

Contemporary Discourses of Citizenship

Kathleen Knight Abowitz

Miami University

Jason Harnish

Senn High School Achievement Academy

Meanings of “citizenship,” a concept that has informed teaching practices since nation-states first institutionalized schooling, are shaped over time and through cultural struggles. This article presents a conceptual framework for the discourses that currently construct the meanings of citizenship in contemporary Western cultures, particularly the United States. Using discourse analysis, the authors examine texts related to citizenship and citizenship education from 1990 through 2003, identifying seven distinct but overlapping frameworks that ascribe meaning to citizenship. The “civic republican” and “liberal” frameworks are the most influential in shaping current citizenship education; five others are the most active in contesting the terrain of citizenship practices in lived political arenas. The “transnational” and “critical” discourses have yet to significantly challenge the dominant discourses that shape citizenship education in schools. This article questions the view of political life in Western democracies that is promoted by the dominant discourses of citizenship in K–12 schooling.

KEYWORDS: citizenship, citizenship education, democratic education, patriotism.

What does it mean to be a “citizen”? The term has a complex and evolving history. We begin with a simple yet comprehensive definition: Citizenship in a democracy (a) gives membership status to individuals within a political unit; (b) confers an identity on individuals; (c) constitutes a set of values, usually interpreted as a commitment to the common good of a particular political unit; (d) involves practicing a degree of participation in the process of political life; and (e) implies gaining and using knowledge and understanding of laws, documents, structures, and processes of governance (Enslin, 2000). Citizenship, at least theoretically, confers membership, identity, values, and rights of participation and assumes a body of common political knowledge.

In his classic essay “Citizenship and Social Class” (1950/1998), British sociologist T. H. Marshall traced the expansion of citizenship in his society over three centuries. Civil citizenship—or individual rights to speech, faith, and property—emerged as a force in 18th-century England, when capitalist political systems instituted the protection of property, equality before the law, and civil liberties (Katz, 2001). Political citizenship, or the “right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body” (Marshall, p. 94), developed in the 19th century, when the franchise was granted first to middle-class and later to working-class men.¹

Social citizenship arose mainly in the 20th century and includes a broad range of rights, “from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society” (Marshall, p. 94). As Katz notes, “social citizenship took shape as the welfare state” (p. 344). Marshall’s three categories of citizenship—civil, political, and social—show both the complexity and the dynamic nature of the meanings of citizenship.

Political changes in the last half-century—the fall of Communism, the rise of populist movements expanding social rights for oppressed groups, the formation of the European Union, the proliferation of transnational alliances, the growth of multinational corporations, and economic globalization have fed the debates and questions about citizenship, democracy, and schooling (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994). Questions about what constitutes good citizenship and proper civic education have also been fueled by a widely perceived crisis in democratic life and citizenship in America. Growing distrust in government and other key institutions, diminished trust in fellow citizens, eroding interest in public affairs, and declining voting rates all have been documented by social scientists in the past several decades (Galston, 2003). We continue to witness shifts in the meaning of citizenship in our own time. The events of September 11, 2001, immediately galvanized discussions about citizenship and civic education. The irony of our current debates on citizenship is seen in the simultaneous rise of American nationalism, felt in the aftermath of the events of 9/11, and growth in awareness of transnational and cosmopolitan perspectives on citizenship, which have been on the ascendance since the end of World War II. Nationalist expressions, ironically combined with a renewed sense of our global ties to other peoples and nations, have further intensified and complicated the interest in citizenship and in the role of schools in shaping democratic citizens.

Our study aimed to map out the multiple citizenship discourses circulating in contemporary Western democracies, particularly the United States. Through this study we illustrate the patterns of contemporary meaning making with regard to citizenship, revealing dominant and emerging discourses that shape citizenship education in schools. Our conclusions reveal a continued dominance by the Enlightenment-inspired citizenship discourses of civic republicanism and liberalism in K–12 curricular and policy texts. This prevalence of two prominent citizenship discourses in schools belies a vibrant and complex array of citizenship meanings that have more recently developed out of, and often in opposition to, these dominant discourses. Drawing from the practice and theorizing of citizenship in critical and transnational spaces, our analysis ultimately provides criticism of the pallid, overly cleansed, and narrow view of political life in Western democracies promoted by the dominant discourses of citizenship in K–12 schooling.

The Study and Its Methods

To highlight the idea that citizenship is not a “natural” idea but an invented concept that shifts with economic, political, and social changes, we examine the discourses that shape meanings of citizenship. “Discourse” is used here in the Foucaultian (1972) sense, as a body of rules and practices that govern meanings in a particular area. While a number of good reviews of citizenship literature are available to educators,² none focus on citizenship as a discursive practice. Understanding citizenship through a discursive framework can provide educators invaluable

able tools for critically analyzing the meanings of the varied and often competing agendas and interests that shape texts on citizenship. We reviewed selected contemporary theoretical and more applied (curricular) texts focusing on citizenship or citizenship education, identifying through this review a number of discourses that shape the ways we talk, think, and teach about citizenship. Citizenship texts, like all other texts, are shaped by political interests and particular visions of what democracy and the nation-state should be; discourse analysis allows us to understand how these interests are expressing and shaping meanings of civic life and citizenship education.

Discourses are not composed of randomly chosen words and statements; rather, each discourse is a product of historical and social circumstances that provide the discursive practices—terminology, values, rhetorical styles, habits, and truths—that construct it (see Cherryholmes, 1988, pp. 2–3). Discourse is the primary way that ideology is produced, reproduced, and circulated; ideologies, by contrast, are belief systems that help people to understand and act in the world. “Ideologies are the frameworks of thinking and calculation about the world—the ‘ideas’ that people use to figure out how the social world works, what their place is in it, and what they ought to do” (Hall, 1986, p. 97). Ideologies are constructed and circulated through discourse. “Ways of talking [speaking, writing] produce and reproduce ways of thinking, and ways of thinking can be manipulated via choices about grammar, style, wording, and every other aspect of language” (Johnstone, 2002, p. 45). A speech, article, or curriculum articulating a position regarding civic membership, identity, values, participation, and knowledge constitutes an expression of belief about citizenship. Such expressions, by the very language and ways of thinking they employ, construct meanings of citizenship, privileging some meanings over others by means of choices of language, logic, or rhetoric. Thus “deciding what to call something can constitute a claim about it” (p. 48). These choices and claims lead to the assertion, production, reproduction, and contestation of certain meanings and truths of citizenship.

We focused this review on scholarly and curricular English-language texts and authors whose works were published from 1990 through 2003. We further chose works in which citizenship or citizenship education was the primary focus. This time period was selected not only because it included 9/11 and its aftermath but also because it included the last decade of the 20th century, in which a large number of theoretical and speculative writings were generated on the nature of democratic life. In the field of political theory alone, Kymlicka and Norman (1994, p. 352) documented the “explosion of interest in the concept of citizenship,” an interest that has spread through many academic fields, including education. The texts that we reviewed included multiple disciplines, ideological perspectives, and interest groups. We randomly selected texts from the fields of education, social studies education, philosophy, and political theory in which citizenship or citizenship education was the central topic, drawing from academic journals and scholarly books in those disciplines. We sampled essays and curriculum from a wide array of educational groups to reflect the ideological diversity of citizenship ideals and programs. To get a sense of the states’ unique interests in and meanings of citizenship education, we also reviewed civic standards from the states of New Jersey, California, and Ohio. New Jersey was chosen because it is one of a minority of states that do not yet use any standardized tests in civics. California was chosen for the size and

diversity of its population. Ohio was selected as a state representing a close alignment with the national standards, accreditation, and standardized testing movements.

We also reviewed documents from private foundations, teachers' unions, independent nonprofits, and professional organizations that developed curriculum or specific educational positions for citizenship education. We sampled materials from the curriculum standards of the National Council for the Social Studies (1994); *Down the Street, Around the World: A Starter Kit for Global Awareness* (2003), published by the American Federation of Teachers; the Center for Civic Education's "We the People" curriculum (1995); the Youth Leadership Initiative at the University of Virginia Center for Politics (2003); the Veterans of Foreign Wars Citizenship Education Program (2003); the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation's *September 11th: What Our Children Need to Know* (2002); "Thinking About the War" (2002), from *Rethinking Schools Online*; a report from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and CIRCLE (Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement) entitled *The Civic Mission of Schools* (2003); the Kettering Foundation's National Issues Forums (2003); the Public Achievement project of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship (2002); and *Civics Report Card to the Nation* (1999), from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). In sum, our review focused on theoretical texts as well as texts that specifically prescribed the types of knowledge and learning activities that constitute "good" citizenship education and curricula that purport to instruct students in such notions.

A textual analysis was conducted on these works, with a particular focus on the following aspects of each text: (a) the claims and evidence forwarded by the author(s); (b) the rhetorical choices (vocabulary, slogans, style) made by the author(s); (c) the moral and political values advocated by the text; and (d) the context from which, or in which, the text was produced. Thus we examined each text by asking: *What is the author advocating, and what are the terms/expressions used to identify political membership, identity, values, participation, and knowledge? What kinds of moral, civic, and/or educational values does the author defend?*

After working through the analysis, we identified patterns in how citizenship was conceptualized, patterns that could be seen in shifts in the language used to describe citizenship, differences in claims about what citizenship means or should mean, and differences in the values attributed to "good citizenship." While these distinct ideals were more specifically named and clearly delineated in the scholarly texts that we reviewed,³ we saw them emerging within the applied and curricular texts, too. The patterns eventually became identified as distinct citizenship discourses. Seven citizenship discourses emerged through the research. We review the two dominating discourses—civic republican and liberal—first. Subsequently, we discuss the discourses that we collected under the name "critical," because they challenge the twin pillars of civic republican and liberal discourse in our society. The critical discourses reviewed here include feminist, reconstructionist, cultural, queer, and transnational. In this review, we describe broad characteristics of each discourse⁴ and how each discourse is actualized or expressed in school curriculum. We analyze the multiple, shifting meanings of citizenship and citizenship education in the contemporary United States, providing educators with a guide to the diverse ideological orientations that are shaping our thinking about civic life and political participation.

We draw two broad conclusions from this review. We found a distinct dominance of the Enlightenment-inspired notions of citizenship over the more critical

discourses that have recently emerged. The civic republican and liberal discourses continue to define and powerfully shape how U.S. society understands citizenship and the ways in which the society's institutions, such as schools, thereby shape citizens. Yet we also discovered many powerful challenges to these dominant notions of citizenship and civic life. In the past hundred years, social, political, and economic movements have inspired new forms and ideals of citizenship and are invigorating old forms. The feminist, cultural, queer, and reconstructionist discourses of citizenship have developed or retained vigor as a result of the unfulfilled promises of the civic republican and liberal discourses, shaping new forms of civic agency, identity, and membership. These more critical discourses have also cross-fertilized with the ancient ideals of cosmopolitanism and transnationalism, leading to new meanings and forms of citizenship practice and education. Critical and cosmopolitan discourses that gained significant ground in the 20th century represent important challenges to these dominant ways of thinking. Still, the challenge is far more potent in scholarly literature and in political life than in the mainstream curricular texts that we reviewed. This exclusion from curricular texts is explained, in part, by the fundamental critiques and controversial questions that they raise about traditional meanings of citizenship and of the nation-state itself. Critical and transnational discourses of citizenship raise basic questions about identity (who we are as citizens), membership (who belongs, and the location of the boundaries), and agency (how we might best enact citizenship)—questions debated in political life across the globe by scholars and activists, political thinkers and neighborhood organizers. However, the critical and transnational civic reconstructions are marginalized in the curricular texts that define the standards and prominent meanings of citizenship taught in schools. The diminution of these discourses in the taught curriculum means that much of our schooling in citizenship fails to reflect the continual struggles of democratic politics. In short, the lived curricula of citizenship and the lively debates among activists, scholars, and thinkers is ideologically diverse and suggests multiple forms of democratic engagement, while the current formal, taught curriculum of citizenship produces a relatively narrow scope and set of meanings for what citizenship is and can be. This difference suggests that, rather than blaming democratic disengagement on the apathetic choices of young people, we should perhaps be looking at how we reduce, confine, diminish, and deplete citizenship meanings in our formal and taught curriculum.

Discourses of Civic Republican Citizenship: Strong Political Community

The civic republican discourse habitually expresses the values of love and service to one's political community (local, state, and national); its views on civic membership in the political community are characterized by an exclusivity not seen in other citizenship discourses. Civic republican discussions highlight the need for better civic literacy and the importance of a central body of civic knowledge for good citizenship. Civic republicans wish to promote a civic identity among young people characterized by commitment to the political community, respect for its symbols, and active participation in its common good. Cooperative participation in pro-government activities (voting, involvement with political parties, and civic activities) is stressed in civic republican texts. The prominence of this discourse is seen throughout the texts that we examined but was particularly evident in the state documents on civics standards and the citizenship materials of some of the more

politically conservative nonprofit organizations, such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Fordham Foundation. As we will later argue, the nationalistic meanings of citizenship found in civic republican discourse pose a direct challenge to the more cosmopolitan and transnational perspectives now circulating in our culture.

