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This dissertation is a result of the study of the citizenship standards in the K-12 social studies standards documents of ten U.S. states. As a qualitative textual study, it considers the content of the standards in light of recent thinking in the field of citizenship studies. Through discourse analysis it examines the emergence of global citizenship discourse in the standards as well as other traditional and emergent citizenship discourses. It employs discourse mapping as an analytical tool for reading the vision of citizenship that is presented by the standards. A governmentality framework is used to understand how standardization works to limit citizenship possibilities for students. It draws upon Foucault’s notion of care of the self to conceptualize an ethical/critical social studies curriculum. This project is informed by postmodern theories of citizenship and imagines how these might be useful in creating a more robust and democratic citizenship education.
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Chapter 1

Citizenship Standards as Techniques of Governance

Introduction

The goal of this project is to analyze the citizenship discourse(s) presented by K-12 social studies curriculum standards and to understand how they intersect with broader citizenship discourses in both national politics and in the field of citizenship studies. I use a 1.0, 2.0, 3.0 framework to help conceptualize citizenship discourses that correspond to traditional, expansive and explosive notions about what citizenship is. In the United States we are taught that our status as an American citizen is a fundamental and valuable part of our identity. Indeed, a large part of one’s identity remains inextricably linked to one’s citizenship in the modern nation-state, whether or not this is a conscious choice on the part of the individual. While some groups have traditionally counted strong nationalism as an important component of how they identify themselves, other groups have been marginalized because of their outsider status, even if they are legally defined as citizens of a particular nation-state. Still others are among the invisible who make up the population of stateless refugees, those who have no citizenship and therefore, in the eyes of the nation-state, no identity, regardless of the other qualities they share that do make them members of alternative forms of community. In our global era, the blurring of borders, increased mobility and cultural hybridization of populations has important implications for the ways in which each of these groups conceptualizes citizenship. The
The educational system in the United States has not been able to ignore the implications of globalization and notions of global citizenship can increasingly be found in the social studies curriculum standards documents of various states. As language about globalism proliferates in these documents, an important question arises about whether the policy aim is to serve the interests of global capital or to instill a sense of global community in students so that they can navigate complex webs of interrelationships and understand that local and national matters have important connections to and intersections with world affairs.

This project involves reading the text(s) of citizenship and analyzing citizenship discourse(s) as they are constructed by state standards and other supporting documents in the K-12 U.S. social studies curriculum. I focus on written documents published by state departments of education and social studies education organizations with the understanding that this is only one component of many that comprise the whole of citizenship discourse in education. Policy processes, teaching practices and student learning are some of the many other important elements that constitute citizenship discourse in education. However, the focus on written documents allows me to explore the conceptualization of citizenship education in the standards and offer one interpretive reading. I construct an archive in order to use qualitative content analysis and discourse analysis to read the text of educational citizenship in conjunction with reading the more expansive text of citizenship created by scholars within the field of citizenship studies. Because no text can be read in isolation, the examination of intertextual relationships is an important task in this study. I explore instances of dialogue and disconnect between
the two bodies of work in order to understand where citizenship education is situated within larger conversations about citizenship at both the national and global scale.

Current citizenship theory is vast in scope, which signifies a depth and richness in the field. This project focuses primarily on the concept of global citizenship as it relates to curriculum and policy, but also takes into account a multiplicity of other citizenship discourses that shape (or have the potential to shape) the social studies curriculum. My analysis is informed by the understanding that including notions of the global and cosmopolitanism in the curriculum is not unproblematic. Quite a lot of criticism has been directed at global education that seeks to include the cultural perspectives of other peoples and some fear that teaching global citizenship promotes the idea of a one-world government (Merryfield & Kasai, 2010). Walter C. Parker (2010) also warns against ignoring the economic motives for global education that have nothing to do with education for democratic citizenship. Keeping these and other complexities in mind, I analyze state curriculum standards and other documents to locate examples of an emerging concern for the global, as well as absences of the global. Of course many discourses circulate in citizenship education, and in order to understand the emergence of globalism it is necessary to also analyze other prominent discourses such as classical liberalism and republicanism. By examining the ways in which both traditional and emergent discourses are written into curriculum and policy documents, I hope to better understand the state of citizenship discourse within current K-12 education and reflect upon possible future directions for citizenship education.
This study comes at a critical moment in the ongoing national conversation about what U.S. citizenship is and should be. Arizona recently passed a law requiring police to detain individuals who are suspected of being in the U.S. illegally and criminalizing the failure to carry immigration papers (Archibold, 2010). Alabama passed a similar law, part of which has been blocked by a federal appeals court, that also requires elementary and secondary schools to check the immigration status of students and has resulted in as many as 2,000 students no longer attending school because their families fear deportation (Robertson, 2011; Mears, 2011; Bustamante, 2011). Additionally, some legislators have proposed ending the Fourteenth Amendment’s guarantee of birthright citizenship for all who are born in the United States, regardless of their parents’ citizenship status (Lacey, 2011). Indeed, even the citizenship of Barack Obama has been challenged (however unfoundedly) by those who oppose his policies (Haines, 2011). The conversation extends outside the boundaries of national citizenship as well. In the context of global citizenship, former U.S. Representative (and 2012 presidential candidate) Newt Gingrich declared, “I am not a citizen of the world. I think the entire concept is intellectual nonsense and stunningly dangerous!” (Gingrich, 2009). Consequently, it is not uncommon to hear discussions about citizenship on the nightly news and these examples make it clear that our conceptions of citizenship are in flux, that they are changing and in competition with one another, rather than static and fixed.

*Civics Education in the United States: Establishing a Historical Context*

Education in civics and citizenship has always been part of the social studies curriculum in the United States, so it is worth noting how social studies evolved into its
present form. Prior to 1861, the subject that would later emerge as social studies existed in the U.S. school curriculum as a hodgepodge of history, geography, civics, political economy, moral philosophy and religious education. The curriculum area that we now think of as social studies began to emerge the last decade of the nineteenth century. Early social studies education in the United States was dominated by history, but the primary aim of history education was to produce obedient and patriotic citizens. The history curriculum glorified the nation’s history and did not question the structure of society.

The 1916 Report of the Social Studies Committee of the NEA Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education established social studies as we know it today by suggesting a pattern of study in history, geography, civics, economics and geography and encouraged a greater emphasis on social problems and contemporary issues. (Evans, 2004). According to E. Wayne Ross (2006), the 1916 Report along with the National Educational Associations 1893 report by the Committee of Ten and the American Historical Association’s 1899 report by the Committee of Seven established an ongoing debate between those who advocated a social studies curriculum centered in history and those who advocated ideas that emerged from the nineteenth and early twentieth century social welfare and improvement movements. This rift laid the foundation for the ongoing struggle for the social studies curriculum that Ronald W. Evans (2004) labels “the social studies wars.”

During the first half of the twentieth century, several key battles were fought over the purposes and content of social studies education that effectively villainized social studies in the mind of much of the American public. In the 1930s and early 1940s
controversy erupted over Harold Rugg’s social reconstructionist textbooks that were based on the belief that schools should engage in social transformation in order to mitigate the failures of capitalism and overcome social injustice. According to Evans (2004), “the controversy generated a national media feeding frenzy and left the lingering impression that social studies was some sort of radical plot” (p. 28). Later in the 1940s, Allan Nevins, a respected historian, charged that United States history was no longer being taught sufficiently in public schools. Although much evidence was offered to counter his claims, his charges stuck in the public mind and worked to further undermine the reputation of social studies. During the early Cold War years, attacks were launched against “progressive education” and the National Council for the Social Studies eventually appeased its critics by developing a curriculum based on the disciplines that was less concerned with social issues (Evans, 2004).

In the 1960s and 1970s, there was renewed interest in teaching social issues and what became known as multicultural education started to emerge. By the late twentieth century, globalization was a powerful force and global education also became a concern for social studies educators. These trends were not without their critics, so multiculturalism and globalism became new targets in the battles waged over social studies education. In 2003, the Fordham Institute published a report on the condition of social studies education in the United States titled Where Did Social Studies Go Wrong? The authors condemn the state of social studies education, which they blame largely on multiculturalism and globalist influences. They strongly support a homogenized version of American history that highlights the good, largely ignores the bad, and creates patriotic
citizens (Rochester, 2003). From the perspective of most who are involved in the social studies wars, educating citizens remains one of the expressed purposes of social studies education, but what it means to be a “good” citizen is an issue of contention.

Civic roots of the common school movement: Citizenship 1.0

In many ways the history of social studies education in the United States is closely intertwined with the common school movement that began in the 1830s. Ideas about civics and citizenship were historically important in establishing a system of public education in the United States and David Tyack (2003) provides a useful overview of the centrality of these issues to early educational activists who sought schooling for all. For Tyack, public education in the United States has historically been an effort to “create civic cohesion” (p. 3) in a society that was otherwise very fragmented. He illustrates that civic education was the most important purpose of public schooling in the nineteenth century, especially as it related to the “Americanization” of immigrants and their children in an attempt to achieve civic unity though educating republican citizens. Reformers believed that “a properly schooled individual would recognize the bonds of obligation and principle that stabilize society and preserve freedom” (p. 10). This represented a shared faith in the ability of civic socialization to shape good citizens for the republic.

Part of this civic task involved ensuring the formation of a particular national character based upon republican principles that would strengthen the union. As Tyack (2003) explains, in the mid-nineteenth century, the common school sought “to teach a common denominator of political and moral truths that was nonpartisan and nonsectarian” (p. 20). This represented a homogenizing vision of citizenship that
attempted to assimilate members of ethnic groups by focusing on the role of the individual in the republic and also aimed to break the bond the person had to any particular group. Tyack explains that the assimilation effort continued into the early twentieth century as citizenship was defined primarily as conformity to Anglo-American, middle-class social norms rather than as actively participating in the democratic political system. Immigrants were encouraged to view themselves simply as Americans instead of identifying with a particular ethnic group. This, Tyack argues, reveals the “inevitable tensions in civic education between liberty and unity” (2003, p. 34). In order to preserve the American republic, which was still viewed as a tenuous experiment, agreement about certain values was necessary. The teaching of citizenship was important to this end, and by 1923, thirty-nine state required citizenship curriculum in public schools.

While training in civics was an important purpose for early public education in the United States, it was not universally agreed upon as an appropriate policy goal. David K. Cohen (1984) describes two divides that impacted the trajectory of the early common school movement. First, there was a divide between the Jacksonians, who believed that schools were an essential resource for democratic politics and that democracy could not function properly without education, and the conservatives, who viewed the common school as an alternative to reformatories and prisons for the young and therefore as “an instrument the state created for its own protection against potentially dangerous citizens” (p. 255). The second divide existed between those who sought common instruction for political democracy and those who viewed education as a commodity for social and economic competition among Americans as well as a critical
element for the economy’s expansion. Cohen explains that educators began to emphasize the “money value of schooling” (p. 259) in an attempt to counter the increasing marginality of educators within industrial society. The effort to demonstrate that education played an important role in industrial society led to the ultimate primacy of the industrial vision for education that remains evident today.

*Education for Democratic Citizenship: Citizenship 2.0*

Cohen and Tyack examine what might be thought of as citizenship 1.0, but there has been pressure for social studies education to move away from assimilationist and industrialist visions of citizenship. Amy Gutmann (1987) envisions an education that cultivates the skills and virtues of deliberative democratic citizenship, what might be thought of as citizenship 2.0. For Gutmann, it is essential that schools foster the development of democratic character in their students, but in a non-homogenizing way. Instead of shying away from questions of moral character, Gutmann argues that cultivating character is an appropriate and unavoidable role for education. She explains that a democratic state of education tries to teach democratic virtue, which consists of deliberative ability that will allow citizens to self-consciously participate in social reproduction. Gutmann states that, “Education, in a great measure, forms the moral character of citizens, and moral character along with laws and institutions forms the basis of democratic government” (1987, p. 49). Therefore children do not only need to learn how to behave appropriately in the face of authority, but they also need to learn how to think critically about authority if they are going to become democratic citizens capable of
sharing political sovereignty. Gutmann asserts that a democratically sovereign society cannot exist without the development of deliberative character in its citizenry.

Gutmann offers practical advice for educators when she argues that democracy within schools is important to democratic education and advocates participatory approaches that are democratic, rather than disciplinary, in nature. She asserts that students will be more committed to their education if they participate more in determining its course and that “the low levels of political participation in our society and the high levels of autocracy within most schools point to the conclusion that the cultivation of participatory virtues should become more prominent among the purposes of primary schooling” (1987, p. 92). Because schools are the primary mode of preparing students for citizenship in a democracy, Gutmann posits that a significant amount of democracy within schools is necessary for creating an ideal citizenry. She criticizes the tendency for schools to focus on job preparation and the resultant lack of focus on deliberative citizenship skills. Gutmann’s ideas are important to this study because while most of the state standards documents analyzed say something about participatory citizenship, only very limited options for such participation are presented to students.

Robert J. Helfenbein and Nicholas J. Shudak (2009) write specifically about democratic participatory education in the social studies classroom. They assert that standards and the related methods of assessment also serve to limit students’ abilities “to ask critical questions such as why standards even matter to American democracy” (p. 7). In order to counter this, Helfenbein and Shudak call upon social studies educators to reimagine the connection between democracy and education and to teach students that
The democratic countermovement is possible. This can be difficult because of what they name the social studies teachers’ paradox—“How does one teach something that must be lived?” They answer that it involves context saying, “It is the teacher’s job to identify for and with the students their context, their lifeworlds, and to help them make the necessary connections with democracy” (2009, p. 17). This task is, of course, complicated by the current emphasis on assessment in the form of standardized tests rather than on more participatory forms of assessment. Still, the authors emphasize the need for attention to ways of realizing democracy in the social studies classroom despite the difficulties of doing so.

One method of accomplishing this goal, according to Helfenbein and Shudak, is to present democracy as something that is constantly evolving and unfinished. Currently, they explain, many students consider the present a time of full democratic realization and believe “that one can operate on democratic auto-pilot because the modern form of democracy is the final triumph of human political reason” (2009, p. 20). Helfenbein and Shudak recommend that social studies teachers use classroom processes to exercise democracy. Such processes should help students develop discerning minds that are able to penetrate below the surface of social and political issues. The authors propose that social studies educators constantly ask themselves how they can be instrumental in promoting democracy by help students practice it.

**Building a Bridge to Citizenship Studies:** Citizenship 3.0

The field of citizenship studies, which I describe more thoroughly in the next section, has evolved from a universalizing emphasis on legal status and political rights to
a concern with a diversity of citizenship experiences and, currently, to a de-emphasis on identity politics in favor of post possibilities for re-envisioning citizenship in multidimensional ways. Helfenbein and Shudak (2009) have begun to build a bridge to this fertile area, which I name citizenship 3.0. In general, educational scholars (Ladson-Billings, 2004; Gonçalves e Silva, 2004; Merryfield & Kasai, 2010; Mignolo, 2009; Subedi 2010) operating from a postcolonial perspective who are interested in multicultural and global education are moving in this direction while it is not embraced by the majority. The distinctions between citizenship 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 are presented in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship 1.0</th>
<th>Citizenship 2.0</th>
<th>Citizenship 3.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bounded by nation-state</td>
<td>Expanding boundaries</td>
<td>Issues of Statelessness/refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalizing</td>
<td>Identity politics</td>
<td>Multilayered citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation of immigrants</td>
<td>Cultural citizenship</td>
<td>Rights of indigenous populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal status/obligation</td>
<td>Active citizenship</td>
<td>Transnational solidarity movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National citizenship</td>
<td>Global citizenship</td>
<td>Digital citizenship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Citizenship 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0

This progression should not be thought of as one that abandons the past concerns of citizenship studies for newer versions. Instead, it is additive and expansive in what it embraces as within the realm of citizenship.
While educational scholars are beginning to embrace a move to citizenship 3.0, a single-minded focus on standardization and testing has stifled a similar transition in K-12 education. The march toward adopting statewide curriculum standards in all fifty states began in earnest with the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk* which reported that schools in the United States were failing miserably and recommended increased standardized testing as a remedy (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). The report is credited by many for ushering in the era of curriculum standards and high-stakes testing, which grew throughout the 1980s and 1990s and culminated in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Lefkowits and Miller, 2006, Mathison, Ross, & Vinson, 2006). Although No Child Left Behind does not measure student performance in social studies, most states have moved to adopt curriculum standards and implement testing in the content area. Therefore, while reading and math teachers get most of the national attention surrounding the mandates of No Child Left Behind, social studies teachers also face increased standardization and a narrowing of the curriculum (Ross, 2006).

There is no real consensus about the impact of high-stakes testing on teachers’ instructional practices, but many studies have shown that teachers do make modifications as a result of testing (Gaylor 2005; Jones & Johnston, 2002; McNeil, 2000; Vogler, 2002, 2005). It is common for teachers in any state to feel pressured by standardized testing because of the enormous stakes riding on them for students and the systems of merit pay and penalization for teachers and schools (Vogler, 2005). Kenneth E. Vogler and David
Virtue (2007) argue that the growth of academic standards and high-stakes testing has made it difficult to move beyond a “just the facts” approach to teaching social studies. However, they believe that the integrity of the teaching profession is at stake if this is accepted as the role of social studies education.

*Citizenship Studies*

Citizenship has existed from the time of the first republics, but the field of citizenship studies as an academic endeavor has emerged much more recently. According to Isin and Turner (2002), the academic discipline arose out of “new claims for inclusion and belonging” and became a “*de facto* field” (p. 1) in the social sciences and humanities during the 1990s. They explain that what is new about citizenship studies and distinguishes it from traditional political theorizing about citizenship “is the economic, social and cultural conditions that make possible the articulation of new claims and the content and form of these claims as citizenship rights” (p. 1). Citizenship studies is particularly concerned with “new rationalities of government” that result in “an urgent need to rethink the political agent or subject” (p. 1). The field considers how the three fundamental axes of citizenship are being redefined and reconfigured. The *extent* of citizenship includes formal rules as well as norms of inclusion and exclusion. The *content* of citizenship encompasses the rights and responsibilities of citizens. The *depth* of citizenship refers to its thickness or thinness. The incorporation of these three issues makes the theme of citizenship significant to a variety of policy domains; citizenship studies seeks to engage in interdisciplinary analysis of these connections. Isin and Turner describe the basis of contemporary citizenship studies as such:
The modern conception of citizenship as merely status held under the authority of a state has been contested and broadened to include various political and social struggles of recognition and redistribution as instances of claim-making, and hence, by extension, of citizenship. . . Citizenship studies is about producing analytical and theoretical tools with which to address these injustices with the depth, sensibility, scope and commitment that they demand and deserve. (pp. 2-3)

Postmodern Citizenship

Engin F. Isin (2002a) considers citizenship in the postmodern world, which he names “citizenship after orientalism” (p. 117). The Western concept of citizenship was built upon two fundamental ways of viewing the world. The first, Orientalism, divided the world into two types of civilizations – those considered rational and therefore modern (the West), and those determined to be irrational and traditional (the “rest”). As Edward Said (1978) explains, the Orient was constructed as an exotic space, an “other” that needed to be tamed by the West that brought the discipline it lacked. From the perspective of the West, the inhabitants of such places were not citizens because they lived in disordered societies. The second world view that Isin (2002a) discusses is synoecism – “a way of seeing the polity as embodying spatial and political unification” (p. 117). According to Isin, both perspectives began to be called into question in the late twentieth century because of various political and theoretical events; however the views persist and represent significant obstacles to reconceptualizing citizenship in postmodernity. Viewing citizenship through the lenses of Orientalism and synoecism has
become problematic because their credibility has been challenged by both postmodernization and globalization. Isin discusses postmodernism’s effects on citizenship saying:

If we define postmodernization as both a process of fragmentation through which various group identities have been formed and discourses through which ‘difference’ has become a dominant strategy, its effect on citizenship has been twofold. On the one hand, various groups that have been marginalized and excluded from modern citizenship have been able to seek recognition…But it also forced rethinking of fundamental categories of political discourse by critiquing totality, universality, unity and homogeneity that have been attributed to politics (pp. 122-123).

Isin goes on to explain globalization’s impact on citizenship:

If we define globalization as both a process by which the increasing interconnectedness of places becomes the defining moment and as a discourse through which ‘globalism’ becomes a dominant strategy, its effect on citizenship has also been twofold. On the one hand, with the rise of global flows of capital, images, ideas, labour, crime, music, and regimes of governance, the sources of authority of citizenship rights and obligations have expanded from the nation-state to other international organizations, corporations and agencies…In fact, much of what we defined as ‘postmodernization’ has undoubtedly been concentrated in cosmopolises, simultaneously emanating from and producing them. On
the other hand, the dominance of such cosmopolitan agents and cities
has issued challenges to the sovereignty principle of the nation-states”
(p. 123)

Although there is debate about the extent of globalization, it is clearly occurring concurrently with an increased postmodernization of politics and culture, and this impacts the concept of citizenship in significant ways.

Power relations are being dramatically refigured so that new spaces are replacing old geographic divisions and the former North/South, First World/Third World dichotomies no longer make sense. Relying upon such partitions to contain places in detached zones no longer represents reality (if it ever did). The occident can no longer be defined in contrast to the orient, as a unified and unique space. By extension, new notions of citizenship are required and, according to Isin (2002a), this reconceptualization requires two moves. First, a more sophisticated vision of citizenship must be developed that adequately considers struggles for redistribution and recognition as well as imagines a postnational variety of citizenship that recognizes sovereignty as multiple, intersecting and overlapping. Second, new historical investigations must be conducted that recognize difference without passing judgment about inferiority and superiority and that seek to deepen our understanding of both ourselves and the Other. This task extends into the realm of education and involves rewriting imperialist histories that persist in dividing the world (Willinsky, 1998).

Isin (2002a) also warns against new forms of orientalism, for example the prevalent Western belief that Islamic societies are not capable of establishing and
sustaining democratic institutions. Instead, “new sociologies of citizenship” (p. 127) could avoid grouping varying cultural zones as fundamentally the same without seeking to understand their nuances. They would also recognize group-differentiated identities and incorporate struggles for recognition into their visions of postmodern citizenship.

*Citizenship and Identity*

Identity has always been, and remains, an important component of citizenship because it allows people who are excluded from citizenship to organize interest groups and social movements in an attempt to gain political, legal and social rights as citizens. These movements have successfully extended citizenship rights to an ever expanding group of people, but citizenship is also always “an act of closure” (Janoski & Gran, 2002, p. 35) around a certain group of people who are named citizens while others continue to be left out. In fact, citizenship rights are subject to increases and decreases within the course of any one individual’s lifespan. As individuals grow into adulthood, they gain citizenship rights; however, during old age, independence and therefore citizenship diminishes. Throughout one’s life course, the reasons for engaging in citizenship behavior are reflexively interpreted and reinterpreted.

As people, capital and information move with increased ease across geographic nation-state borders, the concept of citizenship has become more expansive and fluid without diminishing in importance. Derek Gregory, et al. (2009) explain that nation-states have lost much of their ability to control border crossings as a result of the greater mobility of their populations and, as a result, citizenship has become “a constantly evolving, non-linear formation” (p. 85) that is something vastly different from traditional
notions of citizenship based on the territorial boundaries of the nation-state. However, states are not eager to give up their control over what constitutes national citizenship and frequently attempt to reinforce citizenship boundaries and thereby define the identities of those affected by these boundaries. Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu (2004) argues that the range of identity positions available to citizens is largely determined by the state. He explains that nation-states seek to contain their residents’ identities within boundaries of sameness, but individuals have a multiplicity of identity dimensions beyond nationality. Indeed, as Faza Rizvi (2009) states, there is now a variety of ways to think about cultural identities as a result of globalization, and it is “no longer useful to think about identities in terms of a set of closed cultural boundaries expressed in language, arts, and cultural traditions, bracketed as homogenized entities frozen outside history and contemporary interactive cultural relations, located within particular national spaces” (p. 283). Instead, Rizvi encourages us to recognize the “cultural hybridization” (p. 286) that exists and blurs old boundaries.

Traditional discourses about citizenship have a tendency to erase multiple categories of difference, by oftentimes simply ignoring them or even by sometimes completely denying them, in favor of promoting sameness when it comes to identity. The negation of gender differences in relation to citizenship is the focus of Seyla Benhabib and Judith Resnik’s (2009) collection *Migrations and Mobilities: Citizenship, Borders, and Gender*. The argument that gender should play a significant role in reconceptualizing the nature of citizenship from a transnational perspective is the foundational principle of the book. In their introduction, Benhabib and Resnik explain
that global mobility is not an unproblematic option for all and that barriers to global mobility are shared unevenly by members of different groups. They assert that, “women’s mobility is rarely a simple matter of the movement across state boundaries of a single, isolated individual. Women’s mobility is a nodal point in a network of relationships” (p. 13) that typically involves their relationships with others who are dependent upon them or upon whom they depend. Therefore, the authors contend, gender should be at the forefront of debates about citizenship.

A variety of identities are erased by traditional notions of citizenship, but perhaps none as completely as the identities of those who are not citizens of any nation. Linda K. Kerber (2009) describes this as “the nightmare of statelessness” (p. 86), something historians have been reluctant to admit as part of the history and present of the United States. She uses the Puccini opera *Madame Butterfly* to illustrate the nature of statelessness – a child is born to a young Japanese woman who is seduced by a United States naval officer stationed in early twentieth century Japan. At the time, Japanese women could not transmit Japanese citizenship to their children, and as an unmarried male, under law at that time, the officer did not transmit his United States citizenship to the child. While the laws of both countries have since changed, such instances have by no means disappeared. Kerber warns that, if successful, the current political movement seeking the repeal of birthright citizenship under the Fourteenth Amendment in the United States would greatly increase such instances of statelessness. While stateless people are normally thought of as those who have become that way as a result of their own movement, “liminal people who have not moved physically can find that state
boundaries have shifted, and the protections that citizenship was thought to provide can suddenly evaporate” (p. 87). When it comes to stateless asylum seekers, gender is again an important consideration. Kerber explains that women have only recently begun to be granted asylum for claims of abuse such as rape and forced circumcision, and even now such policies are applied unevenly at best. Frequently women make up a large portion of the invisible group who have no citizenship and therefore no identity that matters to the nation-state.

