

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Middle and Secondary Education Faculty
Publications

Department of Middle and Secondary Education

2001

The meaning of citizenship in the 21st Century

Chara H. Bohan
Georgia State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse_facpub



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), and the [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bohan, Chara H., "The meaning of citizenship in the 21st Century" (2001). *Middle and Secondary Education Faculty Publications*. 21.
https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse_facpub/21

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Middle and Secondary Education at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Middle and Secondary Education Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

Response: Concerns about the Meaning of Citizenship for the
21st Century

Chara Haeussler Bohan
The University of Texas at Austin

The authors in this special issue of *Theory and Research in Social Education* present questions about the meaning of democratic citizenship for the 21st century. Given the ever-changing nature of modern life, these researchers suggest that current definitions of citizenship need to be reexamined and indeed broadened. Despite their common recommendations, the authors employ different research paradigms, advance divergent claims about the nature of citizenship, and propose varied possibilities for social studies education in the future. A well informed response, however, demands investigation of certain differences and similarities, particularly the assertion that educators need to incorporate an expanded notion of citizenship in the social studies curriculum for the new century.

Perspectives on Citizenship

Each of the articles contains notable and thoughtfully researched perspectives on citizenship and democratic education. The three articles by Houser and Kuzmic, Cary, and Shiner constitute theoretical pieces in which the

authors explore and manipulate a variety of interpretations of the concept of citizenship. The article by Bishop and Hamot examines theoretical constructs in actual practice. Bishop and Hamot research the adaptability of democracy as a cross-cultural concept by comparing it, with respect to education and teaching, in the United States and the newly established Czech Republic. Following the collapse of communism in the late 1980s, the recently accelerated democratization of Eastern and Central Europe provided the setting to compare citizenship education efforts with approaches already developed and practiced in the U.S. Indeed, this work by Bishop and Hamot provides a practical portrayal and an analysis of ideas similar to those explored in the other three articles.

In "Ethical Citizenship in a Postmodern World: Toward a More Connected Approach to Social Education For the Twenty-First Century" Houser and Kuzmic investigate ethical dimensions of citizenship. They draw from diverse research traditions, such as pragmatism, social learning theory, critical learning theory, and multicultural education, to develop what they call a caring and "connected approach to citizenship education" (p. 4). They advocate methods of teaching social education that they contend would benefit the communities that schools serve. Houser and Kuzmic's

concern for the responsibility of democratic citizens' relationships to one another echoes Ross's (1998) plea for the pursuit of social justice in social studies education. Ross reminds *TRSE* readers that, "the primary responsibility of democratic citizens is concern with the development of shared interests that lead to sensitivity about repercussions of their actions on others" (1998, p.458).

Shinew, on the other hand, in her article focuses her examination on feminist interpretations of educating for democratic citizenship. She employs a novel methodology in which she encourages readers to "disrupt, transgress and invent possibilities" (citing Fine, 1992, p.xii) as she suggests new and different theoretical understandings of citizenship. The most striking aspect of Shinew's contribution is the manner in which she blurs the boundaries between research and fiction. In doing so, she creates a "visual readers theater" (p.9) where the distinct voices of the participants in her study emerge from an invented story. Shinew deliberately pushes and prods at traditional concepts of educational research.

Drawing upon postmodern and poststructuralist theory, Cary in her article "The Refusals of Citizenship: Normalizing Practices in Social Education Discourses" deconstructs common notions of citizenship. She theorizes

about normalizing practices in social education discourses and suggests the possibility of refusals of citizenship. To her, classic notions of "good citizens" and even "multicultural education" confine, oppress, and damage students as they inevitably lead to the "danger of reinscribing normalizing practices" (p. 25). Despite the overall merit of the article, Cary's extensive use of postmodern jargon tends to obfuscate her central message and provides few alternatives for social studies educators to employ when they make decisions. Specific and substantive proposals that inform practitioners would have proved more insightful.

Common Ideas about Citizenship

Each author expresses a common desire to expand traditional notions of citizenship. With feminist interpretations to consider, Shiner explores numerous definitions of citizenship. Members of her focus group appear dissatisfied with the traditional dictionary definition because of its emphasis on political membership in a nation state and the corresponding importance that this definition has placed upon duties, rights, and privileges. Yet, Shiner's group does not completely accept other definitions either. Clearly, these women believe

that the boundaries between the personal and public sphere are more blurred than classic definitions of citizenship imply. Perhaps, a more inclusive understanding of citizenship would not neglect the traditionally private roles of women as wives, mothers, daughters, and homemakers. Pressing feminist explorations even further, Cary claims that the classic notion of "good citizen/good teacher" implies a superiority of professional knowledge to a "more feminized intuitive knowing" (p. 34). She claims space for women's ways of knowing. Feminist authors Nel Noddings (1992), Jane Roland Martin (1992), and Andra Makler (1999) remind readers that accentuation on the political sphere precludes attention to personal and familial relations. They suggest that the curriculum should be redesigned to be more inclusive of the possibilities and values of women and of other traditionally underrepresented members of society. Of course, many educators would support attempts to establish a more inclusive and equitable society.

