al. (2013) or Knowles et al. (2018)

[6]Portfolio assessment is particularly recommended for the assessment of citizenship education (European Commission (2012)). It is defined as follows: "Portfolio assessment enables the collection of information about students' performance across time (...) it is likely to provide a broader picture of the products of learning and is therefore particularly adapted to holistic areas such as that of social and civic competences" (European Commission (2012, 2017).

3 The intervention

3.1 The ACT program

The objective of the ACT program is to improve students' civic and social skills, democratic participation and tolerance through the implementation of a citizenship project in their school. To reach this goal, the intervention included 2 components: (1) a teacher training at the beginning of the school year and, (2) the implementation, by those trained teachers, of a citizenship project over the course of the school year. In this section we describe the general features of these phases and emphasize some peculiarities of the participating countries that deserve special attention. Both teacher training and in-class implementation were first piloted during the 2017-18 school year in about three schools per country. The full ACT program was then implemented at scale and evaluated during the 2018-19 school year.

3.1.1 Teacher's training

Teacher professional development is key to improve student skills. One of the main dimensions of the ACT program consisted in a teacher training based on the best practices identified in the literature for effective teacher training. The ACT training phase was delivered through two days of face-to-face training sessions and was followed by mentoring conducted by assigned trainers. The mentoring aimed to promote and encourage networking and interactions among teachers. A debriefing session for teachers was organized towards at the end of the academic year.[7] It is also worth noting that this training was recognized with training credits for teachers who carried out the training and implementation of projects.

Face-to-face training

At the beginning of the school year, a two-day training session was provided by specific trainers recruited by the Public Authority in each country. Trainers carried out face-to-face training sessions for voluntary secondary school teachers whose schools were selected into the treatment group of the ACT field trial (Section 3 details the randomisation process). The goals of these sessions were to explore the nature and the objective of the ACT program and to promote active learning through the implementation of student-centered teaching practices. It also aimed to inform teachers about the stages of the program and the methodology to be followed at each stage, with emphasis on citizenship projects. This methodology involved asking teachers to modify the traditional teacher-student relationship so that students may

---

[7]This session was optional but served as an opportunity for reflection that could both improve the ACT project for future iterations as well as help teachers more firmly anchor the teaching practices and strategies implemented during ACT into teachers' minds for future use. Only Greece conducted a face-to-face debriefing session, while the rest of the countries decided to create an online mentoring session for this purpose.

have the opportunity to exercise autonomy as fellow citizens. The training also aimed at promoting the implementation of innovative assessment methods (self and peer evaluation).

Online mentoring of teachers

The mentoring aimed to promote and encourage networking and interactions among teachers by providing continued support, guidance and feedback to teachers throughout the project implementation period. This mentoring program was carried out virtually and contained either synchronous (video chat, instant messaging, phone calls) or asynchronous (email exchange, resource files, message board, etc.) elements. Moreover, the web-based collaborative platform, used during the project implementation period by all partners, served the purposes of mentoring by providing teachers with valuable and practical information and helping them to collectively develop strategies and skills on how to best implement their versatile role in the citizenship project. It is worth noting that teachers could interact among themselves on this on-line platform, helping them to learn from what others were doing.

Almost 100% of the volunteer teachers from treated schools actually participated in the training in all countries (Table A27). However, it is worth noting that this proportion is lower in Greece, where about 15% of teachers did not attend any training session. Generally speaking, teachers were very satisfied with the training in France and England. In both countries, training sessions observed by researchers were interactive and practical and provided space for teachers to consider how the activities proposed might work in their own schools. With regards to the pedagogy both promoted and used by ACT trainers, the qualitative report notes a big difference with respect to traditional training programs in France. Qualitative observations also reveal the very high level of trainers' knowledge and pedagogical skills in France and England. By contrast, the Spanish qualitative reports emphasizes lower levels of teacher satisfaction with the training. In particular, Spanish teachers found that too little time was spent on practical and ACT-specific issues whereas too much time was spent on general issues. They also raised problems with the online follow-up and pointed to the low quality and level of engagement of one of the four trainers.

3.1.2 Implementation of ACT citizenship projects

The ACT protocol

The ACT citizenship project encompasses a set of activities (events, services, videos, campaigns) related to at least one of the ACT themes (fighting discrimination, social inclusion, cultural diversity) and designed to benefit a specific group of people (other classes in the same grade, classes from lower grades, another school, community groups, the whole community). It should have a well-defined objective

(to raise awareness, to inspire change, to promote dialogue, to bring people together) around which these activities were organized. Above all, an ACT citizenship project had to be led by students and guided by the teacher.

Participating classes in treated schools designed and implemented their citizenship projects over the course of the school year 2018-19, from roughly October through April.[8] The ACT protocol is divided into two distinct phases: a preparatory phase and an implementation phase. During the preparation phase, preliminary activities are first implemented by the teacher to set the tone for the ACT project and to prepare the students for the new type of active pedagogy. These activities are then followed by three mandatory lesson plans designed to (i) introduce the main objectives of the program and the scope of citizenship projects; (ii) have students design citizenship project proposals and present their proposal to the class; and (iii) have students vote for one project to be implemented in the whole class. Students are randomly allocated to groups of 4-5 students during all this preparation phase. Once students have voted for the project they wish to implement, the teacher can work with the class to co-construct an action plan for project implementation. Working in their randomly assigned small groups, students share responsibility for various steps in the implementation of their chosen citizenship project and the realisation of its activities. For instance, some projects consisted in collecting food at a supermarket to distribute to homeless people; others organized activities for the elderly in a close-by retirement home; others played a theater performance related to discrimination issues in a primary school; some classes produced posters aiming to reduce islamophobia in their school; others planned a picnic with food from different cultures represented within their school to raise awareness of and celebrate multiculturalism in their school; etc.

The final mandatory aspect of the ACT protocol is the implementation of self and peer assessment of the project implementation, based on the regular use of student portfolios.

Citizenship project implementation

As regards project implementation, England is the only country where compliance to treatment assignment is perfect (Table A27). In the three other countries, 93-96% of treated teachers declare to have implemented an ACT citizenship project in their class at the end of the school year, but 2 teachers (4%) from the control group in France and 3 teachers (9%) from the control group in Greece also declare to have implemented a project following the guidelines of the ACT protocol. Treated schools have devoted, on average, between 14.25 hours (in England) and 22.14 hours (in Spain) to the projects (Table A30). Among the 3 topics covered by the program, discrimination was the most frequent in the four partici-

---

[8]This period may vary across countries, especially in England, where it was much shorter for a subset of schools, that started in February.

pating countries, followed by social inclusion and cultural diversity, and this order is consistent in the four countries (Table A29). Disabled people were the most frequently targeted population in France and Greece (38%), while migrants were also one of the most frequently targeted population in Greece (35%) and Spain (32%). Furthermore, 28% of projects in Spain targeted women. English projects were mostly targetting other groups other than those defined in Table A29 (40%), with homeless being the second biggest group (15%) in England.

To implement ACT citizenship projects, teachers in treated schools globally declare to have followed the protocol provided during the training sessions (Table A33). However, the proportion of treated teachers who declare to have followed this protocol "completely" or "a lot" varies from 94% in France to 50% in Spain. Accordingly, the proportion of teachers who declare to have implemented 3 of the key features of the ACT protocol which we were able to measure (random groups, vote, portfolios) is much higher in France (67%) and Greece (54%) than in Spain (27%) and England (15%). This pattern is consistent with students' perception, who declare a higher degree of teacher interventionism in Spain than in the three other countries (Table A34).

At the end of the school year, students were also asked whether they had taken part in a citizenship project in their school over the year (Table A28). A non-negligible share of students from the treatment group declare to have not participated in any citizenship project over the school year. While this share represents 20-24% in France, Greece and England, it goes up to 36% in Spain. This is likely due to students from treated schools misreporting their participation to the project or to projects stopped early or not started at all in treated schools (such occurrences are mentioned in the qualitative reports). However, this may also be due to students from treated schools actually not taking part in the project: when we restrict to the schools where teachers declare to have implemented an ACT project and where at least 50% of the students declare to have participated in a citizenship project over the year, 16% (France and Greece) to 24% (Spain) of students still declare no participation in such projects. This lower level of student actual participation to ACT projects in Spain echoes findings from the qualitative analysis which emphasizes low levels of student engagement and students' reluctant behaviours in this country.[9]

---

[9]While the qualitative report highlights a subsequent level of individual reluctant behaviour (shirking, making jokes, etc.) in Spain, it also notes that in one school out of the ten observed, students collectively proposed to give up the project, which didn't happen this way in other countries.

4 Experimental design

4.1 Recruitment process

The schools' recruitment process started in February 2018. National educational authorities aimed to identify a set of approximately 100 schools in each country to participate in the ACT program on a voluntary basis.[10] For practical reasons, in most countries the recruitment process was limited to a subsample of educational regions. Schools in this experiment are a selected sample in each of the participating countries and, within schools, teachers participated on a voluntary basis. There was no eligibility criterion, therefore volunteer schools were identified in the whole population of schools in these educational regions.[11]

Public Authorities in each country first prepared the letters that were used to recruit schools for the ACT field trials. These letters briefly described the ACT project and provided general information about the main features and components of the program (e.g. random selection of schools, teacher's training characteristics, the implementation and evaluation timeline). The draft letters were validated by evaluators in each country to ensure that they contained all necessary information but did not unduly influence future project implementation by schools and teachers. Once validated, Public Authorities sent out the letters between February and April 2018 and between April and May they carried out follow-up steps or further campaigns for interest as necessary (*e.g.* a detailed informative letters about the ACT project, the school commitment letter, principals on-line questionnaires to gather administrative data). Schools had to express their interest in participating in ACT before the end of June 2018.[12]

In a second step, between July and September 2018, Public Authorities collected the names of the teacher(s) and students whom volunteer schools planned to include in the program, should the school be allocated to the treatment group, and communicated them to the evaluators. Only schools that expressed their interest in participating in ACT and provided the lists were included in the randomisation. This process ensures that the teachers and the students to be surveyed in treatment and control schools are identified before randomization, and thus are *ex ante* comparable.

---

[10]In England, the British Council (rather than the Department for Education) took responsibility for school recruitment. As there were difficulties in recruitment, the randomisation process was undertaken in three separate rounds (with a cut-off date in September 2018, February 2019 and May 2019). In all countries but Greece, all participating schools were public.

[11]In England, schools are from all regions; France and Spain targeted a subset of regions, but they were scattered over the national territory; In Greece, school were concentrated in the Attica region.

[12]This was different in England. Given a lack of volunteer schools, campaigns were launched again by the British Council from September 2018, with continous efforts from the British Council, the Department for Education and the London School of Economics to encourage more school participation.

4.2 Randomisation process

Randomisation took place between September and October 2018, depending on the country (and in February and May 2019 for English schools belonging to the second and third round of recruitment). Evaluators collected school data, either via existing administrative databases or directly from the schools (on-line questionnaire to school principals). They formed school strata on the basis of similar characteristics of the school (e.g. location and school size) and/or student's characteristics (e.g. student social and immigration background or metrics of student achievement in previous years). Schools were randomly allocated to the treatment and control groups within strata. When a school was allocated to the treatment group, all teachers in the initial list were called to attend the training, and implement the program with all the students also mentioned in the initial list. Although the randomisation process was rather similar between countries, there were some differences in the stratification process depending on data availability.

Table 1: Sample size

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Number of schools				
Total	77	90	103	42
Treated schools	38	46	52	21
Control schools	39	44	51	21
Number of students				
Total	2290	3286	2293	1097
Students in Treated school	1211	1855	1184	462
Students in Control schools	1079	1431	1109	635
Number of teachers				
Total	126	115	145	44
Teachers in Treated school	61	61	70	21
Teachers in Control schools	65	54	75	23

In England, the British Council recruited 42 schools in three waves from all regions of the country, and the evaluation team formed 21 pairs of schools with similar characteristics, of which one was assigned to treatment and one to control. In France, 77 schools volunteered: clusters of four were formed, completed with one cluster of three: 38 schools were drawn to participate in the program and 39 schools to the control group. In Greece, 46 schools were randomly assigned to the treatment group and 44 to the control

group. In Spain, the Ministry of Education recruited 103 schools. The evaluation team formed 50 pairs of schools and a trio with similar characteristics (51 strata) from which 52 schools were assigned to the treatment group and 51 schools to the control group. In total, the ACT project involved 312 schools for the four participating countries (Table 1), of which 157 were assigned to the treatment group and fully participated in the ACT project, and 155 were placed in the control group and did not participate in ACT during the 2018-19 school year.[13]

A total of 8,966 students and 430 teachers were selected in the study, of which 4,712 and 213 were in the treatment schools respectively. While there was one participating class per school in Spain and England, several classes participated in some schools in France and in many schools in Greece.

5 Data

5.1 Data sources

Student and teacher surveys

Online surveys were conducted at the beginning and the end of the school year. Student surveys were conducted in school computer laboratories and their conduction was supervised by teachers, who were present during the whole process. Each student was given a personal access code to enter the online questionnaire. Students were given the option not to participate in the survey as soon as the questionnaire opened. Prior to that, parental consent was given through an opt-out procedure that was approved by the research ethics committee (Internal Review Board) of the Paris School of Economics and the Ethics Committee of the London School of Economics. Teacher surveys were directly sent to teachers at the beginning and the end of the school year.[14]

While the main objective of these surveys was to measure the impact of the ACT program on both teachers and students, they also included a broad set of questions related to student and teacher characteristics. In particular, the student baseline survey included questions on student individual characteristics (gender, age, geographical origin and experience as a student representative) and family background (parents' employment and socio-economic status, number of books at home and composition of the household). Similarly, the teacher survey included questions on teacher demographics (gender, age), professional background (experience, subjects taught, experience in citizenship teaching) and civic engagement at school

---

[13]Schools in the control group had the opportunity to carry out the ACT project during the 2019-20 school year.

[14]While teachers systematically took the baseline survey before randomization, most of involved students took it within the next 2-3 weeks after randomization, but before the program actually started and the teachers even entered training.

and outside of school. At the end of the school year, specific questions were asked to treated teachers and students to collect information on projects' implementation and program satisfaction.

Campaign for Climate questionnaire

To complement the surveys, students involved in the program were asked to volunteer their testimonials and express their concern about global warming and environmental degradation at the end of the school year. Testimonials were gathered anonymously at the school level through an additional online survey and could take the form of either a written text addressed to European political leaders or a picture illustrating their concern about global warming and environmental degradation. The aim of this additional research activity was to measure possible differences in concrete democratic participation. A total of only 484 students from control and treatment classes shared their stories as part of this process.[15]

Administrative data on student school behaviours

We have collected administrative data on student school behaviour (truancy, disciplinary sanctions) in France. To do so, surveyors recruited by the research team went directly to the schools involved in the program at the end of the school year to obtain this data from schools and anonymize it. Recording students' absences, tardiness and disciplinary sanctions is a legal requirement for each school in France. Consequently, this data is available for every student in the French sample, irrespective of survey response.

