Publisher

http://jssidoi.org/esc/home

DIGITALIZATION OF CIVIC EDUCATION: RISKS AND CHALLENGES

Dainius Genys

Educational Research Institute at Vytautas Magnus University, K. Donelaičio g. 52, 44244 Kaunas

E-mail: dainius.genys@vdu.lt

Abstract. The passionate debate prevails in Lithuanian public discourse about the results of individuals in subjects such as mathematics, the Lithuanian language, etc., but very rarely about pupils' humanity and readiness to become independent members of society. The educational shift to distance learning (during the pandemic) has changed the whole structure of the educational process almost overnight, and such symbolic elements as the authority, status, order and dignity of the teacher, as well as the sense of community, diminished. It is clear that distance learning has its advantages, but it also has its uncertainties, and the long-term consequences still need to be generally known today. The academic intrigue of this paper stems from the question of how the digitalization of education may affect civic education and its outcomes from a political sociology perspective. Drawing on Kavolis' model of psychological modernization, the paper seeks to identify the potential groups that emerge in the digitalization of education and rationalize their worldviews and civic action features. Framing the process of digitizing schooling within the classical political sociology framework will highlight the likely future profiles of civil society groups.

Keywords: digitalization; civic education; Kavolis; typology; future profiles of civil society groups; political and sociological perspectives

1. Introduction

Progressive ideas are popular in Lithuania. Ambitious strategic goals are linked to technological development. The education sector is where the potential of using technology is widely discussed. The importance of digital technologies in the education sector has been highlighted during the COVID-19 pandemic when the need to ensure continuity of education arose. The move towards distance education has become an inevitable alternative, requiring a specific technological literacy. It soon became apparent that replacing contact teaching with distance education is challenging and natural. The new form of communication has inevitably changed the learning

process. The forced and rapid change has raised the need to consider the digitalization of education (including civic education) and the possible broader implications for the choices of future citizens.

Technological literacy is a "must-have" skill on the eve of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. So the pandemic has only accelerated a process that was already imminent. However, the notion of technological progress as a panacea for solving various problems seems questionable. Such optimism could be linked to the continuing modernistic discourse that technological developments will help to end the world's "enchantment" and to liberate (in this case) humanity from systemic gaps in education, such as inequality, exclusion and inefficiency. Modernization can thus be understood in a Dostoyevskian, hence rather pessimistic, as a mechanism of unbridled power that ignores or contradicts the original human condition. But it can also be seen oppositely, in a Muskian way, that is to say, in a somewhat optimistic manner, as a moment of triumph of human imagination and capacity and as the resultant birth of indispensable helpers – various state-of-the-art technologies.

The academic intrigue of this paper stems from the question of how the digitalization of education can affect civic education and its outcomes from a political sociology perspective. Symbolic elements of social relations, such as the teacher's authority, status, order and dutifulness, the sense of collectivity, and even a certain sense of intimacy, transformed with the transition to distance learning. In Baudrillard's words, the notion of "school", which had been built over the centuries, has collapsed and remained an electronic simulacrum. And while the benefits of distance education are widely talked about (Cook, 2007; Cojocariu et al., 2014; Dhawan, 2020), they are also highlighted by the uncertainties (Sintema, 2020; Lincényi & Mindár, 2021), which suggests that the real long-term consequences may be ambivalent and, therefore, unknown as yet and unrevealed today.

In Lithuanian public discourse, there is ongoing passionate debate about the learning outcomes of individual subjects such as mathematics, the Lithuanian language, etc. Alas, there is rarely any discussion about students' humanity and readiness to become autonomous members of society. While it could be argued that technological innovations do not in themselves change the goals of learning (e.g. to develop a free and independent personality), as the same pandemic has shown, relying on technocratically rationalized regulation of social life inevitably decreases the frequency and importance of qualities such as attentiveness, mindfulness, understanding, and empathy (Latar, 2015; Montal & Reich 2017; van Dijk, 2020). Thus, the trajectory of the rapid rise in the importance of technology and the declining trust in people's social skills prompts a critical discussion of how to assess the (inevitable) impact of widespread technological innovations in education on the moral sensitivity of future societies. The aim is to identify potential groups emerging in the digitalization of education and to rationalize their worldviews and horizons of civic action based on Kavolis' model of psychological modernization. Framing civic education's digitalization process within the classical political sociology framework will allow us to highlight the likely profiles of future civil society groups.

2. Trends in the digitalization of education

The rapid shift towards digital learning in the pandemic era has prompted researchers to explore the impact of technology on educational content. The first attempts at academic reflection have already appeared, and several directions are emerging regarding benefits and challenges. There is consensus about the benefits of digitalizing education in terms of ensuring a seamless educational process due to its wide accessibility, ease of use and interactive nature (Almaiah, Al-Khasawneh & Thunibat, 2020). Reducing social exclusion is also an advantage of distance education (Volchik, Posukhova & Strielkowski, 2021; Ragnedda, Ruiu & Addeo, 2022). Digital technologies and distance education tools play an essential role in managing, planning, delivering and monitoring the learning process (Bida et al., 2021).

Anyway, opinions about the impact of digitalization of education on the content or the education process differ. For example, replacing contact-based learning with distance learning has profound implications for the physical

and psychological health of students and teachers, for student achievement, and the emergence of social differences (von Hippel & Hamrock, 2019; Dehghan et al., 2022). Much of the academic literature focuses on teachers' challenges, particularly technological literacy, with some teachers needing more preparation for distance-only teaching (Moorhouse & Kohnke, 2021).