Many other identities are erased by discourses of homogenous citizenship, and groups are increasingly beginning to define citizenship on their own terms. Where race and ethnicity are concerned, Gloria Ladson-Billings (2004) states that “the establishment of White supremacy is a major feature of U.S. citizenship and is an ideological organizing principle for the nation” (p. 110). According to Ladson-Billings, citizens of color do not have an easy time blending into the “melting pot” and this reflects the unequal power relations between members of different racial, ethnic and cultural groups. She argues that, in response, people of color are adopting a “new citizenship” that is “both local and global…fluid and changing” (p. 117) and involves making citizenship commitments at the international level, not just at the local level. Outside of a U.S. context, Petroneilha Beatriz Gonçalves e Silva (2004) discusses how the Black Brazilian population is constructing their own citizenship in response to injustice and exclusion, and education is one important component of this. She explains that “education for citizenship implies preparing oneself for the confrontation and negotiation with the other, who may be different but who is equally human” (p. 207). Walter Mignolo (2009)
names similar efforts across marginalized groups (the indigenous of Australia, New Zealand and the Americas) “de-colonial cosmopolitanism” (p. 125) that springs forth from the margins and connects peoples based on their shared histories as colonial subjects.

New forms of citizenship are multiple and intersecting as in the figure of the “multiple-passport holder” (Ong, 1999, p. 2). This contemporary figure embodies the divide between an identity that is imposed by the state and a personal identity that results from migrations, upheavals, and changing global markets. In a globalized world, ethnic and national identities become separate entities at the same time international boundaries become less significant, or at least appear to become so. Ong questions whether political borders are really becoming insignificant or whether the nation-state is really just constructing new relationships to mobile capital as well as to both citizens and noncitizens. The traditional role of the nation-state to “align social habits, culture, attachments, and political participation” (p. 2) is being undone by nomadism and modern communications. Because of these developments, passports have less of a role in declaring citizenship, not to mention signifying loyalty to a particular nation-state, than in establishing claims to participate in labor markets. “The truth claims of the state that are enshrined in the passport are gradually being replaced by its counterfeit use in response to the claims of global capitalism” (p. 2). Thus Ong aims to pay attention “to the transnational practices and imaginings of the nomadic subject and the social conditions that enable his flexibility” (p. 3).
Global citizenship in state curriculum standards

It can seem like quite a leap to make from theoretical notions of citizenship to K-12 curriculum standards, but globalization is influencing the educational system in the United States and increasing numbers of state standards and other policy documents include references to the global, particularly in relation to social studies education. However, the aims of these statements about globalism are not always immediately clear.

Can an attempt to forge a sense of global community be found in these documents, or are they intended to serve the aims of global capitalism? Thomas S. Popkewitz and Fazal Rizvi (2009) encourage us to question the fact that, “globalization appears to suggest a fatalism about society and schooling; that is, globalization is presented as a fact of life to which schools must simply accommodate through revisions to their curriculum and expectations about who the child is and should be” (p. 1). To pay critical attention to this naturalization of globalization is to understand it “in terms of multiple social processes, each of which are historically constituted, politically implicated and culturally calibrated. This implies the importance of understanding global processes through specific positionalities and perspectives, as well as the need to be theoretically self-reflexive” (p. 1). Popkewitz and Rizvi explain that the nation-state has not disappeared because global capitalism cannot perform all of its functions, especially those of security and social stability that provide an environment for economic productivity. However, some mechanisms of the state have changed so that it now works through global networks, which affects how educational policies are developed in an effort to shape certain kinds of subjectivities through schooling. When it comes to the social studies curriculum, one
Adele E. Clarke’s (2005) discourse mapping, which will be further explained in chapter three. This discourse analysis is also influenced by Foucauldian poststructuralism, and specifically Foucault’s concepts of governmentality and care of the self. Governmentality provides a framework through which to examine state curriculum standards and how they work to discipline populations. Care of the self offers the opportunity to introduce aspects of Foucauldian ethics in the citizenship classroom. These concepts will be detailed in chapter two.

This project is guided by four research questions: (1) What vision(s) of citizenship emerges through the reading of state social studies standards and other supporting documents? (2) What are the intersections (or lack thereof) between citizenship studies and citizenship discourses in the K-12 curriculum and what does citizenship studies have to offer citizenship education in terms of creating a more critical social studies? (3) How are notions of global citizenship being written into standards documents and how can the current nationalist focus on citizenship be enriched by incorporating a concern with the global into the social studies curriculum? (4) How do all of the different discourses that
circulate in citizenship education make possible particular subjectivities while closing off the possibility of others and how might we reimagine education for postmodern citizenship?

The national conversation about citizenship has important implications for education since all fifty states include at least some mention of citizenship in their social studies standards documents. In fact, citizenship is a term that is used frequently and loosely in the U.S. social studies curriculum. Except when it specifically refers to the event of being born into citizenship or becoming a naturalized citizen, what is most often meant by citizenship is clearly not the simple legal definition. It is typically used to broadly signify some form of participation in public life, although it sometimes appears in various policy documents and state content standards without being clearly defined at all. As it is used in the U.S. social studies curriculum today, it most regularly boils down to a discussion of individual rights and responsibilities without much discussion of communities or social issues. It also tends to be bound by a nation-state centered approach that does not take into account the global.

The nebulous quality of the term as it is used in education can be traced to the contested nature of the term itself, as it is used in all contexts. Numerous scholars (Beiner, 1995; Crenson & Ginsberg, 2004; Dean, 2003; Kivisto & Faist 2007; Lister, 1997) have written about the problematic nature of citizenship, and this study focuses on how these problems impact what is labeled citizenship education in the United States today. There are some areas from the larger citizenship discussion that are particularly relevant to education. First, as Ruth Lister (1997) argues, citizenship is a contested term
that operates as a mechanism of both inclusion and exclusion. While it defines who “belongs,” it has also traditionally been used as a tool of social and political exclusion, inequality, and xenophobia. In addition, the term presents a homogenized vision of the group of people called “Americans” that negates differences such as gender, sexuality, race and socioeconomic status. Lister asserts the need for an inclusive politics that establishes a view of citizenship that accommodates difference.

Another important aspect of the wider citizenship conversation, and the one that is my focus, is the tension between the ideas of national and global citizenship. Increased globalization has significantly lessened the isolation of nation-states and their citizens and has created a multiplicity of communities to which one can belong. This, in turn, has created the need for an expanded vision of citizenship that transcends national boundaries (Scott & Lawson, 2002). However, the idea of world citizenship is largely absent from U.S. citizenship discourse in general, and particularly in the educational curriculum, so that Gingrich’s stance appears to be the perspective that is driving much of the social studies curriculum in the United States today (Kivisto & Faist 2007).

As part of its national social studies curriculum, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) has a position statement titled “Creating effective citizens” (2001). It states, in part, that:

Throughout the curriculum and at every grade level, students should have opportunities to apply their civic knowledge, skills, and values as they work to solve real problems in their school, the community, our nation, and the world…Citizens in the twenty-first century must be
prepared to deal with rapid change, complex local, national, and global issues, cultural and religious conflicts, and the increasing interdependence of nations in a global economy.

The statement moves towards the idea of global citizenship and highlights the importance of community, but it has been widely criticized. Critics argue that the statement depends heavily on the social sciences and lacks a discussion of values; there is not enough focus on contemporary controversial social issues; and there is too little emphasis on developing important intellectual abilities as well as on service learning and real world involvement in the community (Ochoa-Becker 2007). However, the statement is referenced in the curriculum standards of other states, and I will explore to what extent a vision of global citizenship is present in these documents and how it aligns with current theorizing about global citizenship.

State curriculum standards and modes of assessment can be thought of as a way to indirectly control what goes on in individual classrooms because the fact that teachers must prepare students for state mandated assessment may impact what they believe they must do in the classroom. Standards also attempt to mold the individual student into a particular type of person. As Tina Besley (2009) explains, “Foucault wants to understand the self as a cultural and historical construction created or fabricated” (p. 165), and youth must learn to control their conduct so that they can be useful to the state. Thomas S. Popkewitz (2009) argues that the aim of standardized curriculum is to fabricate the standardized child. He addresses the centrality of curriculum standards to educational reform and writes that “it is assumed that the right mixtures of reforms will change the
conditions of society by changing people” (p. 223). Curriculum standards are heralded as mechanisms through which to increase participation and success and are therefore “part of the process of governing through making the citizen” (p. 224). It might be easiest to view standardized assessments that involve multiple choice tests in this light, but David Lee Carlson (2009) explains how other forms of assessment can also play a role in producing a particular type of subject in his analysis of portfolios used to assess student writing in Kentucky. He argues that the implementation of portfolio assessment was “a strategic move and emerged to meet an ‘urgent need’ to produce a certain neoliberal subject that is supposed to practice their freedoms in specific ways” (p. 257). According to Carlson, methods of assessment are political technologies designed to produce subjects rather than innocent pedagogical tools used to reveal students’ proficiencies. He argues that the portfolio “represents an instrument to neoliberal rationality of rule designed to measure levels of risk and social security based on the principles of entrepreneurship and responsibility” (p. 264). Carlson explains that the portfolio functions as a gate-keeper for high school students, labeling them either novice or proficient writers, and argues that this illustrates one way in which power functions when government governs from a distance.

Social studies standards, especially those dealing with history and notions of citizenship, play an important role in shaping students’ conceptions of history as well as their conceptions of the present and future and their expected roles. They offer students normalized options for who they can become and tend not to offer opportunities to expand this vision to include other possibilities. Curriculum standards, whether at the
national or state level, and related methods of assessment can be thought of as techniques of governance because they do not visibly monitor or overtly control what transpires in the classroom. While there is no real consensus about the impact of high-stakes testing on teachers’ instructional practices, studies such as those by Kenneth E. Vogler (2002, 2005) and Linda M. McNeil (2000) have shown that teachers do make modifications as a result of testing. It is common for teachers in any state to feel pressured by standardized testing because of the enormous stakes riding on them for students and the systems of merit pay and penalization for teachers and schools (Vogler, 2005). Except in cases where teachers are required to teach from a scripted curriculum, teachers conceivably have a fair amount of autonomy in determining their own teaching practices. Perhaps standards and accountability are some of the more transparent techniques of governance, but they exert indirect influence, rather than direct coercion, and are appropriate objects of study through a lens of governmentality.

It is clear that curriculum standardization is here to stay, and whether national or state content standards ultimately become the basis for social studies education, the way citizenship is presented to students will impact their ways of being in the world as adults. As globalization increases, students will need an understanding of their position in the world that goes beyond the narrow nation-state approach and fosters a critical understanding of global relations. Much of what is defined as citizenship content knowledge in state curriculum standards positions students as citizens of their local and national communities only and presents nationalism as the sole basis for citizenship. If we hope to create a social studies education that teaches students to critically question the
way things are, moving beyond a curriculum that is based upon nationalism will be necessary.

Overview of Chapters

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. The first chapter provides a brief historical overview of social studies and citizenship education in the United States, considers the importance of education for democratic citizenship and assesses the impact of standardization and testing on this aim. The field of citizenship studies is also introduced in the context of postmodern citizenship and global citizenship. Chapter two reviews the literature related to traditional and emergent citizenship discourses as well as concepts that expand the notion of what constitutes citizenship. Literature that relates Foucauldian ideas to citizenship education is reviewed in order to establish a foundation for applying the concepts of governmentality and care of the self to citizenship standards. Chapter three details qualitative content analysis and discourse analysis and explains how the methods were used in this study. Discourse mapping as a method of analysis is explained and its uses in this study are demonstrated. Chapter four presents a detailed description of my data and analyzes the citizenship discourses that emerge. The dominance of traditional citizenship discourses is explored as well as instances of emergent discourses in the standards. Chapter five theorizes a postmodern citizen who is not bound by traditional political discourses and imagines a more robust form of citizenship education. Potential new directions for citizenship education and suggestions for further research are presented.
Conclusion

State educational standards do not necessarily illuminate what is actually taught, but they do tell us what a state requires to be taught. Therefore, citizenship standards represent state mandated guidelines for shaping U.S. citizens that present particular, often limiting, possibilities for what a fully realized citizenship can be. Reading the standards closely helps us to understand what these mandates are and how they differ between states. Situating the language of citizenship standards in relation to larger citizenship discourses is important to understanding the ideas that shape the standards documents. By understanding the limits that have been imposed, we may be able to imagine new possibilities for what citizenship education could become.
Chapter 2
Foundations for Citizenship Education: Traditional, Expansive and Explosive Discourses

Introduction

The current study is very much shaped by the tensions between traditional notions of citizenship in social studies education and the dynamic new ways that citizenship studies conceptualizes contemporary citizenship. One of the challenges of this study has been to engage with the exciting trends in citizenship studies in relation to state content standards that are often light years apart. This chapter outlines traditional and emergent political theories about citizenship and explores attempts to expand the definition of citizenship beyond the mere political, social and economic relationships between the citizen and the state, especially ideas about global citizenship and cosmopolitanism. It then explores the ways in which Foucault’s concepts of governmentality and care of the self can be applied to social studies and citizenship education.

Citizenship and Education

In the United States, nationalism has long been the dominant discourse that shapes our notions of citizenship, but other discourses do emerge in particular moments. Here it is useful to draw upon Raymond Williams’ (1977) framework of dominant, residual and emergent cultural elements. Again, nationalism remains the dominant form of citizenship in both political life and education. Liberalism and republicanism can be considered residual forms because they involve grand traditions from the classical world.
that are used to legitimize social relations today. This is especially evident in the state standards documents I analyze because they rarely mention liberalism and republicanism directly but are shaped in significant ways by these traditional citizenship discourses. According to Williams, emergent cultural forms involve new practices that create new meanings and new relationships. He cautions that it can be “difficult to distinguish between those which are really elements of some new phase of the dominant culture (and in this sense 'species specific') and those which are substantially alternative or oppositional to it: emergent in the strict sense, rather than merely novel” (p. 123). So, discussions about global citizenship risk relying on nationalist notions of rights and responsibilities, simply scaled up to the level of the global, without offering any opposition to these limited ideas about what citizenship encompasses. A truly emergent discourse offers new directions for citizenship that do not rely upon old concepts and categories.

**Citizenship**

Traditionally, in theory and practice, citizenship is thought to consist of three fundamental dimensions: political, economic and social, in conjunction with their related institutions (Roche, 2002). Political citizenship is defined by Thomas Janoski and Brian Gran (2002) as having four major components. First, it involves membership in a nation-state that recognizes its citizens as persons having specific rights not shared by noncitizens. Second, it “involves active capacities to influence politics and passive rights of existence under a legal system” (p. 13). Third, citizenship rights are enacted into law and applied to all citizens in universal and formal way. Fourth, “citizenship is a
statement of *equality* (p. 14), that balances rights and obligations within certain limits. Taken together, these four qualities represent the traditional view of citizenship within a bounded nation-state.

Not all citizenship rights are created equally, and Janoski and Gran (2002) distinguish between two types of rights: universalist and particularistic (or categorical). Universalistic rights may be contingent, meaning they universally apply to everyone who meets the criteria for citizenship. Universalistic rights can also be compensatory in that they bestow special treatment on some citizens who were previously denied rights. Additionally, universalist rights can also be organizational rights that allow groups of people to organize and act collectively. Categorical rights, also known as cultural or group rights, exclusively entitle certain citizens to a specific activity or status that is not available to others. Traditional liberal theory is opposed to granting categorical rights while, according to Janoski and Gran, multicultural and postmodern theory embrace them. They argue that this is a flaw in liberal theory because it does not recognize the important value of group rights in many existing democratic societies. They also argue that there is a corresponding flaw in multicultural theories that does not admit the usefulness of universalistic rights to racial, ethnic and gender groups who are attempting to advance.

Political citizenship operates by granting legal and political rights. The categories of legal rights conferred are access to justice, reasonable security of person and freedom of conscience. The four types of political rights granted by political citizenship are personal political rights, organizational rights, membership rights and group self-
determination rights. While Janoski and Gran (2002) offer this very straightforward definition of political citizenship, they also recognize that the political foundations of citizenship in our contemporary world are becoming much more highly contested than at any time in the past. Because the political realm has been re-envisioned by Foucauldian and postmodern theory that sees power everywhere, theories of citizenship have expanded to include every action citizens might take to alter their circumstances rather than simply considering the state-citizen relationship in which the state is directly involved. Janoski and Gran conclude that, “The challenge to citizenship theories in the future is not an all-or-nothing choice of group or individual rights, but rather the complex bricolage of both approaches that will work in a system of legitimate rights” (p. 42).

Economic citizenship is the second fundamental dimension in citizenship theory and economic rights have played a central role in the development of citizenship. Anthony Woodiwiss (2002) sketches a brief history of economic rights in modern democratic states explaining that the right to own property, work and enter into contracts were considered to be basic civil rights throughout much of North American and Western Europe by the middle of the nineteenth century. The turn of the twentieth century saw the gradual enfranchisement of nonowners of property in addition to the development of rights to collective organizing and bargaining. Woodiwiss names this conglomeration of rights “the secondary system[s] of industrial citizenship” (p. 53). Because these rights were foundational in the development of citizenship, Woodiwiss remarks that it is both disturbing and unsurprising that these are the rights that are most specifically threatened by globalization under neoliberalism.
Among nation-states, there is a wide variety of contemporary labor rights and therefore forms of economic citizenship. According to Woodiwiss (2002), the United States has a unique form of economic citizenship that is premised on the concept of liberty. In other words, citizens of the United States are granted liberty in their economic pursuits; this is a doctrine of noninterference. Economic citizenship based on liberty differs markedly from other systems that Woodiwiss claims are much more effective. For example, the critical premise of economic citizenship in Australia and France is power, so that citizens are granted power in their economic pursuits. In both Japan and Sweden, economic citizenship is based upon the concept of claims so individuals are empowered through claims to economic rights. Both powers and claims are much stronger tools than liberty for the individual to use in securing the economic rights of citizenship.

The context of today’s labor rights has shifted significantly from the past in two ways. First, the critical dimension of employment relations has shifted from possession to control, and second, globalization has been so far driven by neoliberalism which is naturally hostile to all labor rights and more specifically hostile to labor rights that are based upon powers and claims rather than liberty. Because local capital has become subordinate to transnational capital, relationships of control that are most common to transnational capital have largely replaced the governing mechanisms of small enterprises so that labor law based upon liberties is ineffective. The solution to these new labor problems, from the perspective of labor movements, is to globalize economic citizenship so that it can be appropriately responsive to transnational capital as globalization
continues to spread. Indeed, this is the goal of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), one of the oldest organizations dedicated to securing global economic citizenship. Its preamble lists specific economic rights, which member states are encouraged to ratify. However, there is no real compulsion for sovereign states to guarantee the rights because the ILO does not have the power to impose any significant sanctions (Woodiwiss, 2002).

This impotence is common to international organizations with no means of enforcement and the ILO is further weakened by the fact that its “social clause” (p. 65) for labor is based primarily on the United States’ liberty model for economic citizenship rather than the more effective power and claims models of other nation-states. In addition, not all states can enact the core labor standards with equal ease at the local level, making them likely to be adopted in very different forms. Woodiwiss recommends that the current list of core labor standards be enhanced to grant labor the power to take part in economic decision making through the powers and claims models which have been more effective in securing economic citizenship in many societies. Because the United States is the only nation-state whose economic citizenship is based on liberty, incorporating the powers and claims models into the ILO’s labor standards makes them more likely to be adopted globally (Woodiwiss, 2002).

The third fundamental dimension of citizenship is social citizenship which is related to social policy in the modern nation-state and in the postwar welfare state. According to Maurice Roche (2002), in modern societies citizenship first developed in the political arena, then in the economic realm, and finally extended to the social sphere. Modern social rights were developed in capitalist societies in an attempt to mitigate the
risk that individuals will suffer from problems such as poverty, gross inequality, poor health and social exclusion. Such rights are frequently rationalized as universal human rights embodied at the national level. Education that is financed by the state is also often included as right of social citizenship, especially to the extent that it is thought to develop human capital, employment and life skills in capitalist societies. Roche discusses the “new social contractualist approaches to social policy and social citizenship” (p. 69) that attempt to reflect on and renew postwar social contracts between nation-states and their citizens in the contemporary period. As with other dimensions of citizenship, the contexts in which social citizenship is theorized and practiced at the national level are changing and new attempts should be made to understand social citizenship at the transnational level.

Roche argues that it is necessary to analyze how systems of citizenship and social rights coexist and compete with one another in an international context. Globalization has become the new context in which to envision and debate citizenship and social rights as countries share common characteristics of welfare states. Where global labor is concerned, the conditions of employment are being fundamentally changed by the enhanced bargaining power of employers. According to Roche, this new system of contractualized labor has created an environment that is fertile for new “social contractualist” (p. 75) politics and processes to develop and take hold. In light of this new international context, national social rights movements cannot ignore the relevance of transnational rights and responsibilities to their causes. Such movements may benefit greatly by coordinating with global policy organizations such as the International Labour
Organisation, the World Bank and the United Nations to promote the rights associated with full social citizenship.

Active Citizenship

While persons born in the United States are granted and can maintain legal citizenship through no actions of their own, a much more robust form of citizenship can be established by those who actively engage in political and social processes. This form of citizenship, named “substantive citizenship” by Engin F. Isin and Bryan Turner (2002, p. 4) involves being politically engaged in the fate of the polity and in the process of claiming, expanding and losing rights. This “sociologically informed definition of citizenship” (p. 4) is one in which legal rules are emphasized less than identities, meanings and practices.

Janoski and Gran (2002) distinguish between participant and nonparticipant citizens. Participant citizens can be categorized into two types: incorporated and active. Incorporated citizens are typically part of the elite in society, or at least believe themselves to be part of this group, and engage politically based on this position and their desire to maintain it. Active citizens tend to engage in conflict with established elites, organize at the grassroots level and participate in various political activities with a concern for people in their groups. Janoski and Gran also name three types of non-participant citizens. Deferential citizens accept the authority and leadership of elites without strongly internalizing the goals of their political party or state. Cynical citizens are often similar to active citizens except they choose not to participate in politics because they believe all efforts toward change are futile. Marginal citizens often have
very few resources and little power and become alienated and detached from the political system. Beyond the participant and non-participant categorization, Janoski and Gran name a third category of citizen, the opportunistic citizen. Opportunistic citizens make rational decisions based on the immediate effects on their material interests. They are not motivated to participate in the political process unless their activities directly affect their own interests, involve substantial benefit to themselves and have a good chance of success. If these conditions are not met, opportunistic citizens withdraw from the public sphere and focus on private interests. When I refer to active citizenship, I use the term to indicate political and social engagement of the form that Janoski and Gran attribute to active citizens.

*Citizenship Education: Incorporating the Global*

Over the past decade there has been a turn in scholarship on citizenship education from traditional citizenship discourses, such as classical liberalism and republicanism, toward more expansive citizenship discourses, specifically ideas about global citizenship. In David Scott and Helen Lawson’s (2002) collection *Citizenship Education in the Curriculum*, the authors devote significant attention to traditional discourses and their role in the K-12 citizenship curriculum. Specifically, they distinguish between liberal individualism, which promotes a rights based approach to citizenship, and a communitarian approach which asserts that as part of a community, the individual has rights as well as obligations as a member of that community. While much of the volume is similar in scope, Cameron White and Roger Openshaw’s (2002) piece near the end of the collection considers the challenges associated with education for global citizenship.
They explore the tension between ideas of national and global citizenship in relation to citizenship education in the social studies curriculum and argue that increased globalization has significantly lessened the isolation of nation-states and their citizens and has created a multiplicity of communities that one can belong to. This, in turn, has created the need for an expanded vision of citizenship that transcends national boundaries, according to White and Openshaw. Their discussion largely revolves around ways in which nationalist visions of citizenship can be scaled up to the global rather than a fundamental transformation of what citizenship might become.

The nation-state has traditionally been, and remains overwhelmingly, the basis of citizenship education in the United States. However, globalization complicates this crude notion of citizenship and this has important implications for the social studies curriculum which cannot be ignored. James A. Banks (2004) describes the recent intensification of both nationalism and globalization which, he explains, are contradictory trends. For most nations, citizenship education is designed around the nation-state and is not concerned with helping citizens function within the global community. Banks argues that “strong nationalism that is nonreflective will prevent students from developing thoughtful attachments to the global community” (p. 9). Indeed, such an approach is untenable since, as Castles (2004) states, “the boundaries of the nation-state are being eroded” (p. 18). Millions of people who have multiple citizenships, move across borders, and reside in more than one country. In order to create a social studies curriculum that is responsive to these new realities, Todd W. Kenreich (2010) outlines the need to juxtapose the global scale with the local scale in the curriculum to help students develop perspective
consciousness and a critical global perspective. Helping students make connections between their local lives and world affairs is an important step in the process of instilling a sense of global community.

Decentering the nation-state is not a simple task to achieve in the realm of education. As Kathleen Hall (1999) explains, a movement toward the global in citizenship education is problematic, in part, because:

The modern system of mass public education from the beginning has been deeply interconnected with the process of nation building and state formation. Educational purposes and processes have been directed toward ensuring national unity and social integration through passing on a purportedly shared national culture, transmitting democratic values and ideals, and providing the skills and credentials required by the economic structure of each nation-state, capitalist or socialist. (p. 122)

Education has become a contested site in the era of globalization because it has always played a significant role in promoting nationalism among the population. The state clearly has an interest in promoting a nationalist vision of citizenship through education, but as globalization increases, it may have a stake in promoting an expansive vision of citizenship that includes the global as well.

In Education Policy: Globalization, Citizenship, and Democracy (2004), Mark Olssen, John Codd and Anne-Marie O’Neill rely primarily on traditional discourses about citizenship as they trace the evolution in educational policy from classical liberalism to social democratic liberalism and finally to neoliberalism. They present a poststructural
analysis of the politics of liberal education under globalization, which they argue is a result of neoliberalism. The authors assert that, in such a world, robust and active citizenship is required to sustain democracy at the level of the nation-state and that education is central to this aim. They offer a helpful theoretical framework for critical educational policy analysis that is closely tied to how schools respond to the call to educate students for democratic citizenship. An emphasis on rights and responsibilities has been a hallmark of liberal and republican discourses about citizenship and is pervasive in social studies standards that relate to citizenship education. The rights and responsibilities frame is employed by Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey (2005) as they argue for the need to teach cosmopolitan citizenship in schools based on the idea of a global community with shared human values as well as rights and duties of citizens that are not limited by the territorial boundaries of nation-states. They propose a new approach to citizenship that extends its vision beyond the local and the national in answer to the moral imperative of solidarity with others. Osler and Starkey effectively connect these ideas to education by calling for democratic educational spaces and a heavier emphasis on the responsibilities, instead of only the rights, of citizenship in the curriculum.

Much recent scholarship focuses on citizenship education outside of the United States but can be useful to consider in a U.S. context. Kevin McDonough and Walter Feinberg (2003) rely heavily on traditional citizenship discourses as they combine the writings of political, legal and educational theorists on the concept of citizenship in liberal democratic society. Their collection considers the historical arguments for and
against nationalist citizenship education that homogenizes diverse identities.