5.2 Outcomes

To evaluate the impact of the program, we construct standardized indexes for students and teachers, each of which is built from several outcomes (scales and/or variables). To do so, we follow Anderson (2008) standardization method. This method consists of (i) switching the sign of outcomes where necessary so that the positive direction always indicates a "better" outcome; (ii) normalizing each outcome and assigning it to an area (or family) of outcomes and (iii) computing a weighted average of all outcomes from the same area to build the corresponding index, where each weight corresponds to the inverse of the covariance matrix of the normalized outcome.

While our main analysis of the program impact focuses on standardized indexes, we also provide the impact on the scales and variables they are built from for interpretation purposes. For this part of the analysis, we report both the unadjusted p-value of the coefficient of the treatment variable and the p-value adjusted for control of the False Discovery Rate (see Benjamini & Hochberg (1995)) within each outcome area, to take into account the large amount of variables tested.

---

[15]This data is only available in England, France and Spain.

5.2.1 Student outcomes

Citizenship is a complex notion which has different meanings across Western democracies (Abowitz & Harnish (2006)). Historically, the notion of citizenship is embedded in a democratic *political* orientation, and focuses on civic knowledge, democratic values and institutions and traditional forms of political engagement (elections, interest in politics, etc). A more recent conceptualization emphasizes the *social* dimension of citizenship, with a higher focus on social cohesion and on the coexistence of citizens.[16] In this study, we build 4 main indexes at the student individual level to capture the program impact on different dimensions of citizenship: they emphasize social dimensions, referring to the stated objectives of the program. These dimensions were defined ex ante in accordance with the Public Authorities, and their exact measure was tested during the pilot phase, adjusted and discussed with the qualitative teams before full scale implementation. The next paragraphs describe the construction of these indexes and briefly discusses how they relate to the different notions of citizenship.[17] We complement these individual measures with school participation rates in the "Campaign for Climate", an initiative which provided students the opportunity to express their concerns about global warming and environmental degradation.

Civic Attitudes

The first index we consider in the analysis is *Civic Attitudes*. This index emphasizes the social dimension of citizenship and relates to the concepts of *acting in a socially responsible manner* and *dealing with differences* developed by Ten Dam et al. (2011). The *Civic Attitudes* index is built from three main outcomes: tolerance, trust and altruism. To measure students' tolerance, we ask them the extent to which they agree with general statements about migrants' rights and gender equality, and the extent to which they favor social interactions with individuals from their own religion. Our measure of trust is based on a classical set of questions intended to measure the extent to which students trust their friends, classmates, teachers, neighbours and others in general. We ask students about three types of behaviours to measure their level of altruism: (i) engagement at school, as measured by tutoring of younger students and involvement to the school newspaper, (ii) social engagement outside of school, measured by volunteering in a humanitarian association or in an association aimed at helping the community or mentoring younger kids (with homework, in sports, etc.) and (iii) altruistic behaviour, measured by a series of questions intended to measure prosocial behaviours in daily life. Generally speaking, our measures of tolerance, trust and altruism are based on scales that are widely used in the political science and social psychology literature and whose psychometric validity has been largely documented. For example, our measures of

---

[16]See Geboers et al. (2013) for a review.

[17]A full description of the construction of each index and scale is provided in the Pre-Analysis Plan (Briole et al. (2019)).

tolerance with respect to gender equality and migrants' right are based on scales adapted from the 2016's International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS), while our measures of religious tolerance is borrowed from the REDco project, an international research project on religion and values among 14-16 years old students (see for example Weisse (2010)). Finally, we measure altruistic behaviour through an adapted version of the Self-Report Altruism scale (SRA-scale) developed by Rushton et al. (1981). For each scale, we further check that Cronbach's alphas are above 0.7 in each national samples.[18]

Democratic Participation

Our second index, *Democratic Participation*, emphasizes the political dimension of citizenship and relates to the concepts of *acting democratically* developed by Ten Dam et al. (2011). It is based on three main outcomes: political self-efficacy, interest in politics and participation in the "Global Climate Strike for Future" of 15 March 2019. Political self-efficacy is measured through a standard set of questions asking students about their political knowledge and their self-confidence in talking about and participating in politics. Interest in politics is measured by asking students how often they keep themselves informed about current events, how often they talk about political and societal issues with their parents and friends, and whether they heard about the "Global Climate Strike for Future" on the one hand, and the likelihood that they would take part in different forms of traditional political engagement (ex: vote in elections, join a political party, etc.) in adulthood on the other hand. These first two measures of democratic participation are essentially based on scales borrowed from the 2016 ICCS. While they both refer to conventional forms of democratic participation, we complement them by asking students whether they participated in the international school strike for climate that occurred on 15 March 2019. This allows us to build a more comprehensive measure of democratic participation, especially because young people often prefer unconventional forms of participation over traditional ones like voting or joining political parties (Dalton (2015)).

Social Integration

Civic Attitudes and Democratic Participation indexes are two specific measures of citizenship competences. We complement them with the *Social Integration* index, a broader concept intended to measure the general quality of social interactions at school. This index is based on four main outcomes: (i) positive social interactions with classmates, (ii) bullying and discrimination in the classroom, (iii) the quality of

---

[18]We also designed experimental measures of student trust and altruism, based on a non-incentivized online version of the "Dictator Game" and the "Trust Game", played by students at the end of the endline questionnaire. As we were not able to incentivize the games, their validity is uncertain. Consistent with the Pre-analysis plan, we decided not to include these measures in the analysis due to very low levels of correlation with the corresponding survey measures (see Briole et al. (2019)).

student-teacher relationships and (iv) number of friends in the classroom. Positive interactions in the classroom are measured in three ways: student support for cooperative behaviour in the classroom, perceived social support from classmates and student well-being at school. The two first measures are based on scales adapted from the Classroom Life Instrument (Johnson et al. (1983)), and the third one on a scale developed by Behaghel et al. (2017). Bullying and discrimination are respectively measured with a series of questions adapted from the TIMSS 2015 student questionnaire and from a French research project on inequality dynamics, namely the "Dynegal" project, which asks students whether they were subject to bullying or discriminatory behaviours from their classmates in the recent past. The quality of student-teacher relationships is measured in two ways: a series of questions asking students what they think about their teachers' behaviour in general and a series of questions asking them whether their teachers encourage student participation when discussing political or social issues in class.

Civic Behaviours

In addition to the three indexes based on student surveys, we build a "hard" measure of civic behaviours based on the administrative data collected in France. The data contains information on student absenteeism and punctuality as well as on the number and the nature of disciplinary sanctions students were subject to over the school year. We can distinguish between exclusions, the most severe type of sanction, and smaller sanctions like hours of detention or disciplinary warnings. We therefore build the *Civic Behaviour* index, based on four outcomes: absences, punctuality, exclusions and smaller sanctions. For each of these outcomes, we consider the individual average over the school year. This index has two notable advantages: it is based on objective measures of student civic behaviours and it is not subject to any bias due to differential attrition, as it is collected for all students involved in the program in France, irrespective of their participation in the surveys. Avvisati et al. (2014) use a similar index to analyse the impact of an educational program on student behaviour in French middle schools.

5.2.2 Teacher-level outcomes

Teacher Pedagogy

We derive two additional indexes from the teacher questionnaires. The first one relates to teachers' pedagogical approach and is based on 4 outcomes: teachers' use of student-centered practices in general and, when they teach the specific class involved in the program, their pedagogical collaboration with colleagues and their beliefs regarding the effectiveness of citizenship education. For the first outcome, we ask teachers how often they implement practices such having students working in small groups or performing research tasks in general. While the second outcome measures a relatively close concept,

it is targeted to the class involved in the program and focuses more specifically on teaching practices emphasized during the teacher training. Teacher collaboration measures the extent to which teachers interact with other teachers to share their teaching experience, to prepare instructional materials and to observe them teaching in their classroom. Eventually, the last component of our measure of teacher pedagogy measures the extent to which teachers believe that citizenship education at school has a positive effect on students' political and civic learning, attitudes at school, involvement in school life and interest in citizenship issues.

School and Class Climate

The second index that we derive from the teacher questionnaire measures the quality of the social climate at the school and the class level. It is based on three outcomes: school climate, class disruption and the weight of student opinion with regard to school functioning. School climate measures the occurrence of anti-social behaviours like cheating, verbal abuse or physical violence at the school level. Class disruption is based on the frequency of disruptive behaviour in the specific class involved in the program. Finally, the last outcome is derived from a general question about the extent to which students' opinions are taken into account regarding the way the school functions.

5.3 Sample characteristics by country

5.3.1 Teacher characteristics

There is an almost equal share of female and male teachers in the Spanish and the English sample, while female teachers are over-represented in France (71%) and Greece (87%) (Table A37). Teachers in our sample are quite experienced: their average experience as a teacher ranges from 11 years in England to 21 years in Greece, while their average age ranges from 37 to 49 years old. While in all countries only a minority of teachers in our sample studied this subject during their initial training, a vast majority of teachers had already taught citizenship for several years in every country even though this proportion is lower in France (64%) than in the three other countries (>80%). Besides, more than seven out of ten teachers declare to have implemented a citizenship project with their students over the last two years in all countries but Spain, where this is true of just under half. Subjects taught by participating teachers vary greatly across countries and seem to be specific to each educational and cultural context (Table A38). A majority of teachers teach History-Geography in France (61%), Social and Political Education in Greece (86%), Ethical values in Spain (78%) and citizenship in England (45%). Teachers in France and

Spain are more engaged at school while teachers in Greece and England are more engaged out of school (Table A37).

With regard to pedagogy, teachers in France implement student-centered practices much less often than in the three other countries, with an index being almost 1 SD lower than in Greece or Spain (Table A39). However, teachers in France and England collaborate more with their colleagues than in Greece and Spain. In sum, it seems that in countries where teachers engage their students more in their teaching, they collaborate less with their colleagues and *vice versa*. Besides, at the beginning of the school year, teachers in all countries were strongly convinced that citizenship education at school is effective in improving student civic attitudes and behaviours, with an average index ranging from 4.13 (/5) in Spain to 4.56 in Greece; this is consistent with the fact that those teachers volunteered to this program. Eventually, based on teachers' opinion, the school climate seems fairly similar across countries in sampled schools.

5.3.2   Student characteristics

While an equal share of female and male students is included in each national sample, students are 0.5 years younger in France and England than in Greece and Spain on average, due to the inclusion of 8th grade classes in the program in these countries (Table A40). A much lower proportion of students have at least one parent or grand-parent born abroad in England (11%) than in the three other countries (24-33%). A much larger proportion of students have all their parents and grand-parents born in a European country in Greece and England (90-93%) than in France and Spain (74-79%). A larger proportion of students have ever been elected as representative in the Greek sample (54%) than in the 3 other countries (28-32%), maybe because students are able to have such an experience as soon as in primary school in Greece. There doesn't seem to be clear differences across countries in terms of student family background, as measured by parents' employment status, socio-economic status and number of books at home.

Student tolerance is fairly similar in all national samples, with an average index ranging from 3.77 (/5) in England to 3.99 in Spain (Table A41).). In contrast, student trust appears moderate in all countries, with an average index ranging from 2.27 (/4) in France and England to 2.47 in Greece. While 20 to 28% of students declare to have tutored younger students or to have been involved in the school newspaper and to have volunteered in a humanitarian association or in an association aimed at helping the community or mentoring younger kids in the past, slightly less students in France declare to adopt altruistic behaviour in daily life than in the other three countries. As a result, our altruism index is lower in France (0.43) than in Greece, Spain and England (0.50-0.57).

Generally speaking, students in our sample seem to be little interested in politics and have low levels of political self-efficacy, though Greek students and, to some extent Spanish students, perform better on these dimensions. Interest in current political and social events ranges from 0.94 (/4) in France to 1.35 in Greece and prospective political engagement ranges from 2.55 (/5) in France to 2.83 in Greece (Table A42). In the same vein, political self-efficacy ranges from 2.11 in France (/4) to 2.56 in Greece. These findings of students from Greece and Spain having a greater interest in politics at baseline are consistent with the idea that the economic crisis hit these two countries particularly hard and made social and political issues very salient for a prolonged period of time.

Finally, the quality of student social interactions at school appears to be fairly similar across countries: while student well-being ranges from 2.81 (/4) in England to 3.03 in Greece, French and Spanish students declare to be victims of bullying or discriminatory behaviours less frequently than Greek and English ones (Table A43). The average number of friends among classmates varies from 5.80 in Spain to 7.10 in France. The quality of student-teacher relationships ranges from 2.60 (/4) in Spain to 2.85 in Greece.

6 Results

6.1 Balancing checks and attrition

Balancing Checks

Before moving on to the evaluation of the program itself, it is important to check on a country-by-country basis that the experimental protocol proceeded as planned and that the schools randomly drawn to participate in the program (among the schools agreeing to participate) can actually be considered comparable to those drawn to serve as a control group based on pre-treatment characteristics.

In all countries, we can measure a set of school-level characteristics before randomization using administrative data (such as school size, academic performance, social environment, and the number of students present in the initial class lists). We also surveyed teachers before randomization and have an extensive list of teacher characteristics and reported class practices. In France, we have further collected student-level administrative data. To begin with, Table A1 focuses on France and on the 77 schools that were included in the randomization protocol.[19] For each variable, the table presents the mean value in the 39 schools that were allocated to control (col. 1), the difference between the mean value in the 38 schools that were allocated to treatment (col. 2), and tests whether this difference is statistically signifi-

---

[19]Two schools are missing for the first three school-level variables because they are based on 2016 administrative sources and these schools were created later.

cant (col. 4 and 5). We show unadjusted p-values as well as p-values adjusted for multiple testing.[20] The Table shows no statistically significant difference between the treatment and control groups, regardless of whether we consider school-level administrative data (rows 1 to 5), teacher-level survey data (rows 7 to 24) or student-level administrative data (rows 25 to 29, this type of data being available for France only).

For example, students' average academic performance (as measured by pre-randomization results at previous end-of-middle-school national exams) is very similar between treatment and control schools. Similarly, average school size is not statistically different across treatment arms as well as the number of pre-selected students in each school (about 30 students per school). Overall, we detect a marginally significant pre-treatment difference across treatment arms for only one pre-randomization variable (out of 29), namely for students' average number of siblings (adjusted p-value= .12). Tables A2, A3 and A4 show the results of replicating those same balancing tests for Greece, Spain and England respectively. Again, these tables do not reveal any statistically significant differences in pre-randomization outcomes between the treatment and control groups in any of the countries under consideration, except for the weight of students' opinion on school functioning which is slightly higher in treated schools in Spain (adjusted p-value=.073). The set of pre-randomization variables that are available to compare treatment and control schools is not exactly the same in the four countries, but the results are consistent, namely no statistically significant difference across treatment arms.[21] Taken together, Tables A1 to A4 suggest that the randomization was properly conducted in each country and did not generate any problematic pre-treatment differences between treatment and control groups.