One of the central features of civic republican discourse since 9/11 has been a focus on patriotism. Viroli (2000) characterizes the love of country, so prominent among the classical republicans of ancient Rome, as a persistent defining feature of civic republicanism. This affection is not abstract but is felt for “a particular public and particular citizens who are dear to us because we share with them important things: the laws, liberty, the forum, the senate, the public squares, friends, enemies, memories of victories and memories of defeats, hopes, fears” (p. 267). This sort of passion is not the result of our rational consent to the principles of governance, but of a love that translates into action and service to the common good. Hence, many civic republican texts make use of the ideas of love for, and loyalty to, the nation and its common good. The idea of working for the good of the political community draws on civic republicanism’s roots in ancient Athens and Rome, but the current revival of such ideas in communitarianism (Etzioni, 1993) also has had a strong influence on this discourse.

For civic republicans, citizenship requires identification with and commitment to the political community’s goals, gained through the processes of education and active engagement in the democratic process (Ravitch & Viteritti, 2001). The democracy of Aristotle’s Athens is an established model, in that citizens derived their self-understandings through identification with and participation in the polis, or political community. For contemporary scholars, the political community is not simply the state or government but is more typically associated with civil society, defined as the “realm of nonprivatized collective action that is voluntary rather than compulsory and persuasive rather than coercive,” providing “a basis for criticizing the excesses of both the state and the market” (Galston, 2000, cited in Glazer, 2001, p. 169). In the civic republican view, civil society is the now-neglected third sphere of democratic life—the theoretical and discursive space outside markets and government—and is the primary sphere for citizenship (Elshtain, 1999). Especially in the civic republican discourse, citizenship is conceptualized as a matter of “healing” our fragmented contemporary civil society.⁵ The social capital derived from healthy communal networks and their values and norms provides a sense of cohesiveness and unity that is central to the civic republican values of citizenship. In civic republican discourse, a weakened civil society results in weak social capital for our country, and this weakness is one of the central malaises to be corrected by invigorated civic education. Governmental organizations such as the Corporation for National and Community Service, with its array of civil service and educational programs, focus on building social capital in communities through localized, cooperative problem solving by citizens (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2003). Public schools across the country are incorporating community service requirements into their curriculum with these aims in mind (Carnegie Corporation of New York & CIRCLE, 2003).

Articulations of political community in this discourse focus on commonality, consensus, and unity. Unlike the exclusive club of ancient Athenian democracy, where only a small group of adults were actually given rights of citizenship, civic republicans often communicate an awareness of a multicultural America. Still, as

Oldham (1998) observes, civic republican discourse largely maintains the benefits of exclusivity.⁶ All discourses of citizenship must define boundaries (of membership, of benefits, of rights, of duties), but the civic republican discourse draws the sharpest lines of inclusion and exclusion in its expressions of political membership. “In choosing an identity for ourselves, we recognize both who our fellow citizens are, and those who are not members of our community, and thus who are potential enemies” (p. 81). Oldham states that this idea of exclusive membership, which lies at the heart of the civic republican tradition, gives priority to political and national community over universalist or humanist ethics. For example, particularly in times of war or economic threat, the needs of nation supersede global or cosmopolitan ethics—recall the nationalist rhetoric that introduced *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) under the threat of a strong Japanese economy. Similarly, after 9/11, Lynne Cheney (2002) stated that “the most important civics lessons for American children are found in American history.” Civics, it is implied here, does not involve a study of world history except as a secondary matter—students primarily need to know about the difficult accomplishments of starting and maintaining our democratic U.S. society.

Texts in this discourse, stressing the importance of conserving and maintaining U.S. democratic ideals and traditions, emphasize the importance of learning facts and information about democracy’s history and institutions. Many of the texts bemoan the diminished civics offerings in high schools and the diminished scores that U.S. students receive in tests on civic knowledge as compared with students in other nations (Quigley, 2003; Lutkus, Weiss, Campbell, Mazzeo, & Lazer, 1999). The civic republican discourse strongly values civic knowledge, sometimes called civic literacy (Milner, 2002), as an essential component of citizenship. Civic education has to do with students’ gaining sufficient civic knowledge, as well as the virtues and skills needed to engage successfully in the process of democracy (Butts, 1988; Milner, 2002; Nie, Junn, & Stehlik-Barry, 1996). Such civic knowledge, in civic republican discourse, focuses on American history, institutions, and seminal texts (the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, etc.), reserving a far smaller place for more humanistic, international, and critical content and pedagogy. Civic knowledge in civic republican discourse also includes an understanding of and loyalty to national symbols and icons, such as the flag (Veterans of Foreign Wars, 2003). In New Jersey, the first goal suggested for social studies instruction is “transmission of our cultural and intellectual heritage”; the sense of the importance of transmitting the heritage of U.S. democracy is quite powerful in many curricula and texts that shape classroom teaching (New Jersey State Department of Education, 1996).

The civic virtues of central concern are self-sacrifice, patriotism, loyalty, and respect. The civic skills are those enabling citizens to engage in productive dialogue around public problems, building consensus and working cooperatively. These virtues and skills are well articulated in the focus on community service in the civic republican discourse. While several citizenship discourses use ideas of community service, the civic republican discourse specifically uses service as a way to help students form a sense of duty to other citizens and to forge a sense of commitment to community and nation (Zaff, 2003). Damon stresses the significance of this kind of developed civic identity, defined as “an allegiance to a systematic set of moral and political beliefs, a personal ideology of sorts, to which a young person forges a commitment. The emotional and moral concomitants to the

beliefs are a devotion to one's community and a sense of responsibility to the society at large" (2001, p. 127).

Damon's concern is not with communal identity as it forms in ethnic, racial, or other cultural groups; indeed, some civic republicans have waged sharp critiques of multiculturalism's emphasis on such bonds, accusing them of having a balkanizing influence on our society (Schlesinger, 1991; Ravitch, 1993). The push for requiring recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance in classrooms across the United States after 9/11 reflects this interest in asserting citizenship primarily as it is associated with unity and loyalty to the nation-state (Piscatelli, 2003). As Chester Finn (2001) noted one month after 9/11, "Kids are pledging allegiance in Pennsylvania, singing 'God Bless the U.S.A.' in Arkansas, wearing red, white and blue to school (for a 'Patriotism Day' assembly) in Maryland. And much more." And, as the California state social studies standards for first graders reflect, knowing the "symbols, icons, and traditions of the United States that provide continuity and a sense of community across time" includes practices such as reciting the Pledge and singing patriotic songs (California State Department of Education, 1998). As a result of these particular values and their emphasis on communal unity, this discourse infrequently addresses the civic tensions and conflicts that spring from racial, ethnic, class, or gender divisions and hierarchies.

State civics standards strongly reflect the rhetoric and agendas presented in the civic republican discourse. In Ohio, as in most states, the civics standards are located within the social studies standards (see Tolo, 1999). These standards give priority to communal values, civic participation, and the history of American democracy. They stipulate that, by the end of Grade 5, Ohio students should be able to "explain how citizens take part in civic life in order to promote the common good" (Ohio State Department of Education, 2003, p. 38). By Grade 8 they should be able to "identify historical origins that influenced the rights U.S. citizens have today" (p. 38). By Grade 12, students are to "explain how individual rights are relative, not absolute, and describe the balance between individual rights, the rights of others, and the common good" (p. 39).

Participation is defined by civic republican texts as prosocial, with an emphasis on personal responsibility and the common good. The Grade 11 content standards for Ohio offer a list of ways that we can exercise personal responsibility and active participation in a democracy: "Behaving in a civil manner, being fiscally responsible, accepting responsibility for the consequence of one's actions, practicing civil discourse, becoming informed on public issues, voting, taking action on public issues, providing public service, serving on juries" (Ohio State Department of Education, p. 97). This list heavily emphasizes participation modes that are cooperative and supportive of the state, emphasizing conventional ways to support the existing governmental and community institutions. The duty of citizenship most heavily emphasized in civic republican texts on education is voting: Many curricular ideas exist for engaging students in and educating them about voting (Youth Leadership Initiative, 2003), and a strong emphasis on voting is found in many state citizenship standards. An emphasis on civic responsibilities, duties, and service to others underscores the goals of working toward the common good.

In civic republican discourse, "responsibility" is often set up against "rights." Following the communitarian critique of liberalism in the 1980s and 1990s (MacIntyre, 1981; Sandel, 1982), the civic republican discourse has put renewed

emphasis on the responsibilities incumbent upon democratic citizens if our political community is to reproduce itself and thrive. Among civic republicans, there is some agreement that our rights are worthless without the strong presence of values that underscore civic responsibilities, and that younger generations erroneously understand democracy to be an exercise of rights rather than a structure that equally obligates them to certain duties. Thus the emphasis on loyalty, civic literacy, and service to government, community, and country is intended to promote the desire and the ability to carry out one's civic responsibilities. Our democracy, according to the civic republican discourse, is broken because of growing cynicism, apathy, and a selfish focus on individual rights over collective responsibilities.

The heroic response to 9/11 and its aftermath gave civic republicans hope that America could renew its communal ties. The civic republican discourse has been in high profile since 9/11, which is unsurprising, given the nationalist tone that historically has made this discourse ripe for wartime rhetoric. In the wake of 9/11, civic republican voices launched scathing critiques of public schooling that were illustrative of their agenda for citizenship education. Criticizing the public schools' response to the events and aftermath of 9/11,⁷ Finn (2002) wrote that "the curricular and pedagogical advice that many of the [education] profession's countless organizations [gave] . . . was long on multiculturalism, feelings, relativism and tolerance but short on history, civics and patriotism" (p. 4). In *September 11: What Our Children Need to Know*, published by the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, Rotherham (2002) states: "[W]hile it is important for schools to teach about tolerance for different people within this country and around the world, we do students and ourselves a disservice by equating tolerance with a relativist examination of September 11th" (p. 34). Rotherham and other scholars whose work appeared in this edited collection believe that teachers, parents, and the media should teach young people about the ideals and institutions that make America special and unique—not without flaws, but with a strong, appreciative focus on the historical and ideological traditions of American democracy that students should cherish. Renewing the Pledge of Allegiance in schools, finding ways to help students serve their communities, and using curricula that transmit the U.S. heritage are all popular discursive practices used in the civic republican discourse on citizenship.

Discourses of Liberal Citizenship

Another powerful discursive force in shaping contemporary meanings of citizenship is liberalism, a discourse of individual liberty. It prioritizes the rights of individuals to form, revise, and pursue their own definition of the good life, within certain constraints that are imposed to promote respect for and consideration of the rights of others. From the conception of individual rights comes a focus on equality, or the ability of all people—especially those in historically marginalized and oppressed groups—to fully exercise their freedoms in society. From a historical emphasis on individual freedom and equality have emerged two predominant threads within liberal citizenship discourses. The first, neoliberalism, will be only briefly introduced here, as it has not yet emerged as an explicit discourse of citizenship. Political liberalism, the more prominent liberal discourse influencing ideas about citizenship education, will be the central focus.

Neoliberal discourse, a combination of market liberal ideology and aggressive individualism, is very influential in American culture and schooling. Neoliberalism

merges the capitalist and democratic spheres, as Wells, Slayton, and Scott (2002) describe: “A careful study of the dominant discourse of democracy in the United States, especially in the last decade, demonstrates that the democracy *versus* markets dichotomy is misleading, as political leaders . . . have continually promoted democracy *for* markets” (p. 341). Under neoliberal logic, the liberty enjoyed by democratic citizens is the same freedom that has helped free-market capitalism to flourish; democratic citizenship takes on an instrumental turn designed to serve the growth of capitalistic markets.⁸ While the neoliberal discourse in education is very powerful,⁹ educators rarely take up the neoliberal discourse as an explicit discourse of citizenship; and most political and educational theorists also largely reject neoliberalism as a civic discourse, in part because its model of *homo economicus*—the human being as an essentially economic animal—reflects an individualism so severe as to be incompatible with the civic ideals long associated with democratic public life and common schooling. The effects of this influence on citizenship education are not analyzed here, but a growing number of theorists and educators argue that the pursuit of rational self-interest that is the essence of capitalism emphasizes individual freedom at the expense of the egalitarian, communal, and public ideals of democratic life (see Barber, 1999).

Political liberalism is a pervasive discourse shaping meanings of citizenship, seen especially in key professional literature of the social studies (including that for classroom use) and in the literature of nonprofit groups such as the Center for Civic Education. In this discourse, national identity is constructed around “thinner” conceptions of a political community than are articulated in civic republican texts. In this discourse many texts give explicit recognition and valuation to the fact of civic pluralism. The “thinner” conceptions of liberal citizenship reflect the belief that there is less relative social agreement on values, chosen identities, and forms of democratic participation than is assumed by the civic republican discourse (McLaughlin, 1992; Strike, 1994). Whereas civic republican discourse values the common good of political communities, political liberalism envisions a more limited political arena, with greater focus on procedures that would ensure fair, inclusive deliberation about governance and policy (Gutmann, 2000). “Thin” refers “not to the insignificance of values” such as tolerance, freedom, and equality, but to “their independence from substantial, particular frameworks of belief and value” (McLaughlin, 1992, p. 240).

