CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Studying Citizenship Education in Troubled Times

Judith L. Pace and Janet S. Bixby

The education of democratic citizens has always been of paramount concern in the United States. But since the early 1990s, the literature on democratic citizenship education has virtually exploded (Johanek & Puckett, 2005). One could reasonably inquire, "Why publish yet another book on this topic?"

The preparation of informed and concerned citizens is especially urgent due to the troubling political, educational, and sociological problems that confront us every time we read the news. (In this book, the word "citizens" is inclusive of U. S. residents; we do not mean to exclude those who do not have legal status as citizens.) In this post 9/11 era, the United States is still at war in Iraq and Afghanistan and embroiled in domestic conflict over topics such as immigration and religion. Heated debates continue about what constitutes good citizenship and what democracy means. Critical questions proliferate about free speech, privacy, and other civil liberties; trust in the government; the role of the United States in foreign affairs; environmental protection; and criminalization of youth. These questions generate yet another: How are today's young citizens, upon whom the future of our democracy depends, being educated to understand these issues, make informed decisions, and contribute to building a more just society?

In addition to politics, the current educational scene begs the question of how we are educating citizens for democracy. The federal government is

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

attempting to exercise unprecedented control over schools through systems of accountability, specifically No Child Left Behind. This new increase in federal control over schools both reflects and generates huge controversy over public schooling. At the same time, education for democratic citizenship is absent from these systems of accountability that focus on reading and math (Johanek & Puckett, 2005).

Another critical factor is the prominent view that young people are inadequately prepared for democratic citizenship. Findings about youth civic knowledge are mixed. Niemi and Junn (1998) examined the 1988 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data and concluded that in the United States, high school seniors possess important civic knowledge. Specifically:

> As students leave high school, they are well informed about citizens' rights in general . . . They are well-informed about the division of powers among the various levels of government and about state and local governments. They are also able to make rudimentary comparisons of the government of the United States and that of other countries. In all of these instances, although students are somewhat hazy on details, they nonetheless perform relatively well on these aspects of the test. (p. 50)

However, according to the Civic Mission of Schools Report, 75 percent of students scored at "basic" or "below basic" levels on the 1998 NAEP civic assessment (Gibson & Levine, 2003). In the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) study of civic education, U.S. ninth graders performed well on assessments of civic knowledge compared to youth in other countries (Baldi, Petri, Skidmore, & Greenberg, 2001). But Gibson and Levine (2003), drawing on data from this same study, conclude that "the range between the best- and the worst-prepared students . . . is exceptionally large in the United States, and this gap may foreshadow continued or worsening political inequality in decades to come" (p. 19). Hahn (2002) argues:

> The results from Phase 2 of the IEA study and from the 1998 NAEP Civics point to the need to learn more about the quality of civic education for particular subgroups of students. In both those assessments, achievement was related to socioeconomic factors, as measured by eligibility for free and reduced lunch program, parental education level,

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

> and number of books in the home. . . . In both there were significant differences by race and ethnicity. . . . In a country that prides itself on valuing equality and justice for all, it is especially important that researchers, policy makers, and educators direct their attention to these glaring inequalities in the outcomes of civic education. (pp. 88–89)

In addition to concerns about civic knowledge, multiple indicators, in recent years, have shown disturbingly low levels of political and civic interest and engagement among youth as compared to both contemporary adults and youth in previous generations (Galston, 2001; Putnam, 2000). Another cause for concern is that while demographic diversity in the U.S. continues to increase, the rights and entitlements of citizenship continue to be denied to various groups. Today the place of millions of U.S. residents is threatened by their illegal status. Ongoing inequalities and discrimination in and outside of schools create significant impediments to the development of civic identity and engagement among low-income and minority youth (Hart & Atkins, 2002).

Within these four troubling conditions—the war on terror; the federal press for school accountability; concerns about civic knowledge, interest, and engagement among youth; and disenfranchisement of marginalized groups—the need to focus on education for democratic citizenship is urgent.

The study of the education of youth for democratic citizenship is multifaceted. Numerous books and articles discuss the connection in the United States between schooling and democracy writ large (see Fuhrman & Lazerson, 2005). The IEA research provides case studies and comparative findings on citizenship education in over twenty countries (see Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schultz, 2001). Other scholarship proscribes particular approaches to citizenship education (for example see Parker, 2003). Still others report empirical findings on citizenship education outcomes, such as students' civic knowledge and attitudes based on standardized tests and surveys (Niemi & Junn, 1998).