Another highly relevant area that has received considerable attention in the literature is the challenges students face, mainly due to a lack of socialization, interactivity and engagement, and delayed or inadequate feedback (Pokhrel & Chhetri, 2021). Attention has been drawn to the physical and psychological problems of children's addiction to virtual space and physical and psychological problems (Brooks et al., 2020; Golberstein, Wen & Miller, 2020). Even before the pandemic (when learning was not so massively digitalized), it was stressed that children of early school age are socially unprepared for school if distance learning is used, and that students and young people are deprived of opportunities for growth and development (UNESCO, 2020). Undoubtedly, these problems have been exacerbated in the pandemic and post-pandemic periods. Initial results show uneven student engagement in distance education (Andrew et al., 2020; Dietrich, Patzina & Lerche, 2020; Reimer, Smith, Andersen & Sortkær, 2021), and it is easy to predict that the consequences will be uneven. For example, studies conducted during the pandemic period have observed declining academic performance of learners when only distance education is used due to a lack of contact hours, tutoring, feedback, etc. (Coman et al., 2020; Carrillo & Flores 2020; Engzell, Frey & Verhagen, 2021).

3. Digital civic education

From a political sociology perspective, the critique of civic education is not about the process of education or its effectiveness but about its ability to contribute to the continuity or change of the tradition of citizenship (Janoski et al., 2005; Goodman, 1989). Practitioners speak of the need to shape a particular direction of (desirable) change in society by drawing on that society's authentic cultural and mental habits (Dahrendorf, 1990; Czyzewski, 2020). From a political sociology perspective, civic education is more than just learning basic facts about political institutions and their functioning. It also includes learning virtues, values and attitudes towards social action (Nash, 2010). In this sense, civic education is not an isolated subject in the curriculum but rather one of the fundamental principles that shape the entire curriculum. One of the most important goals of civic education is to convey standards of common civic culture, a specific moral culture (Donskis, 2004).

In the academic literature, digitalization is associated with expanding forms of civic participation (Hasselwander, 2022). It is believed that using digital resources can increase citizens' involvement, reduce inequality and exclusion, and promote civic participation and empowerment of citizens (especially young people) (Cho et al., 2020). Overall, research on digital citizenship still needs to be completed. However, studies linking forms of digital learning and civic education discover positive links at the empirical level (see, for example, Baron, Gomez, Pinkard, & Martin, 2014; Kwon & de los Ríos, 2019; Woodall & Lennon, 2017), and despite these are not large-scale studies, their positive findings can be taken into account.

The ambition for digitalization matured in the pandemic is likely irreversible; the only question is how fast and broadly it will be realized. It is believed (Dwivedi et al., 2019) that milestone processes affecting future generations may be underway in the nearest future: "the trajectory towards increasing applications using AI has the potential to change many aspects of human lives and impact society as a whole. The way forward is not clear, and the potential roadmap is undefined. Numerous benefits could accrue from AI, but there are also significant risks that swathes of society may be disenfranchised from implementing the technology. Decisions made within the next few years on the forward path for AI are likely to have an impact on all our lives and the lives of future generations" (Dwivedi et al., 2019: 42). It is also interesting to note that in Lithuania, a lot of attention is paid to the digitalization of education in terms of form but not in terms of content, i.e. it is about technological literacy, accessibility of tools, but not about the impact of all this on the value orientation of future members of the society,

e.g. empathy development. As mentioned above, from a political sociology point of view, the debate on the digitalization of civic education focuses on the possible consequences, and it is vital to identify a scientifically evidence-based way of rationalizing such considerations.

In Lithuania, the digitalization of education is also gaining some momentum. Digitalization of education is associated with improving the quality of teaching: reducing student achievement gaps, reducing multiple exclusion, equalizing access and engagement, improving the dynamic environment, monitoring psychosocial risks, and faster decision-making (Skaitmeninė transformacija: ateičiai pasirengęs švietimas 2021: 3). However, all the projects are still in the implementation phase, and it is not yet possible to assess their effectiveness.

The paper has no wish to denigrate digital education. Still, it aims to raise a series of critical cautions about future consequences, especially against simplistic and opportunistic claims that digitalization in education is a ready-made remedy for the current crisis. A wave of research has emerged debating and inviting critical reflection on issues related to possible future implications of digitalization (e.g. Williamson, Eynon & Potter, 2020; Hillman, Rensfeldt & Ivarsson, 2020; Knox, 2020; Selwyn et al., 2020).

4. Dimensions and challenges of civic education in the digitalization era

From a political sociology point of view, it is crucial to make a more explicit link between specific cultural contexts and their impact on public behaviour - what are the cultural trends and their direction, and what choices does this lead to in the social sphere? In the face of new realities, such as the rapid digitalization of education, it is crucial to understand the likely cultural vector of citizenship development. To calibrate valid arguments, it is first necessary to outline the methodological framework of such a model. Accordingly, reference is made to the classical neo-Tocquevillian (e.g. Putnam, 2001; Howard, 2003; Hoffmann, 2006) conception of the genesis and functioning of civil society. In this view, society is not a historical inevitability but a historical phenomenon. Accordingly, civil society is those who, "being free, can overcome their selfishness and, together with others, can take up common causes that transcend personal interest and the inter-private interest of the whole group. It is a voluntary act of fellowship by people who associate the meaning of life and personal development with concern for the common good" (Aleksandravičius, 2023: 16). Obviously, the emergence of such a civil society is not a given, but depends on a wide range of social, cultural, political, etc. aspects. With the rapid digitalization of (including civic) education, it is reasonable to consider how this will affect future forms of civil society.

It should be noted that civic education takes different meanings and forms (global, cultural, and national citizenship) depending on the historical period. Therefore it has undergone a specific development in Lithuania (see more in Balčiūnienė, 2007). Today, civic education in Lithuania is understood as a set of personal competencies (social skills, moral attitudes, knowledge, sense of identification with one's own country and cultural environment, and political-social activism).