As noted by Shiner, definitions that broaden the meaning of citizenship unsettle the common understandings as they call for a new conception of citizenship in which American citizens value diversity and difference (citing Stone, 1996a, p. 51). According to Cary, dominant

conceptions of citizenship silence cultural differences (p. 9). Interestingly, Bishop and Hamot also conclude that commonly held definitions of democracy are problematic in that their meanings vary according to setting, place in time, and individual interpretation (p. 7-9). Their research uncovers the problematic nature of adopting novel and complex understandings of democracy in Czech Republic schools. Yet, they also detect possibilities for improved conceptions of democracy in these schools. Two areas of agreement between Czech curriculum writers and U.S. educators on the concept of democracy is a regard for "democracy as tolerance" and "democracy as decision making" (p. 18-21). These findings, with respect to concepts of democracy, correspond with Shiner's, Cary's, and Houser and Kuzmic's theoretical examinations which place value on diversity and shared responsibility. Nonetheless, Bishop and Hamot also find that Czech teachers typically characterize the concept of democracy primarily as a form of government with only secondary importance placed upon rights and freedoms. To these teachers, explanations of democracy that mention tolerance and duty are almost non-existent.

The possibilities of a broadened understanding of concepts of citizenship and democracy include questions

about agency and methods for teaching social studies education. Cary calls attention to Freire's (1970) work, which discusses issues of power, liberation, and education. In developing an expanded understanding of citizenship important questions need to be deliberated, such as; Who will be included in the dialogue about citizenship? How will an educational program, which includes such dialogue, be developed and implemented? Cary poses numerous questions, but few ideas for action and decision. Houser and Kuzmic, however, detail several alternatives. They note that the ideal of the "good citizen" which implied uncritical obedience has been replaced by that of the "responsible citizen" who recognizes the need for analysis and action (p. 7). They propose that citizenship education should include a discussion of caring and the virtues of shared responsibility, a narrative of conquerors and oppressed, and a focus on community, connectedness, and the common good. Nonetheless, any proposed suggestions would need to include proposals for a move toward genuine dialogue among educators rather than imposed and enforced liberal cultural transmission.

Divergent Themes

Notably absent from several authors' discussions of citizenship and democratic education was an examination of the rich literature of classic political theory upon which such ideas are based. Two of the articles named political theorists, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Alexis de Tocqueville (Bishop & Hamot, p. 9; Houser & Kuzmic, p. 27), and Bishop and Hamot briefly discuss Czech philosopher Tomáš Masaryk (Bishop & Hamot, p. 9-10). However, John Locke, Thomas Paine, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, and John Stuart Mill do not receive mention. Why were their ideas ignored? Does their status as dead "White men" (Shinew, p. 36) mean they only represent the oppressive nature of Western cultural heritage? Developing a truly broadened conception of citizenship, however, is impossible without knowledge of the foundation upon which such ideas rest. In *The Rights of Man*, Thomas Paine (1790), who was ostracized by his contemporaries as a radical freethinker, reminds readers, "There was a time when kings disposed of their crowns by will upon their death-beds, and consigned the people, like beasts of the field, to whatever successor they appointed" (p. 278).

Furthermore, these classical political theorists must be viewed in the context of their times. Their beliefs

about citizenship, democracy, liberty, and man's rights were literally revolutionary *in their times*, and opposed by many leading authorities. Consider Edmund Burke's objections in *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790). Many modern political theorists have questioned the breadth of these 18th and 19th century theorists conception of citizenship and democracy. For example, Richard Matthews discusses the problematic nature of Thomas Jefferson's commitment to the principle that "all men are created equal" because he owned slaves and he viewed blacks as equal but "in reason much inferior" (Jefferson, 1787, *Notes on the State of Virginia, Query XIV*, p. 266; Jefferson to Benjamin Banneker, August 30, 1791, p. 982-983). Yet, even Matthews (1986) claims that Jefferson's, "...unwavering faith in democracy and the ability of humanity to govern itself places him in the radical progressive tradition" (p. 119). Of course, John Stuart Mill in *On Liberty* (1859) explored the tension between a citizen's liberty and the proper sphere of state action and in *The Subjection of Women* (1869) asserted the diversity of human nature and criticized sexual discrimination.