“The embodiment of the moral person in the liberal democratic society is the citizen who is free, self-originating, and responsible in exercising rights and discharging duties” (Shafir, 1998, p. 8). One of the most prominent and most debated values associated with political liberal discourses of citizenship is autonomy. Since the historical origins of liberalism itself are found in the rejection of structures of governance, authority, and control—monarchies, feudal economies, and the Catholic Church, among other institutions—liberal discourses are concerned with the primacy of individual liberty. “Liberals believe that persons merit respect and that consequently they should be free to choose their own ideals or live without ideals” (Macedo, 1990, pp. 215–216). This does not mean that citizenship is understood as a nonjudgmental enterprise in which students believe anything they wish, for any reason they wish. Rather, “we want children to learn that there are better and worse ways of using their freedom . . . [and that] no one educational authority should totally dominate.” Liberals want students to think critically, to be able to

detect conflicts between “our inclusive political ideals and . . . their particular moral and religious convictions” (Macedo, 2000, p. 238). Political liberalism envisions citizenship that takes a certain critical attitude toward all authority, consistent with its focus on liberty (Kymlicka, 1999b). As Callan (1997) also points out, the moral authority of the family and home culture is put into perspective as one source of truth among many in a diverse society.¹⁰ In political liberal discourses, citizenship requires an identity that is neither autonomous nor necessarily separate from one’s familial or religious beliefs, but that develops on the basis of the values and skills necessary to critically consider those and other beliefs. The ability to reason, therefore, is highly valued in political liberal discourses of citizenship. In the NAEP report *Civics Report Card to the Nation* (1999), for example, more than 22,000 students were assessed according to three measures of citizenship: civic knowledge, intellectual skills, and civic dispositions. The intellectual skills were described as abilities to identify and describe, explain and analyze, and evaluate and take/defend a position. These skills typically are understood as reasoning abilities.

Freedom from the tyranny of authority is one of two primary values in this discourse. The other involves the deliberative values of discussion, disagreement, and consensus building—all viewed as essential to democratic societies. Taylor (1995) highlights the two sides of political liberal citizenship—citizens as entitled to rights and equal treatment, and citizens as participants in self-rule. Both are a focus for many political liberals, especially those within the theoretical circles of deliberative democratic theory (Benhabib, 1992; Habermas, 1996; Cohen, 1996; Gutmann & Thompson, 1996; Enslin, Pendlebury, & Tjiattas, 2001). Deliberative democrats seek forums where all citizens can deliberate public problems by providing reasons that are compelling to others—not by simply asserting their own truth claims, which may or may not be shared by others—and where citizens are treated as equal participants in the deliberation. Deliberative democratic theory has been a strong presence in the political liberal discourses of citizenship since the 1990s, and its influence is seen in citizenship education discourses and practices related to civility. Reasoning persons have values associated with civility—the ability and disposition to listen to views that are not one’s own, the cognitive skills to evaluate and measure the claims and truths of diverse others, and the ability to reach collective policy decisions that are acceptable to all participants (Rawls, 1993). Among Galston’s (1991) list of liberal civic virtues are independence, open-mindedness, the capacity to discern and respect the rights of others, the ability to evaluate the performance of those in office, and willingness to engage in public discourse. Parker’s *Teaching Democracy* offers a central argument for schools in which “competent public talk—*deliberation* about common problems—is fostered” (italics in original). Parker urges educators to “expect, teach and model, competent, inclusive deliberation” (2003, p. 78; see also Mathews, 1996). The Kettering Foundation’s National Issues Forums Institute, which organizes forums on public policy issues for schools, groups, and communities, is “rooted in the simple notion that people need to come together to reason and talk—to deliberate about common problems” (National Issues Forums Institute, 2003). In like manner, the introduction to the curriculum standards of the National Council for the Social Studies states that “social studies should help public discourse to be more enlightened because students possess the knowledge, intellectual skills, and attitudes necessary to confront, discuss, and consider action on such issues. Social studies teachers have the

duty to help students explore a variety of positions in a thorough, fair-minded manner” (National Council for the Social Studies, 1994, p. 10).

Many within the political liberal discourse recognize the “need to perpetuate fidelity to liberal democratic institutions and values from one generation to the next,” which requires some shared civic and educational aims (Callan, 1997, p. 9). Gutmann (1987) refers to democratic education as conscious social reproduction, an effort to reproduce structures, norms, and values that are essential to democratic governance in each generation. Rawlsian political liberalism requires that “children’s education include such things as knowledge of their constitutional and civic rights,” but like many liberals, Rawls recognizes the cooperative dispositions and shared aims of citizens in a democracy (1993, p. 39). Liberal texts typically attempt to balance education for responsibility, obligation, and cooperation with education promoting individual and group rights. Landau (2002) advocates this balance against the sometimes singular focus on responsibilities in civic republican discourse. She states that, “rather than valuing the educational experience that would present itself in teaching students about their rights and then helping them to understand that every right carries with it an equally important responsibility, most educators simply want to teach students that they have to be responsible.” Landau presents a political liberal value system as she condemns the practice of “training students to obey rather than to make appropriate decisions [which] has little to do with democratic thinking” (p. 2). Citizenship education is often articulated in political liberal discourse as being about democratic rights and about the skills and dispositions of cooperation, deliberation, and decision making. Democratic schooling practitioners (Angell, 1991; Wood, 1992; Mosher, Kenny, & Garrod, 1994) advocate a political liberal framework of rights, deliberation, and shared decision making as a school governance model. “Schools can provide students with the opportunity to participate in a hands-on political process. This means making schools democratic” (Howard & Kenny, 1992, p. 211). Among the six promising approaches to civic education described in *The Civic Mission of Schools* (Carnegie Corporation of New York & CIRCLE, 2003), are two that echo the emphasis on student participation as a fundamental normative aspect of civic identity: Schools are to “encourage student participation in school governance” and “encourage students’ participation in simulations of democratic processes and procedures” (p. 6). The value and practice of encouraging students’ involvement and engagement in school and community governance are part of the liberal discourse but also reflect an understanding of citizenship that is shared by the critical discourses of citizenship that we will discuss later.

A significant focus in political liberal discourses is on learning the values and skills necessary to take part in a culturally diverse public life.¹¹ In a multicultural nation of immigrants, schools perennially create and recreate citizens and the nation. Political liberal discourses of citizenship see the public school as occupying an irreplaceable role in the formation of democratic citizens. Feinberg (1998) views the common school as having a “public-forming role [which includes] the idea of enabling culturally different formations within the same nation to flourish” (p. 10). He identifies cultural respect and cultural engagement as required skills and understandings for a “multicultural citizen,” and cultural competence and cultural understanding as required cognitive skills for such a citizen (pp. 212–216). Feinberg acknowledges that “to encourage multiple voices and beliefs involves a highly com-

plex set of understandings that includes knowledge about people and the various ways in which they hold beliefs” (p. 221). For political liberals, this is part of the essential knowledge that citizens of the United States need to acquire in schools.

Normative values relating to respect and tolerance, as well as cognitive and social skills related to engagement, are emphasized in the political liberal responses to 9/11. In the October 2001 issue of *Social Education*, the journal of the National Council for the Social Studies, two articles addressed issues of prejudice against Muslim Americans and promoted understanding of and tolerance toward the Arab American community in the United States (Alavi, 2001; Seikaly, 2001). In the wake of 9/11, these values were emphasized in the push for greater understanding of Islam in general and of Muslim Americans in particular.

The civic knowledge needed to advance respect and engagement is not only knowledge of the cultural diversity in contemporary America but knowledge of American history and government (Carnegie Corporation of New York & CIRCLE, 2003; Boyer, 1990), used to understand and critically assess the current social and political context. Substantive knowledge about American government, history, and politics, especially with a focus on individual freedom and our multicultural national history, is stressed. The Grade 10 social studies content standards in Ohio include the study of civil disobedience and periods in history in which some rights were restricted by the government, such as the McCarthy era and the Red Scare of the 1950s (Ohio State Department of Education, 2003, p. 92). In California, students learn about U.S. symbols, icons, and traditions as early as Grade 1 (History/Social Science Standard 1.3, p. 6) and about the forms of diversity in their communities, including “the historical role of religion and religious diversity” in the United States, in Grade 12 (California State Board of Education, 1998, p. 63). But the focus on civic knowledge typically is stated within the political liberal discourse in ways that emphasize the linking of this knowledge with communicative and deliberative skills. Boyer (1990) says that “civic education is concerned, first, with communication. . . . Citizenship training . . . means teaching students to think critically, listen with discernment, and communicate with power and precision” (p. 5). The November/December 2001 issue of *Social Education* focuses on educational responses to war, and heavy emphasis is placed on deliberation and critical thinking. “Teachers need to encourage discussion and debate,” urges Singleton (2001). A further push for critical thinking is found in an article on media literacy skills in which the author argues that students need to learn to question and analyze media messages regarding terrorism and war (Hobbs, 2001). Unlike the more nationalistic, loyalist responses found in the civic republican discourse after 9/11 and the invasion of Iraq, the political liberal discourse included an array of responses that urged discussion and debate about governmental policies and actions.

Many within the liberal discourse have wondered how a pluralistic nation avoids the centrifugal forces of diversity. Callan (1997) acknowledges that “the problem with stability that pluralism creates for the well-ordered society has to do with the fragility of any reconciliation between the good of citizens and the political virtue they must evince if the justice of the basic structure [of a democratic state] is to endure” (p. 96). It is feared that the bonds built through deliberation and debate will be weak in a diverse society. In such cases, how should citizenship education in public schools help to foster national loyalty and love of nation without endangering the fundamental liberal commitment of freedom? The term *patriotism* also has

engendered some controversy in the political liberal discourse of citizenship, particularly since 9/11 (Kazin, 2002; Sleeper, 2003). The idea of patriotism is more contested in political liberal discourse than in civic republican discourse, which views patriotism as a fundamental value and disposition to be nurtured in citizenship education. Bern (2002), in an essay posted after 9/11 on the American Federation of Teachers website, argues for a patriotism of ideas and principles, not of bloodlines, traditions, or personal loyalties. Bern advocates a patriotism that instills loyalty to the ideas of freedom and equality, enabling students to see the perspectives of many nations, cultures, and ideologies, but also helping them to “make distinctions between freedom-fighters and terrorists, based on the methods used and the ends that are being fought for” (p. 6). Callan (1997) argues for a liberal patriotism that is different from a “sentimental civic education” that arouses and shapes notions of civic love and blind loyalty (pp. 103–104). Patriotic pride, he offers, is inseparable from “evaluative judgments about the nation or multinational polity with which one identifies, judgments about the impressive accomplishments of its past or the hopeful prospects for its future” (p. 105). American sentimentality is distinct from pride in America, because the latter involves a reasoned evaluation of whether we are achieving the ideals of freedom and equality for all people.

Critical Citizenships: Addressing the Gaps and Conflicts of Enlightenment Citizenship

The discourses most persuasively shaping the ways in which we think, talk, write, and teach about citizenship today are centuries old. They germinated in the ancient societies of Greece and Rome and were reborn in the Western European Enlightenment tradition. Both civic republicanism and political liberalism provide rich ideological frameworks that should continue to shape our language and thinking about citizenship, structuring both our sense of civic reality and our own identities as citizens (Mills, 1997). Yet our analysis shows that, although these two discourses dominate citizenship education in society and schools, they represent only part of how citizenship is actively being practiced and articulated in today’s civic realms. We found evidence of several citizenship discourses that only slightly influence K–12 curricula or standards but which could represent important innovation in conceptualizing citizenship. Since discourses have represented important shifts and conflicts in U.S. democracy over the past several centuries of democratic life, their omission and/or invisibility in the public conceptions of citizenship is significant. We have labeled these discourses with the umbrella term *critical*. Critical discourses raise issues of membership, identity, and engagement in creative, productive ways; however, these discourses are far more widespread in scholarly and theoretical texts than in practical, applied curricular texts. The relative silence of critical language, values, and practices in curricular and taught texts of citizenship in schools speaks volumes about the power of dominant discourses of citizenship to shape how present and future generations do, and do not, think about democratic citizenship.

Critical discourses have in common the agenda of challenging liberal and civic republican notions of civic membership, civic identity, and forms of civic engagement. Attempting to broaden and deepen the liberal agendas of human freedom, these discourses focus specifically on exclusions based on gender, culture, ethnicity, nationality, race, sexuality, or socioeconomic class. *Feminist discourses* of citizenship raise

many questions about how citizenship has been framed within gendered thinking and constructions. *Cultural citizenship discourses* interrogate how ethnic, language-minority, and other cultural groups have found citizenship to be a role and identity purchased at a high price, as citizenship identities can require assimilation and thus prove inhospitable and harmful to cultural identities that are of great importance to individuals and groups. *Reconstructionist discourses* take up progressive and neo-Marxist histories to question how active, critical participation in democratic societies has been neglected in our conceptualizations of citizenship. *Queer discourses* of citizenship use postmodern thinking to inquire into citizenship not simply as a status, membership, or stable identity, but as a performance of civic courage and risk.

Feminist citizenship discourses are currently “challenging the lions that guard the canonical literature on citizenship” (Jones, 1998, p. 222). Although “citizenship has existed for nearly three millennia, . . . with very minor exceptions, women have had some share in civic rights in the most liberal states for [only] about a century” (Heater, 2004, p. 203). This fact suggests that citizenship is “a status invented by men for men” (p. 203). Pateman’s (1988) seminal analysis of “‘the fraternal pact’ that underlies liberal democratic thought,” and her “exposure of the gender assumptions that shape the citizen as male, are challenging critiques of the ways in which women have, by definition, been included as a negative reference point in theories of democracy and citizenship” (Arnot, Araújo, Deliyanni-Kouimtzi, Ivinson, & Tomé, 2000, p. 218). Feminist citizenship discourses have questioned and shifted the “meanings of such concepts as rights, needs, dependency, entitlements and democratic participation. Equally, they have sought strategic transformation of the relations of power which configure the terms of inclusion and exclusion in the polity” (Kenway & Langmead, 2000, p. 313).