Today, as mentioned above, education is going through another phase of development linked to increasing technology intervention. Civic education is no exception. A type of digital dimensions of citizenship is emerging in the growing academic literature (e.g. distinguishing between digital engagement learning opportunities (opportunities to learn how to create and share digital media tied to societal issues) and digital consumption learning opportunities (opportunities to learn ways to judge the credibility of online content)). At the same time, empirical studies show that the digitalization of technology and learning impacts learning content and outcomes (Bowyer & Kahne, 2020).

There is a wide variety of conceptions of citizenship in the academic literature (e.g. Dunne, 2003; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994). In summary, citizenship can be seen as a set of personal competencies (social skills, moral attitudes, knowledge, a sense of identification with one's own country and cultural environment, and political-

social activism). Citizenship content is historically variable, taking specific forms depending on the political situation and cultural and social traditions (Jackson, 2004; Stevenson, 2001).

Table 1. Comparison of the dimensions of citizenship and digitalization and the categories of civic education.

Dimensions (according to Gagnon and Page, 1990; Dunne, 2003)	Sub-dimensions (according to Kymlicka and Norman, 2000; Diamond, 1997)	General competencies under the NŠA*	Categories of research on digital technologies and civic education	Kavolis's Concept of Citizenship and Categories of Acceptance of Modernization
Identity	Identification with your country, culture, nation and corresponding personal feelings	Cognitive	A system that enables personalized learning, integrating learning outcomes monitoring and management in all environments	Organizational, structural aspects: effectiveness of existing structures for the expression of citizenship vs, control of the bureaucracy, public participation, dialogical approach
Normative	Attitudes, values, virtues: an essential aspect of citizenship involves the ability to transcend one's self-interest and take responsibility for the well-being of the larger group of which one is a member.	Social and emotional aspects of healthy lifestyles	Renewable, progressive technological competencies for educators, transforming education	Values: independence, community, generosity, cooperation, public interest, self-regulation, tolerance, individualism
Capacities	Social skills: teamwork, community, dialogue, leadership, adaptability, communication.	Creativity	A data-driven educational process management infrastructure, including analytics, MM/DI monitoring and solutions	Cognitive abilities: intelligence, autonomy, knowledge, agency, commitment, creativity
	Thinking skills: decision-making, conflict resolution, critical/analytical, and organization.		Standards-driven educational tools, content, processes for quality and interoperability	Acceptance/rejection of social change: associated with rationalism or, conversely, "impulse relaxation."
Participation	Civic/political participation: linked to conventional participation	Citizenship / Cultural / Communication	Long-term financial instruments to promote dialogue and teacher involvement in the creative process	
	Public (social) participation: linked to social and symbolic capital			
	Protest: associated with unconventional participation			

Source: made by the author

Civil society and citizenship are historical constructs that have taken different forms, are historically changing and have specific social, cultural and political content. The analysis of the literature has revealed a variety of other

---

* Project https://www.nsa.smm.lt/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Pilietiskumo-PKT.pdf

theoretical treatments and empirical variables. Civic education is not only a purposeful educational activity expressed in terms of knowledge, the aim of developing certain attitudes and virtues and the encouragement of appropriate action, which is realized through the subjects of civic education, but also as an educational process (going beyond the specific subject matter), which involves the acquisition of knowledge, the formation of attitudes and virtues, and the promotion of appropriate activity, all of which have socio-cultural and socio-political implications for the future citizenship of society.

The dimensions highlight the areas of intervention in civic education and the direction of the educational process. Accordingly, the digitalization process also has its patterns. Since the dimensions of the digitalization process are still crystallized, the typology still needs to be established; Table 1 shows some emerging trends. This makes it possible to identify the direction and objectives of the digitalization process. However, to discuss in a reasoned way the potential impact on future forms of citizenship, a methodological framework is needed to link digitalization, civic education and the most likely consequences.

5. Assessing the future impact of digital civic education

To achieve this task, the methodological principles of acknowledged sociologist V. Kavolis help study the impact of digitalization on individual citizenship. In his analysis, Kavolis was concerned with the trajectories of consciousness of Lithuanians and the circumstances influencing them. It is worth mentioning the sociologist's contribution to the study of the formation of the Lithuanian character (Kavolis, 1991) and civic psychology, for example, what happens to a society when their homeland is taken away from them (Kavolis, 1994). Drawing on Kavolis' conceptual and methodological tradition, the impact of digital civic education on future citizens' attitudes, virtues and activism is discussed.

V. Kavolis model is based on the assumption that the tension between the rational and impulsive elements of the personality grows stronger with modernity. Kavolis has identified two main directions: rationalization on the one hand and relaxation of the impulse on the other. According to the sociologist, a person can react to social trends in two ways: to "accept" them or to "reject" them. The personality can be directly shaped by its environment as if becoming a mirror of the changing society (Kavolis called such a person a modernist personality), or it can become the opposite of the tendencies of social change (Kavolis called such a person an underground character). Theorizing from a much later time, Kavolis recognized that this typology of the two extreme poles did not capture the diversity of society and its possible reactions, and he, therefore, identified a third type, the postmodern personality, which he identified as being the most promising and desirable (1970: 76).