McDonough and Feinberg consider the impact of globalization and offer useful insights into the ways in which liberalism’s anxiety about its own potential demise seeks tighter control over the citizenship curriculum in Europe that can be applied to a United States context. Tristan McCowan (2009) offers practical advice for enacting a version of Gutmann’s (1987) participatory democratic citizenship education in the context of Brazil. He frames his study by examining four major tensions that exist in democratic citizenship: liberal rights and civic republican duties; universalizing and difference based approaches; the local, the national and the global, and critical citizenship and conformity to authority. While acknowledging the still influential discourses of liberalism and republicanism, McCowan proposes a “seamless enactment” (p. 180) of curriculum so that ends correspond with means, meaning specifically that the classroom becomes a space of participatory democracy. Insightfully, McCowan acknowledges that his ideas border on the utopian but argues that utopian ideas are necessary in citizenship education if we are to believe and teach that something different is possible.

In one of the newest volumes on citizenship education, Alan Reid, Judith Gill and Alan Search (2010) collect a variety of citizenship studies to provide an overview how civics and citizenship education policy has developed across twelve different nation-states. They argue that citizenship education remains one of the main functions of schooling and that it “both reflects and produces the dominant version of citizenship in any society” (p. 5). They advocate integrating citizenship education throughout all school subjects as well as structuring school systems to be more democratic in their
operations. They also suggest that the most effective way to develop curriculum for global citizenship might be for teachers to engage in transnational collaboration.

Towards the end of this volume, Walter Parker (2010) discusses two major binaries that he sees emerging out of these studies: multiculturalism versus nationalism and nationalism versus cosmopolitanism. His explains that his own recent studies show that nationalism remains the dominant discourse in U.S. citizenship education. Parker’s chapter is useful to this study because he emphasizes the importance of understanding the “discursive field” (p. 214) well so that possibilities for opening up citizenship education may be imagined.

Traditional and Emergent Citizenship Discourses

Many of the above discussions about citizenship education are rooted in traditional political discourses about citizenship. Liberalism, republicanism and communitarianism represent the major modern political theories about citizenship and they roughly correspond to the three types of states they name (Isin & Turner, 2002). Radical democratic theory offers both a critique of and an alternative to these discourses and has recently emerged as an important political theory. This section provides a brief overview of each theory and how it conceptualizes citizenship.

Liberalism

Liberal theories of citizenship begin with the individual and, based on classical liberal theory, assert that the primary value of citizenship is to maximize the liberty of the individual. Schuck (2002) lists the core principles of classical liberal theory: a primary concern with individual liberty which is understood as freedom from interference by the
state; a strong protection of freedoms such as the freedom of inquiry, speech and worship
coupled with an intense suspicion of state power over individuals; an allowance of state
coercion only in areas in which the actions of individuals affects others; and a strong
favoritism for markets and privacy. As mentioned previously, liberal theory supports
universalistic rights, but is opposed to categorical rights and therefore profound tensions
arise when the state grants rights to a particular group that overrides the rights of
individuals. Thus, liberal citizens tend to be left to their own devices, without much in
terms of guidance from the state and liberal societies tend to be less egalitarian than
societies with communitarian elements.

Citizens of the United States, like citizens in most liberal societies, have very few
duties imposed upon them beyond a requirement to obey the law and appear when called
for jury duty. Interestingly, the duty to obey the law and almost all of the rights of United
States citizens are also shared by legal residents who are not citizens. Schuck (2002)
comments on the criticism against U.S. liberal society that it grants a disproportionate
number of rights compared with the very minimal duties required of citizens. This
critique has driven the claim that liberal citizenship is “too thin to support a healthy social
order” (p. 139) and an insistence on de-emphasizing individual rights and strengthening
common civic duties in order to protect the common good and cultivate a greater sense of
social solidarity. The fact that there are strong forces opposing any move to require more
of individuals signifies the entrenchment of the liberal values of privatism, individualism
and anti-statism in the United States. This makes any redistributive policies very difficult
to enact so that struggles over the appropriate role of the state constantly shape the parameters of liberal citizenship.

*Republicanism*

In republican political theory, it is difficult to separate the terms *republican* and *citizen* because they are so closely intertwined. Classical republicanism holds that citizens do not exist without a republic and republics do not exist without citizens. However, this view of republican citizenship is weakening under the weight of globalization. In a republic, governance is a public matter and the citizens rule themselves. These two conditions – publicity and self-government – are the two essential ingredients of republicanism. Republican theorists critique liberalism’s heavy emphasis on privacy and individual rights as well as its lack of concern with the public virtues that compel individuals to do their duties as citizens. According to republicans, liberals are correct in their promotion of self-government but err in their belief that all forms of control deprive people of freedom. Thus republicans emphasize both the rule of law and civic virtue (Dagger, 2002).

From the republican perspective, citizenship has an ethical dimension in addition to a legal dimension; citizenship is regarded as an *ethos*, a way of life. Therefore true citizenship demands civic virtue in the form of a commitment to the common good as well as active participation in public life. It is only because of this ethical dimension, beyond citizenship as a legal status, that good citizens can be distinguished from bad citizens; in other words, citizenship has an ethical component because there are standards built into the concept of citizenship. The good citizen holds the interests of the
community above personal interests and will undertake public responsibilities when called upon as well as when such responsibilities are not legally required but are good for the community (Dagger, 2002).

Communitarianism

Communitarian political theory advances the needs of the community even further and prioritizes the community over the individual in sharp contrast to liberalism. Communitarianism’s sound rejection of liberal individualism does not make it a popular position from which to argue in the United States. For communitarians, citizenship is grounded in a culturally defined community rather than a political community of individual actors. The liberal concept of individual rights is rejected because it neglects the dimensions of identity and participation which bind community members together and promotes an understanding of community that is too thin.

Delanty (2002) offers a critique of traditional communitarianism as well as a reimagined postmodern concept of communitarian citizenship. He criticizes communitarianism for its uncritical acceptance of the terms citizenship and community that fails to recognized both as socially constructed concepts rather than as unquestioned truths. Delanty correctly notes that groups are not so easy to define and communitarian ideas about community often fall prey to essentialism. There is an errant tendency in communitarian thought to assume the existence of stable and coherent cultural groups. Delanty does, however, recognize the value of communitarian thought in today’s world saying that, “In many ways the postmodern era is the age of community” (p. 168). He advocates approaching community from a more sociological viewpoint so that
community in the global age can be imagined as “open and incomplete…dissensual, porous and contested” (p. 171)

*Radical Democratic Theory*

A more recent development in political thought is radical democratic theory which offers a critique and an alternative to traditional liberal, republican and communitarian theories. The work of Ernest Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985; Mouffe, 1993) has been instrumental in developing radical democratic theory. The theory asserts that citizenship identity has been disregarded by both liberal and Marxist theory by restricting political relations to the realm of the state or the economy only and it seeks to restore citizenship to the center of political thought. To counter the reduction of citizenship to “inefficacious flag-waving” (Rasmussen & Brown, 2002, p. 175), radical democratic theory seeks to enhance the importance of citizenship through a vision of “democracy as a way of life, a continual commitment not to a community or state but to the political conceived as a constant challenge to the limits of politics” (p. 175). The goal is an anti-essentialist politics that resists the exclusion of groups and individuals by continually redefining itself. The theory is predicated on a commitment to equality and participation that radicalizes politics through a dedication to constant social change. According to Claire Rasmussen and Michael Brown, radical democracy’s revision of citizenship makes possible new forms of political resistance that reject the tendency toward exclusion prevalent in other forms of citizenship.

According to radical democratic theory, there are three principles necessary to understanding contemporary politics. First, political struggles are always both temporary
and contextual and are contingent upon the antagonist power relations at particular times and places. Second, citizenship is conceived of as political agency that is not something that is achieved or possessed, but is a continual struggle within particular relations of power. Third, struggle is not simply located between the competing interests of citizens, but is instead located at the site of subject formation and in the ways in which citizens understand their relationships to the political realm. Of utmost importance to radical democracy is the context of political struggle and citizenship is not viewed as something resulting from predrawn boundaries but as the very object of contestation (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985; Rasmussen & Brown, 2002).

Laclau and Mouffe (1985) believe it is essential to rethink the location of power within society in order to maintain a concept of citizenship that does not depoliticize social relations. “Beginning with hegemony was an attempt to envision a bottom-up form of politics where power is located in and can be challenged not just at the institutional level but, potentially everywhere” (Rasmussen & Brown, 2002, p. 177). Because power operates at a multiplicity of sites and levels, the arena of the political must be expanded to include a broader range of activities and locations (Laclau, 1990). Laclau and Mouffe consider the paradox of liberal democracy that pits the liberty of the individual against the democratic impulse toward community. Unlike other theories which attempt to resolve this tension, radical democratic theory views the conflict between competing political principles as the location of the political itself (Mouffe, 2000).
The political sphere is reinvigorated by the inability to resolve political questions “making no questions uncontestable and all issues potentially political and enabling no a priori exclusions from the political sphere as either private or epiphenomenal” (Rasmussen & Brown, 2002, p. 178). The point becomes not whether communitarian or liberal arguments “win” but that they are always both at work, in process and in tension.

As this discussion demonstrates, citizenship is a complex and ever evolving concept. New visions of citizenship insist that it is more than a simple legal status and that it involves political and social recognition in addition to economic redistribution. Emerging claims to citizenship involve circuitous struggles rather than direct paths. While modern citizenship has traditionally been concerned with political, economic and social rights within a nation-state, globalization is forcing a reconsideration of these assumptions. Furthermore, citizenship has traditionally been theorized using inclusionary and universal language while in actuality modern citizenship has continuously excluded certain groups. Simple discussions about expanding and protecting rights are no longer adequate to the complex and evolving nature of contemporary citizenship (Isin & Turner, 2002).

Expanding Citizenship

One of the primary contributions of citizenship studies has been to expand the accepted forms of citizenship beyond the traditional political/economic/social to create a complex and multidimensional vision of what citizenship is and could possibly be. Notions of citizenship are always contested and necessarily fraught with issues about inclusion and exclusion (Lister, 1997). While it citizenship defines who “belongs,” it has
also traditionally been used as a tool of social and political exclusion, inequality, and xenophobia and has a tendency to negate differences such as gender, race and socioeconomic status. Ted Mitchell (2000) explains how citizenship education was used to both include and exclude African Americans in the era of Reconstruction – a period in which educators struggled to define a citizenship role for African Americans and decide how they should be prepared for that role. As a result of ambiguities surrounding African American citizenship, curricula typically discussed freedom while also emphasizing duty and responsibility. Mitchell explains that, “ideas of appropriate civic action as promoted in school texts encouraged broad participation and the robust exercise of citizenship. Yet as black political participation became a reality, the acceptable range of black political activity narrowed, resulting in a clear and unmistakable contrast between the rhetoric of citizenship and the reality of participation” (pp. 43-44). According to Mitchell, the terms of citizenship were altered by the Civil War and Reconstruction period so that they focused much more on loyalty and schools became the government’s agent in shaping citizens.

Marla Brettschneider (2002) provides the framework for an education that expands the vision of citizenship to include individuals, groups and experiences that have previously been marginalized. Brettschneider argues that “multiculturalism as a coherent democratic theory can help us learn that we do not have to leave parts of ourselves at the door when engaging in activist, identity-informed politics” (p. 9). In her view, democratic theory that is based on diversity allows us to explore the ways in which different aspects of our identities locate us in power relations at different points in time.
She seeks “to theorize democracy in a way that does not perpetuate the primacy and exclusive legitimacy of elite male viewpoints, basically delegitimizing and covering over the views of ‘others’” (p. 13). This task requires that we reconsider the framework of citizenship in a way that takes into account individuals who live within a particular set of borders who are not legally defined as citizens. Additionally, while the concept of citizenship excludes noncitizens, it often also ignores many who are officially citizens by not extending full rights and dignity to them.

Brettschneider (2002) is concerned with the idea of relationships in her discussion of a more inclusive citizenship. She states that, “although democratic theorists have had a tendency to understand citizenship as the political relationship, it actually is a particular form of political relationship” (p. 134); it is not the only form of political relationship. A more inclusive citizenship considers relationships such as families, friends and neighbors that have not traditionally been considered political. Taking into account these spheres can allow us to recognize the relationships developed by women and oppressed minorities that have traditionally been ignored by political theory. Brettschneider highlights the importance of including these spheres because, she argues, women frequently “make politics in the places they live” (p. 124). However, instead of understanding this as women’s political consciousness, such activities are often devalued as not “real” politics. Women, along with other marginalized groups, have long been engaged in activism that is based on relationships not typically considered political; however, these activities are commonly excluded from formal definitions of politics. According to Brettschneider, we must strive “to learn some lessons from different
people's experiences to see how we may understand political motivation and thus suggest a view of democratic membership that is more inclusive in both form and content” (p. 120).

**Sexual Citizenship**

Ruth Lister (2002) considers sexual citizenship as a departure from traditional citizenship that is disconnected from the body and insists upon a public-private divide. She explains that sexual citizenship:

has two different, though overlapping, meanings. The first signals a shift in the terrain of what is considered relevant to citizenship to include ‘the intimate’… The second concerns sexuality as a determining factor in the allocation of the rights (and to a lesser extent, responsibilities) associated with citizenship. This usage, in turn, takes two forms. One emphasizes access to the traditional triad of civil, political and social citizenship rights; the other, the articulation of new claims to ‘sexual rights,’ understood as ‘a set of rights to sexual expression and consumption. (p. 192)

For Lister, discussing sexual citizenship allows for the discussion of citizenship as a gendered concept as well. Conventional citizenship has frequently excluded heterosexual women as well as homosexual men and women from full citizenship, and their (assumed) association with the body and sexuality has formed the bases of their exclusion. In both republican and liberal citizenship traditions, “the citizen has stood as the abstract, disembodied, individual of reason and rationality” (p. 194). In this masculine sphere,
desires and bodies are something that must be overcome and only men are capable of this transcendence because they are disembodied from sexuality.

Citizenship can be reconceptualized as “grounded in an ethic of care and the responsibilities to which it gives rise” (2002, p. 197) through feminism, according to Lister. Such an approach may be sympathetic to a cosmopolitan conception of citizenship that recognizes the importance of actors other than the nation-state and traditional political institutions. Central to women’s citizenship are issues concerning sexual and reproductive health and autonomy. Claims based on identity are important as well as relationship-based rights. An important component of sexual citizenship is the understanding that the subject is constructed through multiple discourses rather than by one single position of identity, such as gender, race, sexuality or class.

Brettschneider (2002) looks at women’s experience in particular and considers the obstacles feminists face as they attempt to realize an alternate vision of citizenship. She emphasizes the value of looking at women’s experiences and relationships in less formal spaces in order to understand alternative possibilities for their roles as citizens in the more formal arena of politics. Brettschneider explains how women’s relationships and experiences have been used to exclude them from political participation as full citizens based on the fear that women’s connection to and care for others “would ruin the civic rationality of the public sphere” (p. 130). Because women have frequently performed caretaker roles, the male political sphere has viewed them as motivated by passion rather than by the rationality deemed superior in politics. Brettschneider challenges us to consider what it might mean “to theorize the why question in politics from the margins.”
and explains that, for her, it means “that in the struggle for democracy theorists must situate themselves on the terrain on which the marginalized in (U.S.) American society live their lives and create perspective” (p. 134). Her vision is that we revitalize democratic thought through the eyes of the historically disempowered by expanding what counts as political and thereby redefining citizenship in a more inclusive way.

*Cultural Citizenship*

Toby Miller (2002) explains that, “cultural citizenship concerns the maintenance and development of cultural lineage via education, custom, language, and religion, and the positive acknowledgement of difference in and by the mainstream” (p. 231). It is a discourse that is developing as a result of increasing migration across territorial borders of nation-states. Proponents of cultural citizenship assert that cultural contexts are the means through which identity is developed and sustained. However, there are significant tensions between principles of liberal individualism and cultural rights and even when social movements are based on difference, they are still ultimately exclusionary.

Miller (200) is concerned with cultural governmentality that teaches people how to be good citizens. “Cultural policy always implies the management of populations through suggested behavior…the regimes of cultural policy are the means of forming a collective public subjectivity” (p. 238). Precisely because cultural citizenship is a “a crucial site of governmentality” (p. 242) it opens up the possibility for politics that is radically democratic.
Ecological citizenship

Ideas about ecological citizenship reject the Enlightenment view that only people are eligible for the rights and responsibilities of citizenship and proposes that ecological communities are eligible as well. Ecological citizenship posits that citizenship requires public practice, not just the private pursuit of individual goods. Deane Curtin (2002) argues that ecological citizenship makes possible the formation of “a new intentional community” (p. 301) that is predicated on the integration of ecological and political identities. Ideally, citizenship should encompass a “more-than-human community” (p. 302) and consider our connection to place as an essential element of our humanness.

Ecological citizenship is often compromised by consumerism, but Curtin is confident that we still possess the ability to differentiate between environmental policies that are best for a consumer and those that are best for a citizen. Ecological citizenship requires individuals to respond to the world they inhabit as citizens rather than as homo economicus and this requires the cultivation of a moral identity. The market elevates self interest above the common good, so ecological citizenship attempts to elevate the common good so that it is the primary concern of civil life.

Post-national/Transnational

Because contemporary citizenship is multifaceted and only inextricably linked to the state in certain ways, Saskia Sassen (2002) theorizes “post-national conceptions of citizenship” (p. 277) made possible as a result of two significant transformations. The first is the new positions and institutions of nation-states that have arisen under the process of globalization during the past three decades. The second transformation is the
emergence of a variety of actors, partially as a result of the new qualities of states under globalization, that are not willing to automatically identify with a particular nation-state. This second transformation has been greatly strengthened by the rise of Internet technologies that promote cross-border networks comprised of both individuals and groups. Thus the emphasis of post-national citizenship is on identifying and developing new locations for citizenship that exceed the territorial borders of the state. This sometimes gives rise to new institutions (such as NGOs) that challenge the very authority of nation-states, even within their own domestic spheres. For example, globalization is intricately intertwined with national economics so that supranational institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, European Union and World Trade Organization can play a significant role in determining domestic economic performance. Additionally, the fortification of international human rights organizations influences the domestic policies of some nation-states.

Also central to Sassen’s (2002) ideas concerning post-national citizenship are concepts of local citizenship that also serve to challenge the authority of the state. Since post-national citizenships have largely not been formalized or legalized, experiences of identity frequently form the basis of post-national citizenship and the city has emerged as “a strategic scale for citizen actors” (2002, p. 286). It is in the city where new forms of citizenship claims materialize and the erosion of power at the national level has created openings for new forms of power and politics at a subnational level. Globalization has also allowed for linkages between subnational spaces so that global cities become the sites where processes of globalization are materialized and localized. According to
Sassen, “subnational citizenship practices have to do with the production of ‘presence’ by those without power and a politics that claims rights to the city” (p. 285). Indeed, the fight for the rights of diverse groups are primary fought in cities where the interests of various groups entangle with networks of power. Isin (2002) further explains that “rights to the city” does not refer to property rights but refers instead to the “rights to appropriate the city” (p. 314) and this contrasts with the idea of a city as a political entity with rights of its own.

Importantly, Sassen (2002) argues against a global/local binary because, in many ways, the global has become embedded in the national. Even if citizenship is still situated within national institutions, if those institutions have changed because of global influences, the meaning of the nation has also changed. Citizens may not be the only actors granted rights within a nation-state; foreign actors may also be granted rights as is especially evidenced by global economic actors. Democratic practices can also cross borders and result in the enactment of global policies from within national institutions, such as when international standards of human rights are used by national courts.

Ong (1999) also considers the problem of a global/local binary saying that it is a view that “is informed by a top-down model whereby the global is macro-political economic and the local is situated, culturally creative, and resistant” (p. 4). Such a binary ignores the relational and horizontal nature of cultural, social and economic processes that cross borders as well as the ways in which they are embedded within different power regimes. Therefore, Ong adopts the prefix –\textit{trans} to indicate the “moving through space or across lines, as well as changing the nature of something” and posits the term
“transnationalism to refer to the cultural specificities of global processes” (4) as she attempts “an ethnography of transnational practices and linkages that seeks to embed the theory of practice within, not outside of or against, political-economic forces” (5). Ong conceptualizes transnationalism as an interplay of tensions between social orders and movements and questions the assumption that globalization has weakened the power of the state. Although the flow of people, cultures and capital has altered the sovereignty of states in some respects, Ong asserts that the art of government is highly adaptive to the problems that transnationality present. She proposes the term “graduated sovereignty” (p. 6) to refer to a variety of civilizing and disciplinary regimes that subject multiple zones to different kinds of governmentality. These zones are not necessarily analogous to state boundaries, but may be made up of groups, such as people of a certain ethnicity, that are governed by a set of rights and responsibilities that are different from groups in other zones. Therefore one’s spatial location does not necessarily determine the regimes of power to which one is subject.

In her discussion of transnationality, Ong (1999) cautions against viewing transnationalism as something that is accessible to everyone. While those who possess mobility and modern communication resources have experience transnationalism as liberatory, large populations of individuals are excluded from the spatial and political opportunities of transnationalism. It is therefore important to study “these new relations of global inequalities (p. 11) as well as the systems of power that make mobility possible and then impose disciplinary structures on diverse transnational populations. Situated
analyses will expose the complex networks of global and national forces that cannot be studied independently.

**Global Citizenship**

How can we both draw upon ideas about global citizenship and cosmopolitanism while troubling them at the same time? Certainly globalism and postmodernism have shaken the nation-state’s status as the only source of authority relating to democracy and citizenship and there is a growing awareness that citizenship is transnational in scope. However, almost all citizenship laws are still enacted at the national level rather than at the supranational or local levels so the nation-state remains important to the concept of citizenship (Isin & Turner, 2002). The ancient Socratic phrase “citizen of the world” (p. 8) has reemerged as a utopian vision that seeks world governance and cosmopolitan democracy made possible through contemporary globalization. However, effective technologies of government cannot yet be formed if the apparatus of state citizenship is discarded. This is evident when we consider the case of human rights in relation to citizenship rights. Although legally human and citizenship rights sometimes seem to be in conflict, existing citizenship rights most often form the basis of people’s claims to human rights. And, human rights are frequently unenforceable through any apparatus but that of the state.

This does not mean that citizenship must be limited to traditional forms, however. Ong (1999) proposes the idea of “flexible citizenship” which she defines as, “the practices of refugees and business migrants who work in one location while their families are lodged in ‘safe havens’ elsewhere” (p. 6). Under globalization, according to Ong,
both governments and individuals seek to amass power and capital and develop flexible notions of sovereignty and citizenship to achieve this end. Ong explains that “flexible citizenship” refers to the cultural logics of capitalist accumulation, travel, and displacement that induce subjects to respond fluidly and opportunistically to changing political-economic conditions” (p. 6). She prefers the term flexible citizenship to cosmopolitan citizenship, which is often used to describe only elite Western subjects.

Roger M. Smith (2002) concurs that contemporary citizenship is being transformed by globalizing forces but also emphasizes that the governments of nation-states remain the key actors where citizenship is concerned. He considers the possibility that the idea of citizenship may eventually come to mean simultaneous membership in multiple human groups, but questions the probability of this scenario because of the unwillingness of political communities to relinquish power. An additional impediment to true global citizenship is the hugely difficult task of creating global forms of government that can wield authority and be viewed as legitimate. Therefore, Smith concludes that membership in political communities is likely to remain foundational to citizenship, even though these communities may morph into new forms. These communities will most likely continue to have exclusionary tendencies as they grant membership and power to some but not others.

Cosmopolitanism

Some writers (Delanty, 2002; Held & McGrew, 2003; Nussbaum, 2002) have proposed that cosmopolitanism offers an alternative to the either/or of reactionary nationalism and the false universalism of globalization (McCowan, 2009). Andrew
Linklater (2002) provides a useful history of the concept of cosmopolitan or world citizenship. He explains that the Greek philosopher Diogenes was likely the first to call himself a citizen of the world as rejection of the idea that the polis had the primary claim upon his political allegiances. Thus Diogenes used the concept of world citizenship as a critique of the polis rather than to develop a vision of universal human community.

During the Enlightenment, philosophers such as Immanuel Kant defined world citizenship in positive terms that referred to a sense of moral obligation between members of different sovereign states. The second half of the twentieth century saw the revival of the concept of cosmopolitan citizenship by global social movements that promoted collective responsibility for the world in the areas of human rights, environmental destruction, poverty and inequality. Proponents of cosmopolitan citizenship argue that it provides a new language of politics that does not tie the individual’s primary obligations to the nation-state and that it is key to securing universal rights and responsibilities in a more equitable world.

Critiques have be targeted at this highly utopian vision. Some have argued that the language of universality makes it easy for political interests to hide their agendas by calling for cosmopolitan citizenship. Others contend that new forms of cultural imperialism are likely to arise. Critics have also argued that individuals lack any real sense of belonging to an international community so it is futile to attempt to break the bonds between forms of democratic citizenship and the state. Other critiques do not assume that the decline of the nation-state is a good thing and argue that cosmopolitanism is contrary to its preservation and that cultivating civic virtues within nation-states should
be of primary importance. Still others argue that cosmopolitan citizenship implies world
government and contend that this is a frightening prospect.

Linklater (2002) considers these critiques in an attempt to determine if the
concept of cosmopolitan citizenship is defensible in a world with no global political
culture or public sphere and where the most powerful form of political community
remains the sovereign nation-state and democracy and citizenship are mostly national.
He points out that advocates of cosmopolitan citizenship rarely promote the idea of world
government, but instead encourage individuals to view themselves as members of two
communities, their nation-state and humanity, so that they will be more likely to consider
the interests of the world as a whole. This is seen as essential to combating violations of
human rights, environmental degradation and economic inequality and to developing a
global ethic. Linklater describes “a cosmopolitan turn in democratic political theory” (p.
327) positively, but cautions that if the rights of the world citizen are to be solidified, they
must be institutionalized so that individual governments are bound to protect them.
Additionally, the world citizen must have the right to representation and participation in
global political institutions. The task, Linklater argues, is to create democratic
instruments of global governance. This is a monumental task, of course, because the
most vulnerable are the least likely to have access to global governing institutions and
what currently passes for cosmopolitan rights is largely shaped by Western interests.
Linklater cautions against the danger of consolidating Western hegemony through such
institutions.
Developing a global ethic that is built upon the consent of the weakest is essential to avoiding these dangers, according to Linklater (2002). Just as national citizenship emphasizes the importance of both rights and responsibilities, cosmopolitan duty, in addition to rights, would be a hallmark of cosmopolitan citizenship. Linklater admits that the concept of cosmopolitan citizenship is “essentially contested” (p. 330), but ultimately views it as a worthy goal. What is not clear in his analysis is how such global political institutions would come into being and how sovereign states would become subject to their authority. McCowan (2009) explains that cosmopolitan citizenship without global policy is a moral, rather than a legal, status but can still function to shape practices and understandings.