Attrition

A balanced randomization is only one of the conditions necessary to assess the effects of the program. Another important condition is that response rates to post-treatment surveys should be the same in both treatment and control schools. Put differently, the data should be consistent with the assumption that selection into the treatment group did not affect the propensity of students (or teachers) to complete our endline questionnaires. To explore this issue, Table A5 shows the rate of non-response (or "attrition") for each post-treatment data source and each country, while Table A6 shows the difference in non-response rates between treatment arms for each post-treatment data source and each country. With respect to student post-treatment surveys, Table A5 and A6 show that the non-response rate is relatively low (about

---

[20]Equality of the two means can be rejected at a 10% confidence rate (resp. 5%) when the p-value is below 0.10 (resp. 0.05).

[21]Baseline student surveys on civic attitudes, democratic participation or teaching practices were conducted in all countries before the program, but after the randomization. This is the reason why we cannot include them in these randomization checks and have to rely on ad hoc sets of pre-randomization variables that can be different from one country to the other. Baseline surveys conducted in all four countries will be used, however, to check for pre-treatment difference across treatment and control respondents to end-line surveys.

20%) and balanced across treatment arms in Spain and France. In Greece, non-response rate is larger (47%), but it is still balanced across treatment arms. The English case appears to be more problematic since the non-response rate is both relatively large (38%) and significantly different across treatment arms (with a response gap of about 11 percentage points).

With respect to teacher post-treatment surveys, the non-response rate is relatively small and balanced across treatment arms in France and in England. It is much larger in Greece, but still balanced across treatment arms. In Spain, the non-response rate is significantly different across treatment arms by 7 percentage points.

France is the only country where we have been able to collect student-level administrative data on post-treatment outcomes.[22] This data provides us with information on students' post-treatment behavior (days of absenteeism, disciplinary sanctions) that are likely less exposed to social desirability biases than information obtained from post-treatment surveys presented to students. Furthermore, this administrative data is exhaustive, with a very small rate of missing values (1.7%) and no significant unbalances across treatment arms.

To further analyze non-response patterns, Tables A7 to A10 show differences in pre-treatment variables between treatment and control respondents to post-treatment surveys in each country. These tables build on our baseline students (and teachers) surveys to test whether there are significant differences across treatment and control respondents in our pre-treatment measure of students' civic attitudes, democratic participation and social integration (as well as in our measure of teachers' pedagogical practices and perception of school climate).

Consistent with the non-response analysis above, the results of these balancing checks appear to be more problematic in the UK than in the other three countries. In England, there is evidence that the pre-treatment levels of democratic participation, civic attitudes and social integration were all significantly higher among respondents who benefited from the program (see Table A10). There is also some evidence that students' representatives (as well as older students) were over-represented among respondents who benefited from the program, which likely explains some of the initial differences in civic attitudes, democratic participation and social integration. All in all, we have a body of evidence demonstrating that UK end-line respondents in the control group were initially significantly less civic-minded than those in the treatment group. Assuming for instance that the main effect of the program is to help the less civic-minded students mature and catch up, the comparison of end-line respondents in the treatment and

---

[22]The English team has applied for administrative data (National Pupil Database) but this has not yet been approved by the time this report has been written.

control group would lead to an under-estimate of the actual effect of the program on students' level of citizenship.

The difference in pre-treatment characteristics across treatment and control end-line respondents are less significant and less systematic in France, Greece and Spain, consistent with previous non-response analysis.

In France (Table A7), there is no significant pre-treatment difference in the level of civic attitudes or social integration across treatment and control respondents. There is no difference in the proportion of representatives (or age difference) either. There is evidence, however, that the pre-treatment level of democratic participation was significantly lower among students in the treatment group. The effects of the program on this dimension of citizenship will have to be interpreted with caution in France.

In Spain (Table A9), there is no significant pre-treatment difference in the level of democratic participation or civic attitudes across treatment and control end-line respondents. There is no difference in the proportion of representatives (or age differences) either. There is evidence, however, that the level of social integration was significantly higher pre-treatment among respondents in the treatment group. Assuming that the effect of the program is not the same on the most socially connected students as on the others, the over-representation of socially connected students in the treatment group may be a source of bias in Spain.

In Greece (Table A8), we only find some marginally significant differences in students' pre-treatment characteristics across treatment and control respondents, with treatment respondents being older, being more often with non-European origins and having less siblings.

It should be emphasized that – among endline respondents - we find no pre-treatment difference in teachers' characteristics, teaching practices or the school climate's perception across treatment and control teachers. [23]

It is worth emphasizing that the few differences we find between control and treatment respondents are not generated by the initial randomization (we have seen no evidence of imbalance at that stage), but by the differential selection of treated and control students into answering end-line surveys. The decomposition in Table A5 shows that much of the attrition is related to some students not answering rather than entire schools not implementing the surveys. The exception is England where both sources contribute.

---

[23]The only exception relates to teacher education level, which is slightly lower among respondents in the treatment group in Spain (p-value=.097).

6.2 Program effects and heterogeneity

The average impacts of the ACT program are presented by country in Table 2.[24] The main outcomes are student scores, computed from our end-line surveys, along three dimensions: civic attitudes, democratic participation and social integration. While our main analysis focuses on these indexes, Tables A11 to A14 in the Appendix report the impact of the program on the subscales they are built from. Because there are many subscales, multiple testing issues are serious when it comes to analyzing program impact in detail: we report adjusted p-values for them. We also measure the rate of participation in our end-of-the year Climate Campaign, measured at the school level (this did not happen in Greece). In France only, we could build a civic behavior index from administrative data (absences, sanctions). This specific index has two qualities: it reflects actual behavior and it is not subject to desirability bias; and it has negligible attrition, compared to all other outcomes.

Finally, Table 3 reports the impact of the program on teacher pedagogical practices and on their assessment of school climate. Here again, we concentrate on these two indexes, but report program effects on the subscales from which they are built in Tables A11 to A14 in the Appendix.

There is no significant impact on student outcomes in Greece and Spain. In France, we observe a significant impact of the program on civic attitudes, and, consistently, on civic behavior. The former index is increased by 11 percent of a standard deviation, and the latter by 17 percent of a standard deviation, and both are precisely estimated. The impact on civic attitudes seems driven by increased altruism. The impact on civic behavior is driven by a reduction in the more serious behaviour and sanctions – truancy and exclusion – rather than by smaller sanctions and punctuality.[25]

In England, we observe a significant *negative* effect in civic attitudes and no significant effect on the other student outcomes. However, the previous section has discussed the large attrition rates in this sample, driven both by entire schools and students within schools. Further, this attrition does not have the same structure in the treatment and control groups, and this is due in a large part to the fact that some control schools dropped out of the research protocol at the end of the year. As a result, respondent students are less similar between treatment and control samples than in other countries, and their comparison is not robust. Given these methodological difficulties, we will not emphasize impacts on students' outcomes in this country.

---

[24]All specifications are OLS regressions of the outcome on a dummy for treatment school, and include strata fixed effects, as well as predetermined control variables selected by a LASSO estimation. Weights correcting for different within-strata probabilities to be selected as treatment or control are included. These weights matter for a very small number of strata in France, Spain and England, as almost all strata in these countries consist of pairs or groups of 4 (except one strata in France and one in Spain). In Greece, 13 out of 31 strata have unbalanced probabilities to be selected in treatment or control.

[25]Some of those outcomes are not reported in a few schools, but absences are available in all schools.

Table 2: Impact of the program on students

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) p-value	(5) N	(6) Clusters
France						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.112	0.049	0.023	1758	76
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.064	0.053	0.231	1790	76
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.032	0.044	0.473	1793	76
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.168	0.074	0.023	2251	77
Participation to Climate Campaign	0.059	-0.033	0.243	0.892	77	77
Greece						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.024	0.041	0.552	1711	75
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.061	0.049	0.215	1734	75
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.034	0.058	0.556	1737	75
Spain						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.007	0.049	0.880	1884	99
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.004	0.040	0.925	1897	99
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.065	0.053	0.220	1898	99
Participation to Climate Campaign	0.047	-0.111	0.228	0.628	103	103
England						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.106	0.057	0.063	675	39
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.007	0.053	0.897	679	39
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.063	0.087	0.468	679	39
Participation to Climate Campaign	0.127	-0.269	0.323	0.405	42	42

Note: This table shows XXXXXX.

There is some evidence that teacher pedagogy is affected by the program: the effect on this index is always large, and it is significant around the 10% threshold in three out of four countries. It likely reflects the stronger importance given to citizenship education in the treatment group, and the more frequent use of student centered practices and collaboration, all features conveyed by the teacher training. Naturally, these are self-reported measures and are likely subject to desirability bias from trained subjects. Surprisingly, we detect no improvement of school climate, in spite of the collaborative nature of the intervention.

The lack of average effects on students' outcomes in Greece and Spain, compared to France, cannot be explained by teacher participation in the training, which is very high in all three countries (Table A27). Furthermore, 85% to 93% of treatment group teachers in all three countries report that they have

Table 3: Impact of the program on teachers

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) p-value	(5) N	(6) Clusters
France						
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	0.278	0.181	0.124	107	75
School and Class Climate Index	0.000	0.038	0.146	0.795	107	75
Greece						
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	0.447	0.235	0.057	65	59
School and Class Climate Index	0.000	0.014	0.288	0.962	65	59
Spain						
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	0.168	0.190	0.375	114	93
School and Class Climate Index	0.000	-0.267	0.200	0.182	114	93
England						
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	0.534	0.295	0.070	38	38
School and Class Climate Index	0.000	0.152	0.317	0.631	38	38

Note: This table shows XXXXXX.

implemented the project (this is almost all training attendants). Also, there is no very clear difference in topics covered by the projects, or hours devoted to the projects (Tables A29 and A30), and if anything, teacher time and involvement is higher in Spain and Greece.

At the end of the school year, all students were asked whether they had taken part in *any kind of* citizenship project in their school over the year (it would be the ACT project in treatment schools, but could be other citizenship projects in control schools). The difference between the treatment and the control groups in the proportion of students who thus declare to have participated in a citizenship project over the school year is only of 30-35% in Greece and Spain, compared to more than 50% in France (Table A28). This differential reflects a lower incidence of projects in the control group in France compared to Greece, and a higher participation in the ACT project in France compared to Spain. Logically, a stronger participation gap can result in larger differences in outcome between treatment and control groups. This striking difference is not in contradiction with the teachers' report: It doesn't imply that projects were not implemented, but does measure imperfect student participation. As a matter of fact, the qualitative reports mention that it is frequently the case that only a fraction of students are really active up to the end of the project. Therefore, this measure captures students' stronger involvement in the program

in France, where we do find average effects on civic attitudes and civic behaviour.[26] Furthermore, as highlighted in section 3.1.2, French teachers declare to have complied better with the project protocol (Table A33), by more than a standard deviation with respect to Spain and a third of a standard deviation with respect to Greece. They are also significantly more satisfied with the project (Table A35). This may reflect difficulties with the training (for which there is anecdotal evidence in Spain) or implementation management. A more effective implementation of the program is a plausible explanation for the stronger average results in France.

Table 4: Program effects by student geographical origin - France

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) p-value	(5) N	(6) Clusters
European origin only						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.172	0.061	0.005	1148	75
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.120	0.062	0.054	1162	75
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.054	0.055	0.328	1162	75
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.187	0.080	0.020	1346	77
Non-European origin						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.072	0.079	0.362	354	68
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.070	0.102	0.493	363	68
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.044	0.093	0.636	364	68
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.045	0.104	0.664	470	72

Note: This table shows XXXXXX.

Heterogeneity[27]

In the previous section, we show that the program led, on average, to a significant improvement in students' attitude and behavior in France, but had, on average, no significant effect in Greece or Spain (while UK results are difficult to interpret because of differential attrition). In this section we further explore whether the program had the same effect across groups of students as defined by their geographical origin (European vs non-European), their gender or their engagement at school (as measured, pre-treatment, by whether they were ever elected students' representative).

---

[26]Tables A31, A32 and A36 report more similar student involvement, satisfaction etc. across countries, but only students that report to have implemented a project answer those questions.

[27]All heterogeneity dimensions that are considered in this section have been pre-specified in the Pre-Analysis Plan. Those for which we find no heterogeneity (Parental SES, sibship size, birth order) are not discussed.

Table 5: Program effects by student experience as representative

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) p-value	(5) N	(6) Clusters
France						
Representatives						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.184	0.097	0.059	480	74
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.063	0.089	0.481	488	74
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.005	0.066	0.936	490	74
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.176	0.099	0.077	586	77
Non-Representatives						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.099	0.062	0.107	1117	75
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.100	0.065	0.124	1135	75
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.042	0.058	0.467	1136	75
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.128	0.068	0.060	1374	76
Greece						
Representatives						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.187	0.064	0.004	812	72
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.073	0.058	0.208	820	72
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.126	0.072	0.081	822	72
Non-Representatives						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.060	0.077	0.438	722	74
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.025	0.066	0.703	731	74
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.003	0.071	0.962	731	74
Spain						
Representatives						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.097	0.090	0.285	534	98
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.108	0.060	0.074	539	98
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.047	0.073	0.521	540	98
Non-Representatives						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.042	0.049	0.396	1201	99
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.001	0.046	0.975	1209	99
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.087	0.062	0.158	1209	99
England						
Representatives						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.436	0.131	0.001	171	34
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.174	0.117	0.135	171	34
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.329	0.209	0.116	171	34
Non-Representatives						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.053	0.088	0.548	433	37
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.075	0.097	0.435	436	37
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.040	0.086	0.645	436	37

Note: This table shows XXXXXX.

Table 6: Program effects by student experience as representative: pooled sample

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) p-value	(5) N	(6) Clusters
France+Greece+Spain						
Representatives						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.171	0.047	0.000	1826	244
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.080	0.040	0.044	1847	244
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.053	0.042	0.210	1852	244
Non-Representatives						
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.006	0.035	0.858	3040	248
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.043	0.033	0.201	3075	248
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.012	0.036	0.740	3076	248

Note: This table shows XXXXXX.

This analysis first reveals that the main effect found in France is entirely driven by students of European origin: civic attitudes, democratic participation and civic behavior of European origin students are all significantly improved by the program, with effects between 12% and 19% of a standard deviation (Table 4). By contrast, students of non-European origin (about 23% of the French sample) tend to be negatively affected by the program, even though these negative effects are not statistically significant at standard levels. Such differential impacts are specific to France and are not apparent in other countries, where the proportion of students of non-European origin is also much smaller than in France. It is important to note that those non-European origin students have on average the same baseline civic indexes as other students. Historically, the modern French school was built on a strict secular model. It is often criticized for its mono-culturalist secularism, especially by families from non-European Muslim minorities from former colonies. The program's failure to promote citizenship among students from these minorities likely reflects the mistrust that many of these students may feel towards the French school system.

The second lesson that we can draw from our exploration of heterogeneous effects is that, in all countries, the program seems to be more effective for students who were initially the most citizen-minded. Specifically, in France, Greece and Spain, the program tends to further increase differences in behavior and attitudes between students that have and have not ever been student representatives in the past (Table 5). We selected this dimension in the Pre-Analysis Plan because school involvement is associated with higher levels of democratic participation and civic knowledge at the individual level (Torney-Purta et al. (2001); Losito & D'Apice (2003)). As a matter of fact, in all countries, representatives have higher civic attitudes, democratic participation and social integration indexes measured at baseline in our data, with differences

typically representing 20 to 30% of a standard deviation (Table A44).[28] We do find that representative students' civic attitudes are positively affected in France and Greece; and their democratic engagement is affected in Spain. In contrast, no significant effects are found for non-representative students, except in France where the program improved their civic behaviour. Consistent with the stronger effect of the program on them, student representatives report more involvement and more satisfaction with the program in the treatment group in all countries (Table A45).