Kavolis' typology of the impact of modernization on personality psychology is based on the reaction to change - "accept" or "reject". Thus, the personality can be directly shaped by its environment, as if becoming a mirror of the changing society. Still, it can also become the complete opposite of the tendencies of social change, i.e. what its community is not, to find and take on the qualities that it misses the most in its society (Kavolis, 1970: 68). Accordingly, two primary and markedly opposite personality types emerge (Kavolis, 1970: 74-76):
    • The first type - the modernistic personality - is formed by direct exposure to social trends and imitating them in the psyche. This personality is rationally organized but functions non-emotionally. It is concerned with the application of rules rather than with solving fundamental existential problems. This personality is characterized by internal fragmentation: each function of the soul operates separately. Solutions are organized in systems, like a flight to the moon. Things, events and feelings repeat themselves in a standardized way. What exists to be consumed, and nothing has lasting value. All desires must be immediately satisfied. This personality experiments with what (and those) is the newest because it is the most recent. It is not concerned with the ultimate consequences of its actions or the criteria for its choices. Its life consists of fleeting moments of impermanence.
    • The second type - the underground personality - rejects the social trends of its period, whatever they may be, and shapes itself by rebellious reactions to them. It trusts what is subjective. It is constantly dissolved in

one or another ecstatic chaos, movement, or event. It does not count in precise language. Definitions are only meant to distinguish man from man. Every event, person, image, and sound is disposable (exclusive and soon to disappear) and, therefore, to be cherished. The world of such a person is a fragment of sensations. Nevertheless, he is concerned with producing something tangible in which he can feel a hint of lasting values and a sense of his necessity. He is looking for some nameless home in the fast-moving history and circular universe, for some primitive, archaic, mundane and straightforward things amid constant experimentation. He is terrified that he might become stagnant, silent, and unable to react. He is looking for a connection with the new dogmas and rituals which form the character

Such typology of the two extreme poles does not capture the diversity of society and its possible reactions. Kavolis identifies a third type, the postmodern personality, which is recognized as the most promising and desirable (1970: 76). However, based on the strict conceptual scheme proposed by the author himself, we would suggest that the latter type is more representative of the reactions of a person in a later stage of modernization (variously referred to by different sociologists as late modernity, post-modernity etc.). In other words, it does not arise automatically from merely accepting or rejecting trends of change. The accompanying feature of this type is reflexivity, i.e. the ability to reflect critically not only on the environment but also on one's actions and to determine the degree of responsibility, which in sociological discourse becomes a key feature of late modernity. This latter characteristic allows us to pick out the best parts of the previous two types and to balance the response. Therefore, according to Kavolis (1970: 76):

   • The third type of personality feels all these dilemmas. It defines itself through the tension of the dilemmas and the inner necessity to embrace the contradictions of these tensions and resolve them in its way of life and creativity. This is the postmodern man. It has the hint of the creator of a future civilization - technically sophisticated, but "with a human face". Only such a personality can counteract the pathologies inherent in modernist and underground characters. Not so much to neutralize the pathologies, however, as to mediate the values he finds among modernists and undergrounders.

V. Kavolis' theory, in its way, enters the discourse of civic education in Lithuania. As mentioned above, the digitalization process is associated with the potential of technology to expand the horizons of democracy, for example, to increase the participation and effectiveness of future citizens, but there is minimal discussion of the spillover effects, which are increasingly visible in academic literature (Sancho-Gil, Rivera-Vargas & Miño-Puigcercós 2020; Alirezabeigi, Masschelein & Decuypere 2020). It is a truism of political sociology that low public identification with the political community and sluggish engagement with public affairs inevitably lead to an increase in the bureaucratization of public life. Kavolis' theory links the impact of social change to a psychological modernization model, pointing out that combinations of value, virtue and performance characteristics are not necessarily unambiguous.

By elaborating on the dimensions of civic education identified in the scientific literature and rationalizing (in a Kavolian way) the impact of digitalization from a normative perspective, we can identify the more general attitudes, civic virtues and levels of activism expected by different groups.

Table 1. The impact of the dimension of civic education and digitalization on Kavolis types of worldview

Dimensions of civic education and digitalization	V. Kavolis' personality types and the rationalization of their worldview and moral culture		
	Modernists	**Underground**	**Postmodernists**
Embracing social change/digital trends in education	- openly accept and are willing to rely on the promise of progress - rational reasoning and technological competence to overcome humanity's fundamental challenges, such as liberation from suffering and improving well-being.	- characterized by an *a priori* opposition, not necessarily from specific situations, but rather from a value-based attitude to reject and not accept the imperatives of the changing order - progress. It is a relative niche group.	- are open to the prevailing innovations of the times, as long as it is in line with their values and helps to solve social ills.
Technological literacy	- trust in scientific rationality, embrace innovation and support the innovations of the times largely shape their worldview. Highly receptive to technology.	- do not trust the promise of progress nor rational reasoning, and reject any technological innovation or novelty.	- openly critical of the promise of progress to liberate humanity from suffering and improve well-being, understanding that this will not be achieved without engagement and empathy.
Attitudes, values, virtues.	- are more accepting of pragmatic - statistics-based - than value-based arguments, and are therefore more likely than other groups to justify instrumental relations, and consequently prioritize "deeds over talk", "expert knowledge over Socratic debate", and "rational calculation over social dialogue".	- are pragmatic but lacking clarity of values (often conflicting values that do not allow a tangible direction to be proposed), are not acceptable and are more likely than other groups to justify a nostalgia-infused worldview.	- are more accepting of value-based than pragmatic arguments, and are therefore more likely than other groups to justify a dialogical relationship, prioritizing ideas, public interest considerations and the best views that emerge from debate.
Identifying with your country, culture and people	- tend to delegate responsibility for the content of public life to government and relevant services, whose effectiveness is measured by innovative service delivery, modern communication and technological innovation.	- the majority also tends to delegate responsibility for the content of public life to the government, while efficiency is associated with conservatism and preserving tradition.	- tend to take personal responsibility for the content of public life. They are a group of active people who trust each other, are reluctant to withdraw from the organization of social life and prefer to take the initiative rather than delegate it to the state.