Despite the plethora of writing on the topic, we know little about enactments of citizenship education in the United States. There are studies of classes that teach for citizenship (Baldi et al., 2001; Dilworth, 1994; Hahn, 2002; Hess, 2002; Kahne, Rodriguez, & Smith, 2000), special curricula (Patrick, Vontz, & Nixon, 2002), and programs such as community service (Walker, 2002). Parker's (2002) collection of essays and studies presents specific ideas and cases that speak to a vision of education for

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

liberal democracy. But to better understand how young people are being prepared to play their role as citizen, we need far greater knowledge about what constitutes specific programs, how youth participants and adult educators make meaning of their experiences with citizenship education, and how these experiences are shaped by local and larger contexts, such as ever-increasing demographic diversity along with continued socioeconomic and racial inequality in schools and society. We need to know much more about the relationship between theory about how citizenship education should proceed and what actually happens in various educational settings.

This book is a collection of qualitative studies on formal programs that provide citizenship education for contemporary youth, either school or community-based, and located within the United States. These programs include social studies classes and curricula, school governance, and community-based education efforts. Because schools operate under many constraints that inhibit certain kinds of educational experiences, it is vital to explore programs in alternative settings that have taken up the aims of citizenship education. In fact, by juxtaposing studies of efforts in mainstream high schools, alternative high schools, and community-based organizations, much can be learned about the contextual factors that shape these efforts and the challenges and possibilities that exist across a range of educational sites.

As a collection, the studies in this book investigate the diversity of purposes of citizenship education, meanings of citizenship held by participants, and approaches to teaching and learning. The studies present the voices of educators and youth involved in these civic education efforts and analyze key elements of their practices. The authors utilize a wide variety of theoretical lenses and qualitative methodologies, including ethnography, focus group interviews, and content analysis of textbooks. All of the chapters offer findings that bear valuable and specific implications for strengthening citizenship education. The authors' analyses deepen the often tenuous connections between research and practice.

Research Questions

The studies in this volume address three research questions:

1. What are the purposes of education for democratic citizenship enacted in a particular setting?

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

2. What understandings of citizenship are held/exhibited by the curriculum, the educators, and/or the youth in a particular program?
3. What is the nature of teaching and learning evident in these programs and how do these educational enactments limit and enable various kinds of education for democratic citizenship?

The purposes of citizenship education have changed over time according to the historical context and political/social needs of the nation (Reuben, 2005). The fundamental aim is to prepare young people with knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be the good citizens upon whom democracy depends. But debates over the aims of citizenship education in public schools have intensified along with battles over the social studies curriculum in part due to tension between the ideals of pluralism and unity. Questions of purpose also center on what kind of democracy is desirable, and how much/what kind of knowledge and engagement is required of citizens (Galston, 2001). Ross (2001) argues that while there is widespread agreement that "citizenship education" is "the proper aim of social studies" in the public schools, "there is no consensus on what "citizenship" means nor on the implications of "citizenship" for curriculum and instruction" (p. 23). This is equally true outside of public schools.

Conservative thinkers promote coherent coverage of content and transmission of particular values such as unity, patriotism, and consent to the status quo. This approach aims at providing students with knowledge about the U.S. system of government and "developing understandings of and pride in the contributions that American democracy has made to U.S. citizens and to the world" (Simon, 2005, p. 108). The central aim here is to prepare citizens who vote and support the nation.

Progressive education scholars who dominate the recent literature on citizenship education reform advocate "deliberative pedagogies" (Simon, 2005, p. 107), and more specifically an "issues centered curriculum" (Evans and Saxe, 1996; Ochoa-Becker, 2007) in which students research, analyze, and discuss controversial public issues, and engage in simulations, debates, and decision-making. Democratic deliberation is meant to develop critical thinking and "help students gain the skills they need to address the complex problems facing society" (Simon, 2005, p. 107). The ultimate purpose is to prepare citizens who will actively and thoughtfully participate in the social and political arena. (See chapter 2 for more discussion of conservative vs. progressive orientations.)