It should be emphasized that the national differences between estimated effects for representatives and non-representatives are not statistically significant, so we must remain cautious in our interpretation of these results. However, as the effect on representatives is similar for France, Greece and Spain, we can pool the data to have a more general and more precise picture (Table 6). The effect on civic attitudes is very precisely estimated at 0.171% of a SD, and it is now significantly different from that on non-representatives. The effect on democratic participation is also significant, but substantially smaller; there is no pattern for social integration.[29]

This finding is consistent with the French and Spanish qualitative reports: although they don't point to the representative category as such, they do observe that some students take the lead while others have a hard time finding their place; the former may be more comfortable with a pedagogy that is based on initiative and autonomy. It raises the risk that the program could increase inequalities. In France, however, the qualitative team notices that many teachers made the effort to support the less engaged students, which may be a reason why the contrast remains somewhat lower in that country.

Also notice that, in our sample, student representatives are not particularly recruited among students from privileged background. This is because all classes from all neighbourhoods must elect representatives every year; and probably also because social origin is not strongly correlated with civic attitudes or motivation for holding this position. Our finding is thus consistent with the fact that social origin is not a clear source of impact heterogeneity.

Finally, we do not find very substantive differences in the impact of the program on civic attitudes or democratic engagement across gender groups (Tables A15 to A18 in the Appendix). In France, the program leads to a significant improvement in civic behavior for both girls (+20% of a SD) and boys (+16%). Generally speaking, female students have higher levels of both non-cognitive skills (Duckworth

---

[28]Notice that this is in itself a confirmation of the informational content of our constructs.

[29]Although this was not declared in the Pre-analysis Plan, we could also split the sample depending on *baseline* student measures, for instance students above vs. below the median of our indices. This is very correlated, but not identical to the representatives/non-representatives partition. Strong heterogeneity of the treatment effect on civic attitudes and democratic participation is then found along that category: it suggests that initial levels of attitudes and engagement may be driving the contrast between representatives and non-representatives.

& Seligman (2006); Bertrand & Pan (2013); Cornwell et al. (2013)) and civic knowledge at age 14 (Schulz et al. (2010)), which is reflected in our measures in the baseline data for all three indexes and in all countries. But this does not appear to translate into very different response to our program, even though the impact on civic attitudes tends to be more positive for boys.

References

Abowitz, K. K. & Harnish, J. 2006. "Contemporary discourses of citizenship". *Review of educational research*, 76(4):653–690.

Active Citizenship Project. 2018. "ACT Reference Framework.".

Anderson, M. L. 2008. "Multiple inference and gender differences in the effects of early intervention: A reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, and Early Training Projects". *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 103(484):1481–1495.

Angrist, J. D. & Lavy, V. 2001. "Does teacher training affect pupil learning? Evidence from matched comparisons in Jerusalem public schools". *Journal of Labor Economics*, 19(2):343–369.

Araujo, M. C., Carneiro, P., Cruz-Aguayo, Y., & Schady, N. 2016. "Teacher Quality and Learning Outcomes in Kindergarten". *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(3):1415–1453.

Aslam, M. & Kingdon, G. 2011. "What can teachers do to raise pupil achievement?". *Economics of Education Review*, 30(3):559–574.

Avvisati, F., Gurgand, M., Guyon, N., & Maurin, E. 2014. "Getting parents involved: A field experiment in deprived schools". *Review of Economic Studies*, 81(1):57–83.

Behaghel, L., De Chaisemartin, C., & Gurgand, M. 2017. "Ready for boarding? The effects of a boarding school for disadvantaged students". *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 9(1):140–64.

Benjamini, Y. & Hochberg, Y. 1995. "Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing". *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):289–300.

Bertrand, M. & Pan, J. 2013. "The trouble with boys: Social influences and the gender gap in disruptive behavior". *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 5(1):32–64.

Blazar, D. 2015. "Effective teaching in elementary mathematics: Identifying classroom practices that support student achievement". *Economics of Education Review*, 48:16–29.

Boxell, L., Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. M. 2020. "Cross-Country Trends in Affective Polarization". National Bureau of Economic Research.

Briole, S. 2019. "From Teacher Quality to Teaching Quality: Instructional Productivity and Teaching Practices in the US". *PSE Working paper N 2019 – 08.*

Briole, S., Gurgand, M., López-Torres, L., Maurin, E., McNally, S., Ruiz-Valenzuela, J., Santin, D., Schmidt, L., Sicilia, G., Simancas, R., & Tsirbas, Y. 2019. "Active citizenship program in middle school.". AEA RCT Registry. August 30.

Carneiro, P. & Heckman, J. 2003. *Human capital policy, In J. J. Heckman, A. B. Krueger, and B. M. Friedman (Eds.), Inequality in America: What Role for Human Capital Policies?* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cornwell, C., Mustard, D. B., & Van Parys, J. 2013. "Noncognitive skills and the gender disparities in test scores and teacher assessments: Evidence from primary school". *Journal of Human Resources*, 48 (1):236–264.

Dalton, R. J. 2015. *The good citizen: How a younger generation is reshaping American politics.* CQ press.

Duckworth, A. L. & Seligman, M. E. 2006. "Self-discipline gives girls the edge: Gender in self-discipline, grades, and achievement test scores.". *Journal of educational psychology*, 98(1):198.

European Commission. 2012. "Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes, European Comission, Strasbourg".

European Commission. 2017. "Citizenship education at school in Europe–2017: Eurydice report.".

Geboers, E., Geijsel, F., Admiraal, W., & ten Dam, G. 2013. "Review of the effects of citizenship education". *Educational Research Review*, 9:158–173.

Isac, M. M., da Costa, P. D., Araújo, L., Calvo, E. S., & Albergaria-Almeida, P. 2015. "Teaching practices in primary and secondary schools in Europe: Insights from large-scale assessments in education". *JRC Scientific and Technical Reports. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. DOI*, 10: 383588.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Anderson, D. 1983. "Social interdependence and classroom climate". *The Journal of Psychology*, 114(1):135–142.

Kane, T. J., Taylor, E. S., Tyler, J. H., & Wooten, A. L. 2011. "Identifying effective classroom practices using student achievement data". *Journal of Human Resources*, 46(3):587–613.

Knowles, R. T., Torney-Purta, J., & Barber, C. 2018. "Enhancing citizenship learning with international comparative research: Analyses of IEA civic education datasets". *Citizenship Teaching & Learning*, 13 (1):7.

Losito, B. & D'Apice, A. 2003. "Democracy, citizenship, participation. The results of the second IEA civic education study in Italy". *International Journal of Educational Research*, 39(6):609–620.

Machin, S. & McNally, S. 2008. "The literacy hour". *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(5):1441–1462.

Muijs, D., Kyriakides, L., Van der Werf, G., Creemers, B., Timperley, H., & Earl, L. 2014. "State of the art–teacher effectiveness and professional learning". *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 25 (2):231–256.

OECD. 2019. *TALIS 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. OECD Publishing.

Print, M. 2012. "Teacher Pedagogy and Achieving Citizenship Competences in Schools". In *Schools, Curriculum and Civic Education for Building Democratic Citizens*, volume 2. Springer, 2012.

Putnam, R. D. et al. 2000. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and schuster.

Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R. D., & Fekken, G. C. 1981. "The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale". *Personality and individual differences*, 2(4):293–302.

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. 2010. *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic Knowledge, Attitudes, and Engagement among Lower-Secondary School Students in 38 Countries*. ERIC.

Ten Dam, G., Geijsel, F., Reumerman, R., & Ledoux, G. 2011. "Measuring young people's citizenship competences". *European Journal of Education*, 46(3):354–372.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. 2001. *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. ERIC.

Weisse, W. 2010. "REDCo: A European research project on religion in education". *Religion & Education*, 37(3):187–202.

Appendix A - Tables

Balancing checks - randomization

Table A1: Balancing checks randomization - France

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
School characteristics							
Academic performance	12.052	0.073	0.168	0.665	0.665	75	75
Family background	0.186	-0.026	0.020	0.191	0.665	75	75
Enrolment	516.933	16.787	33.474	0.616	0.665	75	75
Nb students initial list	30.188	5.188	5.129	0.312	0.665	77	77
Nb classes initial list	1.201	0.136	0.190	0.474	0.665	77	77
Teacher characteristics							
Teacher answered survey	1	0.000	.	1.000		126	77
Female	0.743	-0.071	0.084	0.402	0.984	126	77
Experience	15.977	-2.000	1.200	0.095	0.984	126	77
Seniority	8.023	0.200	0.934	0.830	0.984	126	77
Advanced certification	0.078	0.009	0.046	0.845	0.984	126	77
School responsibilities	0.000	0.030	0.152	0.842	0.984	126	77
Engagement out of school	0.000	0.000	0.170	0.984	0.998	125	77
Years teaching citizenship	9.526	-0.221	1.662	0.894	0.984	125	77
Studied Citizenship init. training	0.381	0.047	0.084	0.571	0.984	126	77
Studied Citizenship prof dvpmt	0.451	-0.036	0.075	0.629	0.984	126	77
Citizen project over last 2 years	0.743	-0.030	0.084	0.720	0.984	126	77
Nb teachers initial list	2.331	-0.158	0.254	0.534	0.984	126	77
Teacher Pedagogy Index (TP)	0.000	0.148	0.174	0.395		126	77
School Climate Index (SCC)	0.000	-0.161	0.197	0.414		125	77
TP - effective cit educ	0.000	0.180	0.178	0.313	0.470	124	76
TP - stud-cent practices	0.000	-0.039	0.162	0.809	0.809	125	77
TP - collaboration	0.000	0.238	0.162	0.142	0.425	125	77
SCC - school climate	0.000	-0.037	0.189	0.847	0.847	125	77
SCC - weight stud opinion	0.000	-0.237	0.193	0.219	0.438	125	77
Student characteristics							
Age	13.696	-0.084	0.096	0.383	0.478	2269	77
Female	0.492	0.004	0.018	0.801	0.801	2270	77
High SES	0.505	-0.031	0.025	0.215	0.358	2201	77
Nb siblings	2.341	-0.179	0.080	0.024	0.120	2235	77
Grade 8	0.561	0.141	0.095	0.140	0.350	2285	77

Table A2: Balancing checks randomization - Greece

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
School characteristics							
Average income	26588.852	935.846	1670.025	0.575	0.811	90	90
Income category	2.494	-0.037	0.101	0.715	0.811	90	90
Percentage of foreigners	0.093	0.002	0.009	0.811	0.811	90	90
School special	0.144	0.000	0.000	0.713	0.811	90	90
School mult	0.300	-0.048	0.190	0.800	0.811	90	90
Nb students initial list	31.515	8.539	4.464	0.056	0.195	90	90
Nb classes initial list	1.285	0.337	0.148	0.023	0.160	90	90
Teacher characteristics							
Teacher answered survey	0.899	0.038	0.049	0.446		115	87
Female	0.918	-0.119	0.071	0.093	0.441	106	81
Experience	20.377	-0.153	1.330	0.908	0.908	105	80
Seniority	8.345	0.367	1.169	0.753	0.843	104	80
Education level	2.758	0.058	0.194	0.766	0.843	105	80
School responsibilities	0.000	0.061	0.205	0.766	0.843	106	81
Engagement out of school	0.000	0.298	0.231	0.197	0.441	106	81
Years teaching citizenship	5.404	-0.561	1.213	0.644	0.843	105	80
Studied Citizenship init training	0.288	-0.122	0.081	0.129	0.441	105	80
Studied Citizenship prof dvpmt	0.290	0.169	0.099	0.089	0.441	104	80
Citizen project over last 2 years	0.747	0.082	0.064	0.200	0.441	106	81
Nb teachers initial list	1.213	0.117	0.161	0.468	0.811	81	81
Teacher Pedagogy Index t0	0.000	-0.097	0.218	0.658		105	80
School Climate Index t0	0.000	-0.209	0.223	0.350		106	81
TP - effective cit educ t0	0.000	-0.272	0.235	0.248	0.745	102	78
TP - stud-cent practices t0	0.000	-0.009	0.187	0.960	0.960	105	80
TP - collaboration t0	0.000	-0.089	0.205	0.663	0.960	103	79
SCC - school climate t0	0.000	-0.161	0.243	0.509	0.700	103	80
SCC - weight stud opinion t0	0.000	-0.077	0.199	0.700	0.700	103	79

Table A3: Balancing checks randomization - Spain

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
School characteristics							
Average income	24129	-57	264.346	0.828	1.000	103	103
Income quartile	2.476	0.000	0.055	1.000	1.000	103	103
Pctge migrants	16.136	-0.764	1.289	0.553	0.941	103	103
Pctge migrants - quartile	2.417	-0.019	0.034	0.564	0.941	103	103
Nb students (initial list)	21.88	1.15	1.460	0.433	0.941	103	103
Nb classes (initial list)	1.000	0.000	.	1.000	1.000	103	103
Teacher characteristics							
Teacher answered survey	0.987	0.000	0.013	0.996		145	103
Female	0.617	-0.107	0.084	0.203	0.705	143	103
Experience	18.832	0.045	1.498	0.976	0.996	143	103
Seniority	7.584	-0.496	1.255	0.693	0.996	143	103
Education level	3.356	-0.268	0.125	0.032	0.389	143	103
School responsibilities	0.000	-0.248	0.143	0.083	0.495	143	103
Engagement outside of school	0.000	0.116	0.196	0.553	0.996	142	103
Years teaching citizenship	10.423	-0.334	1.555	0.830	0.996	143	103
Studied Citizenship init. training	0.416	0.063	0.078	0.420	0.996	143	103
Studied Citizenship prof dvpmt	0.584	-0.004	0.072	0.956	0.996	141	102
Citizen project over last 2 years	0.456	0.030	0.085	0.721	0.996	143	103
Nb teachers (initial list)	1.636	-0.123	0.104	0.235	0.705	145	103
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	-0.158	0.166	0.341		142	103
School Climate Index	0.000	0.077	0.157	0.621		142	103
TP - effective cit educ	0.000	0.032	0.176	0.855	0.855	141	103
TP - stud-cent practices	0.000	-0.288	0.143	0.043	0.130	141	103
TP - collaboration	0.000	-0.035	0.167	0.833	0.855	142	103
SCC - school climate	0.000	-0.206	0.183	0.260	0.260	141	103
SCC - weight stud opinion	0.000	0.294	0.141	0.037	0.073	140	102