Self-expression Social skills	- tend to associate the meaning of life with a functional mission (stemming from a profession, hobby or social status) and its effective fulfilment. The success of self-expression is linked more to form (and, presumably, the quantitative and qualitative parameters of its visuality) than to content (its artistic uniqueness or conceptual originality). The value attitudes that are in flux in society are often met with ridicule as a competing domain. Priority for professional leadership. Communication is driven by a specific goal or needs, organized in a targeted way, targeting particular social groups, and dominated by functionality (it is about solving a specific problem or achieving a goal).	- do not trust the dominant innovations of thetime, but tend to rely on various populist claims, steeped in historicity, to restore "order", to prioritize traditional values and "historical justice", and to reject any traces of modernity. They are reluctant to trust people who use scientific knowledge or expert modelling to make their case, even if they have noble goals. Communication is linked to specific values, organized according to socio-political circumstances, not group-specific (the target audience is the public), and dominatedby the attitudes of the represented discourse (it is crucial to make one's position known).	- associate the meaning of life with creation and self-creation, and see the challenges they encounter as challenges to be overcome. Dialogue between groups and public consensus is more important than expert knowledge or rational calculation. Communication is linked to values and needs,organized in a targeted, contextual way, selecting arguments that enable dialogue between differentgroups, and is dominatedby the public interest (it is essential to achieve a broader consensus in society).
Thinking patterns	- innovation will always take precedence over tradition. Any historical or cultural sentiment is secondary to them. Value and fairness of a different approach are closely linked to the effectiveness of the delivery of the underlying objectives. Decisions are based on scientific reasoning. The origin of conflicts lies in the divergence of arguments. It is primarily concerned with efficiency and professional/group interests.	- reject other opinions if it is not in line with their values. Decisions are based on tradition. Conflicts have their origins in emotions. Primarily concerned with the process and exclusively with group interests.	- when faced with a different opinion, they question it, review the arguments and then decide whether to reject or accept it. Whatever their judgement of the other idea is, they tend to get its right to exist because it does not offend their collective feelings. Decisions are taken from a holistic perspective. Conflicts are rooted in the public interest. It is primarily concerned with socialjustice, placing interests in the context of the public interest.
Civic/political participation	- link their civic mission to the dutiful payment of taxes, and see their responsibilities as consumers of public services, not creators. They prioritize material security and tend to develop and continuously improve their competencies but oftenlimit themselves to narrow specialization.	- link their civic mission with a kind of resistance, dissatisfaction with everything happening, but personally - demonstratively - refusing to participate more actively or otherwise contribute to the enrichment of social life. Only a tiny part of this group tries to take personalinitiative.	- are open to change, linking their civic mission to a willingness to experience global trends in practice, making participation in public affairs an inevitable way of life without creating tensions with other groups insociety or with the authorities.

Public (social) participation	- when being convinced of their righteousness (which is based on empiricism), they tend to deny the other view, basing their belief on "accidental" or "insufficient" "evidence" or "inference".	- When convinced of their righteousness (based on value-based sentimentality), they fight for their right to an opinion. They tend to fight against dissent that offends their collective feelings, but in principle, they recognize that friction also has a right to exist.	- When convinced of their righteousness (based on constant modelling and reflection of any situation), they prefer to take responsibility and express leadership in representing the public interest. They prefer environments where they can better serve society and use their talents.
Potential for protest	- relate social order to institutions and their functionality, and see power as a vertical hierarchy of positions.	- relate social order with tradition, and see power as a pyramid of values, supporting hierarchical structures.	- relate social order to self-government, and see power as a mechanism of critical and reflective reasoning for the public interest.

Source: made by the author

The distinguished types are more suitable for academic purposes; in reality, their expression may not be (as usual) so precisely separated. Usually, it is overlapping and not necessarily visible in such apparent forms. However, in this case, it is crucial to recognize its expression's direction and possible trends. Assuming that Kavolis' theory of psychological modernization reveals societal development patterns, it is possible to get a picture of the potential consequences of the digitalization of civic education. Without an empirical study, we cannot demonstrate reliable quantitative expressions of this process. It is important to recognize the likelihood of consequences that are likely to increase with the acceleration of this transition (both quantitatively and qualitatively), and to think about countermeasures to ensure the transmission of the desired civic skills and values to future generations. It is still unclear, which group (be it modernistic, underground or post-modernistic) will become dominant in increasing the digitalization of civic education, and which features will become predominant among future citizens. However, the consequences of digitalization will be complex and produce various aftereffects of civic activity. As mentioned above, research shows mixed evidence for digitalization interventions in education, especially in citizenship education (Williamson, Eynon & Potter, 2020; Selwyn et al., 2020). With a schematic view, we can understand where civic education needs to be directed to increase future empathy and communication in society and what needs to be avoided to reduce the growth of narrow interests and closed emotional groups. This study contributes to the academic literature in two ways: by testing the applicability of Kavolis' theory to the digitalization of civic education and by expanding the range of arguments for the guidance of the digitalization process.

6. Discussion

The study's limitations are related to the need for more application of Kavolis' concept in empirical research, which would allow for improving and validating the methodological approach. On the other hand, exploratory analysis shows that the types developed by Kavolis are recognizable in reality (Genys, 2020). The groups formed based on personality types have indeed undergone some development (depending on the age of the members, they have experienced the modernization of Soviet and Independent Lithuania and rapid global digitalization). Still, the types have neither mellowed nor become more similar. On the contrary, they have crystallized even more, taking on specific features (typical of the post-Soviet reality). It is worth mentioning that the pilot mentioned above study was carried out on the data of Lithuanian migrants, which may impact the answers' quantitative and qualitative characteristics.

On the other hand, the rationality of the groups and the structure of the arguments (not the answers, but the rationalization of the solutions) showed apparent differences: the "underground" group seems to be the most

internalized in terms of the value-oriented typology of Kavolis and thus the most evolved. At the same time, it is the smallest group in terms of numbers. The underground man with strong convictions has drifted towards a type that retains a strong dissatisfaction (often turning into anger), which, instead of basing principled opposition on concrete alternatives, is more likely to affirm its apparent powerlessness and hypertrophied paternalistic expectations. The "modernist" group has an obvious objective, which becomes the basis for further choices. The group is characterized by a transparent, instrumental chain of rationalization - problem, solution, result. Finally, the "postmodernists" take responsibility for the world around them but do not link their activities exclusively to Lithuania. The global world becomes the area of their activity. The members of this group become less dependent on the factors around them and more in search of self-fulfilment, which directly results in a more positive attitude and a more assertive and moderate posture.