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

Parker (1996) explicitly critiques both the conservative and progressive models. Although he favors the progressive aim of developing intellectually able citizens who participate more directly rather than the conservative aim of transmitting knowledge and values to future voters, he points out that both camps disregard matters of social and cultural diversity and inequality. He argues that rather than teaching students that democracy is a finished product, citizenship education should prepare young people to become involved in democracy as an ongoing work in progress (Parker, 2003). To be successful, citizenship education must promote both democratic enlightenment and political engagement. Political engagement means participation in the form of voting, deliberating public problems, campaigning, civil disobedience, and so on. Democratic enlightenment refers to understanding the ideals of democratic living and the commitment to freedom and justice (pp. 33–34). Similarly, according to Banks (1997), students should develop the knowledge, attitudes, and skills to transform society, to close the gap between the ideals and realities of democracy in the United States.

Two quotes from a recent issue of *Phi Delta Kappan* on patriotism and civic education articulate purposes pertinent to our contemporary situation:

> Even as we strive for balance and fairness, we should provide our students with the analytical skills to critique and evaluate information they are exposed to so that they can develop a logical and historically grounded framework for comprehending present conflicts and foreign engagements (Noguera & Cohen, 2006, p. 576).

> Rather than "teaching" students to love their country, teachers need to help students build an explicit connection between their "love of country" and democratic ideals—ideals that include the role of informed analysis and, at times, critique; the importance of action; and the danger of blind loyalty to the state (Kahne & Middaugh, 2006, p. 606).

Given the vast amount of writing on what should be the aims of citizenship education, what purposes are actually enacted in particular settings? How do these purposes vary, depending on contextual factors, such as location within mainstream classrooms, alternative schools, or the community? And how are these purposes influenced by the educators and the youth who bring these educational efforts to life?

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

Secondly, what meanings of citizenship are manifested by the curriculum, the educators, and the youth in these programs? Findings from the IEA Civic Education Study conducted with adolescents in twenty-eight countries provide general information about the views of youth: "The large majority of young people surveyed in 1999 believed that citizens should obey the law and should vote. Between 80% and 90% in the United States . . . thought these activities important or very important. In contrast, only 58% of these students believed it important or very important for the citizen to participate in political discussions, and the figure was 48% for affiliating with a political party" (Torney-Purta, 2002, p. 208). Baldi et al. (2001) found that in the United States "more than 80% of students thought it important or very important for adult citizens to participate in activities helping the community, promoting human rights, and protecting the environment" (Torney-Purta, 2002, p. 208).

Research points to the separation young people make between involvement in community service and politics: "Many students actively involved in community service say that they have chosen service as an antidote to politics" (Battistoni, 2000), which they hold in disdain (Walker, 2002). Chiodo and Martin (2005) also find that students do not relate to politics, but rather to the social side of citizenship, such as community service and being respectful, helpful, and obedient. These findings indicate the need for more explicit and broader conceptions of citizenship in curricula.

How do meanings of citizenship and democracy vary for youth from different racial, ethnic, and socio-economic backgrounds? Sherrod, Flanagan, and Youniss (2002) ask how the definition of citizenship changes for people who are not offered full rights as U.S. citizens, for example immigrants and sexual minorities. The activism of these groups is vital to the expansion of democracy: "In this regard, we are reminded that it was the collective resistance of Black citizens and their civil disobedience of laws on the books that denied them full inclusion as citizens that eventually resulted in the passage of a Civil Rights Act in this country" (Sherrod, Flanagan, & Youniss, 2002, p. 265).

Sanchez-Jankowski (2002) and Junn (2004) find that young people from marginalized minority groups develop civic understandings and skills that may not manifest themselves in standardized measures but are adaptive to the real life situations of their communities. Do educational efforts acknowledge and adapt to these differences, or further marginalize youth from low income and underrepresented backgrounds?

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

Westheimer and Kahne (2004) investigate different visions of citizenship exhibited by ten school programs: the *personally responsible citizen,* the *participatory citizen,* or the *justice-oriented citizen.* How do these models pertain to curricula, educators, and youth in different kinds of settings? Content analysis of the National Standards for Civics and Government (Gonzales, Riedel, Avery, & Sullivan, 2001) shows a heavy focus on the rights and freedoms of citizens versus responsibilities to the public good and civic virtue. Also, the role of political engagement is de-emphasized, as are the contributions of women and minorities to society. Programs that enjoy freedom from the structural and curricular constraints imposed on classrooms may be much more inclusive in the views of citizenship they embrace.