A key reference point in this discourse is the public/private divide that pervades much political thinking in the Western world (Elshtain, 1981). “Beginning with Aristotle, influential political theorists argued that women’s reproductive function destined them for the private (domestic) sphere,” while their (initially White, property-owning) male counterparts participated in public life (Smith, 1999, p. 141). The public, in much political theorizing in the West, is idealized as a universal space for all, where the mind rules with rationality and logical thought; the private is a sphere of body, emotion, and the particularity of relationships. Feminist discourses question whether democratic citizenship is itself such a gendered, patriarchal concept as to require a complete transformation to live up to its inclusive ideals (p. 141; Assiter, 1999). “Feminist campaigns to break down the gendering of public and private spheres, or indeed to achieve equality for women in the public sphere, strike at the heart of a gendered discourse of western European notions of democracy” (Arnot, 1997, p. 279). Equality or liberal feminism has generally argued for women’s full inclusion in the political sphere, objecting to women’s “relative lack of access to conventional arenas of political decision making, as well as to women’s unequal representation in leadership positions in radical organizations for political change” (Jones, 1998, p. 225). In liberal feminism, there is a reliance on the discourses of political liberalism to shape arguments for women’s agency, rights, and autonomy (Dillabough & Arnot, 2000). Much of the liberal feminist agenda in citizen education still involves enhancing the public achievement of women and girls, enabling them to reach their full capacities as persons, workers, and political actors through legal and educational reforms such as Title IX, affirmative action,

nonsexist educational policies, and similar curricular initiatives (Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Kaplan, 2003).

Difference feminists take another approach to the public/private dualism. Rather than perceiving gender difference to be a deficiency of women, these feminist theorists advance women's difference as a sign of strength or even superiority. The public sphere, with its values of universalism, reason, and logic, can benefit from the values and skills that women have developed as a result of both their long confinement in the private sphere of family and child rearing and their biological abilities to reproduce. Difference or woman-centered feminists, such as those espousing the power of "maternal thinking," have argued that women's differences from men—chiefly their capacities for "relationality" and care—should not be compromised but should be used in their roles as citizens (Ruddick, 1989). Educational theorists such as Noddings (1992) and Roland Martin (1992) advance versions of difference feminism in education, working to reform and reshape education to accommodate relationality and community in school structures and curriculum. Indeed, Noddings suggests that we need to go far beyond simply expanding the notion of citizenship to include women. Taken seriously, studies of women's lives, work, and social contributions would expand and dramatically shift social studies curricula, including but not limited to those for civics or formal citizenship education (1997).

Postmodern feminists seek to combat various types of oppression that keep women and others absent or silent in the political world. Iris Marion Young's work (1990) advocates a public sphere that is more particularistic and sensitive to the differences and pluralities of people, especially those who have faced various forms of oppression. Young (1987) calls for spaces and forms of public expression that are radically open to all who wish to "raise and address issues of the moral value or human desirability of an institution or a practice whose decisions affect a large number of people" (p. 73). In such public expression, Young concludes, "consensus and sharing may not always be the goal." Rather, "the recognition and appreciation of differences, in the context of confrontation with power," also is prioritized (p. 76). Postmodern and deconstructionist feminists also emphasize constructs of difference and power as central to citizenship theorizing, and seek to radically pluralize the concept of "woman" in political life. Mouffe (1992) critiques difference feminists for essentializing the category of woman—melding "woman-ness" down to one central quality or thing. Citizenship is not simply one identity but allows for "a plurality of specific allegiances and for the respect of individual liberty" (p. 378). Emphasis on the plurality of women's oppression—varying by social contexts and factors such as race, nationality, ethnicity, and religion, as well as migration patterns across borders—points to a move in citizenship discourses away from singular notions of identity and toward plural identities and memberships (Werbner & Yuval-Davis, 1999). Across many forms of critical citizenship discourses, we see the centrality of the nation-state and homogenous identity being questioned.

Feminists have expanded the educational opportunities and achievements available to girls, thus opening doors for citizenship and transformed civic life for girls and women. However, there is much work still to be done to change the public and the interdependent private landscape for all citizens. In the state content standards reviewed for this article, the category of "woman" or "girl" is almost invisible, and mention of the home or domestic life is virtually absent, with a few notable excep-

tions. In Grade 10, the state of Ohio uses the women's suffrage movement of the late 1800s to illustrate an example of civil disobedience (Ohio State Department of Education, 2003, p. 92); in an examination of the social developments of the 1920s in the United States, the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment and the changing role of women in society is only one focus among many. The values articulated in the early grades focus more on "trustworthiness," "pride," "self-control," "fairness," and "respect for those in authority" than they do on values that might be associated with care and relationality (see Grade Level Indicators, Ohio State Department of Education, p. 87). For centuries, education prepared males and females for life in different spheres (Douglas Franzosa, 1988). Although this is no longer the case, separation of the public and private spheres seems to be alive and well in citizenship education discourses. Giarelli and Giarelli (1996) argue that to break free of the construction of citizenship education as education for *public* life, we must see education as "the paradigmatic mode of socially established, cooperative human activity through which we attempt systematically to extend *all* varieties of human powers and excellences, and [we must see] that these powers and excellences do not come neatly packaged in gender-driven categories of public and private, productive and reproductive" (pp. 33–34).

Discourses of cultural citizenship emerge from critiques arguing that citizenship has been ethnically and otherwise culturally normed and thus is overly assimilationist. Collective forms of agency—political actions conducted through cultural group formations and alliances—are valued within cultural citizenship texts (Flores & Benmajor, 1997). Thus "cultural citizenship refers to the right to be different (in terms of race, ethnicity, or native language) with respect to the norms of the dominant national community, without compromising one's right to belong, in the sense of participating in the nation-state's democratic processes" (Rosaldo & Flores, 1997, p. 57). As McLaren (1999) charges, "procedural liberal democracy is to some extent a prophylaxis to liberation" (p. 19). Signaling links to neo-Marxism, to liberal multicultural educational theories, and to cultural studies, the term "liberation" is a prominent signifier in this discourse. "We have affirmed universal rights, but for most of our history, we have defined who was entitled to those rights in racial terms" (Foner, 2003). In this discourse, citizenship is posed as a problem, a category in which cultural difference is erased: "Procedural liberalism is officially proclaimed to be difference-neutral and universal but is predicated upon group membership in which the White, heterosexual Anglo male of property is the prime signifier" (Spinner, 1984, p. 113). Spinner claims that "liberal citizenship has failed Black Americans, not completely, perhaps not irrevocably, but mostly" (p. 113). Spinner goes on to argue that because liberal theory is based on individual rights and individual actions, it is ill-positioned to deal with the needs and problems of cultural groups.

Renato Rosaldo is credited with first use of the term "cultural citizenship," which "names a range of social practices which, taken together, claim and establish a distinct social space for Latinos in this country" (Flores & Benmajor, 1997, p. 1). "Difference is seen as a resource, not a threat"—a parallel to the feminist, reconstructionist, and queer discourses surveyed here. "The United States has thrived not because of its efforts at cultural homogenization, but despite them. What is more, rejection of difference prevents us . . . from understanding the highly complex world in which we reside" (p. 5.). In opposition to some of the consensus-based, unification values

articulated in civic republicanism, cultural citizenship discourses emphasize the role of conflict that produces new cultural and political forms. Cultural citizenship is an attempt to name citizenship and political membership as an activity that is fraught with struggles over culture; conflicts over representation, naming, language, minority rights, and full inclusion; and a myriad of other issues. Speaking specifically of Latino cultural citizenship, Rosaldo and Flores (1997) emphasize the dynamic nature of citizenship construction. “Latino identity is, in part, shaped by discrimination and by collective efforts to achieve social gains and recognition for Latinos and their culture. Thus, cultural citizenship is a process that involves claiming membership in, and remaking, America” (p. 58).

Cultural citizenship speaks a language of rights and agency. Whereas individual rights play a central role in political liberal discourses of citizenship, certain cultural forms—including collective or communal cultural norms regarding rights—make strict adherence to individual rights less legitimate. If fluid but unifying conceptions of culture provide meaning to many Latino people in the United States, then culture cannot be realistically or productively segregated from citizenship as a practice or a status. As Rosaldo (1989) notes, since “cultural” has historically meant “different” in U.S. society, “full citizenship and cultural visibility appear to be inversely related. When one increases, the other decreases” (in Silvestrini, 1997, p. 44). Too many have had to choose between “trying to belong to [both] their cultural community and national community” (p. 44). Cultural citizenship discourse weaves its way into educational texts through variations on “multicultural” writings and research. Banks (1990) represents a leading voice in this discourse; he writes that citizenship education in a multicultural society must incorporate the “voices, experiences, and perspectives” of students of color and low-income students.

Our goal should not be merely to educate students of color or white mainstream students to fit into the existing workforce, social structure, and society. Such an education would be inimical to students from different cultural groups because it would force them to experience self-alienation. . . . This kind of uni-dimensional, assimilationist education would also create problems for the citizenship and national identity of youths of color. (p. 211)

An assimilationist citizenship education sends the message that poor students and students of color are not “an integral part of the state and national culture,” despite the fact that belonging to the national state and culture is a fundamental feeling that must be acquired for full and legitimate democratic commitment and participation (p. 211). The assimilationist fallacy that operates within most citizenship education must be replaced by an acknowledgement of the “cultural, national, and global identifications” that are all part of the human experience (Banks, 2001, p. 9).

The reconstructionist discourses are so named here to capture the legacy of George Counts, reaching back to the early 20th-century progressive and Marxist critiques of political and economic life in capitalistic democracies. In 1932, Counts wrote of a rapidly changing world in which capitalism no longer functioned well for the majority of U.S. citizens. Counts felt that in contemporary times “the growth of science and technology has carried us into an age where ignorance must be replaced by knowledge, competition by cooperation, trust in providence by careful planning, and private capitalism by some form of socialized economy” (2003, p. 104). Reconstructing U.S. political, economic, and social institutions and systems would be the

only way to see democracy achieved, and the teacher and schools would assume primary leadership roles in this transformation.

A civic identity of bold radicalism, combined with a Deweyan critical intelligence and active political work both within and outside the state, characterize the reconstructionist discourse in citizenship. Like other critical discourses on citizenship, reconstructionist texts express values of inclusion, equality, and the open embrace of difference. Reconstructionist texts focus, in particular, on those citizens who have been left out or poorly treated in former or present political processes or social institutions, and advocate strategies for expanding rights and powers to those groups and reconstructing social hierarchies and institutions. A point of focus, given the Marxist threads within reconstructionist discourse, are the poor and working classes (Torres, 1998). Wilson (1994) refers to Marshall's description of civil, political, and social citizenship when he asserts that "concerns about the civil and political aspects of citizenship in the United States have overshadowed concerns about the social aspects of citizenship (that is, the 'social' rights to employment, economic security, education and health)" (p. 49).

Reconstructionist discourse consists of two overlapping but distinct threads, differing in the kinds of reconstruction they wish to undertake through civic participation, activism, and work. The progressive, populist thread leads to a more inclusive, involved, active, participatory democracy that engages in public (often local) problem solving and common work. The Marxist or critical thread employs more revolutionary rhetoric and practice in constructing notions of civic identity, as well as a more hegemonic analysis of government and corporate power. What the progressive and the critical strains in the reconstructionist discourse have in common is their shared commitment to the transformation of U.S. democracy, such that it embodies broader political inclusion and participation, as well as their common belief that social and political life in the United States has done profound damage to the least powerful classes and groups. Both strands rely heavily on the values and skills associated with social justice activism.

"Social justice" is a term widely used in reconstructionist writings on democracy and political theory, especially in education. Giroux (1991) writes: "[C]ritical educators need to offer students the opportunity to engage in a deeper understanding of the importance of democratic culture while developing classroom relations that prioritize the importance of cooperation, sharing, and social justice" (p. 3). The volume *Teaching for Social Justice* (Ayers, Hunt, & Quinn, 1998) documents the work of the Institute for Democracy and Education at Ohio University, a progressive organization working with teachers on Dewey-inspired democratic education. In the foreword to this volume, Ayers writes: "Education . . . is an arena of hope and struggle—hope for a better life, and struggle over how to understand and enact and achieve that better life" (1998, p. xvii). The moral and political value of "social justice" as expressed in the reconstructionist discourse recalls the late 18th-century usage of the term, when it was "first used as an appeal to the ruling classes to attend to the needs of the new masses of uprooted peasants who had become urban workers" (Novak, 2000, p. 1). Contemporary leftists use the term to signal the effort to address the growing inequality in wealth, income, and educational opportunity and achievement among classes and ethnic groups in the United States.