*Exploding Citizenship*

The body of work overviewed in the previous section might all be thought of as part of citizenship 2.0, an upgrade from citizenship 1.0 which was primarily concerned with the relationship between the citizenship and the state and largely shaped, in the U.S., by liberal and republican citizenship discourses. What I am naming citizenship 2.0 grapples with how diverse identities and groups engage in civic relations, both relations among citizens and relations between citizens and the state. Additionally, the tightly nationalist focus of citizenship 1.0 has been loosened under the pressures of globalization. These are important discourses that have the potential to illuminate new citizenship possibilities for students, but as I demonstrate in chapter four, K-12 education is largely stuck in version 1.0.
This stuckness in citizenship education is troubling because the upgrades do not end at version 2.0. New ideas are constantly emerging that push citizenship thinking beyond these frameworks and reach a point where old categories are not just expanded, but exploded. What I term citizenship 3.0 is emerging in ways that rely less upon categories of identity politics and offer post-possibilities for re-envisioning citizenship. These emergent forms help us to problematize some of the expansive discourses that are just starting to appear in the standards documents of some states. For example, the discussions of sexual citizenship and ecological citizenship above both risk reinscribing old binaries by using the public/private divide as a framework for analysis. Post-subjectivity/identity politics are exploding the categories of cultural citizenship. Cosmopolitan citizenship still often proposes a direct link between government and citizenship, but what if that was severed? Post-foundational political thought seeks to redefine the political and what constitutes democratic participation. Citizenship 3.0 grapples with issues of statelessness (McGregor, 2011; Kerber, 2009), refugees (Baghdasaryan, 2011), multilayered citizenship (Ronkainen, 2011; Pan, 2011), indigenous populations (Steinman, 2011), transnational solidarity movements, and digital citizenship (Goode, 2010). These new trends in citizenship studies mean that the chasm between citizenship studies and citizenship education in the U.S. continues to widen.

_Foucault and Citizenship Education_

This study employs discourse analysis that is heavily influenced by Foucauldian poststructuralism, and Foucault’s concepts of governmentality and care of the self are important parts of this analysis. Governmentality provides a framework through which to
examine state curriculum standards and how they work to discipline populations. Care of the self offers the opportunity to introduce aspects of Foucauldian ethics in the citizenship classroom.

**Governmentality**

Foucault refers to governmentality as “the art of government” (2000, p. 201), meaning that it goes beyond a concern with the sovereign rule of a state and encompasses various techniques of governance, or strategies that program people to behave in desired ways (p. 205, 211). According to Foucault, governmentality emerged during the modern period; previous to that, the primary mode of governance was through direct coercion. Governmentality differs from what Foucault terms sovereign rule in that the techniques of governance employed are multiple and not always transparent. In liberalism, Foucault observed an important link between the government of the state and the government of the self (Peters, 2009). In addition, governmentality is a productive form of power because it produces behavior rather than restricts it. Instead of writing a law that prohibits a particular behavior, governmentality develops strategies, or norms, that guide people to specific actions. For example, if the desire is for people to drive cars, it is not necessary to pass laws that prohibit other forms of transportation. Techniques such as limiting the number of bike paths, designing unwalkable neighborhoods, and making cars more affordable will produce the desired effect. Governmentalites reflect specific rationalities or mentalities; how these rationalities get materialized, on the ground, are the techniques of governance. Thus governmentality is about practices and, under liberalism, is not a political or economic doctrine but is instead “a style of thinking quintessentially
concerned with the art of governing” (Gordon, 1991, p. 14). Liberalism rejected the visible order of police control in favor of “the necessarily opaque, dense autonomous character of the processes of population” (p. 20). Thus the security of the state is ensured by creating specific economic and juridical subjectivities.

According to Foucault (2000), governmentality only occurs when people have freedom, i.e., are not slaves. Freedom is a requirement because it provides the possibility for resistance, which is always a characteristic of governmentality. For Foucault, resistance involves questioning norms and rationalities. It is different from traditional views of resistance that involve one group resisting another or resisting a prohibitive law. Foucault’s notion of resistance involves resisting norms, not groups. The individual is the resistor, rather than a group, and it is not about resisting laws, but resisting practices. Foucauldian resistance differs significantly from Marxist resistance which is equated with revolution. Marxism provides one possibility for change that involves an overall structural change while Foucault offers more varied possibilities for resistance, arguing that smaller scale resistances count too. An individual rejection of norms counts as resistance for Foucault, who says that it is important to consider every voice or thought as resistance.

Foucault also differs from Marx by rejecting the idea that resistance is about adversarial relations, or one entity going up against another. For Foucault, resistance is not located in entities, such as labor versus capital. Instead, he proposes a mode of analysis that starts with examining individual acts of resistance and then moves upward in scale. Resistance exists even in thoughts, and it is from this perspective that Foucault
considers resistance as critique (2000). Validation for resistance does not come from the
effect of the act of questioning, but from the act of questioning itself. According to
Foucault, resistance is as much a part of governmentality as governance is, because it is
always a possibility. Since power is diffuse, or present everywhere, in governmentality,
resistance can also be possible at every level. This is one of the key features that
distinguishes governmentality from a sovereign form of governance, which does not
provide the same possibility for resistance.

In contrast to sovereign power, Foucault discusses more modern diffuse forms of
power that have proliferated. In order to understand these forms of power, it is necessary
to understand toward what interest(s) power is directed. Foucault argues that the forms
of power in many societies today serve a neoliberal purpose, which is “a novel set of
notions about the art of government” (Gordon 1991, p. 6). Neoliberalism holds that
competition is the fundamental regulatory principle within society at all levels.
According to Foucault (2008), neoliberalism evolved out of a crisis of liberalism, or the
clash of material realities (e.g., protectionism) against the discourses of liberalism (e.g.,
free trade). Foucault explains that liberalism assumes an equal world that is based on free
exchange. This, however, is a fiction that neoliberalism recognizes because it is
predicated on inequality and the idea that there must be winners and losers.
Neoliberalism is a competitive mentality that extends into all areas of society, so that it is
not just applied to the markets but is applied to areas such as education as well. For
example, the practices of standardization and high stakes testing at the primary and
secondary levels are saturated with discourses about producing educated citizens who are
competitive at the local, national and global scales. Competition becomes the primary motive for education rather than producing citizens capable of democratic deliberation or education for the sake of education itself.

Foucault (2008) explains that in liberalism the site of power is the market which gives rise to the need for government, but under neoliberalism governing is done for the market, not because of it. Monopoly is a possibility, so regulation is necessary in order to allow for competition. Therefore, the role of government is to create the conditions necessary for competition to occur, the conditions necessary for the market to exist; it is not a natural phenomenon but a constructed one. The state cannot simply withdraw from the economic sphere, but is actively engaged in constructing economic progress and societal wealth through intervention. Neoliberalism only desires intervention in service of competition and defines *homo economicus* as “an entrepreneur of himself, he only has competitors” (Donzelot 2009). Through its concern for political economy, government is able to accomplish more while at the same time exerting less visible force and authority (Gordon, 1991). Here emerges the impetus for the making of civil society and “it becomes the ambition of neoliberalism to implicate the individual citizen, as player and partner, into [the] market game” (p. 36). Strategies are enacted at all levels of society in order to achieve economic competitiveness that is based on neoliberal ideas. Economic theory is enlarged so that its territory encompasses all conduct and all government action which ultimately results in what Gordon refers to as “the capitalization of the meaning of life” (p. 44).
Ong (1999) explains how transnational strategies are related to systems of
governmentality in the techniques they employ to regulate behavior and manage the flow
of capital and populations. She is interested in “the cultural logics of governmentality in
the production of subjectivities, practices, and desires” (p. 17). Transnational mobility
makes possible new modes of subjectification and identity construction that crosses the
political borders of nations. Regimes of power and truth still limit available subjectivities
under transnationalism and many of these are related to global capitalism and the cultural
mechanisms and political rationalities it produces. Ong gives the example of labeling
individuals as “Muslim” and thereby limiting their subjectivities as specific kinds of
citizens even if they are able to move across political borders.

Transnationalism, in Ong’s view, has not simply weakened state power, but has
instead created more complex and flexible relationships between governments and
capital. She describes state power as a force that is positive and generative in response to
the transformations brought about by global capital. Thus a discussion of flexible
citizenship considers the forms of governmentality practiced by the nation-state, the
family and capital and the ways in which they intersect and constrain subjectivities. Ong
identifies the passport as the primary biopolitical instrument that regulates citizenship and
thus it can be used to promote the needs of the marketplace. For example, Ong discusses
a change to British immigration policy in 1990 that granted full citizenship to an elite
group of Hong Kong subjects who owned property, had attained a high level of
education, were fluent in English, and had connections in British government. “British
immigration law thus produced a new discourse on overseas Chinese, who were eligible
for citizenship only as *homo economicus*” (p. 215). In more recently industrialized nation-states it is not uncommon for citizens with different roles in systems of production and capital to be subject to different forms of surveillance and be granted different civil and economic rights, thus control over citizenship is matched to the needs of global capital.

*Governmentality and State Curriculum Standards*

The concept of governmentality is applicable to the field of education because, as Gordon (2009) explains, the public sphere consists of the dimensions “in which a population offers itself to governmental influence or intervention” (p. xxi) and education is one mode of governmental intervention. He describes the role of education in modern society as “an axis linking the governability of societies to the formation of public discursive space” (p. xxii). Peters (2009) further describes the expansion of economic theory into all domains:

The innovation of American neoliberalism for Foucault is the generalization of the model of *homo economicus* to all forms of behavior representing an extension of economic analysis to domains previously considered to be non-economic and the redefinition of *homo economicus* as entrepreneur of himself with an emphasis on acquired elements and the problem of the formation of human capital in education. (p. xxx)

Peters terms this “‘government through the market’ to produce ‘responsibilized’ citizens who harness their own entrepreneurial and self-governing capabilities” (p. xlii). Thus
education, as an arm of government, has the task of shaping students into citizens who function appropriately under a neoliberal regime.

Thomas S. Popkewitz (1998) focuses on the usefulness of employing a governmentality approach to educational research and argues that viewing school knowledge as sovereign power is limiting to the research endeavor although it is the approach taken by many, if not most, sociological studies of school knowledge. Instead, according to Popkewitz, we should consider power to be something that circulates among the various relationships between actors (students, parents, teachers, administrators) within an educational system. In particular, the student-teacher relationship is characterized by power that moves in more than one direction rather than by a teacher who maintains all of the power and uses it to direct the student. Bill Green (1998) argues that “students are caught up in a particular relationship with a teacher, one that is always intimate, interactive, transactive, and negotiated” (p. 183), and similar negotiated relationships exist between parents, teachers, and administrators as well. This is consistent with Foucault’s (2000) discussion of governmentality in which he theorizes power as something that circulates throughout various levels of society and is productive, meaning that it is something that people engage in rather than something that is enforced upon them from above. Popkewitz (1998) goes on to argue that when the educational researcher examines school governance, the concern should be less with policies and more about “the conditions by which practices are constructed as plausible” (p. 20). It is in this light that the governing work of schools can be examined, and this can best be done at the microlevel to understand how power functions in pedagogy. At this level,
power can remain invisible without careful examination, so if reform is to be possible, an awareness of the microlevel is necessary (Gore, 1998).

**Care of the Self as Citizenship**

Some of Foucault’s later work (1997) is interested in subjectivity as it is related to both governance and resistance. When Foucault discusses subjectivity, he is referring to one’s identity and how it gets imposed by societal norms and he is therefore interested in cultural and contextual systems that constitute the subject and produce norms. In this realm, Foucault is concerned with what he names ethics rather than morality. For him, morality is defined by acting in accordance with moral codes, while ethics is something quite different. Ethics involve individual matters of self-transformation so that one can question his or her subjectivity and role in society. Foucault is interested in the process of thinking deeply about norms and deciding for oneself whether to follow or question them. This is where the idea of resistance is tied to subjectivity because the ethical constitution of the subject allows for the possibility for resistance through questioning and rejecting norms.

Foucault (2005) looks to antiquity for models of self-reflective practices, which he terms “care of the self” (p. 2), or as Gordon (2009) describes them, “the care of the soul, or the conscience, of the citizen” (p. xii). Foucault points to the ancient practices of meditation and daily writing in a notebook as paths toward knowing oneself in contemporary society. Such practices invite self-reflection and allow access to knowledge that in turn allows one to develop judgment about what should be accepted and what should be rejected. It is then possible to understand that there are other
possibilities and to refuse an identity. This involves not accepting a constructed identity as truth, as well as the proactive development of agency and individual thought; it is a reflexive project. Such a project is necessary in order to know what might be done towards making change. Then, the transformation of one’s subjectivity can be put to use at a larger scale. This is where Foucault connects the art of living with the art of governance. Care of the self leads to good self-governance, which can be scaled up to governance over others. According to Foucault, only one who is successful at self-governance can be successful at governing others.

Foucault (1980) questions the idea that truth is knowable and naturally occurring. Instead, he argues that truth is produced as discourse, which is a body of knowledge that is socially constructed into truths and norms that govern human relations and form a mentality or rationality. Truth then is never discovered as something that is preexisting, but is always produced, always socially constructed. Truth does not reveal the way things are; what gets presented as truth can only show the way things are represented. Multiple truths and discourses are constructed so that truth cannot be thought of as a singular thing. Maarten Simons and Jan Masschelein (2009) describe self-mastery through care of the self as a pathway towards questioning the truth that is presented through the processes of governmentalization and therefore, “the ethics of de-governmentalisation is at the same time an ‘ethics of de-subjectivation’” (p. 538). One can ask how the self is part of the present through current ways of acting and thinking. Simons and Masschelein describe the connection to education in this way: “Being engaged in a study of governmentality is in view of this not about wanting to accumulate
and transfer knowledge (and processes of governmentalisation), but to live a true life and to be a touchstone for others to take care of the self and to live a true life oneself” (p. 541). They propose thinking of education as “work on the self … through limit-experiences or processes of de-subjectivation” (p. 542) so that “e-ducational truth-telling takes care for others, however not by telling them what to do (based on true knowledge) but by opening up spaces to take care for oneself and to verify one’s life” (p. 543). This task involves making things public and bringing to light the constructed nature of practices previously taken for granted. Such acts, according to Simons and Masschelein, are demonstrations of equality so that the study of governmentality also has a democratic concern as well as a public concern.

Mark Olssen (2009) describes ethical work, as envisioned by Foucault, as “the work one performs in the attempt to transform oneself into an ethical subject of one’s own behavior, the means by which we change ourselves in order to become ethical subjects … the kind of relationship you ought to have with yourself … and which determines how the individual is supposed to constitute himself as a moral subject of his own actions” (p. 77). This ethical work does not just focus on codes of moral behavior, but it involves developing an understanding that the way we relate to ourselves effects how we construct our identities and govern our conduct. The process of self-formation becomes the art of self-government in the relation of the self to the self and to others. Olssen argues that these strategies of self-government allow the self to demonstrate its agency and attempt to effect change and learn to think differently about the regulatory rules of society. This is connected to citizenship because the formation of character is
essential to freedom, according to Foucault, which is also a way of caring for others. Community is implied in ethical practice because “ēthos implies a relation with others to the extent that care for self renders one competent to occupy a place in the city, in the community, or interpersonal relationships, whether as a magistrate or as a friend” (Foucault 1997, p. 287). According to Olssen, liberty is political and so are practices of the self because they constitute relations of power and ensure that, if done correctly, one does not abuse power over others. He explains that, “The care of the self thus posits a politically active subject, involving practices of the self which include governance, with all of the associated problems of practical politics” (p. 90).

Jacque Donzelot and Colín Gordon (2009), in a conversation about the impact of Foucault’s lectures, discuss the implications that governmentality has for citizenship, in other words, how a certain way of being governed effects conceptions of citizenship. Gordon argues that Foucault’s de-emphasis on sovereignty anticipated the effects that globalization has had on the status of the nation-state. Donzelot sees in this “an enhanced possibility of linking the ‘technical’ analysis of governmentality with the ‘moral’ analysis of forms of citizenship corresponding to this new historical context” (p. 12). He considers the type of civil society that is possible under neoliberalism which emphasizes autonomy and individual responsibility at the local level. This gives rise to the need for shared institutions which requires consent that is a form of civic engagement as well as trust. Here Donzelot distinguishes between the governed and the citizen, saying that only the citizen participates in civic engagement. Simons and Masschelein (2009) explain that ethics transform the subject of knowledge into a subject of action. The concept of an
actively engaged citizen is consistent with the stated goals of the standards documents of many states which list active civic engagement as an aim of social studies education.

A few authors examine pedagogy within Foucault’s framework of governmentality in order to reimagine classroom practices as they relate to care of the self. For example, Maarten Simons & Jan Masschelein (2008) argue that learning is not only a matter of government, but is also a matter of self-government. The discourses surrounding education promote a “managerial attitude toward learning” and expect learners to “become managers of their own learning (pp. 400-401). The responsibility is on the learner to develop into an “entrepreneur of the self” (p. 406) in order to be successful in the economic system. This, according to the authors, is a form of business ethics rather than individual ethics that is promoted by education and involves no questioning of norms. An effective teaching strategy might be to help students question the interests promoted by these ideas of self-government and personal responsibility.

Gert Biesta (2008) seeks to problematize current ideas about emancipatory education and re-envision it from a Foucauldian perspective. Emancipation is a common discourse in pedagogy that has traditionally been contingent upon the outsider (teacher) revealing the objective truth of one’s (the student’s) oppression. However, this model necessarily relies upon a mistrust of one’s own experience and Foucault argues that care of the self can make this knowledge possible from within the individual. Biesta questions the traditional model and proposes a “new logic of emancipation” (p. 175) that does not claim an escape from power is possible and that is productive – not something that is done to individuals but something that is done by individuals. He names this a horizontal
rather than vertical logic. Such an approach teaches students that they have opportunities to become agents of change rather than always being subjects of those changes.

Robert J. Helfenbein and Nicholas J. Shudak (2009) study the role of resistance in the classroom and consider the possibility of teaching practices becoming sites of resistance in social studies education. They explore the ethical commitments of social studies teachers and how they struggle to maintain a sense of their own identity in light of curriculum standardization. The ethical construction of the teacher/subject becomes important in this discussion since Foucault (2005) states that one must begin with care of the self in order to effectively govern (and I would argue teach) others. Helfenbein and Shudak assert the importance of contextualizing when teaching about democracy and of making the link between democracy and education clear in order to teach that democratic countermovement is possible. They give some helpful practical suggestions, such as teaching about local resistances to particular historical events so that students understand that individual resistance is possible. Mimi Orner (1998) argues that resistance in teaching is primarily about method, about problematizing the content we are expected to teach. Thus, can we imagine a social studies education that is more about teaching critique than about curriculum standards and testing?

In a similar vein, Tyson Lewis (2007) contemplates the possibility of “education for insurgency” based on the constitutive power of youth (p. 699) He argues that youth must be made aware that they are subjects of constitutive power. Henry Giroux (2003), in his discussion of democracy and education, is also concerned with the subjectivities of youth and argues that youth have “become the new casualties in the ongoing war against
justice, freedom, citizenship, and democracy” (p. 145) in the United States. While his writing is about college students, I think his point can be made by considering younger students as well. He explains that the practices of pedagogy have become less concerned “with providing the conditions for students to learn how to think critically, hold institutional authority accountable for its actions, and act in ways that further democratic ideas” (p. 154). Commercial, managerial, and technical skills and considerations are privileged over the ethics of political and social responsibility that are part of the democratic project. Giroux asserts that citizenship has become solely about becoming a consumer and the idea of self-government no longer holds any meaning beyond the economic. He names the university as a site of resistance and struggle and I believe the K-12 social studies classroom has a role to play in teaching the skills and ideas that can give rise to these later activities. Giroux names this “educated hope” (p. 156) that more critical forms of schooling can be developed.

While the goal would be to develop a more critical education across all content areas, the social studies classroom might be best suited as a starting point because of the subject matter. However, the possibilities for this are threatened by the de-emphasis of social studies education in the United States as a result of various educational reform processes that require more focus on math, reading and science. Wayne Au (2009) refers to social studies “the disappearing subject” (p. 47) and examines the potential for social studies education to provide an education that challenges the hegemonic norms of high-stakes testing generally as part of a broader need to teach for social justice in today’s schools (p. 44). He cites numerous studies that show the teaching of social studies has
declined dramatically across the United States as schools struggle to improve their students’ scores on standardized tests in reading and math. Au highlights a school in California where students who are testing below proficiency levels take as many as two periods of math and three periods of reading each day, and as a result, some students take no social studies at all. He also cites studies that show teachers use less class time for inquiry and critical analyses in order to meet the content demands of the test and this makes it almost impossible to teach students the skills necessary to engage actively with social issues. Au proposes that we adopt an alternative model for social studies that he names “social studies for social justice: a challenging of hegemonic, status quo norms of historical knowledge, with visionary and pedagogic ‘shift into the elsewhere of the possible’” (p. 54). This brand of social studies learning certainly cannot be adequately assessed through content driven standardized tests.

What might all of this mean for citizenship education, assuming it survives in the curriculum at all? Applying Foucault’s concept of care of the self would involving teaching students to reflect on the self as a citizen and what that means in terms of identity and subjectivity. Questions to explore with students might include: What are the expectations of citizenship? How have these expectations developed? What does it mean that a discussion of citizenship rights almost always involves a discussion of citizen responsibilities as well? What does this mean for the life of the citizen? Do you accept or reject these expectations? How can the notion of citizenship be reconceptualized? Questioning is an often heralded skill in the context of teaching critical thinking, but it frequently comes with boundaries that define what can be questioned and what cannot be
questioned. Citizenship is enmeshed with patriotism in the U.S. social studies curriculum and patriotism tends to be one of those unquestionable concepts, so that makes it even more important that critical reflection be incorporated into teaching about citizenship.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of some of the dominant and emergent discourses in citizenship studies as a foundation for the analysis of state standards I present in chapter four. Not all of these discourses appear in the standards, but it is important to understand the major themes in citizenship theory so that we might imagine new directions for citizenship education. Chapter three will elaborate on the methodology used in this study and provide a detailed description of the research design.
Chapter 3

Citizenship Discourses in K-12 Education: Identifying the Conditions of Possibility

Introduction

This study employs qualitative content analysis and discourse analysis to arrive at an interpretive reading of the citizenship curriculum standards of ten different states. This reading, which is multilayered and composed of three major phases, considers each state individually as well as comparatively. The methodological approach I describe in this chapter relies heavily on Adele E. Clarke’s (2005) situational analysis, which she proposes as a supplement to traditional grounded theory approaches. Clarke’s methods of situational, positional and narrative mapping are central to the analysis of data. I also rely on Foucault’s (1972) assertion that discourse limits the “conditions of possibility” (p. 116) to help understand how citizenship standards are techniques of governance that shape the possibilities for the kinds of citizens students can/should be. Discourse analysis is important to this study because, as Clarke argues, it is one of the primary strategies for “pushing grounded theory around the postmodern turn” (p. 19).

Qualitative Content Analysis

Qualitative content analysis has been defined as “any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings” (Patton, 2002, p.453) and as “a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic
classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns” (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p.128). It is an important analytical tool when working in an interpretive paradigm and can help the researcher provide thick descriptions of data. Yan Zhang and Barbara M. Wildemuth (2009) explain that:

Qualitative content analysis emphasizes an integrated view of speech/texts and their specific contexts. Qualitative content analysis goes beyond merely counting words or extracting objective content from texts to examine meanings, themes and patterns that may be manifest or latent in a particular text. It allows researchers to understand social reality in a subjective but scientific manner. (p. 1)

Zhang and Wildemuth cite four main differences between quantitative and qualitative content analysis. First, they were developed in different fields of research and therefore have been used for different purposes. Quantitative content analysis was developed largely in the field of mass communication and became a tool for counting textual elements. Qualitative content analysis emerged out of the disciplines of anthropology, psychology and qualitative sociology and became a technique for exploring “the meanings underlying physical messages” (p. 1). The second difference is that quantitative content analysis is deductive and used to either test hypotheses or consider questions raised by theories or prior research while qualitative content analysis is mostly inductive and seeks to ground categories and theories in the data. The third difference is that the two approaches employ different sampling techniques. Random sampling, or other probabilistic methods, are required in quantitative content analysis in order to
ensure validity. Samples for qualitative content analysis, however, “usually consist of
purposively selected texts which can inform the research questions being investigated”
(p. 2). Fourth, the two approaches result in different products. Quantitative content
analysis uses statistical methods to produce numbers while qualitative content analysis
frequently produces descriptions or typologies that pay “attention to unique themes that
illustrate the range of the meanings of the phenomenon rather than the statistical
significance of the occurrence of particular texts or concepts” (p. 2).

Hsiu-Fang Hseih and Sarah E. Shannon (2005) argue that qualitative content
analysis is not a single method, but instead encompasses three different approaches that
vary in terms of coding and involvement of inductive reasoning. Conventional
qualitative content analysis derives coding categories directly from the textual data and is
used to develop grounded theory. Directed content analysis begins with a theory or
relevant research findings that is used to derive codes. This approach is often used to
extend or validate a theory or conceptual framework. Summative content analysis counts
and compares keywords or content in order to interpret the underlying context and
discover latent meanings and themes. While this approach is initially quantitative, the
ultimate goal is an inductive exploration of the usage of words in a text. As I explain in
more detail below, my study employed a mixture of conventional and summative content
analysis at different stages of the research process.

Philipp Mayring (2000) describes how he and his research colleagues developed a
method of qualitative content analysis in the 1980s, influenced by earlier methods dating
back to the early twentieth century, that engaged in “systematic, rule guided qualitative
text analysis, which tried to preserve some methodological strengths of quantitative content analysis and widen them to a concept of qualitative procedure” (p. 1). Mayring is concerned with critiques of qualitative research that label it “unscientific” and seeks to develop very specific rules and procedures to systematically analyze texts. He cautions against using the method in studies that are “highly open-ended, explorative, variable” (p. 8), in which working with categories is difficult, or studies that require a more holistic, rather than step-by-step, approach. Zhang and Wildemuth (2009) agree that a step-by-step approach is desirable, but allow for more flexibility based on the research goals. Ultimately, the research product should consist of thick description and rich interpretation that provides the reader a clear understanding of the data and how the conclusions are drawn by the researcher.