Finally, what is the nature of teaching and learning evident in these programs, and how do these educational enactments both enable and limit various kinds of education for democratic citizenship? Numerous scholars, including Gutmann (1999), Newmann (1989), and Parker (1996), agree that "the most important component of effective democratic citizenship preparation involves teaching young people how to deliberate about the nature of the public good" (Hess, 2002, p. 12). Indeed, research indicates that social studies classes with discussion of controversial issues in an open climate foster citizenship learning and involvement (Hahn, 1998; Hess & Posselt, 2002; Patrick & Hoge, 1991). And twelfth grade civics classes that include a variety of topics and frequent discussion of current events increase political knowledge according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Civics Assessment (Niemi & Junn, 1998). However, studies show that discussion of controversial public issues and other "deliberative pedagogies" (Simon, 2001) are rarely employed (Hahn, Dilworth, Hughes, & Sen, 2001; Kahne et al., 2000). Instead, Ross (2001), taking an historical look at research on the social studies curriculum in schools, states that within social studies classes "citizenship transmission" or "conservative cultural continuity" is the dominant approach practiced in the schools" (p. 24). This is true even though in one national survey of social studies teachers "respondents identified more strongly with social studies as "reflective inquiry" and "informed social criticism" than with approaches to social studies as "citizenship transmission'" (Vinson, 1998 as quoted in Ross, 2001, p. 24).

One highly publicized nontraditional approach to education for democratic citizenship within the schools is service-learning, although there are multiple interpretations of exactly what service-learning means. According to the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

(CIRCLE), service learning "consists of sustained community service projects that are closely connected to formal instruction and curriculum . . . [and] often involves close partnerships between schools or colleges and communities" (http://www.civicyouth.org/research/areas/serv_learn.htm). A recent study of high school students who participated in service-learning found that in regards to increasing students' civic knowledge, behaviors, and dispositions, "service-learning is effective when it is implemented well, but it is no more effective than conventional social studies classes when the conditions are not optimal" (Billig, Root, & Jesse, 2005, p. 1).

What approaches are employed in classrooms, given the well documented constraints of schooling? How do educators break out of the traditional mold of textbook and lecture centered classes that typify high school social studies? How does civic development differ in school governance projects or community based youth organizations that provide opportunities for authentic and experiential education? How do authority relationships between educators and youth, which greatly bear on the quality of teaching and learning (Pace & Hemmings, 2007), shape citizenship education experiences? And, considering the gap between recommendations for practice and actual practices in schools (Gibson & Levine, 2003), how do specific approaches in these diverse locations relate to scholarship on citizenship education?

This volume provides answers to these key questions. In doing so, it both builds upon and challenges prior scholarship in the field. We aim to encourage greater support for citizenship education efforts, both within schools and in the community, that foster enlightenment and engagement, to use Parker's terms. The book also generates critical questions, for example how citizenship education is being affected by the accountability movement and other reforms, and how educators can be better prepared to employ recommendations for practice. Future research and policy must attend to these fundamental concerns.

Contents of the Book

Section 1: Inside Classrooms

Chapter 2, "Teaching for Citizenship in 12th Grade Government Classes," addresses a serious gap in research on classroom practices in citizenship education. Judith L. Pace describes different versions of Government

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

classes taught by four teachers in two racially/ethnically diverse metropolitan high schools during fall 2004 and the Presidential election. Using data from classroom observations and interviews with teachers and students, she analyzes the teachers' approaches and students' responses to the enacted curricula. The Government classes were all knowledge-based, and according to recommendations from the Civic Mission for Schools (Gibson & Levine, 2003) and others (see Hahn, 1998; Parker, 2003), classes did not adequately prepare most students to be politically engaged citizens. But the classes varied significantly in levels of student participation, critical thinking, attention to social justice and contemporary political issues, and promotion of active citizenship. Variation was influenced by a set of inter-related factors—track level, views of students, and school demographics and culture. At both schools, students in the Advanced Placement classes had greater opportunities for learning than did students in college preparatory classes. Also, the smaller high school with a higher percentage of White and Asian American students was more progressive; teachers encouraged more student participation in class, and contemporary events, including the war on terror and fights over civil liberties, were more openly discussed. The larger high school, with a higher percentage of African American and Latino students, was a more controlled environment and classes were teacher-centered. Contemporary political and social issues were not as central to the curriculum. However, students at this school organized political activity outside of class, and fought the administration for the right to hold an anti-war rally at school. Pace's chapter both reveals and contradicts the view that adolescents are politically apathetic and paves the way for more, sorely needed, research on how Government classes do and do not teach for political engagement and are shaped by institutional factors.