Clearly, as Leming and Nelson (1995) discovered, the field of social studies research continues to focus narrowly on its own scholarship placing no emphasis on a

broader base of social science research for its foundation of knowledge. Houser and Kuzmic mention contemporary political theorists whose writings explore the relationships between individuals and society, as well as prominent educational philosophers, such as John Dewey and Maxine Greene. But these authors omit more recent classic political theorists, such as Peter Woll, Richard Neustadt, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. After reading these articles the reader is left with the impression that modern political theory is extinct everywhere except the Czech Republic. The curricular implications of neglecting the foundation of classical conceptions of citizenship and democracy are significant. How can researchers broaden an understanding of citizenship and democracy if they neglect traditional conceptions? Not only did these researchers uncover the challenges that inevitably accompany the teaching of concepts such as democracy and citizenship in a place where a democratic form of government is relatively recent, but they also highlight the complexities that teachers face as they struggle to teach these ideas in established democracies such as the United States.

Critiquing problems of the modern world, such as overpopulation, depletion of vital resources, and a culture of individualism, calls needed attention to societal

concerns. Analysis and scrutiny of positivist paradigms, of limited perspectives in educational research, and of hidden normalizing practices in educational discourses, also focuses attention on flaws in methodologies, assumptions, and findings. Importantly, Reid (1994) and Schwab (1970) persistently point researchers toward practice, to the contextual situations in which particular situations in which particular teachers in specific schools must inevitably make curriculum decisions about the teaching of concepts such as citizenship and democracy. Teachers and administrators throughout the country who strive to provide solid democratic education for their students do not have the luxury of theorizing or creating knowledge that may or may not involve the making of difficult decisions. Will educators be better prepared to teach about citizenship and democracy if they were to encounter and debate the ideas presented in this issue of *TRSE*? Leanne, the teacher in Shinew's research, wonders "... **I don't know if we ever really did teach citizenship, now that I think about it. But perhaps we've gotten to the point where we're so afraid to step on somebody's toes that we don't dare tell anybody that this is the way a good citizen does things...**" (p.26-27).

Meanings of Citizenship

Questions about the meaning of democratic citizenship form the core of all four of these research studies. Each of the authors asks fundamental questions about the nature of citizenship, such as; What is the meaning of citizenship? What is the role of citizenship in a democracy? How should understandings of citizenship change in modern times given the increased diversity of society? Each of the authors addresses these important questions in very different manners. Yet, after reading and reviewing each of the articles, significant questions remain about citizenship education. Throughout the authors' analyses, readers might ponder how real teachers in real classrooms could employ the ideas, explorations, or suggestions. That a level of "productive ambiguity" remains after reading the articles should not be disturbing. Rather, each author acknowledges the complexities of understanding citizenship. Cary claims to ask more questions than she answers (p.5). In addition, Shiner repeats Eisner's (1997) idea that if material presented is more evocative than denotative, "... in its evocation, it generates insight and invites attention to complexity" (p.8). If such complexity leads to more enlightened citizenship, perhaps such research eventually will result in an improved American society. Such

improvement, however, ultimately includes the making of decisions by practitioners who engage in the process of deliberation. If theories about a broadened understanding of democracy intend to influence or inform this process of deliberation, they should retain a close relationship to the practical reality of teachers, students, and curriculum decisions.

References

- Burke, Edmund. (1790). *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. New York: Doubleday Books, reprint 1989.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Jefferson, Thomas. (1787). "Notes on the state of Virginia." In Merrill D. Peterson (Ed.) *Thomas Jefferson Writings*. New York; Library of America, Reprint, 1984.
- Jefferson, Thomas. (1791). "Letter to Benjamin Banneker, August 30." In Merrill D. Peterson (Ed.) *Thomas Jefferson Writings*. New York; Library of America, Reprint, 1984.
- Makler, A. (1999). Courage, conviction, and social education. In Margaret Smith Crocco and O. L. Davis, Jr. (Eds.), *"Bending the future to their will" : Civic women, social education, and democracy*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Leming, J. S. & Nelson, M. (1995). A citational analysis of *The handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 23, 169-182.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *The schoolhome: Rethinking schools for changing families*. Cambridge, MA:
- Matthews, Richard K. (1986). *The radical politics of Thomas Jefferson: A revisionist view*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Mill, John Stuart (1859). *On Liberty*. Oxford University

- Press, reprint 1975.
- Mill, John Stuart (1869). *The Subjection of Women*. Oxford University Press, reprint 1975.
- Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools*. New York:
- Paine, Thomas. (1790). *The Rights of Man*. New York: Doubleday Books, reprint 1989.
- Reid, W. (1994). *Curriculum planning as deliberation*. (Rapport No. 11). Oslo Norway: Universitete Oslo.
- Ross, E. W. (1998). Social Studies Education and the Pursuit of Social Justice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26, 457-460.
- Schwab, J. (1970). *The practical: The language for Curriculum*. Washington DC: National Education Association.