Reconstructionist texts often claim that U.S. institutions have dramatically weakened in their responsiveness to populist concerns, especially the concerns of the

poor, working-class, and non-White groups in recent decades. “Government now responds less to popular will and more to narrow financial interests and influential elites” (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 716). Like Kincheloe, many within this discourse link the attenuation of democratic public life to the growing and dangerous influence of multinational corporations and consumer culture. Commenting on the “commercial frenzy” to profit from the genuine heroism in response to the events of 9/11 through patriotic products, commercials, and sales pitches, Giroux (2003) reminds us “how easily the market converts noble concepts like public service and civic courage into forms of civic vacuity” (p. 26). Market culture, Giroux (1999) warns, “threatens to cancel out the tension between market values and those values representative of civil society that cannot be measured in commercial terms but that are critical to democracy, values such as justice, freedom, equality, health, respect, and the rights of citizens as equal and free human beings” (p. 162). Consumerism leads people “increasingly to see their work in instrumental terms—as means to an end. The accumulation of enough money for purchase of consumer products supersedes producing things of use and larger value” (Boyte & Kari, 1996, p. 123). *Public work*, Boyte argues, depends not on instrumental and individualist thinking promoted by consumerism but on a democratic process and spirit “that makes things of value and importance in cooperation with others” (p. 2). Public work, spaces, and processes of deliberation and problem solving all signal the values of open, accessible, shared democratic life of reconstructionist discourse. The philosophy of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship is rooted in this progressive idea of public work and has stories and links that tout the value of helping students to engage problems in their communities. One arm of the organization is called Public Achievement, an international youth initiative that focuses on citizen work (open to all, regardless of age, nationality, sex, religion, or income), the messiness of participatory democracy, and learning by doing (Center for Democracy and Citizenship, 2002).

To reclaim democratic institutions for the poor and marginalized, reconstructionist citizenship discourse embraces critical thinking, conflict, and controversy. Westheimer and Kahne (2003) explicitly address the distinction between the kind of critical thinking advocated in the political liberal discourse and the kind touted by reconstructionists. “The consensus regarding critical thinking generally vanishes when the possibility arises that students will articulate conclusions that differ from mainstream or parental values (or, in some cases, values the teacher holds that differ from mainstream values)” (p. 10). Educators in public schools often see “critical thinking” and citizenship in a way that will work in the interests of the current hierarchy and structure. Indeed, as Kincheloe (2001) explains, in the reconstructionist discourse of citizenship, the term *critical* has an explicitly political frame. “Critical theory is concerned . . . with issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy, matters of race, class, and gender, ideologies, discourses, education, religion and other social institutions, and cultural dynamics interact to construct the social systems that construct our consciousness” (pp. 122–123).

If state-run schooling is about order and loyalty, as is exemplified in some civic republican texts, reconstructionist citizenship is antithetical to state-run schooling in some of its more critical forms. This is because it is, as Kaye (2001) states, “learning how to connect with one’s fellow citizens to confront power and authority” (p. 104). Dryzek (1996) argues that, because democratic states are “less democratic to the extent that public policy becomes dictated by the need to compete and

flourish in the transnational political economy” (p. 3), democratic citizenship needs to be “multidimensional . . . often unconventional,” and often should be waged “*against* the state, and *apart* from the state” (p. 36). Reconstructionist texts advocate fostering civic identities that embrace the values and skills to question, rethink, and confront, when necessary, the ways in which democratic institutions are not working on behalf of all citizens.

The civic knowledge emphasized in reconstructionist citizenship discourse goes beyond the “facts,” as Kincheloe (2001) argues. He articulates the distinction between a fact-based, supposedly neutral civics education and a critical civics curriculum:

Often, when I observe middle school civics teachers lecturing their students about how a bill becomes a law, never referring to lobbyists and economic power wielders’ role in the process, I wonder about the future of participatory democracy. If students are to learn how power actually operates and how governing takes place in a privatized twenty-first century, they will have to unlearn the fairy-tale civics lessons they learn in many schools. (p. 721)

Learning facts, within this discourse, is important only insofar as those facts help to promote and propel active learning about the actual workings of political life. As Parker characterizes the citizenship education debates, “traditionalists want more study, progressives want more practice” (1996, p. 112). The progressive strains of reconstructionism have successfully integrated some active-learning pedagogies into civics education discourses. As Boyte characterizes progressive civic education literature, it is agency and reasoning, not civic knowledge in any pure sense, that are central: “[E]mphasized is the development of ‘public agency—people’s capacities to act with effect and with public spirit’ ” (Boyte, 1994, p. 417; quoted in Parker, 1996, p. 112).

More critical reconstructionist texts explicitly advocate types of civic knowledge that unmask and derail official and state-sponsored “fairy tales.” Such knowledge may include or focus on the more complete histories of various individuals and social and political movements in the United States. In an article describing the civic disengagement of African American young people, Payne (2003) argues that education for liberation requires an understanding of the African American struggle for freedom, citing the Mississippi Freedom Schools as an important historical legacy and a role model for contemporary efforts in citizenship education, especially for people of color. In the essay “Straight Talk With Kids About the War,” Connor (2002) advocates helping students to come to an informed position on the war with Iraq through candid discussions. “Answers to kids’ questions can be much more honest and satisfying if justifying U.S. foreign policy is not the top priority. We can begin by admitting that war is horrible and deadly. Details aren’t necessary, but the overarching truth is.”

Patriotism in reconstructionist discourses is, in some senses, the antithesis of what civic republicans mean by “love of country.” To love the United States is to “encourage dialogue, critique, dissent and social justice.” It is to engage in the messiness and difficulty of a pluralistic democracy that does not currently work well for all citizens. A culture of discussion and dissent is necessary to “inform public citizenship and legitimate access to decent health care, housing, food, meaningful employment, child care, and childhood education programs for all citizens.”

(Giroux, 2003, p. 25). Citizenship education in this realm seeks to foster the engagement and criticism of powerful institutions, including the government and state-sponsored schooling itself.

Discourses of queer citizenship highlight and celebrate conditions of diversity and radical difference. These conditions engender “positive possibilities in the differentiation and proliferation of contacts and experience flowing from the diversification of social worlds which constitute the postmodern experience” (Gilbert, 1992, p. 55). Hall (1989) asserts that each of these worlds has its “own codes of behavior, its ‘scenes’ and ‘economies,’ and . . . ‘pleasures’ ” and that for those who have access to these worlds, they provide space in which to assert some choice and control over everyday life (p. 129, quoted in Gilbert, p. 55). These worlds and spaces provide opportunities for the expression and performance of identity, especially those identities that have enjoyed few “legitimate” spaces for political expression and agency. Queer citizenship highlights the performance of citizenship, reframing civic life not as a sphere in which individuals enact their beliefs but as a diverse, open stage where people perform their lives and social worlds.

This diversification of social worlds, the expressions and performances of these varied social identities, and the positive possibilities within this diversity define queer citizenship. Queer theorists and activists have contributed several unique ideas to the discourses on citizenship.¹² First, they propose that the public sphere so central to most citizenship discourses is a utopian fantasy. They therefore challenge most other citizenship theorists to rethink certain mainstream assumptions. Second, they do not privilege rational debate over other forms of public engagement but include performance and play within their repertoire of political skills.

Queer theorists join feminists in troubling the public/private divide that dominates social life, but they go further in challenging the assumptions made by theorists or policymakers who evoke the idea of the public domain as one of rationality and universality. The current “pseudopublic sphere,” according to Berlant (1997), is a privatized world where work and family making construct a nostalgic vision of citizenship, full of individualistic and conservative values based on a fantastical notion of “family” and “the American way of life” (p. 5). In this pseudopublic sphere, “the notion of public life, from the profession of politician to non-family-based forms of political activism, has been made to seem ridiculous and even dangerous to the nation” (p. 5).

Public spheres, as a cultural form, “never required a widespread culture of rational discussion,” argues Warner (2002), but “required the category of a public—an essentially imaginary function that allows temporally indexed circulation among strangers to be captured as a social entity and addressed impersonally” (p. 144). The public is not a continuum of critical opinion making and debate; it is far too inhibited and commercialized a sphere for that. It is an anonymous space of discourse “organized by nothing other than the discourse itself,” and is “as much notional as empirical” (p. 67). A public is better thought of as “poetic world making” rather than a sphere of rational-critical dialogue. We make publics when we perform new ideas through language or action (p. 114). Public discourse consists of these performances and new ideas, which sometimes create worlds that can put “at risk the concrete world.” Queer citizenship’s political ideas, debates, and performances—by putting into play risky ideas that challenge historic exclusions and suppressed norms—can

endanger the current nostalgia that passes for public life in the United States. “This is its fruitful perversity” (p. 113).

Enacting what Berlant (1997) calls “diva citizenship,” Anita Hill countered the dominant constraints of family-values citizenship when she testified against Clarence Thomas in an effort to show that the workplace is a public space in which women’s so-called private sexual and economic vulnerabilities are exposed. Diva citizenship exists in acts of pedagogy, risk, controversy, and struggle in response to emergencies—threats to human dignity, such as slavery, or sexual harassment—that are embodied, and first experienced as personal, intimate, and private (see Knight Abowitz & Rousmaniere, 2004). Diva citizenship exists in acts of public pedagogy about conditions of oppression or exclusion, acts that transgress the public/private divide and are historically embedded in systemic relations of power. Diva citizenship is political action in the sphere of counterpublics, “in which it is hoped that the poesis of scene making will be transformative, not replicative merely” (Warner, 2002, p. 122).

Queer citizenship discourses openly and aggressively pursue questions of membership. It is within these discourses that the us/them divide that is so central to most citizenship discourses is radically challenged. Phelan (2001), using feminist discourses along with queer theory, takes Bauman’s concept of the “stranger” as a central construct. The stranger, Phelan writes, is “neither us nor clearly them, not friend and not enemy, but a figure of ambivalence who troubles the border between us and them”; Phelan urges us to embrace the stranger in others and ourselves. “Rather than flee from strangeness, sexual strangers may offer one another and others new ways of questioning the current tight fabric of citizenship and national identity” (pp. 4–5). Membership requires more than tolerance of different strangers, Phelan suggests. It requires that all persons be recognized, not “in spite of [their] unusual or minority characteristics, but with those characteristics understood as part of a valid possibility for the conduct of life” (pp. 15–16).

“Queering citizenship” is a civic project that has a powerful normative direction: engaging in dialogue, contestation, and performance to challenge normative structures and discourses that keep certain “undesirable” identities at the margins. Although this discourse is invisible in the applied and K–12 curricular texts that we examined, it is a creative theoretical discourse that turns many of our most cherished civic ideals and utopias on their heads, serving an important, sobering function in a world whose language of ideas often relies too heavily on the myths and fantasies of an idealized democratic life.

Discourses of Transnationalism: Beyond the Nation-State

Since 9/11, America has seen a resurgence of the civic republican values of patriotism, community, and loyalty to America. Paradoxically, the transnationalist discourse also has been revitalized. Transnational citizenship focuses on the local, national, *and* international communities. A citizen in this discourse is one who identifies not primarily or solely with her own nation but also with communities of people and nations beyond the nation-state boundaries. This discourse articulates an agenda for citizenship that simultaneously educates students for membership in local, national, and international organizations and civic organizations. Membership is more fluid and transcends national or regional borders. A citizen therefore weighs political and social decisions considering both the local and global possible

effects. A citizen participates in local associations and government as well as in global alliances (NGOs, international organizations, etc.). Because of this interconnectedness and focus on new global frontiers, transnational citizenship is represented as a new kind of citizenship to be ushered to the forefront of civics classrooms.

The transnational discourse traces its roots to the ancient Stoic tradition, idealizing equality, compassion, democracy, universalism, and humanism. Transnationalist texts, although often linked with the ethic of cosmopolitanism, typically distinguish between the two traditions. Cosmopolitanism is an ethical formulation that focuses on the philosophical implications of fostering love and compassion with people beyond one's domestic state (Nussbaum, 1997). Transnationalism, on the other hand, is a belief that the world would benefit from a legal, social, economic, and ideological intermingling of cultures and societies (Bauböck, 1994; Held, 1999; Enslin, 2000). According to Bauböck, transnational citizenship is characterized by three developments. The first is the "clash between normative principles of liberal democracy and current forms of exclusion," a clash that produces a gap between the promises of liberal democracy and its realizations. The second is "the emergence of interstate citizenship in certain regions of the world," sites where people have formed alliances that transcend national borders and membership (pp. 20–21). Joseph (1999) picks up on this theme, describing transnational citizenship as "nomadic, conditional citizenship related to histories of migrancy and the tenuous status of immigrants," extending "beyond the coherence of national boundaries," and "transnationally linked to informal networks of kinship, migrancy, and displacement" (p. 2). Joseph gives the examples of "feminisms, black nationalisms, labor movements, regional and subregional formations" that have staged citizenship outside the nation-state boundary (p. 9). The third major development toward transnational citizenship is "the evolution of human rights as an element of international law" (Bauböck, p. 21). The United Nations, one of the oldest existing transnational political bodies, is known for its defense of human rights as international law.

Globalization and interconnectedness are not particular to our century. Held (1999) states: "[P]olitical communities have rarely—if ever—existed in isolation as bounded geographical totalities; they are better thought of as multiple overlapping networks of interaction" (p. 91). What *are* new are the emerging technologies and economies linking human beings together, supplying media and means for participation in ways that previously only the wealthy could experience. "Citizen education based on identity defined by membership in a 'nation' rests on the mistaken assumption that democracy is effectively pursued within the nation-state, whose influence and authority has been reduced by globalization" (Enslin, 2000, p. 149). Growing recognition of these developments strengthens transnationalist discourses of citizenship.