Chapter 3, "Connecting Diversity, Justice, and Democratic Citizenship: Lessons from an Alternative U.S. History Class," showcases one teacher's efforts to enact multicultural democratic education (Marri, 2005) with marginalized, academically struggling youth. Anand Marri outlines the classroom practices of Mr. Sinclair, a well-educated and committed social studies teacher at a public alternative high school, by focusing on a month-long unit on the Civil Rights Movement. Mr. Sinclair enacts ideas and approaches advocated by citizenship education experts, such as Walter Parker (2003). For example, he engages students in applying Kohlberg's theory of moral development to civil rights activists' law breaking. He gets his class to

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

grapple with political action that is illegal yet morally justified. The teacher also involves students in inquiry-based lessons that draw connections between segregation in the South and contemporary housing and school segregation patterns in their own city. And he conducts a seminar on Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s *Letter from Birmingham Jail.* Marri's analysis points to elements of teaching that aims to empower marginalized students and educate them for multicultural democratic citizenship. These elements are inclusive pedagogy, a diverse learning community, critical thinking, discussion, and transformational knowledge. The author identifies a missing element from Mr. Sinclair's curriculum—mainstream academic knowledge and skills—which raises the question of how to provide struggling students with the range of educational experiences needed to become empowered citizens.

In chapter 4, "Urban Youth and the Construction of Racialized and Classed Political Identities," Kysa Nygreen uses participatory action research to explore the emerging political identities of three urban youth (age 16–19) as they worked together to design and teach a social justice class. The class was located at an urban continuation high school serving a predominantly African American and low-income student body, where the research participants were/had been students. Working from a sociocultural perspective, Nygreen conceptualizes political identity as a way of acting and interacting as a certain "kind" of political subject. Political identity is fluid, dynamic, and shaped by local and larger factors, including shared counter-narratives about the government and its relationship to marginalized communities (i.e., poor people, people of color). Political identity grew out of (to differing degrees) the youth's lived experiences of social marginalization, and the "disjuncture" (Rubin, 2007) they experienced or witnessed between the ideals and realities of U.S. democracy. While the youth developed and taught their weekly class, as social justice educators they enacted, confirmed, and strengthened their political identities. Nygreen's study shows the processes through which this occurred, and makes a unique and important contribution to sociocultural theories of identity formation and youth political agency. Her work implies that efforts to educate for democratic citizenship begin by seeking to understand youths' existing and emerging political perspectives, and recognizing the critical political insights and potential agency youth possess even if they score poorly on civics tests or surveys.

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

Section 2: Inside Schools at Large

Chapter 5, "Service-Learning as a Promising Approach to High School Civic Engagement," presents findings from a national study of service-learning and high school students' civic engagement. Susan Root and Shelly Billig discuss service-learning as a teaching strategy wherein students learn important curricular objectives by providing service that meets authentic community needs, and they review the possibilities and challenges of service-learning. Their chapter first outlines a national study that involves quantitative and qualitative measures, and then focuses on qualitative data from three sites. It argues that service-learning can be used to revitalize citizenship education within high schools when particular design components are in place, even at a time when the curriculum is undergoing increased constriction under accountability pressures. Successful programs in this study featured components that required students to learn about political institutions and processes and practice skills for political participation. These components included:

1. **Preparation** for service that included research, advocacy, and student voice;
2. **Action/Implementation** of service activities that were of sufficient duration and offered cognitive challenges, opportunities to empathize with the community, and skillful teacher facilitation of student work; and
3. **Reflection** activities that were continuous and in-depth;
4. **Public demonstration** of results in which students engaged in a public demonstration of learning with previously unfamiliar adults.

Importantly, the teachers at these sites had extensive experience implementing service-learning and were comfortable in allowing students voice and choice in the activities they conducted.

Chapter 6, "Democracy's Practice Grounds: The Role of School Governance in Citizenship Education," shows how schools can engage students in democratic citizenship by providing exercises in community governance and public problem solving. Richard Battistoni's chapter showcases Project 540, a national initiative involving 270 American high schools. It uses interviews with students, teachers, and administrators to analyze the opportunities and challenges involved in using student governance as a tool in citizenship education. This "democratic school practice" approach to