Satu Elo and Helvi Kyngäs (2007) respond to various critiques of qualitative content analysis. Because quantitative researchers also use content analysis, they have a tendency to view qualitative content analysis as inferior because it does not produce detailed statistical analysis. As outlined above, the intended product of qualitative content analysis is interpretive analysis, not numbers. Others have charged that content analysis is not qualitative enough, that is really a quantitative technique. While approaches such as summative content analysis do rely on some initial counting, the final product is interpretive rather than statistical. Another critique of qualitative content analysis is that it is too simplistic. This, of course, is dependent upon the analytical skills of the researcher and any method can produce simplistic results in less capable hands.
Qualitative content analysis is not less likely to produce rich interpretive analyses than other qualitative methods.

**Discourse Analysis as Performative**

Discourse refers to a particular series of practices and representations that collectively work to produce meanings, constitute identities, establish social relations and open or close possibilities for political and ethical outcomes. Discourses produce notions of “the social” and “the self” and “constitute the objects of which they speak” (Gregory, et al., 2009, p. 166). Discourses are also performative so that the ideas they represent become materialized through enactment. Understanding discourses as performative frees us from a reliance on social construction and allows us to recognize how discourse “stabilizes over time to produce the effects of boundary, fixity and surface (Butler, 1993, p. 12). Over time, some interpretations stabilize at the expense of others and thereby produce discursive formations. As Gregory, et al. (2009) explain, “Discourses shape the contours of the taken for granted world, naturalizing and universalizing a particular subject formation and view of the world” (p. 167).

Discourse has also been defined as “a body of ideas, concepts and beliefs that have become established as knowledge, or as an accepted way of looking at the world” (Doherty, 2007, p. 193). Discourse analysis frequently denotes an analysis of language, but can also refer to analyses of visual images, symbols, material and nonverbal modes of communication. Therefore, a wide variety of forms such as speech, written documents, photographs, music, buildings and artifacts are considered “texts” that can be analyzed (Clarke, 2005). Adele E. Clarke outlines two main theoretical roots of discourse analysis.
The first is an examination of the ways in which meanings are socially constructed. Discursive representations frame reality and thereby delineate realms of the possible. The second focus is a Foucauldian analysis of the analytics of power. Foucault (1972) describes discourses as bodies of knowledge made up of practices through which power as knowledge and knowledge as power operate. Therefore discourse analysis is key to an analysis of power. Particular texts are typically chosen for discourse analysis because they are either products of a group in which the researcher is interested or because they are about a specific group of topic of interest. These groups may be dominant or marginalized, so discourse analysis provides tools with which we can deconstruct regimes of truth (Clarke, 2005).

Foucauldian discourse is important to this study because, rather than refer to an object, it refers to a set of relationships, both static and dynamic, that exist between discursive events. As Ruth Wodack (2008) explains, “discourse is defined on a different, more abstract, level as text. Discourse implies patterns and commonalities of knowledge and structures whereas a text is a specific and unique realization of a discourse” (p. 6). So in this study, the standards documents are the texts in which various citizenship discourses are realized. Foucault developed “discursive rules through which knowledges come to be produced, framed and displayed” (Clarke, 2005, p. 147). Discourse sets limits as to what “can be said about a phenomenon but also, in the positivity of power, empowers certain agents to speak and make representations, while also disempowering others from doing so” (p. 160). Therefore, according to Foucault (1972) discourses are forms of knowledge that establish “conditions of possibility” (p. 116).
Citizenship discourse encompasses all the ways in which citizenship is theorized, written, bounded and practiced. There is no singular way to engage with citizenship nor is there a singular way to investigate its objects. “In fact, it is this dispersed discursive aspect that provides its vitality and liveliness, rather than an orthodox set of rules that govern conduct” (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 5). Social studies curriculum standards are part of both the citizenship discourse in education as well as the larger U.S. citizenship discourse.

Norman Fairclough (1999) offers several reasons why discourse analysis is important to the social sciences. He explains that discourses represent an important type of social action and that it is important to understand the work that language does in the world. He also asserts that texts are important sources of evidence that can be used to ground claims “about social structures, relations, and processes” (p. 204). Additionally, he posits that texts are reliable indicators of social change because they “are sensitive barometers of social processes, movement and diversity” (p. 204). Fairclough also argues that texts (especially mass media) are frequently used as tools of social domination and social control. As Clarke (2005) explains, “the questions become: Where did this text come from? What work is it intended to do in the world? How so?” (p. 153).

In their reader on discourse analysis, Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland (2006) present four possible foci for discourse analysis and I will focus on examining how identities and subjectivities are produced through discourse. Social systems and institutions exert pressures that impact the formation of identities and subjectivities. The
task is to study key sites where identities and subjectivities are produced, and education is one such site. Clarke (2005) proposes situational analysis as a method of discourse analysis that employs grounded theory and discourse mapping. She explains how situational analysis is a flexible approach that draws upon Foucauldian discourse analysis but ultimately takes a very different approach. While Foucault analyzed a single discourse in a given situation – the one with the most power, situational analysis that maps discourses “seeks to represent all of the major discourses related to the situation of interest – not just what could be called ‘the master discourse,’ that which usually trumps all the others” (p. 175). Clarke goes on to explain that this approach differs radically:

By not analytically recapitulating the power relations of domination,

analyses that represent the full array of discourses turn up the volume on lesser but still present discourses, lesser but still present participants, the quiet, the silent, and the silenced. Such analyses can amplify not only difference but also resistances, recalcitrancies, and sites of rejection of discourse per se. (p.175)

The attempt to represent all of the discourses at play and bring to light marginalized discourses “are the radically democratic – and not undangerous – features of situational analysis” (p. 178). Clarke acknowledges that discourse analysis is full of ambiguity, but she argues that we must learn to live with this if we expect “to even begin to stagger around the postmodern turn” (p. 178).

*Doing Post-Structural Discourse Analysis*
I relied heavily on poststructural discourse analysis as I examined citizenship as a discursive construction. A poststructural approach allows for the rejection of the citizen/non-citizen binary that erases identities and clearly delineates who is included and who is excluded. Deborah P. Britzman (2000) explains that in poststructuralist theories, subjects cannot be uncoupled from the conscious and unconscious of discourses that fashion how subjects become recognized and misrecognized. Every discourse constitutes, even as it mobilizes and shuts out, imaginary communities, identity investments, and discursive practices. Discourses authorize what can and cannot be said; they produce relations of power and communities of consent and dissent, and thus discursive boundaries are always being redrawn around what constitutes the desirable and the undesirable and around what it is that makes possible particular structures of intelligibility and unintelligibility…The point is that if discourses construct and incite the subject and produce contradictory investments, pleasures, and knowledge, then they can also be employed to deconstruct the kinds of naturalizations that push one to take up the impossible moral imperatives of policing categories, ensuring boundaries, and attempting to live the promises of a noncontradictory, transcendental self. (p. 36)

In this theory, discourse constrains available subject positions so that one’s citizenship determines one’s identity and those who have no citizenship are without identity as it is constructed by discourses about national citizenship. A poststructural analysis allows an
interrogation of how the concept of citizenship works to maintain dominant systems of power. It also allows identity to be reimagined as something more than singular, fixed and static – something that is multiple and shifting.

This does not mean that other theories did not inform my project. My work is also informed by feminism, deconstruction, and postcolonial theories, among others and at various points in the project I experienced the need to shift or reformulate my frame. Andrew Abbot (2004) offers useful advice regarding heuristics that guided me in my use of theoretical concepts. He writes about using multiple heuristics “to free yourself from the restrictions of your point of view” (p. 86). In the “fourth and final level of social science work,” Abbot states, “You start using the different standard stances to question one another; each becomes the others heuristic … You can combine stances into far more complex forms of questioning than any one of them can produce alone…Only a master of many styles can make them talk to each other in this way” (pp. 87-88). He goes on to explain that “our theories often focus excessively on one or another aspect of what we study. When we need to think anew, it’s usually a question of figuring out what aspect of our analysis could be changed to produce a whole new view” (p. 106). In a similar vein, Patti Lather (2007) advises that “putting one’s necessary categories in crisis can help us see how such categories work across time and what they exclude” (p. 73). At multiple stages of the project I made the decision to switch the “lens” through which I was reading the data in order to arrive at a richer interpretation.
Situational Analysis

Clarke’s (2005) approach to situational analysis incorporates a very systematic approach to data and employs discourse mapping as its main analytical strategy. It is an effort toward postmodernizing grounded theory by illuminating the key discourses that surround a situation of inquiry. Clarke argues that “the methodological implications of the postmodern primarily require taking situatedness, variations, differences of all kinds, and positionality/relationality very seriously in all their complexities, multiplicities, instabilities, and contradictions” (p. xxviii). Thick analyses are necessary in order to explore these interrelations. Clarke posits that any analysis is essentially a reading(s) of a situation through interpretation and understanding. I understand the findings of my study to be just that, a particular reading of citizenship standards in education.

Although Clarke’s (2005) approach to data is systematic, it is not prescriptive. Instead, it “offers flexible and elastic empirical tools” (p. 178) in the form of maps, which are described more extensively in the next section. While her method of discourse analysis is inspired by Foucault, her method is also “contra Foucault” because it “intentionally seeks to represent all the social worlds and discourses in an arena, amplifying the silent and silenced, specifying implicated actors and actants, and seeking out their (usually quite marginalized) discourses” (p. 178). A situational analysis of narrative discourse data allows the researcher to create a map of a particular discourse that also frames the discourse arena as a whole. This “can flexibly allow the analyst to pursue one or another element of the discourse for further analysis – while holding that element clearly ‘in place’ within the broader discourse arena as a whole” (p. 178). Clarke
uses the analogy of a camera to illustrate, saying that “big picture maps that enable the researcher to ‘see’ better where they may – and may not – want to go in terms of smaller portraits and/or the use of wide-angle lenses” (p. 178). In this study, the smaller portrait I attempt to paint is of the global in citizenship standards but I use a wider lens to capture the other discourses that also circulate in the standards documents.

Discourse Mapping

Central to Clarke’s (2005) situational analysis is her method of discourse mapping. She explains that the contextual elements in a situation, including power and structural elements, are actually located inside the situation itself and can be mapped and analyzed. Clark outlines her argument for the importance of mapping to qualitative research:

Because maps are visual representations, they helpfully rupture (some/most of) our normal ways of working and may provoke us to see things afresh (e.g., Latour 1986, 1988b; Suchman 1987). Maps also work more easily as discursive devices for making assemblages and connections – relational analyses. Maps are excellent ‘devices to materialize questions.’ Maps are tools of control, appropriation, and ideological expression. Mapping is a fundamental cognitive process – we can ‘just do it.’ Mapping opens up knowledge spaces. Maps are great boundary objects – devices for handling multiplicity, heterogeneity, and messiness in ways that can travel. Maps work well as spatial and temporal narratives. Maps allow unmapping and
remapping…Most important here, one can move around on/in maps much more quickly and easily than in narrative text, excellent for analytic work. Last, at least since the postcolonial era began, maps have been widely understood as very political – and shifting – devices. (p. 30)

For this study, it was essential to create a visual representation of the data that I could read in different ways than I read the narrative texts of the standards. These multiple readings allowed for a richness and thickness that I am not sure would have existed otherwise.

Clarke (2005) describes two types of discourse maps: situational and positional. Situational maps includes all of the human and nonhuman, material and discursive elements of the situation in question. These are important for understanding the socio-cultural contexts of a situation. In this study, the major mapping activities involved positional maps, but situational mapping was not unimportant. Specifically, my analysis takes into account only one element in educational citizenship discourses – the standards. Although I found it most fruitful to bound my study in this way, as I explain in the section on sampling, I could not completely ignore other elements such as processes of standards development, textbook adoption, teaching practices, assessment methods and the political leanings of the states. I created a situational map (shown in the section on research design) that allowed me to single out the standards for analysis while understanding that they are always also connected to these other elements and processes.

Positional maps, as defined by Clarke (2005), “lay out most of the major positions taken in the data on major discursive issues therein – topics of focus, concern, and often
but not always contestation” (p. 126). These maps include relevant issues, positions on issues, differences in discursive positions and discursive silences, or the absence of positions. They are analytic tools that are applied to the data. In situational analysis, there are no negative cases or deviant positions. Instead, outliers, less common positions and more marginal position “are just other positions” (p. 126). How these positions compare in terms of dominance is still important to analyzing the fluidities of power though. Representing the various positions on their own terms is the goal of positional mapping. These may not be the terms of the researcher but come from the best efforts of the researcher to represent the positions taken in the discourse. Clarke names this “a more insistently democratic theory of representation” (p. 126).

For Clarke (2005), the important and radical quality of positional maps after the postmodern turn is that positions do not have to be associated with a person or an institution. This is compatible with Foucault’s (1973) movement beyond “the knowing subject” (p. xiv). Thus the positions that appear on positional maps are positions in discourse. Because groups and individuals frequently hold multiple and contradictory positions on any one issue, positional maps represent this heterogeneity. Again, Clarke argues that representing the major positions on their own terms is radically democratic. However, this does not mean that all positions are valued equally by the researcher. Instead, “representing all positions on their own terms is a democratizing move, a politics of the acknowledgment of presence instead of a fascist denial of diversity” (p. 128). Clarke also outlines the importance of comparative mapping and analysis, which was employed in
this study to analyze the curriculum standards of multiple states. One of the positional maps I created is included in the section on research design.

Clarke (2005) outlines methods for mapping narrative, visual and historical discourses. Narrative mapping, which analyzes documents as products of collectivities, is most relevant to this study. This study analyzes state standards documents as products of state policymakers, specifically state departments of education and their curriculum governing bodies. The goal of narrative mapping is to include all of the discourses, both major and minor, that exist in the situation. This process must begin from the assumption that we do not yet know which discourses are in the situation. This assumption was important to my use of grounded theory because I did have a priori assumptions about what might be in the standards because of my previous exposure to them. However, I allowed the discursive categories to emerge from the data and created positional maps based on this.

Research Design

The current study is a qualitative study using content and discourse analysis. The social studies content standards related to citizenship of ten different U.S. states, as well as closely related documents published by their state departments of education, were examined. The documents for each state were considered individually in an attempt to reach an interpretive reading of the citizenship text in that state. The documents for each state were also considered comparatively to identify trends and gaps in citizenship curriculum standards. Foucault’s (1972) notion of discourse and Clarke’s (2005) discourse mapping were central to the analysis.
Timeline

I began the most preliminary phase of my research in December 2010 when I collected the social studies standards documents of all fifty states. From these documents, I cut and pasted to create a document for each state that contained only the standards dealing with civics and citizenship education in grades kindergarten through twelve. These fifty documents contained a total of approximately 9,500 individual standards. I then used summative content analysis to read and very generally code the standards of each state. I decided upon my sampling technique and selected ten sets of state standards to study: five that have a significant amount to say about global citizenship and five that do not mention global citizenship or anything that is closely related, based on my preliminary coding of the standards.

In January 2011 I began a two and a half month process of coding the standards. This initial coding was unexpectedly long and arduous, mainly because, even after paring down the standards to those I interpreted to be specifically about citizenship, I had roughly 1,150 standards to code. While I did not code each individual word, I did code individual phrases and this typically resulted in between two and five codes per standard. This represented the first of three major readings of the standards; it was a noncontextual reading that did not consider the state or any other relevant material. I also created a messy/working situational map (Clarke, 2005) during this phase that represented the field of citizenship education in these ten states.

In late March 2011 I began the second of my readings, a contextual reading of the standards that also involved reading introductions to and other relevant parts of each state
standards document as well as other related documents published by the state departments of education, specifically any that outlined plans, rationales and purposes for global education. I reviewed my initial coding and made necessary revisions based on new contextual interpretations. I also created a messy/working positional map for each state during this phase that lasted through the end of April 2011.

In May 2011 I read the standards, for the third time, comparatively. In other words, I read the standards of the five nonglobal states together in order to locate similarities, differences and intertextual dialogue. I then did a similar reading of the five global states. I used these readings to write a preliminary analysis of all ten state standards documents. I reviewed my coding again to spot inconsistencies in the assignment of codes across states and revise when necessary. I also created more ordered positional maps for each state.

Although I wrote preliminarily about my data in each of the previous phases, I formalized this data write-up in June 2011. I also played with combining the positional maps in various ways and created one large positional map for each group of five states. I used both my preliminary data write-up and the visual maps I created as sources for my formal writing that occurred from July through September 2011.

Sampling

Clarke (2005) explains that theoretical sampling is shaped by theoretical concerns that emerge in the provisional analysis of data. I developed my theoretical sampling technique during the preliminary phase of my research when I read the civics and citizenship standards of all fifty states. At the start of this reading, I knew I wanted to
analyze global citizenship discourses, but I was not yet sure how that interest would translate into a sampling strategy. As I read the standards, a very clear distinction began to emerge between standards that incorporated the global (there were very few of these) and those that said very little or nothing about global citizenship. Here I could see the distinction between an emphasis on traditional citizenship discourses and the incorporation of expansive and emergent citizenship discourses, as I described in chapter two, and I used this to shape my sampling method. Clarke suggests that the data collected should represent the best range of discursive positions related to the situation under study. I selected standards documents at opposite ends of the citizenship discourse continuum in an attempt to collect a wide range of positions. Because I was most interested in studying global discourses, I sought to find “appropriately conflicting” (Clarke, 2005, p. 185) standards that would add depth and richness to my analysis.

I chose to bound my study in a way that did not involve an analysis of all fifty standards documents because I wanted to do a very close and multilayered reading. After I selected ten standards documents to study, I read the standards in order to pare down the sample to just those standards specifically related to citizenship. For example, the citizenship standards are usually contained within the broader category of civics and this tends to include standards that require students to do things like identify the roles of the executive branch and understand various governmental processes. These are arguably things a “good” citizen should know, but I was interested in looking specifically at how citizenship is defined and the possibilities for citizenship that are offered by the standards. I was a little surprised to still be left with 1,150 standards after this paring
down, but it provided me with a wide range of global and nonglobal discourses to
examine. Howard S. Becker (1998) cautions against sampling based only on what is
most interesting to us or what our theoretical leanings tell us is most important. While I
was most interested in global discourses when I began this study, it became very
important to also study the decidedly not global and this involved analyzing a whole
range of discourses that I did not initially expect to include in my study.

I used purposeful sampling (Patton, 2002) that relied on my initial coding of all
fifty state standards documents in order to select the standards for the study. Patton
describes an intensity sample as one which includes “information-rich cases that manifest
the phenomenon of interest intensely” (p. 234). He explains that this type of sampling
involves some prior information as well as a great deal of judgment on the part of the
researcher. I used intensity sampling to select the five state standards documents that
include a focus on global citizenship. This involved using my initial coding to select the
documents that had the highest number of codes related to global citizenship. I was not
able to use this technique to sample the non-global standards by simply selecting those
that had the lowest number of codes related to global citizenship because the majority of
the standards had no codes for global citizenship. Instead, I selected the five standards
documents that contained the fewest number of different coding categories overall.

I still reflect on my choice of sampling method from time to time and imagine
how a different method may have altered my study. I know my method was not perfect,
but for me, initially reading the standards through a lens of the global made the most
sense to ensure that at least five states in my study did include standards about global
citizenship. I did contemplate other sampling methods though. For example, I considered sampling based on the dates of standards adoption in order to analyze only the most recent documents. My aim was really to find distinct contrasts though and I do not know if that sampling method would have produced the striking contrasts that I did find. I also considered analyzing the standards of the ten biggest adoption states, the states where textbooks are adopted statewide rather than by district. These states, especially California and Texas, drive much of the textbook content in the United States because of the money publishers make when their textbooks are adopted by them. This method may have captured the standards that more directly shape adopted curriculum in the United States. Again, I do not know if I could have emphasized an analysis of the global in my study if I had chosen this sampling method.

Data Collection

As I mentioned in my timeline, the first task of the study was to download the social studies content standards from each state’s department of education website. These standards can usually be easily accessed by the public by following a few links from the homepage. It is also common for states to publish drafts of their standards before they are adopted in order to solicit public input, and the standards for a few of the states were in that form. I saved a copy of each document and then did an initial read of the relevant citizenship standards of all fifty states. During this read, I used summative content analysis to search for instances of key terms, with a primary focus on any mention of global citizenship. A sample of the terms that emerged from the standards is included Figure 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Influencing government</th>
<th>Group interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>Active participation</td>
<td>Public speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization</td>
<td>Informed citizenry</td>
<td>Civic mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>Global interdependence</td>
<td>Media critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal sovereignty</td>
<td>Role of individual in</td>
<td>Functioning in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>world affairs</td>
<td>community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal definition of citizenship</td>
<td>Global citizenship</td>
<td>Service projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Cultural groups</td>
<td>Protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic values</td>
<td>Effecting change</td>
<td>Civil disobedience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil rights</td>
<td>Transnational</td>
<td>Skills of critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common good</td>
<td>Global competence</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate crimes</td>
<td>Global participation</td>
<td>Role of conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of rights</td>
<td>Global community</td>
<td>Character</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Key Terms for Preliminary Coding
This process included some elements of quantification, but it was also highly interpretive. For example, if a standard specifically mentions human rights without directly linking it to American citizenship, I consider that an instance in which ideas about global citizenship may be emerging. I also paid particular attention when a standard introduces the potential for students to participate in world affairs rather than just domestic affairs; that is another example of the interpretive moves I made.

I coded the data based on the instances of key terms and then selected the five states that I interpreted as having the most language relating to global citizenship or some form of global society. Then I selected five states whose standards are concerned almost completely with traditional discourses about the rights and responsibilities of U.S. citizens without any efforts toward expanding the realm of what constitutes citizenship. After I completed my list of ten states, I searched each department of education website for any additional policy documents dealing with citizenship or globalism. An example of a relevant document is the New Jersey International Education Summit Report, published in 2005. Again, selecting “relevant documents” was very much an interpretive move and I did not find such documents for all states in the study.

Coding

My coding process involved in-depth readings of the data and I generated codes from the readings without relying on the initial list of key terms I used during data collection. I wrote a brief description of each code and then grouped them together into broader categories. A sample from my code book is included in Figure 3.
As I mentioned in the timeline, the coding/reading process of my study involved three major reading phases. For the first reading, I wanted to code the standards outside the context of their states because I did not want my knowledge about their political leanings and other conditions to shape my reading. In order to do this, I pasted all of the standards into a spreadsheet, indicated the state next to each standard in a hidden column, sorted the standards alphabetically, added my codes, and then resorted the standards by state only after all the initial coding was complete. My aim was to focus solely on the language of each individual standard and this technique was important to the analysis at the stage in the process.
Contextual readings were important at later phases of the process. The second major reading considered the citizenship standards in the context of introductory and other material in the standards documents as well as other relevant documents published by the state departments of education. I only located a few of these other relevant documents, so I did not analyze them for every state. During this phase, I reviewed and updated my initial coding based on my contextual interpretations of the standards. I also wrote an initial narrative description of the citizenship standards for each state.

The third major reading involved reading the standards comparatively. I read the five nonglobal state standards documents in the context of one another and then read the five global state standards documents in a similar way. I reviewed my coding once again and made any necessary revisions. I looked for instances of convergence and divergence as well as intertextual dialogue among the documents. I wrote a narrative description for the nonglobal states as a whole and another for the global states as well as a preliminary analysis of each group. Clarke (2005) insists that the researcher must know the data well in order to map it and these three phases of close reading and coding allowed me to gain very detailed knowledge of the standards that I used in my mapping process.

**Mapping**

Mapping the narrative discourses of citizenship was a significant portion of my data analysis process. I initially created a situational map of the major elements related to citizenship curriculum standards in the U.S. Clarke (2005) recommends creating a preliminary messy/working version followed by an ordered/working version. Figure 4
shows the messy/working version of my situational map that I created after my sampling process but before the reading/coding process began.

Figure 4: Situational Map for U.S. Citizenship Curriculum – Messy/Working Version

The situational map was useful for reminding me of the sociocultural context of citizenship standards since my study considered only one small element – the standards. Figure 5 shows the ordered/working version of my situational map.
**Individual Human Elements/Actors**
- Elected officials/Politicians
- Administrators/Board members
- Community members
- Teachers

**Collective Human Elements/Actors**
- Federal/state departments of education
- State and local school boards
- Political parties
- Textbook publishers

**Nonhuman Elements/Actants**
- Standards
- Textbooks
- Assessment tools

**Implicated/Silent Actors/Actants**
- Students

**Discursive Constructions of Individual/Collective Human Actors**
- Teachers are to blame
- Students are underprepared

**Political/Economic Elements**
- Funding cuts
- Monetary incentives/sanctions
- Performance-based teacher pay

**Sociocultural/Symbolic Elements**
- Educating “good citizens”
- Patriotism

**Temporal Elements**
- AYP/other mandated deadlines

**Spatial Elements**
- Schools’ distance from policymakers
- Standards variation across states

**Major Issues/Debates**
- Role of schooling – prepare for citizenship or job training
- Declining emphasis on social studies

**Related Discourses**
- Nationalism/Globalism
- Neoliberalism

Figure 5: Situational Map for U.S. Citizenship Curriculum – Ordered/Working Version
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The ordered version of the map was created after the first reading phase and revised it throughout the project as necessary. Because my study was so narrowly focused on the standards, the situational maps reminded me to anchor my work to its larger sociocultural contexts.

At the end of the first reading phase, I created a messy/working version of a positional map for each individual state representing all of the various discourses at play in their citizenship standards and other related documents. My initial coding was the basis for these maps. My messy/working positional map for the state of New Jersey is shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6: New Jersey Positional Map – Messy/Working Version
I used my coding as well as the narrative descriptions I wrote for each state to create the ordered/working versions of the positional maps for each state. I grouped the elements from the messy/working maps into major discourses. My ordered/working positional map for the state of New Jersey is shown in Figure 7.

Figure 7: New Jersey Positional Map – Ordered/Working Version

These positional maps were analytical tools for understanding the discourses circulating in the standards documents. The larger map nodes with words typed in capital letters
represent the a priori discourse categories that I identified. The smaller map nodes with words typed in lowercase letters represent the discourses found in the citizenship standards. Only after I coded the standards on their own terms did I attempt to map them onto the citizenship discourses discussed in chapter 2. This tension in my use of grounded theory is discussed further in the next section.

I used Visual Understanding Environment (VUE) software to create the positional maps and then to combine the five nonglobal states into one positional map and combine the five global states into one map. Finally, I created one overall positional map laying out all of the discourses identified in the ten standards documents. These combined maps became very crowded, but they allowed me to see patterns of repetition across the states as well as which states contain unique elements in their citizenship discourses. These maps were crucial to my analysis and interpretation that I present in chapter four. For me, the visual presentation of the data in map form allowed for a different kind of reading and another layer of interpretation that would not have been possible through a verbal reading alone. The maps added richness and thickness to my analysis and facilitated a multilayered reading. The visual reading became the third important type of reading in my project after the noncontextual and contextual readings.