Table A4: Balancing checks randomization - England

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
School characteristics							
Percentage girls	49.895	-4.790	6.189	0.439	0.852	42	42
Percentage no English speakers	21.686	-0.157	4.225	0.970	0.970	42	42
Percentage free meals	16.471	0.929	2.405	0.699	0.852	42	42
Average academic performance	0.542	0.012	0.032	0.710	0.852	36	36
Nb students (initial list)	30.714	-8.667	6.808	0.203	0.852	42	42
Nb classes (initial list)	1.238	-0.238	0.238	0.317	0.852	42	42
Teacher characteristics							
Teacher answered survey	1	0.000	.	1.000		44	42
Female	0.478	0.140	0.152	0.357	0.881	44	42
Experience	11.455	-0.344	1.692	0.839	1.000	43	42
Seniority	7.318	0.109	1.578	0.945	1.000	43	42
Education level	4.273	-0.125	0.117	0.286	0.881	43	42
School resp	0.000	-0.143	0.308	0.642	1.000	43	42
Engagement out	0.000	-0.023	0.268	0.932	1.000	43	42
Years teaching citizenship	4.727	2.391	1.304	0.067	0.734	43	42
Studied Citizenship - initial training	0.318	-0.047	0.125	0.708	1.000	43	42
Studied Citizenship - professional dvpmt	0.500	0.000	0.134	1.000	1.000	43	42
Implemented citizen project - last 2 years	0.773	-0.125	0.149	0.400	0.881	43	42
Nb teachers (initial list)	1.261	-0.140	0.148	0.346	0.881	44	42
Teacher Pedagogy Index t0	0.000	-0.159	0.305	0.602		43	42
School Climate Index t0	0.000	-0.016	0.336	0.961		43	42
TP - effective cit educ t0	0.000	-0.052	0.244	0.832	0.832	43	42
TP - stud-cent practices t0	0.000	0.082	0.280	0.769	0.832	43	42
TP - collaboration t0	0.000	-0.310	0.292	0.289	0.832	43	42
SCC - school climate t0	0.000	-0.131	0.334	0.695	0.784	43	42
SCC - weight stud opinion t0	0.000	0.095	0.347	0.784	0.784	43	42

Attrition

Table A5: Attrition rates

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Student endline survey				
Total attrition	0.217	0.471	0.172	0.381
School level attrition	0.005	0.079	0.036	0.188
Student level attrition	0.212	0.392	0.136	0.193
Student administrative data				
Total attrition	0.017	.	.	.
Observations	2290	3286	2293	1097
Teacher endline survey				
Total attrition	0.151	0.357	0.200	0.136
School level attrition	0.000	0.104	0.124	0.136
Teacher level attrition	0.150	0.252	0.076	0.000
Observations	126	115	145	44

Table A6: Differential attrition rates across treatment groups. without dropout strata

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Student attrition rates				
Student endline survey	-0.035	0.027	-0.013	-0.107**
	(0.031)	(0.060)	(0.024)	(0.040)
Student administrative data	-0.001	.	.	.
	(0.006)	(.)	(.)	(.)
Observations	2269	2704	2134	851
Teacher attrition rates				
Teacher endline survey	-0.001	0.012	0.066*	0.000
	(0.053)	(0.099)	(0.035)	(.)
Observations	126	90	117	34

Balancing checks - respondents

Table A7: Balancing checks on respondents - France

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Teacher characteristics							
Teacher answered baseline survey	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		107	75
Female	0.733	-0.025	0.098	0.801	0.967	107	75
Experience	16.286	-1.975	1.159	0.088	0.882	107	75
Seniority	7.935	0.694	1.122	0.536	0.967	107	75
Advanced certification	0.074	0.012	0.048	0.799	0.967	107	75
School responsibilities	-0.002	0.075	0.167	0.655	0.967	107	75
Engagement out of school	-0.010	-0.029	0.177	0.870	0.967	106	74
Years teaching citizenship	8.967	0.578	1.639	0.724	0.967	106	75
Studied Citizenship init training	0.323	0.069	0.087	0.427	0.967	107	75
Studied Citizenship prof dvpmt	0.424	-0.014	0.083	0.863	0.967	107	75
Citizen project over last 2 years	0.714	0.000	0.086	0.997	0.997	107	75
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	0.184	0.178	0.299	.	107	75
School Climate Index	0.000	-0.252	0.200	0.207	.	106	75
Student characteristics							
Student answered baseline survey	0.930	-0.003	0.015	0.823		1793	76
Age	13.646	-0.059	0.098	0.544	0.960	1788	76
Female	0.510	-0.005	0.017	0.777	0.960	1788	76
European origin	0.790	-0.022	0.031	0.486	0.960	1526	76
High SES	0.559	-0.033	0.024	0.171	0.960	1792	76
Nb siblings	2.192	-0.026	0.074	0.725	0.960	1782	76
Representative	0.303	-0.001	0.024	0.965	0.965	1626	76
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.047	0.061	0.443	.	1647	76
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.145	0.066	0.028	.	1656	76
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.007	0.059	0.906	.	1657	76

Table A8: Balancing checks on respondents - Greece

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Teacher characteristics							
Teacher answered baseline survey	0.833	0.055	0.068	0.420		74	67
female teacher	0.891	-0.019	0.117	0.873	0.960	65	59
Experience	19.667	0.068	1.586	0.966	0.966	64	58
Seniority	8.664	1.476	1.699	0.385	0.840	64	58
Education level	2.706	0.087	0.241	0.718	0.960	64	58
School responsibilities	0.211	-0.215	0.346	0.534	0.840	65	59
Engagement out of school	0.099	0.319	0.351	0.364	0.840	65	59
Years teaching citizenship	4.661	-0.255	1.544	0.869	0.960	64	58
Studied Citizenship init. training	0.258	-0.151	0.108	0.163	0.840	64	58
Studied Citizenship prof dvpmt	0.333	0.090	0.140	0.523	0.840	64	58
Citizen project over last 2 years	0.782	0.118	0.089	0.186	0.840	65	59
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	-0.145	0.303	0.631	.	64	58
School Climate Index	0.000	-0.232	0.280	0.407	.	65	59
Student characteristics							
Student answered baseline survey	0.920	-0.045	0.024	0.061		1737	75
Age	14.043	0.043	0.019	0.021	0.106	1505	74
Female	0.490	0.016	0.048	0.735	0.735	1531	74
European origin	0.791	-0.045	0.023	0.048	0.106	1521	74
High SES	0.425	0.014	0.032	0.666	0.735	1731	75
Nb siblings	1.362	-0.128	0.066	0.055	0.106	1503	74
Representative	0.517	0.013	0.020	0.500	0.700	1553	74
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.038	0.065	0.564	.	1561	74
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.006	0.088	0.946	.	1569	74
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.019	0.080	0.817	.	1571	74

Table A9: Balancing checks on respondents - Spain

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Teacher characteristics							
Teacher answered baseline survey	0.983	0.000	0.019	0.996		116	93
Female	0.615	-0.086	0.109	0.431	0.984	114	93
Experience	19.470	-0.281	1.717	0.870	0.984	114	93
Seniority	7.521	-0.794	1.506	0.598	0.984	114	93
Education level	3.350	-0.361	0.138	0.009	0.097	114	93
School responsibilities	0.041	-0.276	0.167	0.099	0.542	114	93
Engagement out of school	0.011	-0.053	0.248	0.830	0.984	114	93
Years teaching citizenship	10.538	0.253	1.901	0.894	0.984	114	93
Studied Citizenship init. training	0.410	0.091	0.091	0.318	0.984	114	93
Studied Citizenship prof dvpmt	0.590	-0.050	0.086	0.563	0.984	113	92
Citizen project over last 2 years	0.479	-0.047	0.106	0.654	0.984	114	93
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	-0.293	0.207	0.156	.	114	93
School Climate Index	0.000	0.025	0.222	0.911	.	114	93
Student characteristics							
Student answered baseline survey	0.942	-0.024	0.018	0.186		1898	99
Age	14.487	0.050	0.055	0.365	0.449	1690	99
Female	0.536	-0.037	0.022	0.086	0.435	1711	99
European origin	0.815	-0.040	0.028	0.144	0.435	1696	99
High SES	0.532	-0.031	0.034	0.357	0.449	1898	99
Nb siblings	1.667	-0.058	0.104	0.578	0.578	1686	99
Representative	0.296	0.016	0.019	0.385	0.449	1749	99
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.011	0.054	0.841	.	1765	99
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.011	0.069	0.878	.	1775	99
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.144	0.056	0.010	.	1777	99

Table A10: Balancing checks on respondents - England

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Teacher characteristics							
Teacher answered baseline survey	1	0.000	.	1		38	38
Female	0.471	0.235	0.193	0.223	1.000	38	38
Experience	10.588	0.118	2.226	0.958	1.000	38	38
Seniority	7.471	-0.118	1.790	0.948	1.000	38	38
Education level	4.176	0.000	0.128	1.000	1.000	38	38
School responsibilities	-0.079	-0.265	0.363	0.465	1.000	38	38
Engagement out of school	-0.005	-0.173	0.329	0.600	1.000	38	38
Years teaching citizenship	4.353	2.353	1.760	0.181	1.000	38	38
Studied Citizenship init. training	0.412	-0.059	0.169	0.728	1.000	38	38
Studied Citizenship prof dvpmt	0.588	0.000	0.157	1.000	1.000	38	38
Citizen project over last 2 years	0.824	-0.118	0.154	0.445	1.000	38	38
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	-0.244	0.339	0.471	.	38	38
School Climate Index	0.000	0.139	0.406	0.731	.	38	38
Student characteristics							
Student answered baseline survey	0.921	0.001	0.011	0.937		679	39
Age	13.648	0.303	0.145	0.036	0.127	573	37
Female	0.557	-0.063	0.047	0.183	0.426	670	39
European origin	0.926	0.017	0.017	0.311	0.544	573	37
High SES	0.457	0.029	0.044	0.511	0.596	676	39
Nb siblings	2.548	-0.115	0.134	0.393	0.551	578	37
Representative	0.236	0.091	0.036	0.012	0.083	607	37
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.154	0.083	0.063	.	613	37
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.190	0.092	0.038	.	621	37
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.174	0.106	0.102	.	622	37

Impact of the program

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Student outcomes							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.112	0.049	0.023	.	1758	76
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.064	0.053	0.231	.	1790	76
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.032	0.044	0.473	.	1793	76
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.168	0.074	0.023	.	2251	77
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.066	0.044	0.135	0.202	1723	76
CA - Trust	0.000	0.045	0.043	0.291	0.291	1735	76
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.146	0.069	0.034	0.101	1758	76
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.140	0.047	0.003	0.010	1748	76
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.034	0.053	0.521	0.782	1790	76
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.007	0.056	0.902	0.902	1760	76
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.013	0.050	0.800	0.896	1756	76
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.006	0.047	0.896	0.896	1745	76
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	0.037	0.055	0.504	0.896	1755	76
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.041	0.058	0.486	0.896	1793	76
SB - Absences	0.000	0.207	0.083	0.013	0.036	2227	76
SB - Punctuality	0.000	0.086	0.087	0.321	0.321	2184	74
SB - Exclusion	0.000	0.125	0.053	0.018	0.036	2115	72
SB - Smaller sanctions	0.000	-0.098	0.089	0.272	0.321	2115	72
School outcomes							
Participation to Climate Campaign	0.059	-0.033	0.243	0.892	0.892	77	77
Teacher outcomes							
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	0.278	0.181	0.124	.	107	75
School and Class Climate Index	0.000	0.038	0.146	0.795	.	107	75
TP - effective cit educ	0.000	0.156	0.226	0.489	0.489	107	75
TP - stud-cent practices	0.000	0.267	0.165	0.106	0.248	105	74
TP - collaboration	0.000	0.149	0.149	0.318	0.424	105	74
TP - student active participation	0.000	0.371	0.241	0.124	0.248	98	73
SCC - school climate	0.000	0.207	0.137	0.132	0.397	106	74
SSC - class climate	0.000	0.104	0.169	0.536	0.536	99	72
SCC - student opinion	0.000	-0.125	0.184	0.495	0.536	107	75

Note: This table shows XXXXXX.

Table A12: Program impact - Greece

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Student outcomes							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.024	0.041	0.552	.	1711	75
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.061	0.049	0.215	.	1734	75
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.034	0.058	0.556	.	1737	75
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.054	0.052	0.297	0.533	1688	75
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.048	0.052	0.355	0.533	1687	75
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.015	0.066	0.821	0.821	1709	75
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.055	0.051	0.283	0.739	1709	75
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.016	0.054	0.769	0.769	1734	75
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.049	0.071	0.492	0.739	1703	75
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.021	0.040	0.597	0.597	1706	75
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.088	0.067	0.185	0.554	1697	75
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.038	0.047	0.416	0.554	1706	75
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.053	0.056	0.347	0.554	1737	75
Teacher outcomes							
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	0.447	0.235	0.057	.	65	59
School and Class Climate Index	0.000	0.014	0.288	0.962	.	65	59
TP - effective cit educ	0.000	0.395	0.228	0.083	0.333	65	59
TP - stud-cent practices	0.000	0.096	0.247	0.696	0.928	65	59
TP - collaboration	0.000	-0.010	0.368	0.979	0.979	64	59
TP - student active participation	0.000	0.294	0.345	0.393	0.787	63	59
SCC - school climate	0.000	-0.380	0.233	0.102	0.306	64	59
SSC - class climate	0.000	-0.018	0.265	0.947	0.947	64	58
SCC - student opinion	0.000	0.107	0.330	0.746	0.947	64	59

Note: This table shows XXXXXX.

48

Table A13: Program impact - Spain

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Student outcomes							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.007	0.049	0.880	.	1884	99
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.004	0.040	0.925	.	1897	99
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.065	0.053	0.220	.	1898	99
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.080	0.045	0.074	0.222	1851	99
CA - Trust	0.000	0.007	0.038	0.854	0.854	1854	99
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.076	0.062	0.219	0.329	1883	99
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	-0.010	0.037	0.784	0.784	1890	99
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.031	0.034	0.356	0.784	1897	99
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.032	0.056	0.569	0.784	1884	99
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.045	0.045	0.316	0.422	1882	99
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.059	0.043	0.166	0.331	1874	99
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.098	0.054	0.072	0.288	1881	99
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.015	0.049	0.763	0.763	1898	99
School outcomes							
Participation to Climate Campaign	0.047	-0.111	0.228	0.628	0.628	103	103
Teacher outcomes							
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	0.168	0.190	0.375	.	114	93
School and Class Climate Index	0.000	-0.267	0.200	0.182	.	114	93
TP - effective cit educ	0.000	-0.413	0.206	0.045	0.094	114	93
TP - stud-cent practices	0.000	0.288	0.187	0.124	0.139	114	93
TP - collaboration	0.000	0.226	0.153	0.139	0.139	114	93
TP - student active participation	0.000	0.503	0.253	0.047	0.094	114	93
SCC - school climate	0.000	-0.199	0.156	0.201	0.549	114	93
SSC - class climate	0.000	-0.121	0.203	0.549	0.549	114	93
SCC - student opinion	0.000	-0.148	0.188	0.433	0.549	114	93

Note: This table shows XXXXXX.