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

civic education—as opposed to the "formal civics instruction" approach—allowed students to participate in a process of dialogue, decision making, and action. Students, teachers, and administrators spoke about key opportunities: civic communication, participation in public policy decisions, and making change in their schools and communities. In Project 540 learning was experiential, project and performance based, and authentic; it was situated in actual practices of governance and involved deliberative decision making in collaborative, heterogeneous groups. Students spoke about how they applied the civic skills they gained in Project 540 to other aspects of their life: leadership in student government, cocurricular activities, even work and family life. Project 540 also confronted challenges. Often it conflicted with the institutional culture of high schools, where adult educators were used to being in control and making most if not all of the decisions for the school. Another challenge was competing demands, such as pressures for school accountability. Findings suggest that giving students opportunities for practicing democracy, through involvement in real school governance, can enhance democratic citizenship education, especially in the area of students' civic skills and values/attitudes, as well as improve school climate and foster the educational goals of the institution.

Chapter 7, "Civic Development in Context: The Influence of Local Contexts on High School Students' Beliefs about Civic Engagement," examines the salience of social context in youth civic development and civic education. Using focus group interviews with high school seniors, Ellen Middaugh and Joseph Kahne reveal the ways students make sense of their own roles as citizens. Data collection was conducted in May and June of 2005 with focus groups of 4–6 students each from five schools including urban, suburban, and rural schools across the state of California. The schools all are engaged in a process of working to create new opportunities for civic education aligned with the six recommendations of the Civic Mission of Schools Report (Gibson & Levine, 2003). The findings point to similarities as well as important differences within and among groups of students. All the students expressed an appreciation for democracy, but varied in the extent to which they believed the current system of government truly is democratic. More affluent students believed this more strongly than did low income students. Students in very different contexts shared a relative disinterest in politics and political action. The reasons behind this differed across groups. In affluent and majority white communities, students reported few local problems. In demographically diverse

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

and in lower-income, urban, majority Latino communities, students indicated they did not view politics as a viable means for addressing relevant problems. For students across groups, political engagement was seen as a matter of personal inclination rather than the responsibility of citizens. Students did speak positively about service-learning experiences, but often perceived them as separate from politics. Students also said they liked classroom debates and wanted to have more discussion of contemporary social issues. The chapter points to particular implications for civic education. First, exploring only the virtues of democratic institutions is problematic. Forging stronger connections between government curriculum and civic and political engagement is needed. And attending to contextual differences may help build commitments to civic engagement. The authors conclude that there is yet much we have to learn about the influence local contexts have on youth civic development.

Chapter 8, "Examining the Treatment of 9/11 and Terrorism in High School Textbooks," analyzes textbook coverage of 9/11. Diana Hess, Jeremy Stoddard, and Shannon Murto present findings based on a study of top-selling U.S. history, world history, and government textbooks that were published between 2003 and 2005 and included the events of 9/11 and the war on terrorism. The study had two primary aims. The first was to examine critically what curricula are communicating about 9/11, its aftermath, and terrorism more generally. The second aim was to investigate which topics or questions related to 9/11, its aftermath, and terrorism are presented to students as genuinely controversial and which either explicitly or implicitly present a "correct" answer that the curriculum writers expect students to believe. Their analysis focuses on the depth of information on the events, and what students were asked to do with that information. The textbooks used a neutral, compact style and events were presented as matter of fact or used to promote ideas of heroism, patriotism, and unquestioned citizenship. They did not endorse active deliberation about the roots of terrorism, the causes of 9/11, or how the United States should have responded. These texts overall identify 9/11 as an iconic and tragic event with no equal among terrorist attacks, provide examples of terrorism that emphasize attacks on the U.S. over attacks on other countries or peoples, and present inconsistent definitions of terrorism and examples as universally accepted truths.

Implications from this analysis include the importance of utilizing a range of curricular materials in social studies courses. Specifically, schools

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

districts and funders should support materials developed by democratic education organizations with more ideological freedom than textbook publishers who operate under a system of perceived and real market constraints.

Section 3: In the Community

Chapter 9, "Engaging Urban Youth in Civic Practice: Community-Based Youth Organizations for Democratic Education," explores community-based youth organizations (CBYOs) as a meaningful alternative to urban public schools in providing a space where youth can learn democratic citizenship skills. Authors Jennifer O'Donoghue and Ben Kirshner examine the features of CBYOs that impact youth's development as citizens. They conducted qualitative studies consisting of observations and interviews in five youth organizations located in low-income urban areas between 2001 and 2003. While varying in specific mission and goals, all programs sought to engage young people in civic action. In total, these five organizations worked with over 150 youth (with program size varying from 7 to 80). O'Donoghue and Kirshner identify five shared civic education practices across the organizations: working with others, decision-making, interpreting public problems, taking action, and promoting youth public efficacy. They illustrate these practices through vignettes and present participants' perspectives on their learning experiences.