**Challenges of Discourse Analysis**

**Rigor and Quality**

Clarke (2005) addresses several challenges to rigor and quality in studies employing discourse analysis. Discourses are dynamic rather than static, so they can be challenging to analyze. Discourse analysis requires an analysis of culture as “an
emergent dialogic process, historically transmitted but continually produced and revised through dialogues among its members. It is constantly open to new associations and interpretive moves” (Farnell & Graham, 1998, p. 412 cited in Clarke, 2005, p. 153). The researcher must also guard against using overly broad terms and statements such as “society” that mask complexity and ambiguity. Clarke cautions that using such monolithizing terms “risks hegemonizing dominant discourses as the only possible discourses” (p. 154). Rich interpretive analysis can become lost in a maze of vague concepts and poorly defined terms. Monolithizing terms such as “the market,” “schooling,” and “society” had a tendency to pop up in my analysis from time to time but I tried to make a conscious effort to edit this instances as much as possible and use more specific and descriptive terminology.

This study involved me as a single researcher reading and interpreting texts and I know this method can raise valid questions about quality. My efforts toward quality involved multiple readings and multiple types of reading. As previously explained, after the standards documents were chosen I engaged in a three phase reading and coding process. Each of these phases involved a close reading of all standards and I attempted to ensure each read was as fresh as possible by also varying the types of reading. The first phase involved a noncontextual reading and the second and third phases involved both contextual and visual reads. This multilayered approach to reading was useful in helping me to question and move beyond my typical reading processes.
Grounded Theory

My data analysis relied heavily on Clarke’s (2005) situational analysis and discourse mapping, which is meant as a complement to traditional grounded theory approaches, and there were times during my study that I had to question whether I could claim to be doing grounded theory. By allowing the predominant and emergent discourses in citizenship studies to shape my project from the start, I began this study with a priori discourse categories that I knew were common in citizenship studies, so it was a struggle to allow the data to generate its own categories rather than attempt to fit it into preconceived categories. During the sampling phase of my project, I definitely used summative content analysis and the preconceived categories of global citizenship and nation-state based citizenship to select the state standards to include in the study. However, during my main phase of my data analysis I allowed the discourse categories to emerge from the standards themselves through coding that was not based on the pre-established discourse categories that I discuss in chapter two. Only after I coded all of the data initially did I create broader codes that mapped onto citizenship discourses such as liberalism and republicanism. I included all of the existent discourses in my positional map for each state, rather than only the ones I was most interested in analyzing. For example, none of the coded data mapped onto radical democratic discourse and I did not attempt to stretch the meaning of standards dealing with active democratic participation to fit into this category. It is no doubt not perfect grounded theory (if such a thing exists), but my analysis was shaped by a constant imperative to allow the data to generate discursive categories before mapping them onto any predominant discourses in
citizenship studies. Ultimately, the major theoretical distinction made in this study is the traditional/national and expansive/global discourse categories that were generated from the data.

Reflexivity

It can be easy to arrive at the beginning of a purely textual research project with less regard for the need to be reflexive about one’s processes, methods and biases than one might have at the beginning of ethnographic study involving people as research participants. Abigail Brooks and Sharlene Hesse-Biber (2007) encourage researchers, particularly feminist researchers, to recognize and draw upon their situated perspectives. They consider Sandra Harding’s call for “strong reflexivity” (cited in Brooks & Hesse-Biber, 2007, p. 15) that requires researchers to strive for critical awareness about their own positionalities and how these can bring both negative and positive qualities to the research process. Even though my study does not involve issues of representing human research participants, an awareness of my own situatedness is important.

I came to this project as anything but an innocent investigator of state educational standards. During the past twelve years of my career, I have been involved in analyzing state standards, writing curriculum content to meet state standards and aligning textbooks to state standards as a marketing tool for K-12 educational publishers, and I now own a business that profits from these endeavors. I chose to study state standards because it is what I know and because I believe it is a rich area for investigation, but I also recognize that I am in many ways “too close for comfort to the discourse and policy” (Saukko, 2003, p. 163) that I study. My professional, personal and educational lives bring me to a
variety of different and often competing perspectives on the value of state educational standards. As a doctoral student I view increasing standardization as limiting the opportunity for rich and critical learning. As a progressive thinker, I recognize the role that private corporations play in promoting standardization and testing for their own profit. As a business owner, the textbook and standardized testing industry sustains me economically. In my role as a researcher each of these positions influences me and the choices I make.

Interpretive Issues

As I made the academic leap from my background in literary criticism to social science research I was faced with significant challenges surrounding the issue of interpretation. While a research project in either field relies heavily on interpretation, whether it is of a literary text or of qualitative data, as a graduate student in an English department, there is definitely a sense that interpretation is what we do; there is no question that interpretation is a situated act; and there is not much pressure to make our work seem “scientific.” Qualitative research in the social sciences has been forced to validate itself to the quantitative world by taking seriously methods and processes in order to avoid being labeled “pseudo-scientific.” Corrine Glesne (2006) recommends “theoretical triangulation” (p. 169) or analyzing data from more than one framework to ensure interpretations are trustworthy. I used this approach by writing analyses of the data through different lenses and merging these results into one interpretation. Of course any qualitative research product is an act of interpretation, but a study of purely written documents feels dangerously open to excessive interpretive liberties.
One challenge that my professional life brings to the study is that I have already read and worked with some of the standards that I study many times. This makes a fresh reading of the standards more difficult because I have a sense that I already know what one state’s standards say or that I already have a general sense of what citizenship standards say in general. I tried to combat this tendency through my data coding and analysis processes. For example, during my initial coding phase I allowed the language of the standard to dictate my codes rather than beginning with predefined codes. Additionally, I know that the political climate of a particular state often heavily influences the content of its educational standards and this knowledge shapes my reading of the standards, so I tried to do an initial “blind” reading of the standards as much as was possible. Clearly I cannot erase my preconceived notions completely, but I have tried to rely on them as little as possible in my interpretive process.

Limits of the Study

Undertaking a purely textual study involved more methodological complexity than I initially anticipated. There is something unsettling, to the qualitative researcher trained largely in ethnography, about sitting alone for hours on end with no people to provide additional data for analysis. Certainly the ethnographer is eventually left with only texts when all the data has been collected and it is time for analysis, but there are recognizable traces left by the people who helped create the data and especially words from people with whom the researcher has interacted. Of course all state curriculum standards are written by people and there are traces of them in my data, but they are not as easy to locate and cannot be connected to actual people with whom I met and talked.
They are the ghosts of my research who I do not know and can make no attempt to represent but who haunt the data and cannot and should not be completely removed from it.

This study examines only one small part of the entire text of citizenship in K-12 education: the written text of the standards. It does not analyze the production, adoption and implementation of these standards. These elements are essential to understanding how citizenship discourses materialize in practice. However, I decided to study the standards alone because I was interested in using a governmentality framework for analysis. I wanted to explore specifically what the standards tell students about the kind of citizen they can/should be. Because they mandate what should be taught, the standards are the written technologies of governance and can produce rich analytical fruits when studied as such. I used the situational map to carry an awareness of the sociocultural contexts of the standards throughout my study, although this was outside of the project’s boundaries.

The data for this study involves the citizenship standards of only ten states, not all fifty. I considered analyzing the standards of all fifty states with an awareness of the time and data quantity challenges that would pose. As daunting as those considerations were, they are not why I chose to limit my study to the standards of ten states. The rationale for bounding my study in this way has more to do with the content of the standards themselves. My preliminary reading and summative content analysis of all fifty states showed that there is very little about global citizenship in the standards in a few states and none at all in the others. I was most interested in studying instances of the global in
citizenship discourses, so I wanted at least half of the standards documents I studied to be open to this analysis. I chose five states to represent the global and my preliminary summative analysis shows that there were only four other states that said anything at all about the global, and these were very minor instances. A fairly recent study (Rapoport, 2009) quantitatively analyzes all fifty state social studies standards documents for uses of the terms “globalization” or “global citizen(ship).” The study finds that globalization is mentioned in only fifteen of the standards documents and the examples given show that this is mostly in relation to economics. The study also finds that only two states mention global citizen(ship) in their standards and one of these mentions it in the introductory material only, not in the standards themselves. My point here is that even if my study included the standards of all fifty states, it would not have been able to say a lot more about global citizenship in the standards because the discourse does not exist in most of the standards documents. I chose to limit the study to the ten states because I anticipated that this would be most fruitful for analysis in setting up a stark contrast between states that include concepts of global citizenship in their standards and those who do not.

Conclusion

The methodological approach described in this chapter was designed to produce a close and multilayered reading of the text of citizenship as it exists in K-12 educational standards. Qualitative content analysis and discourse analysis were employed through multiple readings of the standards. Discourse mapping was an organizational and analytical tool that allowed for a visual reading of the standards to complement the multiple narrative readings. The standards were read both individually and
comparatively during the narrative and visual reads. The readings were combined to generate the analysis that follows in chapters four and five.
Chapter 4

State Standards as “Scripts” of Citizenship

Introduction

This chapter presents my description and analysis of the social studies standards dealing with citizenship education in ten states and outlines the findings of my discourse mappings. What is most evident in these standards is the constant tensions between liberalism and republicanism that exist in U.S. society, both historically and today. The standards are noticeably shaped by these tensions and closely mirror the ways in which these discourse shape political life. The focus of my study is not on testing, but I found the existence of or lack of state assessments in social studies relevant to the role the standards may play in a particular state. It raises the question of how much the content of the standards matter if they are not assessed. They are used for textbook adoption, so they are not meaningless, but a lack of assessment does raise issues about the importance, purposes and efficacy of social studies standards. Ultimately, I ask the question of each state standards document: What type of citizen do the standards think students are or should become? Techniques of governance are employed to direct the behavior of populations and I want to problematize the notion that it is desirable to produce a standardized “good” citizen.

My analysis of the standards finds a sharp divide between states that include only traditional discourses about citizenship in their standards and those that include both the
traditional and more expansive citizenship discourses. Instances of expansive discourses are few though, and the standards remain largely stuck in traditional discourses. What interestingly seems to be pushing the standards towards more expansive visions of citizenship are the pressures of economic globalization and the need for a competent workforce.

*Traditional Citizenship Discourses in Educational Standards*

The standards of the first five states analyzed in the study were selected because they make no mention of global citizenship. This turned out, unintentionally, to be a criteria that also found five states that do not consider any of the discourses that expand the notion of citizenship beyond a simple legal definition, a concern for individual rights and responsibilities and ideas about the importance of some level of participation in democratic processes. These standards are shaped almost exclusively by traditional liberal and republican discourses about citizenship. Overall, the standards do not present citizenship as complex and are mostly concerned with shaping citizens who obey the law, understand their individual rights, are informed about political issues and vote in elections.

*Arizona*

The Arizona *Standards Based Teaching and Learning* document for social studies was adopted in 2005 and updated in 2006, before the more recent controversial state immigration law was passed and subsequently challenged in the courts. The introduction to the standards is shaped by republican discourse and states, in part, that students:
will understand the importance of each person as an individual with human and
civil rights and our shared heritage in the United States. Students will understand
politics, government, and the responsibilities of good citizenship. Citizenship
skills include the capacity to influence policies and decisions by clearly
communicating interests and the ability to build coalitions through negotiation,
compromise, and consensus. (Arizona Department of Education, 2006a, p. xii)

Democratic participation as a skill of citizenship is important here as well as in the grade
five through eight standards that requires students be able to “describe the importance of
citizens being actively involved in the democratic process (i.e., voting, student
government, involvement in political decision making, analyzing issues, petitioning
public officials)” (p. 108). At the high school level, the standards call for a more
participatory approach requiring students to “demonstrate the skills and knowledge (e.g.,
group problem solving, public speaking, petitioning and protesting) needed to accomplish
public purposes” (p. 110).

In a similar republican vein, the standards emphasize the importance of civic
character beginning in grade two. The grades two through four standards ask students to
“identify traits of character (e.g., honesty, courage, cooperation, respect, trustworthiness,
responsibility, citizenship) that are important to the preservation and improvement of
democracy” (p. 107). The grades five through eight standards require students to
“discuss the character traits (e.g., respect, responsibility, fairness, involvement) that are
important to the preservation and improvement of constitutional democracy in the United
States” (p. 108), and the high school standards briefly refer to “the essential element of
civic virtue (e.g., George Washington’s Farewell Speech)” (p. 110). There is, however, no mention of an expanded vision citizenship that more effectively includes traditionally marginalized groups beyond asking students to analyze civil rights through the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments as part of the high school standard covering individual rights. Indeed, the reference to “our shared heritage” (p. xii) in the introduction to the standards ignores difference and establishes a homogenizing tone.

While ignoring the implications of citizenship for different groups in society, the standards do incorporate ideas about participatory citizenship and civic character. However, it is not clear how these skills are measured because the overview of Arizona’s Assessment Program posted on the Department of Education’s website reveals that social studies is not a tested subject, nor are there plans to test in this subject through 2014. Thus Arizona is part of the 42% of states responding to a recent survey that do not test students in social studies, revealing the lack of importance given to social studies in relation to the heavy emphasis on reading and math under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Although the absence of standardized testing in social studies has the potential to open the door to richer and more innovative assessment methods, studies have shown that, in reality, instructional time devoted to social studies is declining (Maryland State Department of Education, 2006b). While this study does not explore the instructional time spent on social studies, the fact that some of the states test students in reading, writing, math and science, but not social studies, does raise questions about the health of social studies education in these states.
Kansas

Social studies is a tested subject in Kansas at grades 6, 8 and high school only, although there are civics/government standards at each grade level (Kansas State Department of Education 2005, 2008). Students are asked to demonstrate good citizenship beginning in kindergarten and by first grade must identify positive character traits. The first grade instructional suggestions list creating “illustrated posters of the 6 Pillars of Character: trustworthiness, citizenship, respect, fairness, responsibility, and caring” (Kansas State Department of Education 2005 p. 51). This emphasis on civic values and republican discourse continues through grade three; by grade four specific character traits are no longer discussed, although shared democratic values remain a theme through the high school level.

Beginning in grade three, students are introduced to the idea of political participation and taught methods of attempting to effect change. At this level, teachers are encouraged to have their students participate in Kids Voting Kansas, which is a nonprofit organization seeking to increase civic development and voter turnout. Each subsequent grade level requires some knowledge of what it means to participate in a democracy. Similar to the Arizona standards, protest is mentioned as a form of political action at the high school level. The Kansas standard requires that each student “understands that civil disobedience is a form of protest and if taken to extreme, punishable by law” (p. 228). Thus the only mention of protest in the Kansas standards includes a warning about punishment if taken too far, although “extreme” is not defined.
This is unlikely to convince students that protest or democratic countermovement is a desirable activity within the realm of political citizenship.

While the Kansas standards do promote a certain amount of democratic participation and civic values, there is little indication that citizenship can be expanded to more fully incorporate diverse experiences. The only standard along this line of thought, that deals with the present and not with rights already secured, is in grade eight, when students must explain “the recurring problems and solutions involving minority rights (e.g., Title IX, job discrimination, affirmative action)” (p. 202). It is encouraging that the standard does require students to understand that the struggle for civil rights is ongoing, but this singular sentence in the standards does not provide much guidance for teachers who wish to explore what a richer notion of citizenship might look like with their students. In fact, the instructional suggestion that accompanies this standard recommends that teachers ask students to create a historical timeline showing when previously denied rights were granted, which does not require students to consider contemporary struggles for civil rights.

Nebraska

The Nebraska Social Studies/History Standards are the oldest in the study; they were adopted in 2003 and not scheduled to be updated until 2013. Nebraska was the last of the fifty states to jump on the statewide assessment bandwagon, allowing for local schools and districts to design individual assessments until a statewide reading test was mandated in 2010. Social studies learning is still not assessed by a statewide test, but local testing is required in grades five, eight and eleven (Nebraska State Board of
Nebraska requires that all social studies standards be assessed at the local level, but only the assessment of some standards, those named Standards That Are Reported (STAR) is reported to the state department of education. STAR does include the citizenship standards at each grade level (Nebraska State Board of Education, 2003b).

Liberalism and republicanism are the dominant discourses, although there is also a strong current of economic citizenship. In kindergarten and first grade the emphasis is on “good citizenship” and the character traits necessary for effective participation in community groups, such as church, school and family. These standards are closely connected with republicanism and list civic virtues as “honesty, courage, patriotism, and other admirable character traits seen in American history” (Nebraska State Board of Education, 2003a, p. 2). In grades two through four, the emphasis shifts to the responsibilities of citizenship, including obeying laws. Grades five through twelve focus on individual rights and responsibilities as well as on active participation in civic life. Students are required to “identify the way individuals of cultural, ethnic, and other interest groups can influence governments” (p. 15) in grades five through eight, and to analyze and debate public issues in grades nine through twelve.

What stands out in my analysis of the Nebraska standards is the close link between political and economic citizenship. One of the main standards for grades five through eight states that, “Students will explain the structure and operation of the United States economy and the role of citizens as producers and consumers” (p. 14) The individual indicators go on to consider the role of the individual in the national economy and suggest that producing and consuming are fundamental responsibilities of
citizenship. At the high school level, there are two standards dealing explicitly with economic citizenship:

- Compare the relationship between economic and political freedom.
- Describe the development and implementation of personal economic decision-making skills in a democratic society. (p. 30)

It is interesting to note that students are asked to consider economic decisions in a democratic society rather than in a capitalist society. The main standard encompassing these indicators requires that students compare different economic systems; however no economic systems are named. Instead, economic freedom is equated with a democratic political system only.

North Dakota

The North Dakota Content and Achievement Standards: Social Studies were adopted in 2007 as a guide for curriculum, although social studies learning is not subject to standardized testing in the state. The introduction to the standards states that social studies education is essential for students to develop precise and intelligent thinking and to “prepare every student to contribute to society as an informed citizen” (North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, 2007, p. 8). While the standards were written more recently than those of Arizona, Kansas and Nebraska, they present a very basic vision of citizenship based on the traditions of liberalism and republicanism.

The North Dakota standards first mention individual rights in grade three. Before that level, there is a complete focus on republican ideals of “good citizenship” and the responsibilities of community members. Students are identified as members of groups
such as family, school and community and are asked to name the purposes and content of rules within these groups. Beginning in grade three, there is a fairly even balance between liberal and republican discourses as students are asked to identify the rights and responsibilities of North Dakota and United States citizens. There is only one standard, in grade seven, that requires students to understand that individuals can affect change through active civic participation: “Explain how people create and change structures of power (e.g., force, elections, wars, reactions to economic conditions and natural disasters)” (p. 43). In fact, this standard stands out as fairly incongruous to the rest of the standards, which rely almost completely upon very conservative notions about individual rights and responsibilities.

The North Dakota Standards only indirectly allude to the historical denial of full democratic citizenship to certain groups of people: “Analyze historical and contemporary examples of civil liberties and civil rights in the U.S. (e.g., incorporation of the Bill of Rights, amendments, key legislation, and landmark Supreme Court cases” (p. 46). The achievement descriptors require that “students provide a relevant analysis of historical and contemporary examples of civil liberties and civil rights in the United States” (p. 46), but do not explicitly refer to the denial of rights or various movements to secure civil rights.

Wyoming

The Wyoming Social Studies Content and Performance Standards were adopted even more recently, in November of 2008. Wyoming only tests its students at the state level in the subjects of reading, math and science; social studies is not assessed at any
grade level. Wyoming has fewer citizenship standards than any other state in the study, with only between two and five standards at each grade level. Overall, the social studies standards are very broad and provide very few concrete examples for addressing them through the curriculum. The citizenship standards are no exception and give little detail about what should constitute citizenship curriculum in the state.

Part of the rationale for the Wyoming standards reads that the study of social studies is intended “to promote civic competence” and that the mission of social studies in the state “is to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world” (Wyoming State Board of Education, 2008, p. 6). The statement about interdependence hints at a concern for global citizenship that does not materialize in the standards themselves. In fact, the Wyoming standards are very similar to the North Dakota standards in their almost singular focus on traditional notions about individual rights and responsibilities. They also contain almost the exact same statement about studying “how people create and change structures of power, authority, and governance” (p. 9). That statement is contained in the main standard labeled “Citizenship, Government, and Democracy” (p. 9), but no related content appears in any of the grade level benchmarks or descriptors.

The Wyoming standards offer no hint that there has ever been less than full democratic citizenship for all people in the United States. While several of the state standards documents in this study only acknowledge the struggle for full citizenship rights by diverse groups in a historical context, the Wyoming standards do not mention
this struggle at all. Participation in civic life is only considered at the high school level where students are required to “explain and/or demonstrate how to participate in the political processes and express personal beliefs and convictions” (p. 25). Of all the standards in the study, the Wyoming standards offer the least guidance for shaping students into citizens.

Summary

The standards of each of the five states studied for their heavy reliance on traditional citizenship discourses depend greatly upon republican forms of active civic participation in pursuit of the common good while also including a significant liberal focus on personal freedom and individual rights. There is virtually no movement toward expanding notions of citizenship to include emerging discourses. It is worth noting that these standards were adopted before four of the five states in the global discourse group. One of the sampling methods I considered for this study was to analyze the standards of the ten states with the most recently adopted social studies standards, and perhaps this would have painted a different overall picture of the standards. The sampling method I did choose suggests that the more recently adopted standards are more likely to included emergent citizenship discourses, but there is no certainty that this would hold true if the standards of all fifty states were studied.

One of the most notable aspects of these standards is the intense focus on developing civic character in the lower grades that quickly fades at higher grade levels. Only the Arizona standards carry a concern for civic virtues from kindergarten through high school. In Nebraska, North Dakota and Kansas all mention of the characteristics of
a “good citizen” end in grades 1, 2 and 3 respectively. The Wyoming standards are the only ones in the study that do not mention civic character at all. There is definitely a strong push towards developing civic virtues such as honesty, loyalty, fairness and cooperation in the early primary grades that does not follow through the later primary grades and beyond. It is understandable why it is important to introduce these concepts to young children, but it is not equally clear why it is not important to continue this instruction through high school graduation. Since most individuals still pass through school doors, it might be worrisome for those who seek to educate a model citizen to imagine large numbers of graduates who have not had any instruction in civic character for nine or more years. One explanation for the lack of standards dealing with civic virtue at the higher grades is that standardized testing increases at higher grade levels, in most states, and certainly civic character is difficult, if not impossible, to assess through multiple choice testing. However, three of these states do not assess social studies at any grade level, so that is not likely to be part of the reasoning.

Another notable feature of these standards is the lack of attention given to affecting change through democratic participation and processes. Only the standards of Arizona and Kansas give specific examples of how citizens can fight for changes through mechanisms such as petitioning, protesting and civil disobedience, and these standards still treat the subject very lightly. The Nebraska standards only vaguely mention “grass roots citizens’ movements” (p. 30) as a power of the governed. The North Dakota and Wyoming standards both include statements about changing structures of power in their introductory remarks but do not follow up with related standards or any examples about
how such change might be possible. All five of these standards documents name educating a competent citizenry as one of the primary goals of social studies education, but it is not clear what the definition of competence is in this context. Is it simply voting and being informed about issues? Is it functioning effectively in the free market? Or is it something more that involves active engagement and attempts to change the status quo? Of course the standards of five states could never provide a complete view of citizenship education in the United States, but the standards of these five states do not even provide a clear picture of what citizenship is meant to be in a very traditional liberal and republican context, much less what it could possibly become in a more diverse and interconnected world.

**Global Citizenship Discourses in Educational Standards**

The next five standards documents described are from states that have incorporated ideas about global community into their social studies curriculum standards that cover citizenship. Each of these states still includes traditional liberal and republican discourses in its standards, but have in some way incorporated a global citizenship discourse. Overall, these states include more instances of expansive discourses which suggests that a global perspective is more open to alternate possibilities for what citizenship can be.

**Maryland**

Maryland adopted its *Voluntary State Curriculum – Social Studies* in 2006. There are no statewide social studies assessments in grades kindergarten through eight, but high school students do have to pass the government assessment in order to graduate. The
Maryland State Department of Education released its *Task Force Report on Social Studies Education in Maryland: The Challenge and the Imperative* earlier in 2010, so this document was studied in conjunction with the Maryland standards that deal with civics/citizenship. The report expresses concern that social studies is not a core subject tested under NCLB and seeks to increase the amount of time and resources devoted to social studies instruction in Maryland. The authors of the report hope that the implementation of the recommendations “will result in graduates who are better prepared for work and for active, engaged citizenship” (Maryland State Department of Education 2006b, p. vi). This dual purpose – creating both an active citizenship and a qualified workforce – reappears throughout the report; civic competence and workplace skills are repeatedly discussed in tandem so that the need for an actively engage citizenry does not seem to be a worthy goal in and of itself.

The following list of findings and recommendations by the Maryland Task force paints a bleak picture of the state of social studies and, in particular, civics education in both Maryland and the United States at large.

- One of the chief impediments to reforming social studies education is the lack of awareness among stakeholders that instructional time and focus on the subjects have declined sharply in Maryland’s public schools—thereby weakening students’ citizenship and workplace skills. (p. x)
- 54% of Maryland elementary principals reported a decrease in social studies instructional time and 33% reported a decrease in civics instructional time specifically. (pp. 8-9)
• According to a recent study by the National Center for Education …middle schoolers in most states are no longer required to take a government or civics course. Only 29 states require high school students to take a government or civics course, leaving millions of young Americans in the dark about why democracy matters.

• The future of the State of Maryland depends on how well we prepare our young people to be active, responsible, competent citizens. We need our youth to contribute to our democracy while they are students and throughout their lives. We need them to develop the skills, knowledge, and values—in short, the 'civic literacy’—that will enable them to address public problems with their energy, ideas, ethics, and passion.

• On the latest National Assessment of Educational Progress in Civics (2006), less than one-quarter of U.S. 4th–graders scored at or above proficient. The news is no better among 8th– and 12th–graders. Just 22 percent of 8th–graders and 27 percent of 12th–graders reached proficiency in civics. (p. 21)

The report is clearly concerned with the need to develop the civic literacy necessary for democratic participation in the state’s student population. The standards reflect this concern as well and require students to understand that citizens have opportunities to initiate change and influence the political process as well as emphasize the importance of making informed decisions. When it comes to expanding students’ vision of citizenship, there is very little mention of diverse experiences. The standards do cover the struggle
for civil rights at the high school level, although all of the language used is in the past tense, so there is no discussion of struggles in the present.