Transnationalist discourses push a complex civic identity for students, asserting the school's duty to prepare the national citizens for both the traditional domestic community and a continuously galvanized transnational community. Such an identity demands certain values and skills. The responsibility of the school is to cultivate democratic notions of tolerance and empathy so that students attain the tools needed to bridge the gaps dividing people across intellectual, philosophical, and cultural chasms (Nussbaum, 1997). Upon mastering such tools, citizens will be ready to address global issues and recognize humanity in all its diverse forms, creating cli-

mates beneficial to local and international democratic processes (Nussbaum). The curriculum standards of National Council for the Social Studies (1994) are suggestive of this kind of complex civic identity in advocating a standard entitled “Adopting Common and Multiple Perspectives.” The council advocates that the social studies emphasize that persons have personal perspectives and also share common perspectives “as members of groups, communities, societies, and nations—that is, as part of a dynamic world community. A well-designed social studies curriculum will help each learner construct a blend of personal, academic, pluralist, and global views of the human condition” (p. 6). In *Down the Street, Around the World: A Starter Kit for Global Awareness* (McLeod & Houlihan, 2003), a curriculum by the American Federation of Teachers, students are taught about a range of issues that connect the United States to the broader international community; as one culminating activity, students are asked to write about their role in the global community.

The emphasis on humanism is one of the ancient pillars of transnationalism. Texts within this discourse often reflect values of empathy, care, compassion, and other humanistic traits as central to one’s civic education (Papastephanou, 2002). The rhetoric of transnationalist discourse traditionally has reflected a universalist, humanitarian value system. Terms such as “global,” “international,” “transnational,” “cosmopolitan,” and “intercontinental” are often invoked, referencing a boundless or indefinite area to emphasize the larger contexts that citizens share. Because the transnational discourse supports a Kantian universalism of moral truth and human dignity, these texts often promote the homogeneity of the human race—our common needs for good nutrition, safe homes, clean water, work, and health care—rather than its heterogeneity of cultural identities (Nussbaum, 1997). This leads to the prevalence of terms such as “collective,” “group,” “community,” and “collaboration.” The construct of universal human rights is a primary value as well as rhetorical tool in this discourse.

Yet transnationalism’s humanist roots are not simply universalist; they can shift toward more particular forms within and beyond the nation-state. The transnationalist discourse on citizenship typically aims to broaden and make more flexible the membership structures of current political systems while also expanding civic identities toward more global dimensions. This is not necessarily an antinational or antistatist discourse. A transnational conception of citizenship augments the sovereignty of the individuals within the transnational community rather than augmenting a state in hopes that it will bequeath such benefits to its citizens (Held, 1999; Kymlicka, 1999a). Greater power for citizens and less power for states reflects a populist ideal present within some transnationalist texts. This populist dimension of transnationalism has become more pronounced as some critical citizenship discourses, such as reconstructionist and feminist discourses, have intersected with transnationalist citizenship interests and ideas. Social class, race, and gender are categories of identity that cross national borders; transnationalist discourses often are used in strategic ways to further political interests shaped by these and other identity markers.

Transnationalism has a minimal influence on the K–12 public school curriculum, with geography the subject area in which its content is most typically found. On the sample Citizenship Proficiency Test provided on the Ohio State Department of Education website, Questions 1–3 involve a map exercise identifying major rivers and countries on the African continent. However, educating youth about global

geography does not automatically evoke transnational citizenship ideals. The State of New Jersey shows evidence of going a step further in its civics standards, as in the geographic knowledge indicated in the K–4 standard: “Explain how improvements in transportation and communication have resulted in global interdependence” (New Jersey State Department of Education, 1996, chap. 3, p. 36). The inclusion of “global interdependence” as a knowledge indicator more significantly aligns with transnationalist discourse because it weakly suggests a political norm concerning global cooperation on policies, as exemplified in its explicit reference not only to economic interdependence but to interdependence for health and security: The standard explicitly mentions environmental treaties such as the Kyoto Accords (p. 36).

Curricular approaches such as these do not align with the transnational discourse on citizenship simply because their content is global in nature. Transnational curricula move from a region-centered perspective to a global perspective, and students learn about their own country as interdependent rather than self-contained. This form of education goes far beyond the instrumentalist constructions of global interdependence for economic trade that predominates in most curricular texts. Transnationalist citizenship emphasizes compassion for one’s country and its inhabitants while also teaching empathy and compassion for other cultures. Rather than group-centered education, in which students simply learn about various cultures and differences among cultures, a transnational education displays the ways in which the inhabitants of different cultures are interdependent with, and similar to, those in one’s own country. Transnationalist texts often demonstrate a democratic appreciation for plurality while encouraging a connection to another nation’s people based on the universal humanity connecting all people. Hill (2002) defines international education as the acquisition of knowledge about “social justice and equity; interdependence; sustainable development; cultural diversity; peace and conflict; population concerns; languages” (p. 26). Attitudes to be developed include “commitment to social justice and equity on a world scale; empathy for feelings, needs and lives of others in different countries; respect for cultural diversity within and without one’s geographical location; a belief that people can make a difference; a concern for environment on a global scale” (p. 27). Another parallel vision of transnational citizenship in education is the International Baccalaureate Organizations. Since 1968, this group has developed strategies and criteria for imparting a global understanding of the world to students. Three key components of the IB curriculum are focusing on developing citizens of the world (through language and culture), fostering recognition of universal human values (as outlined by the UNESCO Declaration of 1996), and ensuring that content addresses international as well as local and national issues (Drennen, 2002).

Many organizations rethought, reorganized, or reaffirmed their goals and causes after 9/11 in ways that emphasized aspects of the transnationalist citizenship discourse. A number of mainstream education journals published special issues after 9/11 devoted to what one author called a “world-centered” curriculum and education (Dunn, 2002). In a special issue of *Educational Leadership*, Dunn advocated a new world history curriculum to replace “comparison of different cultures with questions that lead students to understand the complex, large-scale changes that have shaped our world” (2002, p. 11). Dunn’s article is illustrated with an image of a young boy holding a large, transparent globe. This image symbolizes a reawak-

ening to the vitality and importance of transnational citizenship, even as U.S. lawmakers have urged a more nationalistic and parochial focus for schools after the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

Transnationalist citizenship discourses are exceedingly flexible. In the same ways that they can be used for more critical and populist forms of citizenship, they can alternatively be assimilated within neoliberal goals of expanded markets and consumerism. In this process the political and ethical ideals of transnationalism become subsumed by the logic of the global marketplace. In a case study of a Vancouver suburb's conflict between Anglo-Canadian residents and Chinese Canadians who were recent immigrants from Hong Kong, Mitchell (2001) observed that the Chinese Canadians formed a strong alliance for traditional schooling (with a focus on morality, authority, and efficiency) in opposition to local Anglo-Canadians, who were in favor of more individualized, creative approaches. Part of the lure of traditional schooling for these Chinese Canadians was the belief that it represented the best preparation for life in the workplace. Mitchell argued that transnational educational narratives will bring greater power to economic or neoliberal discourses of citizenship and new scrutiny to Western political liberal citizenship and forms of education in the nation-state. "For many immigrant Chinese-Canadians, the preparation of individuals to become high achievers in a global workplace is more practical and more attainable than their constitution as citizens of a particular nation-state" (p. 69). Moreover, the Asian identity of the immigrants interceded in the construction of their national Canadian identity: "Precisely because of their Asian 'otherness,' . . . the Chinese residents represent the constitutive outside of the nation; they can never participate fully or unproblematically as democratic citizens of the nation because they are always already located outside of it." Political identities still subject to exclusion in nation-states can increasingly construct political and economic allegiances across national borders. Transnational citizenship thus presses on questions of traditional notions of civic membership and identity.

Conclusions

Our review of citizenship education texts reveals the conceptual conflicts under way, heightened and dramatized by the events of 9/11 and the current War on Terror. Questions of our allegiance to nation-state have not been so pressing for generations; yet alliances and allegiances to individuals, families, cultural groups, and political networks across the globe have never been so powerful, so immediately tangible as technology now allows them to be. In our world, in the United States in particular, civic meanings are both exceptionally weighty and exceptionally plastic—shifting and changing as our technologies, political terrains, and economies fluctuate. This review has drawn a map of those civic meanings to make so-called "common-sense" notions of citizenship visible, so that we might better address these and many other dilemmas of contemporary civic life. "Institutions and social context . . . play an important determining role in the development, maintenance, and circulation of discourses" (Mills, 1997, p. 11). As powerful socializing institutions, schools reproduce civic republican and liberal discourses of citizenship; together, these construct the language, values, and norms of civic life in the United States today. These discourses are not necessarily the product of reflective thinking about best practices or about what sort of democratic life we might want to have,

but are often dominant because of their power to shape the language we use and the values we express when we perform and teach citizenship.

Yet we also see evidence of critiques and shifts at play in the work of the critical discourses and, particularly after 9/11, the renewal of transnationalist traditions of old. These old and new constructions of citizenship pose important challenges to educators and teacher educators of the next centuries. While the feminist, cultural, reconstructionist, queer, and transnationalist discourses are having some effects on citizenship education as it is practiced in public schools, the effects of these discourses is sporadic and shallow in the educational texts that we examined. The criticisms of the civic republican and liberal views of citizenship are still largely at the theoretical level. Citizenship as practiced in schools is predominantly taught as civic republican literacy (factual consumption of American history, geography, and government), combined with varying degrees of patriotic identity and the liberal virtue of tolerance for difference.

The emergence of a strong array of diverse critical discourses of citizenship challenges traditional definitions of membership and pushes against traditional boundaries of agency, identity, and membership. Agency is the idea that individuals and groups act—that citizenship is something that happens when people are engaged in activity for, with, on behalf of, or even against others. The goodness of agency seems to be a key assumption in all understandings of citizenship reviewed here, but feminist, queer, cultural, and transnational discourses question traditional notions of civic agency. Where do citizens do their work? In the home, in “public,” or in national or global settings? In what ways do citizens act? Do they engage in discourse or ironic performance, empathetic dialogue or storytelling, conflict or peacemaking? Do they engage in their discourse through traditional public forums or through worldwide electronic transmissions? What cultural or sexual identities have been permitted to be, or prevented from being, full participants in civil society and political life?

The question of civic identity has been brought into clearer view by many of the critical discourses reviewed here, challenging us to look at the histories of who has been welcomed into the civic realm and who has not. In light of these histories, critical citizenship discourses challenge the very constructions of some of our most cherished political identities. Reconstructionists offer a view of state-sponsored schooling that teaches students to critique the state. Cultural citizenship discourses offer a particularly impressive critique of the way citizenship has been largely a Eurocentric, assimilationist identity and thus a losing proposition for non-Whites throughout the United States and other nations. Feminist constructions of citizenship urge us to rethink the whole civic project, attempting to remake an essentially male realm into one that is hospitable to the diverse interests of women.

Membership—or the idea that a citizen derives her rights and obligations from the social contract of the nation-state—is an idea central to most notions of citizenship. Enlightenment-inspired, dominant notions of citizenship typically define boundaries of membership at the national borders, having moved away from traditional forms of membership based in tribal or ethnic kinship. Bounded membership is still the most prevalent way that we teach and understand citizenship. Civic republican discourses make much of the meanings of these borders; liberal discourses see the borders more pragmatically and less zealously but still provide traditional under-

standings of citizenship in terms of membership in a nation-state. Discourses that challenge the dominant conventions of citizenship are energetically pushing on these borders, terming them socially constructed, artificial, and, worse, misleading in terms of how the borders lead us to envision, categorize, and engage in problem solving both with and against other nations and peoples. Feminist discourses of citizenship challenge us to see the rights of women not merely as a national issue but as a global issue; transnationalist discourses of citizenship argue for the interdependence of nations, both in the sense of shared global resources and in the sense of shared human identity. Culturalists and reconstructionists remind us that citizenship, even as a national category, is far from inclusive; vast earnings gaps effectively create a “dual citizenship” in the contemporary United States, as in many other countries, because poorer members of the society command less power and respect, and hence less entitlement to full participation and a full voice in society (Torres, 1998, p. 135).

The ancient Athenian Diogenes Laertius famously stated, “I am a citizen of the world.” Cosmopolitan discourse positions citizens as belonging to a larger, more inclusive group than a nation-state. Diogenes was known for traveling throughout the world and for his famous, nomadic search for “an honest man.” The stories of Diogenes searching over great distances and many lands told of his interactions with many different peoples. In our own time, such interactions over shared political, economic, and human rights issues are more commonplace, thanks to the fact that people and nations are linked politically, economically, and electronically. At the November 1999 protests of the World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle, Washington, perhaps a hundred thousand people came from around the world to address global trade issues through protest. Coalitions based on environmental issues, women’s rights, fair trade issues, anarchist politics, democratic governance, and animal rights, among others, formulated plans for their protest on the Internet and cell phones; conceptions of both the political issues and the strategies were driven not by nation-state membership but by alliances formed by other means and through many other forms of solidarity. Transnational discourses, intersecting with critical discourses across a wide array of ideological perspectives, will continue to enrich and enliven the work of, and debates about, citizenship. It is important, therefore, to ask why the conceptions of citizenship that currently are communicated in schools reflect little of the theoretical and practical insights that these discourses bring to meanings of citizenship. Citizenship education that engaged the debates, questions, and multiple discourses associated with civic and political life would prove to be far more enlightening, engaging, and inspiring for students than the current civics curriculum—with its vision of a more cleansed, idealized, narrow, and fairy-tale-like citizenship than actually exists. Many of our students are no doubt aware of this gap between school-constructed citizenship and citizenship as actually practiced; this awareness feeds the apathy and cynicism that we may be producing in our citizenship education in schools.