To summarize the discussion, Kavolis' theory (whose conceptual framework is rooted in historical processes) is not deterministic but allows us to point out possible consequences. The digitalization of civic education in Lithuania, as in any other country, depends on many aspects: global technological developments, the region's geopolitical situation, socioeconomic situation, etc. Accordingly, this can provoke different consequences for society. It is important to realize here that the results of the digitalization of civic education will inevitably affect the forms of civic activities of future societies. Irrespective of the aims, not civic education content, but the digitalization process (as an ongoing aftereffect of the modernization process) provokes different responses between groups. Therefore, some groups are more likely to exhibit characteristics of "modernistic" personalities, while others are more likely to exhibit characteristics of "underground" or "postmodernistic" characters. From a political sociology perspective, the digitalization process may lead to different trends in the expression of citizenship (values, attitudes, participation, involvement, etc.) and, thus, to other forms of future civil society. This calls for vigilance and a critical appraisal of the process and its possible consequences.

Conclusions

The literature analysis has shown that the digitalization of education (including civic education) is a growing process, the results and final consequences of which still need to be fully known. At this stage, it is still essential to broaden the analytical discourse on digitalization from various angles to better understand the phenomenon and its implications for the future society.

The study shows that Kavolis' model of psychological modernization is promising in the field of education and allows for a critical assessment and prediction of the possible consequences of the digitalization of civic education. The model enables distinguishing different groups affected by digitalization and, most importantly, discussing their worldview systems and models of citizenship. The analysis has revealed significantly other groups with distinctive rationalizations of worldviews and citizenship practices. The impact of digitalization on civic education is likely to have quite different consequences (i.e. not only desirable but also unavoidable and secondary), as it depends on the individuals' intuitive (what Kavolis called psychological modernization) response to the digitalization process. This analytical rationalization of the possible consequences makes it possible to select more precise (valid) arguments to mitigate the consequences of digitalization for the future civil society.

While there is still a lack of research on the digitalization of education (and civic education in particular), the typology of participants into three groups and the diagnosis of their argument structure can reasonably broaden the choices of decision-makers and allow for a more precise and (hopefully) more effective organization of civic education digitalization policies. The description of the dimensions of the digitalization of civic education enables argumentative discussion of specific scenarios and a justification of decisions.

References

Adedoyin, B., O., & Soykan, E. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments*, https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180

Aleksandravičius, E. (2023). Spalvos ir juostos: Lietuvių akademinės skautijos istorija 1924-2024 [Colors and Sashes: the History of Lithuanian Academic Scouting 1924-2024]. Versus

Alirezabeigi, S., J. Masschelein, & Decuypere, M. (2020). Investigating Digital Doings Through Breakdowns: A Sociomaterial Ethnography of a Bring Your Own Device school. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 193-207 https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1727501

Andrew, A., Cattan, S., Costa Dias, M., Farquharson, C., Kraftman, L., Krutikova, S., Phimister, A., & Sevilla, A. (2020). Inequalities in Children's Experiences of Home Learning during the COVID-19 Lockdown in England. *Fiscal studies*, 41(3), 653-683. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-5890.12240.

Almaiah, M., Al-Khasawneh, A. & Thunibat, A. (2020). Exploring the critical challenges and factors influencing the E-learning system usage during COVID-19 pandemic. *Education and Information Technologies*, 25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-102.

Balčiūnienė, I. (2007). Religinio ir pilietinio ugdymo suderinamumas ir papildomumas [Compatibility and complementarity of religious and civic education]. Daktaro disertacija [Doctoral thesis]. Šiauliai: Šiaulių universitetas

Baron, B., Gomez, K., Pinkard, N., & Martin, C. (2014). The digital youth network: Cultivating digital media citizenship in urban communities. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bida, O., Prokhorchuk, O., Fedyaeva, V., Radul, O., Yakimenko, P., & Shevchenko, O. (2021). Covid-19 and Distance Education: Analysis of the Problems and Consequences of the Pandemic. *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*, 21(12), 629-635. http://paper.ijcsns.org/07_book/202112/20211286.pdf

Bowyer, B., & Kahne, J. (2020). The digital dimensions of civic education: Assessing the effects of learning opportunities. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 69, 101162, ISSN 0193-3973, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2020.101162

Brooks, S. K., Smith, L. E., Webster, R. K., Weston, Dale, Woodland, L., Hall, I., & Rubin, G. J. (2020). The impact of unplanned school closure on children's social contact: rapid evidence review. Euro Surveill. 25(13), 2000188. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.13.2000188.

Carrillo, C., & Assunção Flores, M. (2020) COVID-19 and teacher education: a literature review of online teaching and learning practices. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 466-487. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1821184

Cook, D. A. (2007). Web-based learning: pros, cons and controversies. Clinical Medicine. *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians*, 7 (1), 37- 42.

Cojocariu V.-M., Lazar I., Nedeff V., & Lazar G. (2014). SWOT analysis of e-learning educational services from the perspective of their beneficiaries. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 1999-2003. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.510

Coman, C., Țîru, L. G., Meseșan-Schmitz, L., Stanciu, C., & Bularca, M. Ch. (2020). Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education during the Coronavirus Pandemic: Students' Perspective. *Sustainability*, 12(24), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.3390/su122410367

Czyzewski, K. (2020). Mažasis pasaulio centras [The small centre of the world]. Vilnius: Versus.