The standards are heavily influenced by republican discourse and include language about civic virtue at grades two and three. The grade two standard requires students to “use appropriate informational text to develop an understanding of democratic skills and attitudes, such as rights and responsibilities, respect, fairness, honesty, loyalty, and courage” (Maryland State Department of Education, 2006a). This topic is not addressed in later grades and, in the task force report, the idea of developing democratic character is eclipsed by the emphasis on ensuring students’ future workplace success. The authors of the report begin their conclusion by writing:

Social studies and its disciplines—history, economics, civics, and geography—have long been valued in American education because of their role in helping students participate meaningfully in the democratic process. Additionally, with the emergence of a postindustrial economy that emphasizes creativity, innovation, lifelong learning, and teambuilding, researchers have come to recognize the central role that social studies instruction plays in the formation of these skills.

(Maryland State Department of Education 2006b, p. 52)

Economic citizenship is a major concern in the report and the message is that socials studies skills are important in the present because they are essential to the development of workplace skills. The ultimate recommendation of the task force is that Maryland create standardized statewide assessments in social studies.
Maryland’s approach to global citizenship is interesting because it only appears in grade seven. It is one of only two states in the study that uses the phrase “global citizen” and the only state in the study that used the phrase “citizen of the world” in its standards. There are five standards that deal explicitly with global citizenship:

- Analyze the importance of civic participation as a citizen of the world.
- Analyze the concept of a global citizen and how the awareness and responsibilities have changed during the information age.
- Examine the rights and responsibilities of being a citizen of the world.
- Justify the responsibilities associated with certain human rights in a global society such as a commitment to world peace and the elimination of poverty.
- Explain how international rules and laws protect individual rights and protect the common good, such as the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, European Union membership, Geneva Conventions. (Maryland State Department of Education, 2006a, pp. 4-5)

Not only is global citizenship treated as national citizenship in terms of rights and responsibilities, but a cosmopolitan discourse about international institutions and human rights also emerges. Again, these ideas are confined to grade seven only and it is not clear why they are not carried through to other grade levels. The history standards for grade seven cover contemporary world history, so it is likely global citizenship is considered because of this connection.

Apart from grade seven, the Maryland standards are mostly shaped by traditional liberal and republican discourses about citizenship. At the lower grades the standards are
less concerned with naming specific civic virtues than most of the other standards in the study, but there are strong statements about individuals’ responsibilities as members of communities. There are specific statements about citizens’ abilities to affect change in grade seven and at the high school level. The standards, in grade eight, make a stronger statement than most other standards about the historical denial of civil rights to certain groups in the United States. Students are required to “describe methods that were used to deny civil rights to women, African Americans and Native Americans” (p. 6). This standard makes clear that historically civil rights have not been universal to all citizens, but there is no mention of current struggles for full citizenship rights.

New Jersey

Global citizenship discourse also shapes the *New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards* adopted in 2009 and not assessed at any grade level. New Jersey is the only other state in the study to use the term “global citizen” in its standards. The standards require that students “be prepared to serve as global citizens” and “broaden their understanding of global issues that impact their life as Americans” (p. F-7). The New Jersey standards instill ideas about global community beginning in kindergarten and also require students to communicate and collaborate with students in other countries. The broad K-12 benchmark reads: “Active Citizenship in the 21st Century: All students will acquire the skills needed to be active, informed citizens who value diversity and promote cultural understanding by working collaboratively to address the challenges that are inherent in living in an interconnected world.” Students in grades K-8 must “communicate with students from various countries about common issues of public
concern and possible solutions” in order to meet the standard. The high school standards ask students to:

- Compare current case studies involving slavery, child labor, or other unfair labor practices in the United States with those of other nations, and evaluate the extent to which such problems are universal.

- Collaborate with students from other countries to develop possible solutions to an issue of environmental justice, and present those solutions to relevant national and international governmental and/or nongovernmental organizations. (New Jersey Department of Education, 2009)

Students are encouraged to consider instances of global injustice that occur within their own borders instead of viewing the United States as an exception to such problems. The New Jersey standards represent a fairly advanced global perspective, even at the lowest grade levels, compared with most other states in the study.

The *New Jersey International Education Summit Report* (2005) is several years older than the standards, but it relies upon economic and global citizenship discourse as it outlines a thoroughly developed rationale for the importance of international education to promoting economic activities. The report summarizes the findings and recommendations from the first New Jersey Education Summit, which was held in 2004 and organized in response to a report by the Asia Society in 2001 that bemoaned U.S. students’ lack of knowledge about the global importance of Asia in terms of its economic ties to other countries, including the United States. Interestingly, although the New Jersey report presents itself as inclusively international in scope, the report is really all
about Asia and its importance in the economic sphere. The authors of the report state that New Jersey’s high immigrant population has “created a society of increased diversity that demands an informed, concerned and empowered citizenry” (p. 1). Additionally, New Jersey’s role in international business and trade necessitates that students are able “to function in the society and workplace of a globally interconnected world” (p. 2), according to the report. The report makes it clear that the attention to diversity and understanding Asian cultures is in the interest of business.

The program for the New Jersey Education Summit indicates that it was attended by a mixture of educators, elected officials and national and international business executives. According to the report, the summit was designed to:

- Raise awareness of the importance of international knowledge to social and cultural integration in New Jersey and to New Jersey’s economy;
- Mobilize political, corporate and education leadership to support a greater focus on education about other world regions, their languages and cultures; and
- Build networks among educators and schools interested in infusing international knowledge and skills across the curriculum and strengthening existing international education programs. (New Jersey Department of Education 2005, p. 11)

International education that serves the interests of the business community is a definite priority. Ultimately, the authors of the report recommend that international knowledge and skills be infused into the curriculum standards in all content areas and that all pre-service teachers be required to fulfill an international education requirement before
obtaining New Jersey certification. As I previously described, the New Jersey social studies content standards for civics, adopted four years after the report was written, do encourage students to develop a sense of global community and efficacy in world affairs and do not make any specific mention of economic activities. Although several years passed between the writing of the report and the adoption of the new standards, it seems likely that the economic aims of the report on international education were a driving force behind the incorporation of global concerns into the social studies curriculum standards.

Many of the other New Jersey standards are shaped by traditional liberal and republican discourses. Like Maryland though, there are no standards that list specific civic virtues in the lower grades. The New Jersey standards do require that students describe the naturalization process and also address contemporary civil rights issues. Students are asked to “discuss basic contemporary issues involving the personal, political, and economic rights of American citizens (e.g., dress codes, sexual harassment, fair trial, free press, minimum wage)” (p. F-10). These are the only standards in the study that mention sexual rights or wage rights. New Jersey is also one of only two states in the study whose standards are shaped by ecological citizenship discourse and there are multiple standards that connect the local to the global in terms of environmental problems and the interconnectedness of these issues.

New Mexico

New Mexico is the state with the tenth highest illegal resident population in the United States, with illegal residents making up 4.3% of its total population and 5.6% of its workforce (Pew Hispanic Center, 2011). Immigration issues heavily shape New
Mexico and one current issue of contention is whether to allow illegal residents to obtain driver’s licenses. Currently, New Mexico is one of only three states that allow undocumented immigrants to acquire driver’s licenses, but this allowance is scheduled to be reconsidered during the state congressional session now in progress (Valdes, 2011). Despite the fact that issues surrounding citizenship are important in the state as a whole, the New Mexico Content Standards with Benchmarks and Performance Standards in social studies, adopted in 2009 and assessed in grade eleven only, present a very uncomplicated version of citizenship. Surprisingly, considering New Mexico’s location as a border state, the standards do not even address the process of naturalization or what qualifies someone as a U.S. citizen.

Traditional liberal and republican discourses about citizenship are predominant in the standards. In grades kindergarten through four, heavy emphasis is given to what constitutes “good citizenship.” These qualities include:

- taking turns and sharing;
- taking responsibility for own actions, assignments, and personal belongings within the classroom and respecting the property of others;
- identifying examples of honesty, courage, fairness, loyalty, patriotism, and other character traits seen in American history; and
- explaining and apply “good citizenship” traits within the school and community using the elements of fair play, good sportsmanship, the idea of treating others the way you want to be treated, and being trustworthy. (New Mexico Public Education Department, 2009)
In grades five through eight, the focus shifts to liberal discourse about individual rights and republican discourse about participation in public life and this remains the focus of the standards for grades nine through twelve.

The reason I have included the New Mexico standards in the group of states that include ideas about global citizenship is because they include a standard about universal human rights in every grade, beginning with kindergarten. It is fairly uncommon to see standards about human rights issues at the lower grades, and since New Mexico has fewer than ten citizenship standards at each grade level, the human rights standards make up a significant portion of the citizenship curriculum. The standards require students to “understand the multiplicity and complexity of human rights issues” (p. 9) and to evaluate “conflicts and issues related to universal human rights and their impact on public policy” (p. 8). While global citizenship is not specifically mentioned, a discourse about universal human rights is evident. The human rights standards are very general and do not include any information about what constitutes universal human rights and how these may be secured and enforced.

Oregon

The Oregon Social Sciences Standards K-12 were adopted in August, 2011 and are the newest standards in the study. There is no mandatory statewide testing in social studies at any grade level but there are optional state tests at grades five, eight and ten that schools can choose to administer. Liberalism’s traditional focus on universalistic individual rights is less of an influence on these standards than in many other states. Individual rights are mentioned far less frequently than the responsibilities of citizenship.
The republican discourse encouraging active participation in public life is evident throughout the standards at all grade levels. Students are required to “analyze important political and ethical values such as freedom, democracy, equality and justice” (Oregon Department of Education, 2011, p. 13) as they are embodied in important historical documents. However, there are no specific qualities given as examples of civic virtues in any of the grade levels.

The eighth grade standards acknowledge that citizenship is not a static concept and require that students “analyze the changing definition of citizenship and the expansion of rights” (p. 13). Although citizenship is presented in a largely historical context, it is also presented as ever-expanding and ever-evolving. This is a rare instance of citizenship being represented as something other than a fixed legal status in state standards. The Oregon standards take a particularistic approach to individual rights and require that students in fourth grade “describe and evaluate how historical Oregon governments affected groups within the state (citizens, foreigners, women, class systems, minority groups, tribes)” (p. 6). At the high school level, students are asked to “examine the pluralistic realities of society (e.g., race, poverty, gender, and age), recognizing issues of equity, and evaluating need for change” (p. 16). The concept of cultural citizenship is not fully developed, but the standards do acknowledge that diverse cultural groups, such as ethnic minorities and Native Americans, have been granted unequal status as citizens, both historically and in the present day. Similarly, there is no fully developed discourse about sexual citizenship in the standards. Certainly issues of sexuality and sexual rights are not raised. There is, however, an emerging sense of citizenship as a gendered concept.
with the recognition that women have historically been denied comprehensive citizenship rights and are still struggling with issues of equity.

Two of Oregon’s core standards (meant to be assessed at every grade level) mention global community and global issues.

- Examine the relationship between government and citizens to distinguish and evaluate the ways that civic participation occurs in local, state, tribal, national, and global communities.
- Engage in informed and respectful deliberation of local, state, tribal, national, and global issues. (p. 1)

While these standards explicitly require an examination of civic participation at the global level, the grade level standards contain no mention of individual participation in global politics and issues. Instead, the global sphere is mentioned only in the context of interaction between governments. In seventh grade, students are required to “investigate current issues in the Eastern Hemisphere and how they relate to other countries, including the United States” (p. 11) and in high school students are asked to “evaluate how governments interact at the local, state, tribal, national, and global levels” (p. 16). This disconnect between the core standards and the grade level standards result in no specific requirements that students be taught there is a role for individuals to play in the global sphere.

**Vermont**

A similar approach to global community is taken in the recently adopted Vermont History and Social Science Grade Expectations (2010) (assessed locally only), although
it begins at grade 5 rather than at the high school level. The grades 5-6 standards require students to explore global community by:

- Giving examples of ways people act as members of a global community (e.g., purchasing products made in other countries).
- Identifying problems and proposing solutions in the local community, state, nation, or world.
- After examining issues from more than one perspective, defining and defending the rights and needs of others in the, community, nation, and world (e.g., participating in a forum on child slavery).
- Identifying examples of interdependence among states and nations (e.g., natural resources). (p. 4)

Here, global citizenship has both a political and economic dimension. The citizenship standards for grades 7-8 include very similar requirements and the high school standards state that, “Students act as citizens by … analyzing impacts of people’s actions as members of a global community” (Vermont Department of Education, 2010, p. 4). This standard makes a direct connection between citizenship and global relations so that students understand community extends beyond the bounds of the local or the national.

Many of the other Vermont standards are shaped by traditional liberal and republican discourses, but some expansive discourses are evident as well. For example, Vermont is the only state in the study besides New Jersey whose citizenship standards are influenced by ecological discourse. In grades three and four, students are asked to develop an opinion on a local environmental issue and then write a letter to a state
legislator in an attempt to “influence change” (p. 3). At the high school level, students are required to study the Kyoto Agreement and to consider their “actions as members of a global community” (p. 4). Another high school standard is influenced by sexual, ecological and economic citizenship discourses: “After examining issues from more than one perspective, defining and defending the rights and needs of others in the community, nation, and world (e.g., gay rights, environmental protection, privatization of government)” (p. 5). The Vermont standards are the only standards in the study that make any mention of unequal rights based on sexuality.

Summary

Each of these five states, through their social studies standards dealing specifically with citizenship, attempts to introduce students to ideas about global community and to varying degrees to the fact that they can have a voice in issues of global concern. They represent the most advanced thinking about global citizenship among the states and have the potential to help students view themselves as world citizens rather than as U.S. citizens only. These standards, with the exception of Maryland’s, were all adopted within the last three years, so it remains to be seen if other states will adopt language about global citizenship as they update their standards. There is a current push for national Common Core standards in civics to accompany those in reading and math, so it also remains to be seen how these will incorporate ideas about global citizenship. While these state standards all give students some sense of global community, I am not sure any of them contain a truly cosmopolitan discourse.
Maryland’s standards definitely come the closest since they do mention global institutions that govern human rights.

Overall, economic citizenship is more of a focus in these standards than in those that do not mention global citizenship, so it may be that economic globalization is driving the incorporation of the global to some extent. There certainly seems to be a direct connection in the Maryland standards, but it is not so evident in the standards of the other states. There is definitely a contrast between standards that implicate the United States in global issues and injustices and those that view these as the problems of other countries. The latter present a global perspective that holds the United States as superior to other countries who need our help because of problems such as famine and the spread of HIV/AIDS. This form of orientalism is common in United States social studies curriculum and a concern for the global can work to challenge such assumptions or it can reify them by locating the United States only outside the realm of global problems.

One of the most striking contrasts between the standards of these five states and those that do not mention global citizenship is the almost complete disappearance of specific civic virtues in the standards that do develop a concept of global citizenship. Among these states, only New Mexico lists characteristics of “good citizens” such as honesty, fairness and patriotism. New Mexico is the state with the least fully developed global citizenship discourse in this group since it only includes standards covering universal human rights. A heightened level of global citizenship discourse seems to correspond to a lowered level of interest in the minutiae of individual character and in
shaping behavior to produce one type of “model” citizen, at least in the ten states of this study.

Mapping the Discourses

Discourse mapping as described by Clarke (2005) was a useful analytical tool for examining the discourses in each state’s standards individually as well as for examining the standards documents comparatively. Importantly, the positional maps provided a method of reading the standards visually. This was key to achieving a multilayered reading because looking at the maps was so different from looking at the words of the standards in narrative form. For example, I did not have a good sense of how some elements of the standards were part of multiple discourse categories until I created the ordered maps for each state. In the New Jersey standards, the positional map made it clear how elements of the expansive discourses cross discursive boundaries more frequently than elements of the traditional discourses. The expansive discourses are typically more interrelated than the traditional discourses, which are sometimes oppositional. Sexual, cultural and ecological citizenship tend to be interconnected and are all common concerns of global citizenship, where the elements of the traditional discourses are fairly divided between a focus on rights and a focus on responsibilities. Figure 8 shows an enlarged version of just the expansive discourse side of the map for New Jersey.
These maps, particularly of the expansive discourses, allowed for relational analyses. As Figure 8 shows, the boundaries between discourses are sometimes porous rather than well-defined.
Some of the standards documents, especially New Jersey’s, contain a multiplicity of discourses and a large number of related elements, so the maps became a very useful organizational tool for tracking this data. The situational maps continually reminded me that my study was not taking place in a vacuum and that the standards exist in a larger sociocultural context. This was particularly true when it came to reminding me about the human elements involved in the world of the standards. Because I was working with written documents only, I sometimes forgot about the people who created the documents. Although they were not the focus of my study, keeping my eye on the situational maps helped me to remember the human elements of their creation. The positional maps illuminated the great complexity and heterogeneity of the standards. Indeed, these maps led directly to one of the major findings that I discuss below – the very sharp distinction between states that stick to traditional/nationalist discourses about citizenship in their standards and those that have begun to incorporate more expansive/global discourses. For example, the Wyoming citizenship standards are on the opposite end of the spectrum from the New Jersey standards in terms of complexity. Figure 9 shows the positional map I created for Wyoming.
This is the entire positional map for Wyoming and it has much less complexity than even the one half of the New Jersey map shown above. I can think of no better term than Dorothy Shipps’ (2000) “anemic citizenship” (p. 102) to describe this vision of citizenship. The Wyoming standards present a very uncomplicated version of citizenship that is mostly shaped by traditional liberal and republican discourses with a very light focus on active participation.

The discourse maps also helped me ground my analysis more solidly in the data. What this generated from the standards themselves was a theory about dominant/traditional and emergent/expansive discourses that is not reliant upon the a priori discourse categories that I outlined in chapter two. While I eventually mapped the discursive elements of the standards onto the a priori categories, this was a final move
after I first coded and mapped the standards on their own terms. Here is where Raymond
Williams’ (1977) framework of dominant, residual and emergent cultural elements
becomes very useful. The “rights and responsibilities” elements of liberalism and
republicanism remain the dominant discourses in all of the standards, although the terms
liberalism and republicanism rarely appear in the texts of the standards. The frequent
mention of “rights and responsibilities” across the states are indicative of the residual
discourses of liberalism and republicanism from the classical world. “Rights and
responsibilities” has in effect become the dominant discourse while shedding all direct
reference to liberal and republican theories in the standards. So while liberalism and
republicanism still dominate in a way, they have been stripped of much of their
complexity, reduced to residual discourses and are frequently not mentioned directly.

Here is also where the maps helped me to identify emergent/expansive discourses
in the citizenship standards. In my discussion of citizenship studies in chapter two, I
categorize sexual citizenship, cultural citizenship, ecological citizenship, global
citizenship and cosmopolitanism as expansive discourses. In the context of citizenship
studies they are well established and highly developed concepts that are probably past the
stage of emergence at this point. However, they exist in very miniscule amounts in the
standards, so here they seem to be barely emergent, not even fully emergent yet in all but
perhaps New Jersey’s standards. Therefore I developed the category of
expansive/emergent discourses to be used when mapping the standards onto the a priori
discursive categories.
Major Findings

The analysis of the standards resulted in four substantive findings that illuminate the vision(s) of citizenship presented by the standards of these ten states. First, there is a sharp divide between the states that include only traditional/nationalist discourses about citizenship in their standards and the states that include those discourses along with expansive/globalist discourses about citizenship. Second, even with the elements of expansive discourses in the standards of some states, the citizenship standards I analyzed remain largely stuck in traditional discourses. Third, in the few instances where a well-developed discourse of global citizenship begins to emerge in the standards, it is likely to be in service of a neoliberal focus on global economic competitiveness. Fourth, among the states in this study, those with conservative political leanings are unlikely to incorporate expansive citizenship discourses into their standards while those with more politically liberal leanings are more likely to do so.

Traditional and Expansive Discourses

The citizenship discourses presented by the standards in the study can be rather cleanly divided into categories: traditional and expansive. This is a fairly clean discursive division rather than a division of the states. The states can be more accurately divided into those that include only traditional discourses in their citizenship standards and those that include both traditional and expansive discourses. All of the states’ standards include elements of liberal and republican discourses even if they do not identify them by name, which is usually the case. These contrasting approaches result in differing levels of overall complexity in terms of the vision of citizenship that exists in
the standards. Interestingly, if the standards do not mention global citizenship, they are unlikely to mention any of the other expansive citizenship discourses, such as sexual, cultural and ecological. A global citizenship discourse appears to open the door for more expansive discourses to be included and this may be because the expansive discourses tend to be more interconnected as I explained in the previous section.

The one discursive element that frequently seems to straddle both the traditional and emergent discourse is active citizenship. Republicanism certainly requires active participation on the part of its citizens, but my conception of active citizenship is more in line with Amy Gutmann’s (1987) deliberative participatory citizenship (citizenship 2.0). Kansas is a state whose active citizenship standards I interpret as more closely related to traditional citizenship discourses. Students are taught that citizens should act to effect change, but only within certain limits. As mentioned before, protest and civil disobedience are introduced, but the authors of the standards were careful to put boundaries around these activities by warning that civil disobedience taken to the extreme is punishable by law. Most of the active citizenship standards in the Kansas document are part of traditional republican discourse, such as the responsibilities citizens have to vote, pay taxes, obey the law, appear for jury duty and serve in the military. In contrast, the Maryland standards explain how students have rights and responsibilities as “citizens of the world” (p. 4) as well as how the responsibility for active civic participation extends to a global context. This mandate appears only in grade seven though, and in other grades active participation is part of a fairly traditional republican discourse. This is an
example of where discussions of active citizenship are included in both traditional and expansive discourses within the standards document of one state.

Another distinction between the standards that include only traditional discourses and those that include expansive discourses as well is a differing emphasis on listing specific civic virtues that young students (usually in grades kindergarten through two) are supposed to develop. All of the traditional/nationalist states in the study list very specific characteristics of “good” citizens. Of the expansive/globalist states, only New Mexico requires specific civic virtues; the other four states do not list these. Here I would like to introduce Charles T. Lee’s (2010) concept of citizenship as a “cultural script” (p. 58). This is related to a Foucauldian view of citizenship as technologies of governance, but reframes technologies as scripts. Lee considers how citizenship has “functioned as a modern biopolitical instrument and ideological script that facilitates liberal governance” (p. 62). He begins with Foucault’s (1980) concept of biopower that regulates human subjects in order to properly reproduce the proper social body, so citizenship is a technology of governance under a surveillance state. Lee expands on this idea to name “citizenship-as-script” (p. 57) as encompassing more than political acts and juridical institutions and to include the wider cultural-material domain and works to “reproduce domesticated subjects who will be kept in place” (p. 63). The nonglobal standards documents provide young students with scripts for citizenship by requiring that very specific civic virtues be developed. The question this contrast with the global states raises is what it is about a more expansive approach to citizenship discourse that renders these lists of individual character traits unnecessary. It is perhaps related to the opening
up of possibilities for what “good” citizenship can mean in the context of a global and interconnected world. This may be a bit of a postmodern turn, a shedding of knowable truths about who a universally ideal citizen is.

_Stuckness_

As promising as those last few sentences sound, overall the standards are very much stuck in traditional citizenship discourses. Even though there is a loosening of the hold specific civic virtues have on the standards that incorporate global discourses, the “rights and responsibilities” elements of liberal and republican discourses, both dominant and residual, have not similarly loosened their grip in any of the standards. The question here is, why this stuckness? Beyond the fact that state standards do not often represent the cutting edge in thinking, I propose that this stuckness may have something to do with the stuckness of citizenship within the social studies curriculum. It is relegated to its own domain within the social studies subtopic that is usually named “civics” or vaguely “government” and it is always very clearly labeled as citizenship. On some specified days during the school calendar (or in some specified year of schooling), students are supposed to “do” citizenship in a way that is not clearly part of their everyday lives or other school subjects. The limited attention given to social studies and, by extension and probably even more so, to citizenship, has likely limited innovation in this area. Perhaps citizenship could become unstuck if it were allowed to expand more fully into other areas of the curriculum and become a more fully integrated aspect of education. I address this possibility more extensively in chapter five.
Global Citizenworkers

In the standards where a well-developed discourse of global citizenship begins to emerge, it is frequently accompanied by a neoliberal focus on global economic competitiveness. Additionally, the state standards that incorporate global citizenship discourse have more of a focus on economic citizenship than the nonglobal state standards. The conclusion that seems most likely from this sample of standards documents is that global citizenship standards have been developed in attempt to more adequately prepare students for the increasingly globalized world of work. The Maryland and New Jersey standards provide evidence for this conclusion. They are the states with the most fully developed global citizenship discourses, and they have published related documents that equate civic competence with workplace skills and a call for international education that serves the needs of the business community. Faza Rizvi (2009) cautions against ever assuming that the promotion of global citizenship is innocent because issues of economic power are usually central to such an effort. Chapter five discusses the limited version of global citizenship that results from its service to economic aims and presents some alternatives for what global citizenship might become.

The Red/Blue Divide

As I approached the conclusion of my data analysis, I found myself wondering about regional and political differences and located a red state/blue state map from the 2008 presidential election (The New York Times Company, 2008). My sampling method did not take into account geographic location or political leanings of the states I chose. However, the ten states I studied unintentionally represent all the major regions of the
United States except the south. As I reviewed my findings, it became clear that the coastal states are more likely to lean toward global citizenship and other expansive citizenship discourses. Through my sampling and analysis methods, I tried to ignore the political leanings of individual states as much as possible. However, there is a strong political divide between the two groups of standards I studied. All of the states that include global citizenship discourses in their standards voted for Barack Obama in 2008 and all of the other states voted for John McCain. The political leanings of states heavily influence the educational standards that are written and adopted, so it is not surprising to learn that states with conservative political leanings are more likely to stick with more traditional citizenship discourses while states that are more politically liberal are likely to include more expansive discourses. It may be a little disheartening to see things break down into such predictable and tidy categories and it speaks volumes to the amount of control that elected state officials have over the content of curriculum as well as to the variance of curriculum content among the fifty states.

I think Lee’s (2010) citizenship “scripts” are again relevant here. The states studied in which the majority of the population votes Republican all include a citizenship script that carefully delineates civic virtues “good” citizens should develop. This is an instance of Republican controlled governing bodies attempting to regulate behavior in ways that are similar to their attempts to regulate women’s health, sexual behavior and a wide variety of arguably private activities. Here we see a conflation of public and private life similar to what Lauren Berlant (1997) describes. She addresses the privatization of the concept of citizenship that has resulted in the obsession over citizens’ private,
intimate acts, particularly those that involve sexuality, rather than their public, civic acts. Berlant argues that this shift from a “political public sphere” to an “intimate public sphere” (p. 4) began during the Reagan era. In the standards, these lists of civic virtues are present primarily in the lower grade levels, so perhaps a valid argument can be made that this is the most appropriate way to connect citizenship to the lives of students at a very young age. However, the standards of the Democratic leaning states in the study do not include these prescriptive lists of virtues. Again, I think taking a more expansive approach to citizenship opens up wider possibilities for what citizenship can become.