The authors find that the youth involved in these programs developed important competencies for democratic participation, including collaboration, decision-making, and knowledge about local issues and how to make an impact on them. They also document particular challenges, such as the need for adult educators who are skilled in particular ways in working with young people. Also, by focusing on local issues, youth were not engaged in national or international issues, nor did they learn traditional civic content knowledge. The chapter shows that despite the tensions, CBYOs are vital, emancipated spaces for urban youth to learn about and practice active democratic citizenship to improve their communities.

In chapter 10, "To Think, Live and Breathe Politics: Experiencing Democratic Citizenship in Chicago," Janet S. Bixby examines the experiences of alumni from citizenship education programs run by a private foundation called the Mikva Challenge for urban high school students in Chicago. The Mikva programs have impacted a large number of students, involving over forty schools and 1500 students. The programs provide

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

multifaceted opportunities for youth to engage in authentic forms of civic activism and to experience democracy as a way of life (Dewey, 1966), for example by acting as election judges, hosting a debate for gubernatorial candidates, volunteering for campaigns, and interning with elected officials. The youth in the Mikva programs are predominantly African American, Latino, and/or immigrants, from middle- to low-income backgrounds. Bixby collected data for eighteen months through individual interviews and focus groups with alumni of the programs; interviews with teachers and staff; observations of student, alumni, and teacher events; and materials produced by the foundation. Bixby's analysis utilizes Lave and Wenger's (1991) framework for understanding learning as apprenticeship to examine how alumni of the Mikva programs interpreted the meaning of their participation in these programs and its significance in their lives. All of the twenty alumni she studied reported that their work in the Mikva programs had a dramatically positive, transformative impact on their sense of themselves as civic actors. Their experiences stood in stark contrast to reports that urban youth have little opportunity to participate constructively in the public sphere (McLaughlin, 2000). Their political interest and activity also contrasts with findings related to low levels of civic knowledge and engagement associated with poor and minority youth.

The volume ends with an epilogue by Judith L. Pace titled "Citizenship Education in Diverse Settings: Findings, Tensions, and Future Research." It identifies the major findings of these studies in relation to the three research questions that guide the book. Pace points to the influence of institutional contexts and the tensions that arise in teaching for democracy, as well as the need for further qualitative research.

Note

We are grateful to Lyndsey Schlax and Matt Magansay, former students in the Teacher Education Department at the University of San Francisco, for their helpful research assistance.

References

Baldi, S., Perie, M., Skidmore, D., & Greenberg, E. (2001). *What democracy means to ninth-graders: U.S. results from the international IEA civic education study.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics.

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

Banks, J. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Battistoni, R. (2000). Service learning and civic education. In S. Mann & J. Patrick (Eds.) *Education for civic engagement in democracy.* Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies.
Billig, S., Root, S., & Jesse, D. (2005). The impact of participation in service learning on high school students' civic learning. *CIRCLE.* Available at www.civicyouth.org
Chiodo, J., & Martin, L. (2005). What do students have to say about citizenship? An analysis of the concept of citizenship among secondary education students. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 29*(1), 23–31.
Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education.* New York: Free Press.
Dilworth, P. (2004). Multicultural citizenship education: Case studies from social studies classrooms. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 32*(2), 153–186.
Evans, R. & Saxe, D. (1996). *Handbook on teaching social issues.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
Fuhrman, S., & Lazerson, M. (Eds.) (2005). *The public schools.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Galston, W. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science (4),* 217–234.
Gibson, C., & Levine, P. (2003). *The civic mission of schools.* New York and Washington, DC: The Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning.
Gonzales, M., Riedel, E., Avery, P., & Sullivan, J. (2001). Rights and obligations in civic education: A content analysis of the national standards for civics and government. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 29*(1), 109–128.
Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic education, 2nd ed.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Hahn, C. (1998). *Becoming political: Comparative perspectives on citizenship education.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Hahn, C., Dilworth, P., Hughes, J., & Sen, T. (2001). Democratic understanding: Cross-national perspectives. *Theory into Practice, 40*(1), 14–22.
Hahn, C. (2002). Education for democratic citizenship: One nation's story. In W. Parker (Ed.), *Education for democracy: Contexts, curricula, assessments* (pp. 63–92). Greenwich, CT.: Information Age Publishing.
Hart, D., & Atkins, R. (2002). Civic competence in urban youth. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(4), 227–236.
Hess, D. (2002). Discussing controversial public issues in secondary social studies classrooms: Learning from skilled teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 30* (1), 10–41.
Hess, D., & Posselt, J. (2002). How high school students experience and learn from the discussion of controversial public issues. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 17*(4), 283–314.
Johanek, M., & Puckett, J. (2005). The state of civic education: Preparing citizens in an era of accountability. In S. Furhman & M. Lazerson (Eds.), *The public schools* (pp. 130–159). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Junn, J. (2004). Diversity, immigration, and the politics of civic education. *P.S.: Political Science and Politics, 37,* 253–255.