Cho, A., Byrne, J., & Pelter, Z. (2020). Digital civic engagement by young people. UNICEF Offices of Global Insight and Policy. Available at https://www.unicef.org/media/72436/file/Digital-civic- engagement-by-young-people-2020_4.pdf.

Dahrendorf, R. (1990). Apmąstymai apie revoliuciją [Reflections on revolution]. Vilnius: Periodika

Diamond, L. (1997). Civil Society and the Development of Democracy. Estudio/working paper

Dehghan, H., Esmaeili, V. S., Paridokht, F., Javadzade, N., & Jalali, M. (2022). Assessing the students' readiness for E-Learning during the Covid-19 pandemic: A case study. *Heliyon*, 8(8), e10219, ISSN 2405-8440, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10219

Dhawan S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crises. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 49(1), 5-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239520934018

Dietrich, H., Patzina, A. & Lerche, A. (2020). Social inequality in the homeschooling efforts of German high school students during a school closing period. *European Societies*, 23(1), 348-369. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2020.1826556

van Dijk, J. (2020). The digital divide. John Wiley & Sons.

Donskis, L. (2004) Pilietinė visuomenė ir jos priešai: autoritetas, tiesa ir viešoji erdvė XXI amžiaus pradžios Lietuvoje [Civil society and its enemies: authority, truth and public space in Lithuania at the beginning of the 21st century] Vilnius: Versus aureus.

Dunne, J. (2003). Between state and civil society: European contexts for education. In: McDonough, K., Feinberg, W. (eds.). Education and Citizenship in Liberal-democratic societies, Great Britain: Oxford university press. https://doi.org/10.1093/0199253668.003.0005

Dwivedi, Y.K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., Duan, Y., Dwivedi, R., Edwards, J., Eirug, A., & Galanos, V. (2019). Artificial Intelligence (AI): multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 57, 101994 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.002

Engzell, P., Frey, A., & Verhagen, M. D. (2021). Learning loss due to school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic. PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 118(17), Article e2022376118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2022376118

Gagnon, F., & Page, M. (1999). Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of Citizenship in Liberal Democracies. Vol 1: Conceptual Framework for the Anglysis of Citizenship in Liberal Democracies. Vol 2: Approaches to Citizenship in Six Liberal Democracies. Report submitted to the department of Canadian Heritage. Ottawa: Department of Canadian Heritage.

Garman, B. (1995). Civic Education through Service Learning. ERIC Digest. Available via the Internet:< http://www.ericdigests.org/1996-3/service.htm >. [accessed 17.01.2023].

Genys, D. (2020). Laisvėjimo strategijos: lietuvių emigrantų racionalumas ir emocinės būsenos dinamika [Emancipation strategies: rationality of Lithuanian emigrants and dynamics of emotional state]. *Oikos,* 2(30), 7-23. https://doi.org/10.7220/2351-6561.30.1

Goodman, J. (1989). Education for Critical Democracy. *Journal of Education*, 171 (2), 88-116. https://doi.org/10.1177/002205748917100207

Golberstein, E., Wen, H. & Miller, B. F. (2020). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) and mental health for children and adolescents. *JAMA Pediatrics,* 174, 819-820. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.1456

Hasselwander, M., Kiko, M., & Johnson, T. (2022). Digital civic engagement, open data, and the informal sector: a think piece. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 16, 100700, ISSN 2590-1982, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2022.100700

Hillman, T., Rensfeldt, B., A., & Ivarsson, J. (2020). Brave new Platforms: A Possible Platform Future for Highly Decentralized Schooling. *Learning, Media and Technology,* 45(1), 7-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1683748

von Hippel, P. T., & Hamrock, C. (2019). Do test score gaps grow before, during, or between school years? Measurement artifacts and what we can know in spite of them? *Sociological Science*, 6, 43-80. https://doi.org/10.15195/v6.a3

Hoffmann, S. L. (2006). Civil Society 1750-1914. Palgrave Macmillan

Howard, M. M. (2003). The Weakness of Civil Society in Post-Communist Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511840012

Jackson, R. (ed.) 2004. International Perspectives on Citizenship, Education and Religious Diversity. London and New York: Routledge Falmer

Janoski, T., Alford, R., Hicks, A., & Schwartz A. M. (eds). (2005). The Handbook of Political Sociology. States, Civil Societies and Globalization. Cambridge University Press

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (2006). The Limits of Efficacy: Educating Citizens for a Democratic Society. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 39(2), 289-296. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506060471

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (2004). What kind of Citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002237

Kavolis, V. (1994). Nužemintųjų generacija [Generation of Humiliated]. In Žmogus istorijoje [A Man in a History]. Vilnius: Vaga, 63–120.

Kavolis, V. (1991). Epochų signatūros [Signatures of the Epochs]. Čikaga: A. Mackaus Knygų Leidimo Fondas.

Kavolis, V. (1970). Modernistika ir jos pogrindis [Modernism and its underground]. *Metmenys* 20, 66-76.

Kebritchi M., Lipschuetz A., & Santiague L. (2017). Issues and challenges for teaching successful online courses in higher education. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 46(1), 4-29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239516661713

Kymlicka, W., & Norman W. (2000). Citizenship in Diverse Societies. Oxford: Oxford university press. https://doi.org/10.1093/019829770X.001.0001

Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory, *Ethics* 10, 352-380. 45(3)https://doi.org/10.1086/293605

Knox, J. (2020). Artificial Intelligence and Education in China. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(3), 298-311. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1754236

Kwon, L., & de los Ríos, C. V. (2019). "See, click, fix": Civic interrogation and digital tools in a ninth-grade ethnic studies course. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 52(2), 154-166. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2019.1647809

Latar, N.L. (2015). The robot journalist in the age of social physics: the end of human journalism? In: The New World of Transitioned Media (Einav, G. eds.), pp. 65–80. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-09009-2_6

Liguori E. W., & Winkler C. (2020). From offline to online: Challenges and opportunities for entrepreneurship education following the COVID-19 pandemic. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420916738

Lincényi, M., & Mindár, M. (2021). Comparative analysis of the views and attitudes of elementary and secondary school pupils from the Czech Republic and Slovak Republic on the division of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic (ČSFR). *Insights into Regional Development,* 3(1), 104-123. https://doi.org/10.9770/IRD.2021.3.1(6)

Lukšienė, M. (eds). (1992). Lietuvos švietimo koncepcija [The Concept of Lithuanian education]. Vilnius: Publishing Centre.