Notes

¹Feminist theorists of citizenship, discussed later in this article, will point out that in many modern democracies, political citizenship for more than half the population was not fully granted until well into the 20th century. For a critique of Marshall’s theory of citizenship development, see Walby (1994).

²See, for example, Bosniak (2001, p. 240, note 8). Kathleen Cotton's "Educating for Citizenship" is a review of articles on U.S. citizenship education, mostly from the discipline of social studies education, spanning the 1980s and early 1990s. Cotton finds much agreement in this period; we see much more diversity and difference in the articles that we reviewed, especially after the events of 9/11. David Scott and Helen Lawson, in "Citizenship Education: Models and Discourses" (2001), present a very interesting review of the literature in the form of seven continua that describe the range of citizenship ideals that shape the diversity of practices and approaches in the field. This review does not take a Foucaultian discursive approach and lacks any specificity in terms of distinct texts, curricula, or organizations that are currently shaping citizenship discourses.

³For example, the civic republican, liberal, and cosmopolitan discourses obviously reflect philosophical categories that span many centuries, and these terms are regularly used in the philosophical literature on citizenship. The feminist discourses of citizenship are also typically "named" as such in philosophical and social studies literature. Similarly, "cultural citizenship" is a term used in the literature, and "queer theory" and "queer citizenship" have been explicitly discussed by theorists.

⁴It is important to note that each individual discourse is multivocal, or speaking in many different voices and evolving over time, with a range of common values, habits, and ideologies encompassed within it at any given time (Quantz & Knight Abowitz, 2002).

⁵One of the points of agreement among many civic republicans is on the sociological thesis that America of the late 20th and early 21st centuries is more divided and has less consensus on moral and political values than the America of the early 20th century, as reflected in Robert Putnam's famous "Bowling Alone" article (1995) and subsequent writings. The diminished social networks of American civil society, as seen in declining rates of participation in bowling leagues, parent-teacher associations, and other neighborhood, local, and religious organizations, erode what Putnam (2001) and others have called "social capital."

⁶Jürgen Habermas (1994) documents the history of the word *nation*, tracing its roots in Roman times to *Natio*, the goddess of birth and origin. Until the middle of the 18th century, and later in many cases, *nations* were communities of people linked by heredity. "Hereditary nationality gave way to an acquired nationalism" after the French Revolution, and that form of nationalism "was able to foster people's identification with a role which demanded a high degree of personal commitment" (p. 23). This history makes a clear connection between the idea of nationhood and the civic republican discourse of citizenship.

⁷For a review of the citizenship education debates in the post-9/11 period, see Casey (2003).

⁸Labaree describes this neoliberal influence as education for social mobility and identifies it as the prominent reason that most contemporary Americans value schooling (1997). This consumer-based approach to education has "led to the reconceptualization of education as a purely private good," Labaree notes (p. 73).

⁹The recent rise of neoliberal discourse in educational policy and governance is well documented by researchers analyzing the wave of school-business partnerships, privatization, commercialization, and choice initiatives that have been prominent in recent decades of school reform (Spring, 1998; Boyles, 1998; Molnar, 1996).

¹⁰Penny Enslin, Shirley Pendlebury, and Mary Tjiattas (2001) provide a nice summary of the range of views among liberals on this point. These authors characterize William

Galston (1995) as a “minimalist” liberal whose vision of the state’s authority to educate citizens would not include critically examining the ideological perspectives of one’s family. Amy Gutmann (1995) is characterized by Enslin et al. as a “maximalist,” someone who makes strong claims regarding the necessity of individuality and autonomy as central values of the liberal citizen—even if such an identity would not be friendly to all ways of life. The maximalist vision will conflict with the belief systems of some families and their authority to reproduce their values and identities in their children.

¹¹Although our public life consists of a variety of cultural groups and practices, liberals acknowledge an assimilative effect of citizenship—not only in language (there is only one official language, and bilingual education is now widely outlawed) but in other aspects of identity and values. This critique of liberalism fosters the more recent citizenship discourse of cultural citizenship, discussed later in this article.

¹²The mainstream political theory journals and publishing houses publish almost nothing that fits into this discourse. For this part of the study, we deviated from our methodology somewhat and explored the limited literature on citizenship from the field of cultural studies.

References

- Alavi, K. (2001). At risk of prejudice: Teaching tolerance about Muslim Americans. *Social Education*, 65(6), 334–348.
- Angell, A. V. (1991). Democratic climates in elementary classrooms: A review of theory and research. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 19(3), 241–266.
- Arnot, M. (1997). Gendered citizenry: New feminist perspectives on education and citizenship. *British Educational Research Journal*, 23(3), 275–295.
- Arnot, M., Araújo, H., Deliyanni-Kouimtzis, K., Ivinson, G., & Tomé, A. (2000). “The good citizen”: Cultural understandings of citizenship and gender amongst a new generation of teachers. In M. Leicester, C. Modgil, & S. Modgil (Eds.), *Politics, education and citizenship* (pp. 217–231). New York: Falmer Press.
- Assiter, A. (1999). Citizenship revisited. In N. Yuval-Davis & P. Werbner (Eds.), *Women, citizenship and difference* (pp. 217–231). New York: Zed Books.
- Ayers, W., Hunt, J. A., & Quinn, T. (1998). *Teaching for social justice*. New York: New Press.
- Banks, J. A. (1990). Citizenship education for a pluralistic democratic society. *The Social Studies*, 81(5), 210–214.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 5–16.
- Barber, B. R. (1999). Clansmen, consumers, and citizens: Three takes on civil society. In R. K. Fullinwider (Ed.), *Civil society, democracy, and civic renewal* (pp. 9–30). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bauböck, R. (1994). *Transnational citizenship: Membership and rights in international migration*. Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar.
- Benhabib, S. (1992). *Situating the self: Gender, community and postmodernism in contemporary ethics*. New York: Routledge.
- Berlant, L. (1997). *The queen of America goes to Washington City: Essays on sex and citizenship*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bern, W. (2002). Mystic chords of memory: Cultivating America’s unique form of patriotism. *American Educator*, 26(1). Retrieved May 23, 2003, from http://www.aft.org/american_educator/spring2002/mystic.html
- Bosniak, L. (2001). Denationalizing citizenship. In T. A. Aleinikoff & D. Klusmeyer (Eds.), *Citizenship today: Global perspectives and practices* (pp. 237–252). Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

- Boyer, E. L. (1990). Civic education for responsible citizens. *Educational Leadership*, 48(3), 4–7.
- Boyles, D. (1998). *American education and corporations: The free market goes to school*. New York: Garland.
- Boyte, H. C. (1994). Review of *Civitas: A Framework for Civic Education*. *Teachers College Record*, 95, 414–418.
- Boyte, H. C., & Kari, N. N. (1996). *Building America: The democratic promise of public work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Butts, R. F. (1988). The moral imperative for American schools: “. . . In flame the civic temper. . .” *American Journal of Education*, 96(2), 162–194.
- California State Board of Education. (1998). *History–social science content standards for California public schools*. Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
- Callan, E. (1997). *Creating citizens: Political education and liberal democracy*. New York: Clarendon Press.
- Carnegie Corporation of New York & CIRCLE: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. (2003). *The civic mission of schools*. New York: Authors.
- Casey, L. (2003). Teaching the lessons of 9/11. *Dissent*, 50(1), 50–57.
- Center for Democracy and Citizenship. (2002). *Public achievement*. Minneapolis, MN: Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs. Retrieved October 2002 from <http://www.publicachievement.org/>
- Cheney, L. (2002). Protecting our precious liberty. In *September 11: What our children need to know* (pp. 17–18). Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. Retrieved November 19, 2002, from <http://www.edexcellence.net/foundation/publication/publication.cfm?id=65#745>
- Cherryholmes, C. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohen, J. (1996). Procedure and substance in deliberative democracy. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political* (pp. 95–119). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Connor, M. A. (2002). Straight talk with kids about war. *Rethinking Schools Online*. Retrieved August 20, 2003, from <http://www.rethinkingschools.org/war/readings/kids174.shtml>
- Corporation for National and Community Service. (2003). *National Service Resource Center*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved November 2, 2003, from <http://www.nationalservice.org/Default.asp>
- Cotton, K. (2001). *Educating for citizenship* (Northwest Regional Education Research Laboratory, School Improvement Research Series, Close-Up #19). Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Education Research Laboratory. Retrieved July 8, 2004, from <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/10/c019.html> (latest update 8/31/01)
- Counts, G. S. (2003). Dare the school build a new social order? In K. Rousmaniere & K. Knight Abowitz (Eds.), *Readings in sociocultural foundations of education* (pp. 103–105). Columbus, OH: McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1932)
- Damon, W. (2001). To not fade away: Restoring civil identity among the young. In D. Ravitch & J. P. Viteritti (Eds.), *Making good citizens: Education and civil society* (pp. 122–140). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dillabough, J.-A., & Arnot, M. (2000). Feminist political frameworks: New approaches to the study of gender, citizenship and education. In M. Arnot & J.-A. Dillabough (Eds.), *Challenging democracy: International perspectives on gender, education, and citizenship* (pp. 21–40). New York: Routledge/Falmer.
- Douglas Franzosa, S. (1988). Schooling women in citizenship. *Theory Into Practice*, 27, 275–281.

- Drennen, H. (2002). Criteria for curriculum continuity in international education. In M. Hayden, J. Thompson, & G. Walker (Eds.), *International education in practice: Dimensions for national and international schools* (pp. 55–65). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Dryzek, J. S. (1996). *Democracy in capitalist times: Ideals, limits, struggles*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dunn, R. E. (2002). Growing good citizens with a world-centered curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, 60(4), 10–13.
- Elshtain, J. B. (1981). *Public man, private woman: Women in social and political thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Elshtain, J. B. (1999). A call to civil society. *Society*, 36(5), 11–19.
- Enslin, P. (2000). Education and democratic citizenship: In defence of cosmopolitanism. In M. Leicester, C. Modgil, & S. Modgil (Eds.), *Politics, education and citizenship* (pp. 149–150). New York: Falmer Press.
- Enslin, P., Pendlebury, S., & Tjiattas, M. (2001). Deliberative democracy, diversity and the challenges of citizenship education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 35(1), 115–130.
- Etzioni, A. (1993). *The spirit of community: Rights, responsibilities, and the communitarian agenda*. New York: Crown Publishing.
- Feinberg, W. (1998). *Common schools/uncommon identities: National unity and cultural difference*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Finn, C. E., Jr. (2001, October 4). Patriotism revisited. *The Education Gadfly: A Weekly Bulletin of News and Analysis From the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation*, 1(20). Retrieved November 19, 2002, from <http://www.edexcellence.net/institute/gadfly/issue.cfm?id=88&edition=#1316>
- Finn, C. E., Jr. (2002). Introduction. In *September 11: What our children need to know* (pp. 4–11). Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. Retrieved November 19, 2002, from <http://www.edexcellence.net/Sept11/September11.html#Civics>
- Flores, W. V., & Benmajor, R. (1997). Introduction: Constructing cultural citizenship. In W. V. Flores & R. Benmajor (Eds.), *Latino cultural citizenship: Claiming identity, space and rights* (pp. 1–26). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Foner, E. (2003). Race and citizenship. *Socialism and Democracy Online*, 34. Retrieved November 27, 2003, from http://www.sdonline.org/33/eric_foner.html
- Foucault, M. (1972). *Archeology of knowledge*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.
- Galston, W. A. (1991). *Liberal purposes; Goods, virtues and duties in the liberal state*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Galston, W. A. (1995). Two concepts of liberalism. *Ethics*, 105, 516–534.
- Galston, W. A. (2000). Civic society and the “art of association.” *Journal of Democracy*, 11(1), 64.
- Galston, W. A. (2003). *Civic knowledge, civic education, and civic engagement: A summary of recent research*. Syracuse, NY: Campbell Public Affairs Institute, Maxwell School of Syracuse University. Retrieved June 3, 2003, from http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/campbell/Civic_Virtue/CivicVirtue.htm
- Giarelli, J. M., & Giarelli, E. (1996). Educating for public and private life: Beyond the false dilemma. In J. N. Burstyn (Ed.), *Educating tomorrow's valuable citizen* (pp. 11–37). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Gilbert, R. (1992). Citizenship, education and postmodernity. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 13(1), 51–68.
- Giroux, H. A. (1991). Beyond the ethics of flag waving: Schooling and citizenship for a critical democracy. *Clearing House*, 64(5), 305–309.
- Giroux, H. A. (1999). *The mouse that roared: Disney and the end of innocence*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Giroux, H. A. (2003). *The abandoned generation: Democracy beyond the culture of fear*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Glazer, N. (2001). Some problems in acknowledging diversity. In D. Ravitch & J. P. Viteritti (Eds.), *Making good citizens: Education and civil society* (pp. 168–186). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gutmann, A. (1995). Civic education and social diversity. *Ethics*, 105, 557–579.
- Gutmann, A. (2000). Why should schools care about civic education? In L. M. McDonnell, P. M. Timpone, & R. Benjamin (Eds.), *Rediscovering the democratic purposes of education* (pp. 73–90). Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and disagreement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1994). Citizenship and national identity. In B. van Steenberg (Ed.), *The condition of citizenship* (pp. 20–35). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Habermas, J. (1996). Three normative models of democracy. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political* (pp. 21–30). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hall, S. (1986). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post-structuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2(2), 91–113.
- Hall, S. (1989). The meaning of new times. In S. Hall & M. Jacques (Eds.), *New times: The changing face of politics in the 1990s* (pp. 116–133). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Heater, D. (2004). *A history of education for citizenship*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Held, D. (1999). The transformation of political community: Rethinking democracy in the context of globalization. In I. Shapiro & C. Hacker-Cordon (Eds.), *Democracy's edges* (pp. 84–111). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, I. (2002). The history of international education: An international baccalaureate perspective. In M. Hayden, J. Thompson, & G. Walker (Eds.), *International education in practice: Dimensions for national and international schools* (pp. 18–29). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Hobbs, R. (2001). Media literacy skills: Interpreting tragedy. *Social Education*, 65(7), 406–411.
- Howard, R., & Kenny, R. (1992). Education for democracy: Promoting citizenship and critical reasoning through school governance. In A. Garrod (Ed.), *Learning for life: Moral education theory and practice* (pp. 210–227). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Jones, K. B. (1998). Citizenship in a woman-friendly polity. In G. Shafir (Ed.), *The citizenship debates: A reader* (pp. 221–247). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Joseph, M. (1999). *Nomadic identities: The performance of citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kaplan, M. D. G. (2003). Fly girl. *New York Times*, Education Supplement, A32–34.
- Katz, M. B. (2001). *The price of citizenship: Redefining the American welfare state*. New York: Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt.
- Kaye, H. J. (2001). *Are we good citizens? Affairs political, literary, and academic*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kazin, M. (2002). A patriotic left. *Dissent*, 49(4), 41–44.
- Kenway, J., & Langmead, D. (2000). Cyberfeminism and citizenship? Challenging the political imaginary. In M. Arnot and J.-A. Dillabough (Eds.), *Challenging democracy: International perspectives on gender, education, and citizenship* (pp. 312–329). New York: Routledge/Falmer.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). *Getting beyond the facts: Teaching social studies/social sciences in the twenty-first century*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