Table A14: Program impact - England

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Student outcomes							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.106	0.057	0.063	.	675	39
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.007	0.053	0.897	.	679	39
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.063	0.087	0.468	.	679	39
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.103	0.070	0.143	0.295	658	39
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.059	0.046	0.197	0.295	663	39
CA - Altruism	0.000	-0.016	0.052	0.762	0.762	675	39
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	-0.093	0.076	0.221	0.441	674	39
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.005	0.061	0.941	0.941	679	39
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.056	0.053	0.294	0.441	674	39
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.113	0.062	0.066	0.132	673	39
SI - bullying	0.000	0.066	0.078	0.394	0.526	671	39
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.236	0.062	0.000	0.001	675	39
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.013	0.076	0.864	0.864	679	39
School outcomes							
Participation to Climate Campaign	0.127	-0.269	0.323	0.405	0.405	42	42
Teacher outcomes							
Teacher Pedagogy Index	0.000	0.534	0.295	0.070	.	38	38
School and Class Climate Index	0.000	0.152	0.317	0.631	.	38	38
TP - effective cit educ	0.000	0.082	0.381	0.829	0.829	38	38
TP - stud-cent practices	0.000	0.217	0.325	0.506	0.829	38	38
TP - collaboration	0.000	0.166	0.354	0.639	0.829	38	38
TP - student active participation	0.000	1.126	0.452	0.013	0.051	38	38
SCC - school climate	0.000	-0.354	0.465	0.446	0.669	38	38
SSC - class climate	0.000	0.602	0.336	0.073	0.219	38	38
SCC - student opinion	0.000	-0.097	0.235	0.680	0.680	38	38

Note: This table shows XXXXXX.

Heterogeneity of impact

Girls vs boys

Table A15: Program effects by student gender - France

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Female students							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.083	0.064	0.195	.	896	76
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.054	0.070	0.441	.	907	76
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.055	0.058	0.346		909	76
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.203	0.082	0.013	.	1100	77
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.074	0.073	0.312	0.468	883	76
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.003	0.053	0.951	0.951	888	76
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.128	0.081	0.115	0.345	896	76
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.191	0.062	0.002	0.006	894	76
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.007	0.069	0.924	0.924	907	76
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	-0.041	0.078	0.602	0.903	897	76
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.006	0.061	0.927	0.927	896	76
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.092	0.052	0.076	0.303	892	76
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.033	0.079	0.682	0.927	897	76
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.018	0.067	0.788	0.927	909	76
SB - Absences	0.000	0.232	0.078	0.003	0.012	1086	76
SB - Punctuality	0.000	0.077	0.101	0.443	0.443	1063	74
SB - Exclusion	0.000	0.106	0.062	0.087	0.173	1035	72
SB - Smaller sanctions	0.000	-0.079	0.097	0.416	0.443	1035	72
Male students							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.122	0.067	0.068	.	858	76
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.081	0.065	0.214	.	878	76
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.112	0.063	0.078	.	879	76
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.158	0.080	0.047	.	1141	77
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.036	0.057	0.528	0.528	836	76
CA - Trust	0.000	0.096	0.063	0.130	0.195	843	76
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.149	0.074	0.044	0.132	858	76
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.089	0.063	0.156	0.217	849	76
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.080	0.065	0.217	0.217	878	76
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.104	0.069	0.129	0.217	859	76
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.034	0.054	0.535	0.535	856	76
SI - bullying	0.000	0.060	0.069	0.387	0.516	849	76
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	0.095	0.062	0.127	0.359	854	76
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.095	0.071	0.180	0.359	879	76
SB - Absences	0.000	0.144	0.095	0.130	0.259	1131	76
SB - Punctuality	0.000	0.087	0.092	0.342	0.342	1112	74
SB - Exclusion	0.000	0.123	0.065	0.059	0.237	1071	72
SB - Smaller sanctions	0.000	-0.126	0.118	0.284	0.342	1071	72

Table A16: Program effects by student gender - Greece

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Female students							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.033	0.069	0.625	.	776	71
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.012	0.063	0.855	.	786	72
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.008	0.088	0.926		786	72
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.168	0.071	0.018	0.055	773	71
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.066	0.062	0.288	0.431	774	71
CA - Altruism	0.000	-0.034	0.068	0.622	0.622	776	71
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.065	0.068	0.344	0.865	778	71
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.010	0.058	0.865	0.865	786	72
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	-0.028	0.093	0.764	0.865	778	71
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.012	0.061	0.840	0.840	776	71
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.098	0.076	0.197	0.263	774	71
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.108	0.072	0.132	0.263	776	71
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.111	0.073	0.129	0.263	786	72
Male students							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.175	0.079	0.027	.	736	71
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.076	0.068	0.262	.	743	71
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.060	0.076	0.433		745	71
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.141	0.086	0.099	0.298	722	71
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.059	0.081	0.471	0.471	721	71
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.124	0.104	0.233	0.350	734	71
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.054	0.070	0.440	0.700	734	71
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.036	0.094	0.700	0.700	743	71
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.088	0.124	0.481	0.700	731	71
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.043	0.070	0.542	0.722	733	71
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.119	0.093	0.199	0.665	728	71
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	0.073	0.075	0.332	0.665	733	71
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.009	0.062	0.886	0.886	745	71

Table A17: Program effects by student gender - Spain

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Female students							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.010	0.063	0.868	.	872	98
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.038	0.056	0.491	.	875	98
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.033	0.063	0.603		875	98
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.039	0.067	0.555	0.555	862	98
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.070	0.055	0.203	0.555	864	98
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.051	0.079	0.519	0.555	871	98
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	-0.012	0.038	0.759	0.792	870	98
DP - interest political life	0.000	0.014	0.052	0.792	0.792	875	98
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.075	0.070	0.281	0.792	869	98
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.089	0.045	0.047	0.189	870	98
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.014	0.062	0.817	0.938	869	98
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	0.005	0.067	0.938	0.938	871	98
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.081	0.067	0.225	0.451	875	98
Male students							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.081	0.062	0.188	.	826	98
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.013	0.051	0.792	.	835	98
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.142	0.064	0.027		836	98
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.040	0.059	0.489	0.489	809	98
CA - Trust	0.000	0.044	0.060	0.463	0.489	811	98
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.146	0.078	0.061	0.183	826	98
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.039	0.047	0.410	0.835	833	98
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.017	0.044	0.702	0.835	835	98
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	-0.014	0.069	0.835	0.835	829	98
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.122	0.055	0.025	0.051	826	98
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.075	0.051	0.146	0.195	822	98
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.152	0.067	0.024	0.051	824	98
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.012	0.067	0.857	0.857	836	98

Table A18: Program effects by student gender - England

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Female students							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.083	0.082	0.310	.	341	35
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.051	0.066	0.438	.	342	35
Social Integration Index	0.000	−0.210	0.072	0.004		342	35
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.083	0.122	0.498	0.747	336	35
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.094	0.082	0.251	0.747	338	35
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.013	0.081	0.876	0.876	341	35
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	-0.144	0.095	0.129	0.388	340	35
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.021	0.071	0.764	0.764	342	35
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.059	0.074	0.428	0.642	341	35
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.193	0.091	0.035	0.071	341	35
SI - bullying	0.000	0.158	0.133	0.236	0.236	340	35
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.273	0.070	0.000	0.000	341	35
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.217	0.137	0.114	0.152	342	35
Male students							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.007	0.097	0.946	.	325	35
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.006	0.074	0.934	.	328	35
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.141	0.112	0.208		328	35
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.028	0.151	0.854	0.854	313	35
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.026	0.066	0.691	0.854	316	35
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.048	0.087	0.581	0.854	325	35
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	-0.112	0.089	0.210	0.631	325	35
DP - interest political life	0.000	0.022	0.087	0.796	0.796	328	35
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.051	0.077	0.511	0.767	324	35
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.025	0.074	0.739	0.936	323	35
SI - bullying	0.000	0.008	0.097	0.936	0.936	322	35
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.155	0.079	0.050	0.100	325	35
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.301	0.114	0.008	0.032	328	35

European vs non-European origin

Table A19: Program effects by student geographical origin - France

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
European origin only							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.172	0.061	0.005		1148	75
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.120	0.062	0.054		1162	75
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.054	0.055	0.328		1162	75
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.187	0.080	0.020		1346	77
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.018	0.054	0.743	0.743	1128	75
CA - Trust	0.000	0.108	0.051	0.033	0.049	1135	75
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.237	0.082	0.004	0.012	1148	75
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.202	0.060	0.001	0.003	1137	75
DP - interest political life	0.000	0.055	0.060	0.356	0.535	1162	75
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.003	0.065	0.959	0.959	1148	75
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.044	0.060	0.465	0.639	1148	75
SI - bullying	0.000	0.000	0.051	0.997	0.997	1142	75
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	0.046	0.066	0.479	0.639	1148	75
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.049	0.063	0.432	0.639	1162	75
SB - Absences	0.000	0.183	0.098	0.062	0.124	1339	76
SB - Punctuality	0.000	0.127	0.084	0.132	0.176	1311	74
SB - Exclusion	0.000	0.153	0.058	0.008	0.033	1235	72
SB - Smaller sanctions	0.000	-0.016	0.084	0.849	0.849	1235	72
Non-European origin							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.072	0.079	0.362		354	68
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.070	0.102	0.493		363	68
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.044	0.093	0.636		364	68
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.045	0.104	0.664		470	72
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.149	0.078	0.057	0.170	348	68
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.103	0.106	0.332	0.332	350	68
CA - Altruism	0.000	-0.087	0.078	0.266	0.332	354	68
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	-0.012	0.086	0.893	0.893	355	68
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.227	0.119	0.056	0.169	363	68
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	-0.040	0.113	0.719	0.893	354	68
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.054	0.104	0.601	0.802	352	68
SI - bullying	0.000	0.053	0.095	0.575	0.802	352	68
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.136	0.089	0.129	0.517	353	68
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.021	0.105	0.844	0.844	364	68
SB - Absences	0.000	0.110	0.111	0.324	0.648	460	71
SB - Punctuality	0.000	0.074	0.151	0.623	0.763	453	69
SB - Exclusion	0.000	-0.024	0.079	0.763	0.763	457	67
SB - Smaller sanctions	0.000	-0.309	0.173	0.074	0.295	457	67

Table A20: Program effects by student geographical origin - Greece

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
European origin only							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.047	0.062	0.442		1159	73
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.030	0.056	0.589		1173	74
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.077	0.065	0.237		1174	74
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.097	0.060	0.107	0.321	1153	73
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.051	0.052	0.319	0.479	1149	73
CA - Altruism	0.000	-0.007	0.078	0.930	0.930	1157	73
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.060	0.052	0.254	0.660	1160	74
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.060	0.078	0.440	0.660	1173	74
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.022	0.085	0.790	0.790	1158	74
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.001	0.047	0.991	0.991	1157	73
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.107	0.075	0.153	0.613	1153	73
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.056	0.064	0.382	0.764	1157	73
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.015	0.060	0.805	0.991	1174	74
Non-European origin							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.037	0.096	0.703		343	66
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.166	0.118	0.161		346	66
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.119	0.102	0.244		347	66
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.275	0.107	0.010	0.031	332	65
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.110	0.107	0.302	0.453	336	65
CA - Altruism	0.000	-0.006	0.137	0.966	0.966	343	66
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.193	0.108	0.075	0.133	342	66
DP - interest political life	0.000	0.169	0.099	0.089	0.133	346	66
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	-0.004	0.152	0.979	0.979	341	66
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.160	0.077	0.039	0.155	342	66
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.021	0.117	0.858	0.866	339	66
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	0.017	0.101	0.866	0.866	342	66
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.089	0.107	0.406	0.811	347	66

Table A21: Program effects by student geographical origin - Spain

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
European origin only							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.049	0.057	0.386		1327	98
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.015	0.047	0.758		1337	98
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.022	0.055	0.691		1337	98
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.047	0.054	0.384	0.628	1311	98
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.027	0.054	0.616	0.628	1312	98
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.034	0.071	0.628	0.628	1327	98
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.019	0.041	0.646	0.723	1333	98
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.014	0.040	0.723	0.723	1337	98
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.025	0.065	0.696	0.723	1329	98
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.017	0.046	0.707	0.707	1327	98
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.037	0.053	0.489	0.652	1325	98
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.090	0.057	0.119	0.299	1326	98
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.080	0.056	0.150	0.299	1337	98
Non-European origin							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.030	0.124	0.812		357	91
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.009	0.091	0.925		359	91
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.073	0.129	0.572		359	91
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.100	0.104	0.337	0.337	348	90
CA - Trust	0.000	0.095	0.079	0.227	0.337	350	90
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.145	0.140	0.300	0.337	357	91
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.025	0.098	0.802	0.860	357	91
DP - interest political life	0.000	0.045	0.076	0.551	0.860	359	91
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	-0.021	0.120	0.860	0.860	355	91
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.115	0.093	0.216	0.353	356	90
SI - bullying	0.000	0.039	0.139	0.779	0.779	353	90
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.098	0.088	0.264	0.353	356	91
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.141	0.110	0.201	0.353	359	91

Table A22: Program effects by student geographical origin - England

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
European origin only							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.084	0.098	0.391		534	37
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.036	0.058	0.529		536	37
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.021	0.084	0.802		536	37
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.025	0.110	0.822	0.822	525	37
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.136	0.046	0.003	0.009	526	37
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.035	0.083	0.674	0.822	534	37
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	-0.052	0.080	0.521	0.521	534	37
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.053	0.068	0.436	0.521	536	37
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.065	0.075	0.384	0.521	534	37
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.124	0.056	0.028	0.056	531	37
SI - bullying	0.000	0.091	0.076	0.231	0.308	529	37
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.240	0.067	0.000	0.001	533	37
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.025	0.095	0.795	0.795	536	37
Non-European origin							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.784	0.333	0.019		36	19
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.093	0.628	0.882		37	19
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.032	0.360	0.930		37	19
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.239	0.535	0.655	0.832	36	19
CA - Trust	0.000	0.618	0.483	0.201	0.603	36	19
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.069	0.328	0.832	0.832	36	19
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.099	0.515	0.848	0.864	36	19
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.213	0.514	0.678	0.864	37	19
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	-0.115	0.671	0.864	0.864	37	19
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.660	0.272	0.015	0.061	37	19
SI - bullying	0.000	0.438	0.219	0.045	0.091	37	19
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	0.014	0.480	0.977	0.977	37	19
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.513	0.389	0.187	0.250	37	19