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

Kahne, J., & Middaugh, E. (2006). Is patriotism good for democracy? A study of seniors patriotic commitments. *Phi Delta Kappan 87*(8), 600–607.

Kahne, J., Rodriguez, M., & Smith, B. (2000). Developing citizens for democracy? Assessing opportunities to learn in Chicago's social studies classrooms. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 28*(3), 311–338.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Marri, A. (2005). Building a framework for classroom-based multicultural democratic education: Learning from three skilled teachers. *Teachers College Record, 107* (5), 1036–1059.

McLaughlin, M. (2000). *Community counts: How youth organizations matter for youth development.* Washington, DC: Public Education Network.

Newmann, F. (1989). Reflective civic participation. *Social Education, 53*(October), 357–360.

Niemi, R., & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education: What makes students learn.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Noguera, P., & Cohen, R. (2006). Patriotism and accountability: The role of educators in the war on terrorism. *Phi Delta Kappan 87*(8), 573–578.

Ochoa-Becker, A. (2007). *Democratic education for social studies: An issues-centered decision making curriculum.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Pace, J., & Hemmings, A. (2007). Understanding classroom authority: A review of theory, ideology, and research. *Review of Educational Research, 77* (1), 4–27.

Parker, W. (1996). "Advanced" ideas about democracy: Toward a pluralistic conception of citizen education. *Teachers College Record, 98*(1), 104–125.

Parker, W. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Patrick, J., Vontz, T. & Nixon, W. (2002). Issue-centered education for democracy through project citizen. In W. Parker (Ed.), *Education for democracy; Contexts, curricula, assessments* (pp. 93–112). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Patrick, J., & Hoge, J. (2001). Teaching government, civics, and law. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning.* New York: Macmillan.

Parker, W. (Ed.) (2002). *Education for democracy: Contexts, curricula, assessments.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Reuben, J. (2005). Patriotic purposes: Public schools and the education of citizens. In S. Fuhrman & M. Lazerson (Eds.) (2005). *The public schools* (pp. 1–24). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ross, E. (2001). The struggle for the social studies curriculum. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 19–41). Albany: State University of New York.

Rubin, B. (2007). There's still not justice: Youth civic identity development amid distinct school and community contexts. *Teachers College Record, 109*(2), 449–481.

Sanchez-Jankowski, M. (2002). Minority Youth and Civic Engagement: The impact of group relations. *Applied Development Science, 6*(4), 237–245.

Sherrod, L., Flanagan, C., & Youniss, J. (Eds.). (2002). Dimensions of citizenship and opportunities for youth development: The what, why, when, where, and who of citizenship development. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(4), 264–274.

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany

Simon, K. (2001). *Moral questions in the classroom: How to get kids to think deeply about real life and their school work.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Simon, K. (2005). Classroom deliberations. In S. Fuhrman & M. Lazerson (Eds.). *The public schools* (pp. 107–129). New York: Oxford University Press.

Torney-Purta, J. (2002). What adolescents know about citizenship and democracy. *Educational Leadership, 59*(4), 42–22.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, J., Oswald, R., & Schultz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen.* Amsterdam: IEA <http://www.wam.umd.edu/~iea/>

Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J., & Amadeo, J. (1999). *Civic education across countries: Tweny-four national case studies from the IEA Civic Education Project.* Amsterdam: IEA <htp: //www.wam.umd.edu/~iea/>

Vinson, K. (1998). The traditions revisited: Instructional approach and high school social studies teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 26,* 50–82.

Walker, T. (2002). Service as a pathway to political participation. *Applied Developmental Science, 16*(4), 183–188.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237–269.

© 2008 State University of New York Press, Albany