- Knight Abowitz, K., & Rousmaniere, K. (2004). Margaret Haley as diva: A case-study of a feminist citizen-leader. In *The Initiative Anthology: An Electronic Publication About Leadership, Culture, & Schooling*. Oxford, OH: Miami University, Department of Educational Leadership. Retrieved November 23, 2003, from <http://www.units.muohio.edu/eduleadership/anthology/>
- Kymlicka, W. (1999a). Citizenship in an era of globalization: Commentary on Held. In I. Shapiro & C. Hacker-Cordon (Eds.), *Democracy's edges* (pp. 112–126). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (1999b). Education for citizenship. In M. Halstead & T. H. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Education in morality* (pp. 79–101). New York: Routledge.
- Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics*, 104, 352–381.
- Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(1), 39–81.
- Landau, B. (2002). Educating for citizenship. *Education Week on the Web*. Retrieved June 17, 2004, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/newstory.cfm?slug=25landau.h21>
- Lutkus, A. D., Weiss, A. R., Campbell, J. R., Mazzeo, J., & Lazer, S. (1999). *NAEP 1998 civics report card to the nation* (National Assessment of Educational Progress). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved August 8, 2003, from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard//pubs/main1998/2000457.asp>
- Macedo, S. (1990). *Liberal virtues: Citizenship, virtue, and community in liberal constitutionalism*. New York: Clarendon Press.
- Macedo, S. (2000). *Diversity and distrust: Civic education in a multicultural democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Marshall, T. H. (1998). Citizenship and social class. In G. Shafir (Ed.), *The citizenship debates* (pp. 93–111). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1950)
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *The schoolhome: Rethinking schools for changing families*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mathews, D. (1996). Reviewing and previewing civics. In W. C. Parker (Ed.), *Educating the democratic mind* (pp. 265–286). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- McLaren, P. (1999). Unthinking whiteness, rethinking democracy: Critical citizenship in Gringolandia. In C. Clark & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Becoming and unbecoming white: Owning and disowning a racial identity* (pp. 10–55). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), 235–250.
- McLeod, S., & Houlihan, C. (2003). *Down the street, around the world: A starter kit for global awareness*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Milner, H. (2002). *Civic literacy: How informed citizens make democracy work*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Mitchell, K. (2001). Education for democratic citizenship: Transnationalism, multiculturalism, and the limits of liberalism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(1), 51–78.
- Molnar, A. (1996). *Giving kids the business: The commercialization of America's schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Mosher, R., Kenny, R. A., Jr., & Garrod, A. (1994). *Preparing for citizenship: Teaching youth to live democratically*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Mouffe, C. (1992). Feminism, citizenship, and radical democratic politics. In J. Butler & J. W. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (pp. 369–384). New York: Routledge.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

- National Council for the Social Studies. (1994). *Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Issues Forums Institute. (2003). *About NIF Forums*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation. Retrieved September 23, 2003, from <http://www.nifi.org/forums/about.aspx>
- New Jersey State Department of Education. (1996). *New Jersey social studies curriculum framework: A document in support of the Core Curriculum Content Standards for Social Studies*. Retrieved August 9, 2004, from <http://www.state.nj.us/njded/frameworks/socialstudies/>
- Nie, N. H., Junn, J., & Stehlik-Barry, K. (1996). *Education and democratic citizenship in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Noddings, N. (1997). Social studies and feminism. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 59–70). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Novak, M. (2000) Defining social justice. *First Things*, 108, 11–13.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ohio State Department of Education. (2003). *Academic content standards: K–12 social studies*. Retrieved May 16, 2003, from http://www.ode.state.oh.us/academic_content_standards/SSContentStd/PDF/SOCIAL_STUDIES.pdf
- Oldham, A. (1998). Citizenship and community: Civic republicanism and the modern world. In G. Shafir (Ed.), *The citizenship debates: A reader* (pp. 75–89). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Papastephanou, M. (2002). Arrows not yet fired: Cultivating cosmopolitanism through education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 36(1), 69–86.
- Parker, W. C. (1996). “Advanced” ideas about democracy: Toward a pluralist conception of citizen education. *Teachers College Record*, 98(1), 104–125.
- Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Pateman, C. (1988). *The sexual contract*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Payne, C. M. (2003). More than a symbol of freedom: Education for liberation and democracy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(1), 22–28.
- Phelan, S. (2001). *Sexual strangers: Gays, lesbians, and dilemmas of citizenship*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Piscatelli, J. (2003). Pledge of allegiance. *State Notes: Character/Citizenship Education* [Newsletter]. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America’s declining social capital. *Current*, 373, 3–9.
- Putnam, R. D. (2001). Community-based social capital and educational performance. In D. Ravitch & J. P. Viteritti (Eds.), *Making good citizens: Education and civil society* (pp. 58–95). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Quantz, R., & Knight Abowitz, K. (2002). Social foundations, disciplinarity, and democracy. *Educational Studies*, 33(1), 23–34.
- Quigley, C. (2003). *Promoting civic education*. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education. Retrieved August 21, 2003, from http://www.civiced.org/cq_wh_2003.pdf
- Ravitch, D. (1993). Multiculturalism: E pluribus plures. In F. J. Beckwith & M. E. Bauman (Eds.), *Are you politically correct? Debating America’s cultural standards* (pp. 165–184). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Ravitch, D., & Viteritti, J. P. (Eds.). (2001). *Making good citizens: Education and civil society*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1993). *Political liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Rosaldo, R., & Flores, W. V. (1997). Identity, conflict, and evolving Latino communities: Cultural citizenship in San Jose, California. In W. V. Flores & R. Benmajor (Eds.), *Latino cultural citizenship: Claiming identity, space, and rights* (pp. 57–96). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Rotherham, A. J. (2002). An attack on who we are. In *September 11: What our children need to know* (pp. 48–49). Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. Retrieved November 19, 2002, from <http://www.edexcellence.net/Sept11/September11.html#Civics>
- Ruddick, S. (1989). *Maternal thinking: Toward a politics of peace*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing and fairness: How America's schools cheat girls*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.
- Sandel, M. 1982. *Liberalism and the limits of justice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlesinger, A. M., Jr. (1991). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society*. Knoxville, TN: Whittle Direct Books.
- Scott, D., & Lawson, H. (2001). Citizenship education: Models and discourses. In A. Ross (Ed.), *Learning for a democratic Europe* (pp. 349–356). London: Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe.
- Seikaly, Z. A. (2001). At risk of prejudice: The Arab American community. *Social Education*, 65(6), 349–351.
- Shafir, G. (1998). Introduction: The evolving tradition of citizenship. In G. Shafir (Ed.), *The citizenship debates: A reader* (pp. 1–28). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Silvestrini, B. G. (1997). The world we enter when claiming rights: Latinos and their quest for culture. In W. V. Flores & R. Benmajor (Eds.), *Latino cultural citizenship: Claiming identity, space, and rights* (pp. 39–53). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Singleton, L. R. (2001). Following a tragic event: A necessary challenge for civic educators. *Social Education*, 65(7), 413–418.
- Sleeper, J. (2003). Whose elephant? *Dissent*, 50(1), 37–42.
- Smith, C. L. (1999). Is citizenship a gendered concept? In A. C. Cairns, J. C. Courtney, P. MacKinnon, H. J. Michelmann, & D. E. Smith (Eds.), *Citizenship, diversity, and pluralism: Canadian and comparative perspectives* (pp. 137–162). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Smith, D. E. (1995). *We the people: The citizen and the Constitution*. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.
- Spinner, J. (1994). *The boundaries of citizenship: Race, ethnicity, and nationality in the liberal state*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the rise of the global economy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Strike, K. A. (1994). On the construction of public speech: Pluralism and public reason. *Educational Theory*, 44(1), 1–25.
- Taylor, C. (1995). Liberal politics and the public sphere. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *New communitarian thinking: Persons, virtues, institutions and communities* (pp. 183–217). Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Tolo, K. W. (Project Director). (1999). *The civic education of American youth: From state policies to school district practices*. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education. Retrieved July 5, 2003, from http://www.civiced.org/ceay_civedpolicyreport.pdf
- Torres, C. A. (1998). *Democracy, education and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Knight Abowitz & Harnish

- University of Virginia Center for Politics. (2003). *Youth Leadership Initiative*. Author: Charlottesville, VA. Retrieved May 16, 2003, from <http://www9.youthleadership.net/index.jsp>
- Veterans of Foreign Wars. (2003). *Citizenship education program for school and youth groups: Curriculum guide*. Retrieved May 18, 2003, from <http://www.vfw.org/pdf/citizenshipcurriculumguide.pdf>
- Viroli, M. (2000). Republican patriotism. In C. McKinnon & I. Hampsher-Monk (Eds.), *The demands of citizenship* (pp. 267–275). New York: Continuum.
- Walby, S. (1994). Is citizenship gendered? *Sociology*, 28(2), 379–395.
- Warner, M. (2002). *Publics and counterpublics*. New York: Zone Books.
- Wells, A., Slayton, J., & Scott, J. (2002). Defining democracy in the Neoliberal Age: Charter school reform and educational consumption. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2), 337–361.
- Werbner, P., & Yuval-Davis, N. (1999). Women and the new discourses of citizenship. In N. Yuval-Davis & P. Werbner (Eds.), *Women, citizenship and difference* (pp. 1–38). New York: Zed Books.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2003, April). *Teaching justice: Indoctrination, neutrality, and the need for alternatives*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Wilson, W. J. (1994). Citizenship and the inner-city ghetto poor. In B. V. Steenbergen (Ed.), *The condition of citizenship* (pp. 49–65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wood, G. H. (1992). *Schools that work: America's most innovative public education programs*. New York: Penguin.
- Young, I. M. (1987). Impartiality and the civic public: Some implications of feminist critiques of moral and political theory. In S. Benhabib & D. Cornell (Eds.), *Feminism as critique: On the politics of gender* (pp. 57–76). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zaff, J. (2003). Engaging our youth: Promoting positive citizenship. *The Responsive Community*, 13(3), 80–84.

Authors

KATHLEEN KNIGHT ABOWITZ is an Associate Professor of social foundations and philosophy of education at Miami University, Department of Educational Leadership, 304 McGuffey Hall, Oxford, OH 45056; e-mail knightk2@muohio.edu. Her scholarly work focuses on philosophical meanings of community, the public, and citizenship as those ideals intersect with educational policies and practice.

JASON HARNISH is a recent graduate of Earlham College's Masters in the Arts of Teaching Program and a graduate of Miami University's School of Interdisciplinary Studies. In fall 2006 he began his career as a teacher at Senn High School, 5900 North Glenwood Avenue, Chicago, IL 60660; e-mail cynox@hotmail.com.