Representatives vs others

Table A23: Program effects by student experience as representative - France

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Representative							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.184	0.097	0.059		480	74
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.063	0.089	0.481		488	74
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.005	0.066	0.936		490	74
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.176	0.099	0.077		586	77
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.098	0.086	0.252	0.252	475	74
CA - Trust	0.000	0.107	0.088	0.226	0.252	474	74
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.146	0.091	0.110	0.252	480	74
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.176	0.081	0.030	0.089	479	74
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.005	0.083	0.950	0.950	488	74
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	-0.049	0.087	0.575	0.863	479	74
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.149	0.077	0.052	0.208	479	74
SI - bullying	0.000	0.064	0.086	0.456	0.850	479	74
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	0.014	0.088	0.873	0.873	479	74
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.044	0.094	0.637	0.850	490	74
SB - Absences	0.000	0.257	0.105	0.014	0.057	582	76
SB - Punctuality	0.000	0.136	0.129	0.290	0.456	572	74
SB - Exclusion	0.000	0.073	0.080	0.364	0.456	548	72
SB - Smaller sanctions	0.000	-0.082	0.111	0.456	0.456	548	72
Non representative							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.099	0.062	0.107		1117	75
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.100	0.065	0.124		1135	75
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.042	0.058	0.467		1136	75
Civic Behaviours Index	0.000	0.128	0.068	0.060		1374	76
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.060	0.060	0.323	0.485	1091	75
CA - Trust	0.000	0.031	0.053	0.558	0.558	1103	75
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.171	0.076	0.025	0.074	1117	75
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.141	0.056	0.012	0.037	1109	75
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.015	0.065	0.812	0.812	1135	75
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.066	0.064	0.299	0.449	1118	75
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.005	0.059	0.938	0.938	1116	75
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.005	0.053	0.931	0.938	1108	75
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	0.029	0.060	0.631	0.938	1116	75
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.047	0.070	0.504	0.938	1136	75
SB - Absences	0.000	0.151	0.089	0.091	0.182	1356	75
SB - Punctuality	0.000	0.076	0.075	0.312	0.312	1328	73
SB - Exclusion	0.000	0.121	0.051	0.018	0.073	1283	71
SB - Smaller sanctions	0.000	-0.094	0.092	0.307	0.312	1283	71

Table A24: Program effects by student experience as representative - Greece

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Representative							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.187	0.064	0.004		812	72
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.073	0.058	0.208		820	72
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.126	0.072	0.081		822	72
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.221	0.072	0.002	0.007	802	72
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.020	0.053	0.713	0.713	801	72
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.123	0.097	0.206	0.309	811	72
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.130	0.066	0.049	0.146	812	72
DP - interest political life	0.000	0.003	0.076	0.965	0.965	820	72
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.027	0.084	0.746	0.965	809	72
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.030	0.055	0.586	0.872	810	72
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.170	0.079	0.030	0.122	807	72
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.015	0.060	0.797	0.872	810	72
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.011	0.070	0.872	0.872	822	72
Non representative							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.060	0.077	0.438		722	74
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.025	0.066	0.703		731	74
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.003	0.071	0.962		731	74
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.043	0.079	0.590	0.590	715	74
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.134	0.081	0.097	0.290	716	74
CA - Altruism	0.000	-0.074	0.084	0.379	0.568	721	74
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.038	0.061	0.536	0.721	721	74
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.062	0.079	0.436	0.721	731	74
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.035	0.097	0.721	0.721	721	74
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.023	0.071	0.746	0.746	721	74
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.033	0.078	0.676	0.746	717	74
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.099	0.065	0.127	0.510	721	74
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.057	0.061	0.354	0.708	731	74

Table A25: Program effects by student experience as representative - Spain

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Representative							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	0.097	0.090	0.285		534	98
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.108	0.060	0.074		539	98
Social Integration Index	0.000	0.047	0.073	0.521		540	98
CA - Tolerance	0.000	0.002	0.085	0.984	0.984	518	98
CA - Trust	0.000	0.047	0.078	0.545	0.817	520	98
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.117	0.093	0.208	0.623	534	98
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	0.100	0.060	0.094	0.281	537	98
DP - interest political life	0.000	0.071	0.056	0.205	0.292	539	98
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.083	0.079	0.292	0.292	534	98
SI - stud WB	0.000	0.124	0.057	0.029	0.116	533	98
SI - bullying	0.000	0.062	0.089	0.491	0.491	529	98
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	0.100	0.070	0.154	0.283	534	98
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.106	0.085	0.212	0.283	540	98
Non representative							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.042	0.049	0.396		1201	99
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.001	0.046	0.975		1209	99
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.087	0.062	0.158		1209	99
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.037	0.048	0.444	0.666	1186	99
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.050	0.048	0.296	0.666	1189	99
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.025	0.070	0.724	0.724	1200	99
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	-0.005	0.040	0.893	0.893	1204	99
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.042	0.047	0.368	0.893	1209	99
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.010	0.068	0.888	0.893	1201	99
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.081	0.051	0.109	0.109	1200	99
SI - bullying	0.000	-0.086	0.049	0.079	0.106	1198	99
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.184	0.060	0.002	0.009	1199	99
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.092	0.053	0.080	0.106	1209	99

Table A26: Program effects by student experience as representative - England

	(1) Control mean	(2) T-C	(3) SE	(4) Unadjusted p-value	(5) Adjusted p-value	(6) N	(7) Clusters
Representative							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.436	0.131	0.001		171	34
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	-0.174	0.117	0.135		171	34
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.329	0.209	0.116		171	34
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.046	0.163	0.776	0.776	166	34
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.353	0.094	0.000	0.001	166	34
CA - Altruism	0.000	-0.320	0.122	0.009	0.013	171	34
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	-0.399	0.115	0.000	0.001	170	34
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.327	0.152	0.031	0.047	171	34
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	-0.034	0.109	0.757	0.757	171	34
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.341	0.145	0.019	0.038	169	34
SI - bullying	0.000	0.176	0.195	0.366	0.366	168	34
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.462	0.146	0.002	0.006	171	34
SI - Nb friends	0.000	-0.246	0.157	0.117	0.156	171	34
Non representative							
Civic Attitudes Index	0.000	-0.053	0.088	0.548		433	37
Democratic Participation Index	0.000	0.075	0.097	0.435		436	37
Social Integration Index	0.000	-0.040	0.086	0.645		436	37
CA - Tolerance	0.000	-0.008	0.112	0.946	0.946	426	37
CA - Trust	0.000	-0.062	0.050	0.222	0.665	429	37
CA - Altruism	0.000	0.019	0.091	0.833	0.946	433	37
DP - political self efficacy	0.000	-0.061	0.092	0.503	0.558	433	37
DP - interest political life	0.000	-0.042	0.071	0.558	0.558	436	37
DP - participation to global strike	0.000	0.082	0.089	0.359	0.558	433	37
SI - stud WB	0.000	-0.068	0.075	0.363	0.726	433	37
SI - bullying	0.000	0.022	0.092	0.814	0.814	432	37
SI - stud teach relations	0.000	-0.204	0.060	0.001	0.002	433	37
SI - Nb friends	0.000	0.027	0.089	0.757	0.814	436	37

Program implementation

Table A27: ACT teacher training participation and project implementation

	(1) France	(2) Greece	(3) Spain	(4) England
ACT training participation	0.981**	0.834**	0.947**	1.000
	(0.019)	(0.075)	(0.030)	(.)
ACT project implemented	0.922**	0.852**	0.930**	1.000
	(0.038)	(0.074)	(0.035)	(.)
Observations	102	68	114	37

Note: This table shows the estimated difference between teachers assigned to the treatment group and teachers assigned to the control group. Standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$. ** $p < 0.05$

Table A28: Student participation to a citizenship project over the school year

	(1) France	(2) Greece	(3) Spain	(4) England
Participation rate - Treated schools	0.77	0.80	0.64	0.76
	(0.42)	(0.40)	(0.48)	(0.43)
Participation rate - Control schools	0.26	0.41	0.30	0.29
	(0.44)	(0.49)	(0.46)	(0.46)
Effect of treatment assignment	0.526**	0.377**	0.321**	0.519**
	(0.043)	(0.041)	(0.035)	(0.050)
Observations	1695	1680	1842	646

Note: This table shows the estimated difference between teachers assigned to the treatment group and teachers assigned to the control group. Standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$. ** $p < 0.05$

Table A29: Project topic and population targeted by the project

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Topics				
Discrimination	0.58	0.76	0.66	0.50
	(0.50)	(0.43)	(0.48)	(0.51)
Social inclusion	0.48	0.59	0.45	0.50
	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.51)
Cultural diversity	0.17	0.22	0.42	0.20
	(0.38)	(0.42)	(0.50)	(0.41)
Other topic	0.04	0.05	0.21	0.20
	(0.19)	(0.23)	(0.41)	(0.41)
Targeted population				
Elderly	0.12	0.08	0.17	0.00
	(0.32)	(0.28)	(0.38)	(0.00)
Homeless	0.13	0.16	0.08	0.15
	(0.34)	(0.37)	(0.27)	(0.37)
Migrants	0.13	0.35	0.32	0.10
	(0.34)	(0.48)	(0.47)	(0.31)
Women	0.15	0.11	0.28	0.00
	(0.36)	(0.31)	(0.45)	(0.00)
LGBT	0.12	0.05	0.17	0.05
	(0.32)	(0.23)	(0.38)	(0.22)
Disables	0.37	0.38	0.15	0.00
	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.36)	(0.00)
Other	0.29	0.24	0.26	0.40
	(0.46)	(0.43)	(0.45)	(0.50)
No specific group	0.27	0.11	0.15	0.35
	(0.45)	(0.31)	(0.36)	(0.49)
Observations	52	37	53	20

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A30: Hours devoted to the project and teacher involvement in the program

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Hours spent in class on project - total	20.49 (6.22)	20.50 (7.53)	22.14 (14.41)	14.25 (6.44)
Hours spent - preparation phase	9.41 (3.92)	8.81 (4.10)	9.88 (7.19)	6.30 (3.23)
Hours spent - implementation phase	10.67 (5.69)	12.22 (6.16)	11.16 (11.46)	7.50 (3.43)
Recommended hours enough	0.31 (0.47)	0.11 (0.31)	0.17 (0.38)	0.50 (0.51)
Extra time spent on project by teacher	1.69 (0.92)	2.81 (1.05)	2.33 (1.48)	1.35 (0.88)
0 hour	0.04 (0.19)	0.00 (0.00)	0.13 (0.34)	0.05 (0.22)
1-5 hours	0.44 (0.50)	0.11 (0.31)	0.21 (0.41)	0.70 (0.47)
5-10 hours	0.37 (0.49)	0.32 (0.47)	0.19 (0.40)	0.15 (0.37)
10-15 hours	0.10 (0.30)	0.22 (0.42)	0.12 (0.32)	0.05 (0.22)
15+ hours	0.06 (0.24)	0.35 (0.48)	0.35 (0.48)	0.05 (0.22)
Nb of extra teachers involved in project	0.51 (0.73)	1.14 (0.86)	1.06 (0.86)	0.58 (0.77)
0 teacher	0.63 (0.49)	0.30 (0.46)	0.33 (0.48)	0.58 (0.51)
1 teacher	0.24 (0.43)	0.27 (0.45)	0.27 (0.45)	0.26 (0.45)
2+ teachers	0.14 (0.35)	0.43 (0.50)	0.40 (0.49)	0.16 (0.37)
Observations	52	37	52	20

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A31: Student involvement in the program

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Proportion of students who spent extra time on project	2.33	2.72	2.18	1.80
	(0.73)	(0.88)	(0.87)	(0.52)
No student	0.08	0.08	0.24	0.25
	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.43)	(0.44)
A minority	0.60	0.31	0.41	0.70
	(0.50)	(0.47)	(0.50)	(0.47)
A majority	0.25	0.42	0.29	0.05
	(0.44)	(0.50)	(0.46)	(0.22)
All students	0.08	0.19	0.06	0.00
	(0.27)	(0.40)	(0.24)	(0.00)
Proportion of students seriously involved in project	2.73	3.08	2.71	2.65
	(0.75)	(0.80)	(0.94)	(0.67)
No student	0.00	0.05	0.10	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.23)	(0.30)	(0.00)
A minority	0.45	0.11	0.33	0.45
	(0.50)	(0.31)	(0.47)	(0.51)
A majority	0.37	0.54	0.35	0.45
	(0.49)	(0.51)	(0.48)	(0.51)
All students	0.18	0.30	0.23	0.10
	(0.39)	(0.46)	(0.43)	(0.31)
Observations	52	37	52	20

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A32: Student program involvement: extra time

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Student spent extra hour on ACT project	0.55	0.68	0.51	0.47
	(0.50)	(0.47)	(0.50)	(0.50)
0 hour	0.45	0.32	0.49	0.53
	(0.50)	(0.47)	(0.50)	(0.50)
1-5 hours	0.36	0.45	0.40	0.33
	(0.48)	(0.50)	(0.49)	(0.47)
5-10 hours	0.12	0.17	0.09	0.10
	(0.32)	(0.37)	(0.29)	(0.30)
10+ hours	0.07	0.06	0.03	0.04
	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.16)	(0.19)
Observations	895	1066	884	358

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A33: Teacher compliance to the protocol I (teachers)

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Teacher followed the ACT protocol	4.56	4.30	3.69	4.00
	(0.87)	(0.94)	(0.96)	(0.86)
Not at all	0.04	0.03	0.00	0.00
	(0.19)	(0.16)	(0.00)	(0.00)
A little	0.00	0.03	0.08	0.05
	(0.00)	(0.16)	(0.27)	(0.22)
Moderately	0.02	0.08	0.42	0.20
	(0.14)	(0.28)	(0.50)	(0.41)
A lot	0.25	0.35	0.23	0.45
	(0.44)	(0.48)	(0.43)	(0.51)
Completely	0.69	0.51	0.27	0.30
	(0.47)	(0.51)	(0.45)	(0.47)
Teacher implemented key features of protocol	0.67	0.54	0.27	0.15
	(0.48)	(0.51)	(0.45)	(0.37)
Student worked in small groups	0.98	1.00	0.88	0.90
	(0.15)	(0.00)	(0.33)	(0.31)
Student groups formed randomly	0.95	0.87	0.76	0.84
	(0.22)	(0.34)	(0.43)	(0.37)
Student voted to chose project	0.94	0.97	1.00	1.00
	(0.24)	(0.17)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Student used portfolio	0.82	0.97	0.37	0.25
	(0.39)	(0.16)	(0.49)	(0.44)
Observations	52	37	52	20

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A34: Teacher compliance to the protocol II (students)

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Teacher interventionism	3.31	2.88	3.79	3.00
	(1.23)	(1.27)	(1.09)	(1.16)
Very low	0.09	0.20	0.05	0.14
	(0.29)	(0.40)	(0.22)	(0.34)
Quite low	0.16	0.16	0.05	0.15
	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.21)	(0.36)
Moderate	0.29	0.33	0.27	0.39
	(0.46)	(0.47)	(0.44)	(0.49)
Quite high	0.24	0.20	0.33	0.22
	(0.43)	(0.40)	(0.47)	(0.41)
Very high	0.21	0.12	0.30	0.10
	(0.41)	(0.32)	(0.46)	(0.31)
Observations	895	1066	884	358

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

$^*\ p < 0.05.$ $^{**}\ p < 0.01.$ $^{***}\ p < 0.001$

Table A35: Teacher program satisfaction and project achievement

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Teacher satisfaction	4.33	3.95	3.73	3.75
	(0.86)	(1.15)	(1.07)	(0.79)
Not at all	0.02	0.08	0.02	0.00
	(0.14)	(0.28)	(0.14)	(0.00)
A little	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.05
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.30)	(0.22)
Moderately	0.13	0.19	0.33	0.30
	(0.34)	(0.40)	(0.47)	(0.47)
A lot	0.33	0.35	0.25	0.50
	(0.47)	(0.48)	(0.44)	(0.51)
Completely	0.52	0.38	0.31	0.15
	(0.50)	(0.49)	(0.47)	(0.37)
Project achievement	3.69	4.00	3.50	3.20
	(1.11)	(1.13)	(1.15)	(0.95)
Not at all	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.10
	(0.19)	(0.28)	(0.24)	(0.31)
A little	0.08	0.00	0.12	0.00
	(0.27)	(0.00)	(0.32)	(0.00)
Moderately	0.35	0.14	0.33	0.55
	(0.48)	(0.35)	(0.47)	(0.51)
A lot	0.23	0.41	0.27	0.30
	(0.43)	(0.50)	(0.45)	(0.47)
Completely	0.31	0.38	0.23	0.05
	(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.43)	(0.22)
Observations	52	37	52	20