Milosz, Cz. (2011) Gimtoji Europa [Native Realm]. Vilnius: Apostrofa

Montal, T., & Reich, Z. (2017). I, robot. You, journalist. Who is the author? Authorship, by-lines and full disclosure in automated journalism. Digit. Journal, 5(7), 829-849. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2016.1209083

Moorhouse, B. L., & Kohnke, L. (2021). Thriving or surviving emergency remote teaching necessitated by COVID-19: University teachers' perspectives. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30(3), 279-287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00567-9

Nash, K. (2010). Contemporary Political Sociology. Globalization, Politics and Power. Wiley-Blackwell

Norkus, Z., (2008) Kokia demokratija, koks kapitalizmas? [What democracy, what capitalism?] Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Putnam, D. R. (2001) Kad demokratija veiktų [Making Democracy Work]. Margi raštai

Pokhrel, S., & Chhetri, R. (2021). A Literature Review on Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education for the Future*, 8(1), 133-141. https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631120983481

Ragnedda, M., Ruiu, L. M., & Addeo, F. (2022). The self-reinforcing effect of digital and social exclusion: the inequality loop. *Telematics and Informatics*, 72, 101852, ISSN 0736-5853, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2022.101852

Reimer, D., Smith, E., Andersen, I. G., & Sortkær, B. (2021). What happens when schools shut down? Investigating inequality in students' reading behaviour during Covid-19 in Denmark. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2020.100568

Sacks, J. (2021) Moralybė. Bendrasis geris permainų laiakis [Morality. Restoring the Common Good in Divided Times] Vilnius: Tyto Alba

Sancho-Gil, J. M., P. Rivera-Vargas, & Miño-Puigcercós, R. (2020). Moving Beyond the Predictable Failure of Ed-Tech Initiatives. *Learning, Media and Technology* 45(1), 61-75. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2019.1666873

Selwyn, N., T. Hillman, R. Eynon, G. Ferreira, J. Knox, F. MacGilchrist, & Sancho-Gil, J. M. (2020). What's Next for Ed-Tech? Critical Hopes and Concerns for the 2020s. *Learning, Media and Technology* 45(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1694945

Sintema, E. J. (2020). Effect of COVID-19 on the Performance of Grade 12 Students: Implications for STEM Education. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 16 (7), em1851. https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/7893

Stevenson, N. (2001). Culture and citizenship. London: Sage publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446217665

Skaitmeninė transformacija: ateičiai pasirengęs švietimas. Politikos trumpraštis su rekomendacijomis sprendimų priėmėjams (2021). rumpraštis parengtas pagal Lietuvos mokslo tarybos finansuojamo projekto „Dirbtinio intelekto ir skaitmeninių technologijų panaudojimo sprendimai švietimo kokybei gerinti reaguojant į COVID-19" rezultatus. Projektą 2021 m. įgyvendino Kauno technologijos universitetas (KTU) kartu su UAB „Visionary Analytics", UAB Bitdegree ir KTU Inžinerijos licėjumi. Projekto numeris: P-DNR-21-15. Projektas finansuojamas iš 2021–2027 m. ES fondų investicijų programos finansavimo šaltinių.

Tocqueville, A. (1996). Apie demokratiją Amerikoje. [Democracy in America] Vilnius.

UNESCO (2020). COVID-19 Education Response, Preparing the reopening of schools. UNESCO, Paris

Volchik, V., Posukhova, O., Strielkowski, W. (2021). Digitalization and Sustainable Higher Education: Constructive and Destructive Potential of Professional Dynasties. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, Vol. 20, No 3 (54), pp.21-43.

Walzer, M. (1998). The Civil Society Argument. In. The Citizenship Debates. A Reader. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Walzer, M. (1989). Citizenship. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Williamson, B., Eynon, R., & Potter, J. (2020) Pandemic politics, pedagogies and practices: digital technologies and distance education during the coronavirus emergency. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(2), 107-114. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1761641

Woodall, J. S., & Lennon, T. M. (2017). Using twitter to promote classroom and civic engagement. In E. C. Matto, A. R. M. McCartney, E. A. Bennion, & R. Simpson (Eds.). Teaching civic engagement across the disciplines. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association. (pp. 135-150)

Zaleskienė, I. (2004). Pilietinio ugdymo socialinė dimensija [The Social Dimension of Civic Education]. Vilnius: Regional Civic Education Centre.

Zaleskienė, I. (2003). Globalizacijos įtaka pilietinei edukacijai [The impact of globalization on civic education]. *Pedagogika*, 68, 56-61. Vilnius: Vilnius Pedagogical University.

Data Availability Statement: The data that support the findings of this study are available from the author upon reasonable request.

Dainius GENYS is chief researcher at Energy Security Research Center at Vytautas Magnus University. His research interests: energy security research and democratization process. He is the co-author of the book – "Sociology of energy security: theory and practice". He is a member of Lithuanian Sociological Association, the European Sociological Association, International Sociology Association, the Advancement of the Baltic Studies Association (AABS) and other organizations.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1224-0127

Make your research more visible, join the Twitter account of ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES: @Entrepr69728810