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A36: Student program satisfaction and project achievement

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Project satisfaction	3.26	3.27	3.16	3.08
	(0.81)	(0.79)	(0.75)	(0.85)
Not at all	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.06
	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.24)
A little	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.14
	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.25)	(0.35)
Quite a lot	0.43	0.44	0.56	0.46
	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)
A lot	0.44	0.44	0.33	0.34
	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.47)	(0.47)
Project achievement	3.12	3.26	3.19	2.99
	(0.87)	(0.80)	(0.74)	(0.86)
Not at all	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.06
	(0.25)	(0.21)	(0.18)	(0.24)
A little	0.13	0.09	0.09	0.19
	(0.33)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.39)
Quite a lot	0.43	0.42	0.52	0.44
	(0.50)	(0.49)	(0.50)	(0.50)
A lot	0.38	0.44	0.35	0.31
	(0.49)	(0.50)	(0.48)	(0.46)
Observations	903	1070	885	360

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Teacher characteristics

Table A37: Teacher baseline characteristics

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Socio-demographics				
Female	0.71	0.87	0.57	0.57
	(0.46)	(0.34)	(0.50)	(0.50)
Age	40.48	49.36	47.34	37.07
	(7.24)	(6.14)	(7.64)	(9.46)
Experience	14.86	20.59	18.62	11.26
	(7.03)	(6.27)	(8.88)	(7.84)
Experience at current school	8.02	8.38	7.24	7.40
	(6.00)	(5.86)	(6.80)	(6.78)
Citizenship teaching				
Teacher already taught citizenship	0.64	0.89	0.81	0.84
	(0.48)	(0.32)	(0.39)	(0.37)
Years teaching citizenship	9.61	5.19	10.46	5.93
	(9.23)	(5.85)	(9.86)	(5.72)
Studied Citizenship - initial training	0.41	0.20	0.45	0.30
	(0.49)	(0.40)	(0.50)	(0.46)
Studied Citizenship - professional dvpmt	0.45	0.38	0.60	0.51
	(0.50)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.51)
Implemented citizen project - last 2 years	0.73	0.80	0.48	0.72
	(0.45)	(0.40)	(0.50)	(0.45)
Teacher engagement				
School responsibilities (index)	0.62	0.33	0.45	0.32
	(0.30)	(0.47)	(0.25)	(0.29)
Engagement out of school (index)	0.25	0.49	0.36	0.44
	(0.26)	(0.35)	(0.27)	(0.34)
Observations	126	106	143	44

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A38: Subjects taught by teachers

	France	Greece	Spain	England
National language	0.07	0.30	0.04	0.13
	(0.26)	(0.46)	(0.20)	(0.34)
History-Geography	0.61	0.18	0.16	0.34
	(0.49)	(0.38)	(0.37)	(0.48)
Foreign language	0.11	0.00	0.08	0.13
	(0.32)	(0.00)	(0.27)	(0.34)
Math	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.03
	(0.25)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.16)
Ancient Greek/Latin	0.01	0.20	0.00	0.00
	(0.10)	(0.40)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Social and Political Education	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.34)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Literature	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.44)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Economics	0.00	0.46	0.03	0.13
	(0.00)	(0.50)	(0.16)	(0.34)
Ethical values	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.42)	(0.00)
Citizenship	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.45
	(0.25)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.50)
Philosophy	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.43)	(0.00)
Religion	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.21
	(0.00)	(0.25)	(0.00)	(0.41)
Other subject	0.20	0.00	0.20	0.21
	(0.40)	(0.00)	(0.40)	(0.41)
Observations	107	74	116	38

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A39: Teacher outcomes at baseline

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Teacher pedagogy				
Effectiveness of Citizenship education index	4.31	4.56	4.13	4.52
	(0.59)	(0.49)	(0.76)	(0.52)
Student-centered practices index	2.27	2.58	2.65	2.45
	(0.44)	(0.49)	(0.44)	(0.37)
Teacher collaboration index	1.27	1.06	1.10	1.28
	(0.62)	(0.62)	(0.61)	(0.60)
School and Class Climate				
School Climate index	2.85	2.79	2.93	3.12
	(0.39)	(0.86)	(0.76)	(0.43)
Observations	126	106	143	43

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Student characteristics

Table A40: Student characteristics and family background

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Individual characteristics				
Female	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.48
	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)
Age (September 2018)	13.69	14.08	14.54	13.75
	(0.69)	(0.45)	(0.70)	(0.69)
Nb of siblings	2.42	1.33	1.70	2.57
	(1.89)	(1.15)	(1.66)	(2.19)
Parent or gd-parent born abroad	0.33	0.24	0.30	0.11
	(0.47)	(0.43)	(0.46)	(0.31)
All parents and gd-parents European	0.74	0.90	0.79	0.93
	(0.44)	(0.31)	(0.41)	(0.25)
Representative (ever)	0.30	0.54	0.32	0.28
	(0.46)	(0.50)	(0.47)	(0.45)
Family background				
Mother works	0.80	0.77	0.70	0.76
	(0.40)	(0.42)	(0.46)	(0.43)
Father works	0.91	0.92	0.90	0.94
	(0.29)	(0.28)	(0.29)	(0.24)
Mother high SES	0.25	0.65	0.30	0.60
	(0.44)	(0.48)	(0.46)	(0.49)
Father high SES	0.24	0.60	0.24	0.38
	(0.43)	(0.49)	(0.43)	(0.49)
Nb of books at home	1.75	2.06	2.03	1.80
	(1.32)	(1.21)	(1.23)	(1.30)
Observations	2123	2702	2127	1090

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A41: Student Civic Attitudes at baseline

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Tolerance (index)	3.94	3.77	3.99	3.86
	(0.55)	(0.58)	(0.55)	(0.67)
Tolerance gender	4.32	4.04	4.55	4.32
	(0.77)	(0.77)	(0.64)	(0.86)
Tolerance immigration	3.83	3.80	4.08	4.03
	(0.81)	(0.76)	(0.78)	(0.88)
Tolerance religion	3.70	3.49	3.36	3.30
	(0.63)	(0.76)	(0.79)	(0.91)
Trust index	2.27	2.47	2.38	2.27
	(0.55)	(0.51)	(0.52)	(0.56)
Altruism (index)	0.43	0.52	0.57	0.50
	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Altruistic behaviours (scale)	0.86	1.06	1.18	1.06
	(0.42)	(0.44)	(0.44)	(0.45)
Engagement outside of school	0.26	0.28	0.27	0.27
	(0.34)	(0.35)	(0.37)	(0.35)
Engagement at school	0.20	0.23	0.28	0.20
	(0.30)	(0.32)	(0.34)	(0.31)
Observations	2004	2550	2004	807

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A42: Student Democratic Participation at baseline

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Interest in politics (index)	1.74	2.08	1.87	1.77
	(0.58)	(0.62)	(0.57)	(0.58)
Interest in news	0.94	1.35	1.12	0.97
	(0.59)	(0.77)	(0.60)	(0.58)
Prospective political engagement	2.55	2.83	2.65	2.58
	(0.78)	(0.72)	(0.76)	(0.79)
Political self-efficacy (index)	2.11	2.56	2.33	2.35
	(0.66)	(0.61)	(0.63)	(0.73)
Observations	2016	2564	2018	814

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A43: Student Social Integration at baseline

	France	Greece	Spain	England
Student Well-Being (index)	2.86	3.03	2.99	2.81
	(0.45)	(0.45)	(0.44)	(0.53)
Cooperation	2.91	3.24	3.11	2.99
	(0.59)	(0.56)	(0.55)	(0.65)
Social support	2.63	2.82	2.90	2.73
	(0.69)	(0.63)	(0.60)	(0.78)
Stud well-being (scale)	3.03	3.03	2.97	2.72
	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.47)	(0.56)
Bullying and discrimination (index)	-0.20	-0.30	-0.20	-0.39
	(0.31)	(0.34)	(0.29)	(0.44)
Bullying (scale)	-0.22	-0.21	-0.14	-0.41
	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.27)	(0.55)
Discrimination	-0.16	-0.39	-0.27	-0.35
	(0.36)	(0.49)	(0.44)	(0.48)
Student-teacher relationships (index)	2.71	2.85	2.60	2.70
	(0.50)	(0.51)	(0.47)	(0.57)
Student-teacher relationships (scale)	2.90	3.01	2.90	2.88
	(0.63)	(0.66)	(0.58)	(0.72)
Interactive teaching practices	2.52	2.69	2.31	2.54
	(0.56)	(0.55)	(0.55)	(0.62)
Number of friends	7.10	6.75	5.80	6.26
	(5.16)	(4.85)	(4.83)	(5.26)
Observations	1984	2533	1986	789

mean coefficients; sd in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$

Table A44: Student outcomes at baseline by experience as representative

	(1) All countries	(2) France	(3) Greece	(4) Spain	(5) England
Civic Attitudes	0.195**	0.277**	0.139**	0.210**	0.166**
	(0.017)	(0.036)	(0.025)	(0.036)	(0.058)
Democratic Participation	0.314**	0.325**	0.281**	0.267**	0.546**
	(0.024)	(0.039)	(0.036)	(0.052)	(0.107)
Social Integration	0.088**	0.086**	0.124**	0.081**	-0.036
	(0.015)	(0.029)	(0.022)	(0.030)	(0.047)
Observations	7302	1980	2540	1985	797

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$

Table A45: Student involvement in the project
Impact of being a (former) representative student (treatment schools only)

	(1) All countries	(2) France	(3) Greece	(4) Spain	(5) England
Spent extra time on the project	0.167**	0.331**	0.085	0.134**	0.100
	(0.042)	(0.087)	(0.065)	(0.065)	(0.105)
Project satisfaction	0.123**	0.144**	0.051	0.228**	0.077
	(0.037)	(0.066)	(0.063)	(0.064)	(0.124)
Observations	2193	635	720	592	246

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$

Appendix B - Summary of the curriculum of each of the countries, as presented in the reference framework of the Active Citizenship Project, 2018 (Active Citizenship Project (2018))

England

Citizenship education became part of the National Curriculum in 2002 and it was then reformed in 2012-2013. It is a compulsory subject for pupils between the ages of 11 and 16 but only for schools maintained by the local authority. However, it is not compulsory for Academies, which have the right to disapply the National Curriculum. Most secondary schools are now academies.

The curriculum focuses on how society is governed (knowledge), including its political system, citizenship participation and the role of law and the justice system, and on equipping pupils with skills to think critically and to debate.

In addition, state-maintained schools need to promote spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of their pupils. Academies (state-funded, independently maintained) do not have to follow the national curriculum, but they do have to promote the same skills as state-maintained schools in addition to actively promote British values.

France

Citizenship education was included in the national curriculum in 1945 and it was integrated in other subjects. It became a separate subject in 1985 and it was then reformed in 2015.

The curriculum focuses on developing critical thinking, media literacy (with emphasis on fighting against conspiracy theories), and learning religion through secularism. In particular, in lower secondary school, moral and civic education cover topics such as self-emotional regulation and empathy, law obedience and values of (French) democracy, critical thinking and moral judgements and engagement with the community. In addition, this is implemented alongside practical activities, such as class representatives and the student council.

Greece

Citizenship education has been taught in the Greek system since 1931, and focuses on democratic institutions and values, and human rights. It is accompanied by interdisciplinary approaches and school activities. Greece enacted the "New School – 21st Century School" programme (2010-14) and the curriculum of citizenship education was completely redesigned and implemented in 2011.

The curriculum aims that students in lower secondary schools attain an adequate level of social and political literacy and develop critical thinking as well as social awareness. In particular, the curriculum

sets out that students should become aware of the interaction between the individual and the society and of the value of citizenship and politics. Additionally, students should develop a spirit of collaboration and responsibility, as well as being able to identify various political institutions and systems and cultivate values of harmony and respect for the rule of law, among others.

Spain

Citizenship education was formally introduced in 2002 in the national curriculum and since 2013 each autonomous community (i.e. region) decides how to implement it in the school curricula. Broadly, autonomous communities decide whether to teach citizenship education or ethical values. It is mandatory to implement one of them and as a separate subject.

The curriculum teaches national, European and international economic, political and social issues, in addition to gender equality, road safety and the welfare system. Also, the school system should transmit values that favour personal freedom, responsibility, democratic citizenship, solidarity, tolerance, equality, respect and justice.

Table B1: Curriculum competencies.

	England	France	Greece	Spain
Interacting effectively and constructively with others				
Interacting effectively and constructively with others		Yes		Yes
Self-confidence		Yes		Yes
Responsibility	Yes	Yes		Yes
Autonomy (personal initiative)		Yes		
Respect for different opinions or beliefs		Yes	Yes	Yes
Cooperation	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Conflict resolution		Yes		
Empathy		Yes		
Self-awareness		Yes		Yes
Communicating and listening	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Emotional awareness		Yes		Yes
Flexibility or adaptability				
Inter-cultural skills		Yes		
Thinking critically				
Thinking critically	Yes	Yes		Yes
Multiperspectivity		Yes		
Reasoning and analysis skills	Yes	Yes		
Data interpretation	Yes			
Knowledge, discovery and use of sources	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Media literacy		Yes	Yes	
Creativity		Yes		
Exercising judgement	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Understanding the present world	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Questioning		Yes	Yes	

Note. Own construction from Figures 1.14 to 1.17 in the Eurydice report (Citizenship Education at School in Europe 2017).

Table B2: Curriculum competencies (continued).

	England	France	Greece	Spain
Acting in a socially responsible manner				
Acting in a socially responsible manner	Yes			
Respect for justice	Yes	Yes		
Solidarity		Yes	Yes	Yes
Respect for other human beings		Yes	Yes	Yes
Respect for human rights		Yes	Yes	Yes
Sense of belonging		Yes		
Sustainable development		Yes	Yes	
Environmental protection		Yes		
Cultural heritage protection				
Knowing about or respecting other cultures		Yes		
Knowing about or respecting religions		Yes		
Nondiscrimination		Yes		Yes
Acting democratically				
Acting democratically				
Respect for democracy		Yes		
Knowledge of political institutions	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Knowledge of political processes (e.g. elections)	Yes	Yes		
Knowledge of international organisations, treaties and declarations				
Interacting with political authorities		Yes		
Knowledge of fundamental political and social concepts	Yes	Yes		
Respect for rules	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Participating	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Knowledge of or participation in civil society	Yes			

Note. Own construction from Figures 1.14 to 1.17 in the Eurydice report (Citizenship Education at School in Europe 2017).