**Conclusion**

For Foucault (1973), institutional systems such as education work to reinforce dominant discourses. Technologies of the self are involved in disciplining practices that produce particular subjectivities (Foucault, 1988). Clarke (2005) quotes Nikolas Rose and Peter Miller (1992) who explain further: “Power is not so much a matter of imposing constraints upon citizens as of ‘making up’ citizens capable of bearing a kind of regulated freedom. Personal autonomy is not the antithesis of political power, but a key term in its exercise, the more so because most individuals are not merely the subjects of power but play a part in its operations” (p. 54). State standards as citizenship “scripts” may operate in this way as they define the “conditions of possibility” (Foucault, 1972, p. 116) for the types of citizens students can become. In chapter two I examined state curriculum standards as techniques of governance and this chapter has explored how these techniques materialize into specific citizenship scripts for students to follow. In chapter five I will imagine how we might move from a Foucauldian notion of citizenship...
standards as techniques of governance to a citizenship curriculum that is interested in a
Foucauldian notion of care of the self.
Chapter 5
Foreseeing a Robust Citizenship Education

Introduction

In this chapter I explore how the results of the study open possibilities for new directions in citizenship education that are not necessarily bound only to the social studies curriculum. Postmodernity has radically changed citizenship into something multiple and less containable. If governments are unwilling to acknowledge this, it does not make it any less true, even though the nation-state still retains much power and authority. As state institutions, school are not necessarily going to acknowledge this reality, although the degree to which this is the case will vary by state, and the current push towards national standards in all subjects may make it even less likely. This raises the question of whether or not schools should remain the fundamental training ground for citizenship, but schools arguably retain the greatest reach since almost all young citizens still pass through their doors.

Although the focus of my study was on instances of the global in citizenship standards, it was not possible to analyze only these instances because of the variety of discourses that circulate in and influence the standards. One of the common issues the standards address is what it means to be a “good” citizen. Yes, there are some skill citizens need in order to function effectively in a democracy, but the focus is not so much on competency as it is on “goodness.” Techniques for producing one type of ideal citizen
limit possibilities and define students as subjects rather than citizens. This focus on “goodness” illustrates that the standards already include an ethical dimension, so it might be possible to take ethics to the next level by fostering a cosmopolitan sensibility that instills transnational attachments and concerns and offers alternate possibilities for practicing citizenship that incorporate Foucault’s notion of care of the self.

Foucault (2005) defines care of the self as self-reflective practices that involve knowing oneself. An ethical task of self-transformation is at the root of these practices rather than an acceptance of discourses presented as truth. Gert Biesta (1999) imagines what he terms a “different foundation” for educational theory – justice rather than truth – and I would like to expand his ideas to include the content of education, particularly social studies and citizenship education. He proposes conceiving of education as the space in which the subject comes into presence as a singular being, and therefore education should be considered in terms of responsibility. In this view, education is a response to the singularity of the student that must “be thought of as an infinite responsibility” (p. 216). Biesta uses Emmanuel Levinas’s concept of radical intersubjectivity to illuminate this responsibility “for the singularity of the subject” (p. 216) which, he argues, should become a different foundation for education. Perceiving the subject in terms of ethics and responsibility then, could perhaps be translated into curricular content so that intersubjectivity could become the basis for a new social studies curriculum that is no longer reliant on the notions of citizen and state.

Jan Masschelein (2000) argues that the demand for truth should not be at the center of what he terms “an edifying education” (p. 605), rather it should privilege an
ethical demand. While Masschelein is concerned specifically with the sciences and scientific rationality, he is referring to education as a whole when he writes that, with the traditional notion of an edifying education that includes ethics, “The critical function of education seems to be lost. It is reduced to socialization” (p. 609). He proposes a new vision for education as edification that involves the confrontation between scientific knowledge and the ethical demands and challenges of society today. Thus ethics and moral education are not separated from the teaching of facts as they tend to be in our current system of education. Such an education would involve action and judgment, so that students would be taught to, in any given situation, ask what is demanded of them in that situation. Masschelein argues against divorcing the sciences from the life-world and says, based on Hannah Arendt’s ideas, “Education offers a reading of the life-world in which teachers take up responsibility for the world” (p. 614). He defines education as “the space and time that society gives itself to reflect on itself” (p. 614), and asserts that it is this edifying act that may require more of our teacher education programs so that society can act responsibly towards its younger generation.

Isin and Turner (2002) discuss a radical version of citizenship that is concerned with the idea of virtue rather than with simply expanding social rights. They distinguish between liberal and classical theories of citizenship explaining that liberal theory is minimalist and defines the primary role of the state as protecting the freedom of individuals, primarily through removing obstacles to free market exchange. In contrast, Isin and Turner cite the classical Greek vision of citizenship and the polis as well as the German idea Bildungsroman that focuses on the moral and psychological growth of the
individual. This tradition, they argue, is concerned with the education of the citizen in the virtues necessary for attaining personal autonomy. Further, they declare the neo-liberal view of citizenship is in crisis and explain that:

While neo-liberals have argued that the citizen needs training in order to secure a job in the labor market, virtue ethics argues that a person requires education in order to become an individual. The politics of virtue has a thick rather than thin view of the citizen of a nation, namely of the citizen as complex, educated and vibrant member of a society. There is therefore an important connection between virtuous citizens and effective and living institutions; this connection is through the dual operation of virtue and obligation. An autonomous citizen will want to be an active and involved participant in a community. (p. 8)

For Isin and Turner, contemporary citizenship has been eroded by the decline of education and the marginalization of the worker and has resulted in low rates of political participation, a distrust of politicians and a decline of the public sphere in general. They contend that the revival of cosmopolitan idealism has the potential to reintroduce the language of virtue and the common good and counter the neoliberal emphasis on wealth above all else. Instead of wealth creation, the primary goal of statecraft should be value creation so that an obligation to the common good (on a global scale) is renewed.

_A Limited Vision of Citizenship_

Political life in the United States is strongly shaped by the traditional discourses of liberalism, which prioritizes individual liberties and freedom from state interference,
and republicanism, which also supports self-government but requires more out of citizens in the form of civic virtue and a commitment to the common good. As we study citizenship in the context of globalization and in light of arguments that chronicle the decline of the nation-state, it is tempting to want to de-emphasize the importance of these discourses in favor of newer and more diverse citizenship discourses. Indeed, I had no intention of devoting so much space to liberalism and republicanism in this study. However, these discourses are not disappearing, especially not in the social studies curriculum, and the role of nation-states may be changing but not necessarily vanishing, so they are impossible to ignore. It is useful, though, to ask how much meaning these Western concepts retain in an increasingly global society. In the state standards analyzed for this study, liberal and republican discourses are often simply scaled up from the context of the nation-state and applied in an identical way in a global context. It is also worth asking what it means that standards are mostly stuck in these discourses and how it will affect the future political life of the citizens we educate.

My analysis uncovered a clear lack of influence by communitarian and radical democratic discourses in the standards. This is no surprise given the historical and contemporary political traditions of the United States, but it does illuminate the dismissive attitude with which we teach other political traditions. There are many references to the importance of community in standards for the lower grades in the study and I often tried to examine them from the perspective of communitarianism, but they really represent republican discourses about participation in public life and a concern for the common good rather than instances where the interests of the community are
prioritized over the interests of the individual. Of course labeling an idea or a political candidate socialist or communist is still the easiest way to ensure rejection in U.S. politics, so communitarian ideals are not likely to enter the social studies curriculum any time soon. While active participation by citizens is a common theme among the standards, there is no identifiable influence by radical democratic theory in the standards I analyzed. An effort to not restrict politics to the realm of the state and economy only and to view “citizenship through a vision of democracy as a way of life” (Rasmussen & Brown, 2002, p. 175) has the potential to educate for democratic citizenship in new and productive ways, but it may not be an attainable goal within the state institution of education.

The discourses that I identified in chapter two that seek to expand the realm of citizenship are nonexistent in the standards of many of the states I studied and just barely emergent in some of the others. Ecological citizenship is probably the most likely of these discourses to emerge in the standards because there tends to be a fairly robust concern about environmental degradation in many of the standards documents, especially in the geography standards. I did not find a great deal of ecological citizenship in the standards I studied, but I limited my study to the standards dealing explicitly with citizenship. I would expect to find more traces of ecological citizenship discourse if I examined the geography standards, based on my previous experience with many of the standards documents. A truly cosmopolitan citizenship only begins to emerge in the standards of one state in my study while other discussions about global citizenship simply begin to impart ideas about global interconnectedness and individuals as members of a
larger human community. A few of the states in the study do reference the fact that
different groups of people have always experienced different levels of citizenship, but no
solid discourse about cultural citizenship emerges from these standards. Similarly, ideas
about sexual citizenship are almost nonexistent. There are several discussions about full
civil rights being denied to women in a historical context, but there is no treatment of
citizenship as a gendered concept. And, in the ten sets of citizenship standards I studied
there was just a single mention of rights being denied to individuals on the basis of
sexuality. Certainly each of these expansive discourses gives rise to controversial social
issues and they are not likely to be embraced by all who are responsible for developing
social studies standards, particularly in states with more conservative political leanings.

The Post Possibilities for Subjectivity and Citizenship

While much of the current educational policy in the United States has been
shaped by neoliberal ideology, some scholars (Lather, 2010; Macdonald & Ruckert,
2009; Simon-Kumar, 2011) argue that we may be entering a period of post-neoliberalism
that will be marked by a state that is more active in response to the failures of
deregulating hands-off approaches as evidenced by the 2008 collapse of financial
markets. Rachel Simon-Kumar (2011) contends that the post-neoliberal state governs
through a combination of neoliberal and social-democratic welfare policies. She argues
that the problems created by the markets cannot be fixed by the markets themselves and
require the power of the state to fix it saying, “this whole ‘withering of the state’ thing
(which was pushed by radicals on the left and right) has turned out to be empty. The
economy, the environment, education, sexism, racism, immigration—these social
problems can only be solved by the social power of a state that's globally coordinated with other states” (p. 49). It remains to be seen how educational policy will be affected by this shift, but it is unlikely that standardization will decrease in the near future, so it is important to understand standards that attempt to influence who a citizen is.

Charles T. Lee (2010) conceptualizes “citizenship-as-script” (p. 57) as it defines and limits possibilities. Lee names the different scripts typically involved in citizenship:

The political script denotes periodic (though limited) civil participation in a political community within predetermined bureaucratic parameters: voting through the representative matrix, serving on a jury, or deliberating in a town hall meeting. The economic script figures the ideal citizenworker as an honest and law-abiding subject who works and consumes, saves and invests, and pays taxes in contributing to the productive cycle of capitalism. The life script nurtures, in general, a civil and proprietary citizen-subject governed by the right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. In all, these cultural subscripts form into a stagnant ideological ‘life cycle’ of liberal citizenship in prescribing a relatively fixed social and moral order; they perpetuate a repetitive and mundane circuit of a standardized national subject, M or F, who works and consumes, saves and invests, and pays taxes in the productive cycle of capitalism as an honest and law-abiding citizen-worker, and who periodically participates along with others in an orderly manner in the
business of governing/deliberating through the bureaucratic representative matrix, within a national territory. (p. 63)

If the ten state standards documents are taken as a whole, the content mirrors Lee’s scripts almost exactly. Lee argues that “this standardized citizenship script…is articulated and interpellated in the sphere of everyday discourse and institution as ‘common sense’ and materialized into a way of life. The script is thus not ‘merely cultural,’ [Butler, 1998] but material, as it is linked to material rewards, entitlements, and protections and is lived through and through by human subjects” (p. 63). In order to secure full citizenship, subjects must participate within the bounds of the script. Assessing students, or simply shaping curriculum, based on a standardized citizenship limits possibilities and offers only one way of fully becoming a citizen – passing the test or whatever form of assessment is required.

Here the question of whether we are educating citizens or subjects becomes very relevant. By using the term subjects I am referring to the Foucauldian (1997) concept of individuals who are subjected to discourses and I am distinguishing this from citizens who have more possibilities for being in the world. Mark A. Pike (2007) asks the question about citizens or subjects in the context of the mandatory and tested national citizenship curriculum in England and posits that the central issue is whether the curriculum elevates the interests of the citizen or the interests of the state. He argues that citizenship must be more than what students know or do and must encompass the entirety of their identities. Pike problematizes the idea of an ethical citizenship curriculum that considers the whole person, not just the person’s political life, because there is a risk of
alienating some who are members of conservative religious communities and do not share secular civic values such as the republican focus on active political participation. All students, according to Pike, should be given the opportunity and encouragement to compare the values in the citizenship curriculum with the values they learn at home. We must also trouble ideas about global citizenship and recognize that some students have global allegiances that do not align with a global civic body. Pike offers the examples of some Christians and Muslims who consider themselves part of a global religious body first and foremost. Treating students as citizens rather than subjects takes into account these and other potential conflicts when developing and implementing a curriculum.

Hiro Saito (2010) offers a three-part approach to designing such a curriculum that takes a cosmopolitan approach to citizenship while utilizing the people and objects that already surround students. He uses actor-network theory to assert that the more connections citizens have to other citizens, the more active they can become and explains the importance of connections to both their local and global communities. This is not an attachment to the whole of humanity, but multiple attachments to people and objects across geographical boundaries. This puts a face on the faceless “human” and turns the abstract other into the concrete other who is easier to act for. First, in a cosmopolitan curriculum, students should be encouraged to develop emotional attachments to foreign people and objects. Students may already have positive attachments to other countries at a very young age through exposure to mass media. For example, they may have seen a nature program about kangaroos and have a positive attachment to Australia because of it. Second, students should be taught to understand the transnational connections that
already shape their lives. This can be as simple as asking students where their clothing or home appliances are made since many are produced completely outside the United States. With younger students, this can evolve into a discussion about how their television set traveled from another country to them. With older students, this can turn into a discussion about labor practices in other countries and an ethical discussion about their complicity in these practices and other exploitative social relations. Third, students should learn to act on these understanding and attachments in a way that can effect change across state borders. Here, students are encouraged to critically evaluate their attachments, what they might do to influence change, and how others affected might feel about these actions. The ability to effect transformation is what distinguishes mere subjects from citizens of the world. Saito believes students can be shaped into cosmopolitan citizens who “transverse national borders dialogically by virtue of their transnational attachments, understandings and actions” (p. 333) even if they do not have opportunities to physically cross borders.

_Towards an Ethical/Critical Citizenship Curriculum_

Global citizenship in service of economic aims only does not “cultivate humanity” in the way that Martha C. Nussbaum (1997) envisions. She asserts that “it would be catastrophic to become a nation of technically competent people who have lost the ability to think critically, to examine themselves, and to respect the humanity and diversity of others” (p. 300). Incorporating the global scale into citizenship education creates an opening to discuss equality and democracy that is not bounded by the nation-state. Amy Gutmann (2004) argues that “democratic education undermines the ideal of
civic equality if it conveys to students that only citizens of their society are deserving of equal respect and fair treatment” (p. 94). Murphy-Shigematsu (2004) illustrates this when he points to social movements among people of Korean ancestry in Japan that demand human rights and citizenship rights rather than Japanese nationality. He explains that in Japan, “untying the rights and duties of citizenship from the status of nationality is a way of expanding the boundaries of citizenship” (p. 318) that can result in “a gradual separation of civil rights from formal nationality” (p. 320). Such an approach allows for a discussion of human rights, rather than rights that are only granted to citizens of a particular nation-state.

Christopher Joon-Hai Lee (2006) draws on the ideas of Hannah Arendt to develop his vision of how to teach a radical history by linking the local and the global and critically addressing issues of state power. Lee is writing about college level history courses, but I think some of his ideas can be useful for K-12 education as well. The sort of radical pedagogy Lee suggests “progressively moves discussion beyond what are now conventionally accepted frames of analysis – such as colonizer/colonized, settler/native, the West and ‘the Rest’- without abandoning their import” (p. 130). It is this model for moving beyond these foundational terms that I believe can help us envision how to unbind social studies education from notions of the state and the citizen in the K-12 classroom.

Decentering the nation-state is essential to helping students develop a concern for human rights, rather than simply teaching about individual rights based on national citizenship. Cameron White and Roger Openshaw (2002) argue that a nationalist focus in
citizenship education does not sensitize youth to issues and problems that are common to humanity. If nation-states are depicted as existing in competition with each other, which is certainly true of certain aspects of social studies curricula in the United States, it is difficult to reconcile this with the aim of building cooperation between people. It also prevents the questioning of certain values that are considered sacred to the particular nation-state and can preclude a discussion of human rights. Sharon Todd (2007) discusses human rights education as a means of going beyond traditional ideas about individual rights that are bound up in the nation-state. She terms this just education which creates “forms of living that serve to nourish the very freedoms that allow dignity in human life” (p. 593). She addresses the tendency to prioritize the teaching of rights in civics education saying, “It seems to me that knowledge about rights is the bare minimum required and that the real potential of education lies in its capacities to provoke insights that help youth live well with ambiguity and dilemma, where freedom, justice, and responsibility cannot be dictate to them, but involve tough decisions that must be made in everyday life” (p. 594). Todd considers the fiction of freedom and rights and argues that education should be concerned with the performativity of freedom that occurs when one acts with others in a rights-based society. She also turns to ideas of justice and responsibility as a basis for human rights education that teaches the skills required for living in concert with others and defines rights in terms of responsibility rather than entitlement. Teaching about concepts such as justice and freedom as the foundation for individual rights counters the notion that one must be a citizen of a nation-state in order
to be entitled to any rights and introduces ideas about the common or the human from a transnational perspective.

A number of scholars have considered the often exclusionary nature of citizenship curricula and proposed alternative possibilities for incorporating a more ethical/critical notion of citizenship in the United States. Margaret Smith Crocco (2010), for example, considers the lack of attention to gender in United States social studies education that goes beyond images of non-Western women as oppressed. She argues that such images only serve to reify the stereotypes and one-dimensional portrayals that students are exposed to in a variety of media and do not ask students to engage in critical dialogue about these images. Amani Hamdan (2010) writes specifically about Muslim women and argues that global educators must work to critique the prevailing stereotypes and misrepresentations that dehumanize their lives. It is imperative that students are given alternative images to contradict the messages that do not imagine the Other as fully human.

Merry M. Merryfield and Binaya Subedi (2006) assert that such misrepresentations within the curriculum are a result of a colonial vision of the Other. In order to counter this, the social studies curriculum could teach students skills in perspective consciousness as well as offer alternate histories. Through such practices, they posit, “teachers can construct a world-centered social studies that contributes to ‘decolonizing’ the mind in that it provides insights into ways of knowing that resist and challenge the histories, literature, and worldviews of people who have used scholarship to justify their culture’s imposition of power upon others” (p. 290).
Transforming the curriculum is also the focus of Stephen Castles (2004) who analyzes multiculturalism which, he writes, abandons “the myth of homogeneous and monocultural nation-states” (p. 27) but does not question the territorial nature of citizenship and therefore can still be viewed as a mechanism for controlling difference. In contrast, transnationalism goes further and challenges conceptions of identity that are based on the boundaries of the nation-state. Castles explains that transnational communities often function as diffuse, informal networks that can work to counter the oppressive forces of governments and corporations and he predicts that transnationalism will lead to the rapid growth of multiple citizenship and create “the phenomenon most feared by nationalists: the potentially divided loyalties of people with an instrumental rather than an emotional attitude toward state membership” (p. 29). He proposes “transnational education as a preparation for living across borders and global consciousness” (p. 31) as an anecdote. Education that incorporates a transnational perspective can serve as an alternative to citizenship discourses that presents homogenous visions of identity and are based on simplistic ideas about inclusion and exclusion.

Walter C. Parker (2004) observes that the norm in curriculum work tends to be “domestication, not emancipation” (p. 434). He outlines the need to expand the scale and vision of multicultural education and advocates for a multinational, collaborative effort to develop curriculum for global citizenship. It will be difficult to go beyond the narrow concerns of the nation state without seeking international collaboration in the creation of new curricula. Educating a global community of students will first require a global community of educators. Parker also argues that we must teach students “to do history
rather than only to receive it” (p. 444), and this can be done, in part, through teaching deliberation and dialogue. Subedi (2008) describes how such dialogue can be incorporated into the social studies curriculum when teachers include knowledge that is outside the mainstream and thereby create spaces in which to interpret citizenship differently. He explains that “questions of dialogue are connected to the larger discourse of citizenship because the critical practice of promoting inclusive citizenship advocates the ethics of noncolonizing dialogue” (p. 418). Therefore, according to Subedi, teaching practices that acknowledge citizenship discourses that do not erase difference can illuminate the experiences and subject positions of immigrant students. Such approaches are necessary to move beyond a citizenship education that privileges and makes visible the experiences of the dominant culture only.

Rizvi (2009) recommends that we reformulate our notions of multicultural education in light of globalization saying:

If multiculturalism is to survive as a useful policy concept, then it cannot remain tied exclusively to the agenda for managing inter-ethnic relations within the nation-state. For it to be useful in dealing with the transnational and transcultural spaces that have become central to attempts to deal with what Urry (2003) refers to as ‘global complexity,’ multiculturalism needs to interpret the local and the national within the wider global context. It has to deal, for example, with the diasporic spaces that enable many people to now belong simultaneously to more than one country, and to forge their identity within the context of
economic, social, and political relations that span national boundaries.

(p. 283)

An ethical/critical citizenship curriculum, in our age of global connectedness, might recognize the dialogue and struggles that occur outside the territorial boundaries of the United States and help students to understand their connectedness to the dialogue and struggles they experience at the local and national levels. Certainly there has been a move toward including ideas about global citizenship and encouraging students to engage with global communities in the social studies standards of a few states, but there is much more work to be done before this becomes a commonplace idea that does not privilege global capital over global community in service of human rights.

_Directions for Citizenship Education_

Citizenship standards in the U.S. are largely stuck in the past and lag far behind current citizenship theory. While I can offer little hope that citizenship education will become dynamic and multifaceted in the near future, there are possibilities for transforming K-12 citizenship education. Students should learn to expose the often contradictory roles of citizen and worker/consumer in both a national and global context. Such tasks can become part of a citizenship curriculum that incorporates Foucault’s (2005) concept of care of the self. This section offers some suggestions for developing an ethical/critical citizenship curriculum.

Dorothy Shipps (2000) warns against the “anemic” citizenship that results from using economics as a justification for schooling and curriculum content. This is applicable to curriculum that deals with global citizenship because, Shipps writes,
“although corporations may have attained global urban citizenship, neither the customer
not the shareholder – regardless of their increasing numbers worldwide – have access to
those global rights” (p. 102). Rizvi (2009), in his discussion of cultural hybridization,
explains that promoting global citizenship is never an innocent endeavor, arguing that
“this hybridization is never neutral; it involves a politics in which issues of economic and
cultural power are central” (p. 286). We can be assured that citizenship in the curriculum
will have to confront global capitalism in multifaceted ways. As Gregory, et al. (2009)
assert, the concept of citizenship in the West “is inevitably interrelated with the form and
logic of capitalist development” (p. 85). They go on to explain that citizenship is always
influenced by state and economic restructuring so that “the ways in which citizenship
takes shape at different historical periods and in different places always reflect the actions
of those to whom its transformation matters” (85). For educators, it is important to help
students recognize the implications of global capitalism in connection with learning about
ways to participate in global community.

The complexities of citizenship are intensified when the tensions between
capitalism and both national and global ideas of citizenship are considered. Capitalism
prioritizes the corporation over the boundaries of the nation-state and attempts to render
global human rights violations invisible to the consumer (Beiner, 1995). This is
particularly true in the era of neoliberalism and global capital, whose values have been
incorporated into the social studies curriculum to a great extent. Writing about
curriculum, John P. Myers (2010) critiques the twenty-first century skills movement that
has been largely promoted by the business community to create a global labor force
through schooling. Therefore, the concern is with “real world” skills to fill the needs of the labor market rather than with expanding democratic participation. According to Myers, this movement is designed to develop human capital and envisions students as future workers and is not concerned with creating a global community that is based on anything other than economics and profit.

Not only does neoliberalism imagine students as future workers, it also envisions them as future, or current, consumers. In her study of an Indian college during a student strike against attempts to privatize higher education, Ritty Lukose (2005) considers the discourses of consumption that have emerged from globalization’s reconfiguration of politics and citizenship. She explains that freedom has become nothing more than the freedom to consume and posits that “the privatizing logic of the market asserts its claims on the public through the logic of consumption. The freedom of consumption is linked with the freedom to move in an uninhibited way through public places. In this way, the ‘public citizen’ articulates with the figure of the ‘private consumer’ (p. 513). “The ‘civic’ is increasingly tied to discourses of consumption and a free market” (p. 518) and education becomes a commodity in a society that pits the private market against public politics. Phillip Brown and Hugh Lauder (2009) identify a similar trend and argue that a new international system of production and labor markets has been created that seeks workers with highly desired skills. They question whether we are witnessing “the production of new educational pathways for the formation of a new global ruling class or set of elites …a transnational ruling class” (p. 131) – in other words, an affluent ruling class that
transcends national boundaries and asserts global dominance. A curriculum that imagines students as worker citizens and consumer citizens only is not truly interested in educating for a global community that is based on common humanity and active democratic citizen participation.

Recommendations for Future Study

I make no claims to have read the full text of citizenship in U.S. social studies education since to do so would require an analysis of the standards writing and adoption process, adopted curriculum, teaching practices, assessment instruments and more. It is important to continue mapping citizenship discourses in the places they materialize beyond the text of the standards. For example, teaching practices may play the definitive role in either expanding citizenship or reifying nationalist visions of citizenship. Standards outline what students are supposed to learn but do not necessarily reflect what is actually taught. Many U.S. states now have very complex citizenship mosaics and grant different levels of status to noncitizens. If noncitizen residents are allowed to obtain drivers licenses and other forms of identification in some states but not others, the discourses that shape classroom teaching practices may be very different in these states even if they are not so different in the standards documents.

Studying curriculum design is important as well. Standards are here to stay and there are opportunities to design curriculum that covers all the bases while also bringing richness and complexity to citizenship education. A cosmopolitan education, as explained by David T. Hansen (2008) does not have to conflict with existing requirements and does not necessitate a radical overhaul of the curriculum. He advocates
instilling a “cosmopolitan sensibility” (p. 289) in young citizens that “embodies respect for the reality of self, other, and world. It propels persons to communicate with others and with other traditions and inheritances. It disposes people not only to be open to new values and ideas but to consider them as addresses from the world, as potential candidates for guiding their own lives” (p. 306). Such an approach is not a homogenizing or universalizing approach but an approach that recognizes the fullness of differing experiences and the importance of perspective. Globetrotting is not necessary to developing a cosmopolitan sensibility, and no one should proclaim to be a cosmopolitan; it might instead become an orientation from which one views the world and interacts with others, not an achievement. Such a sensibility is not one of global consumerism but is one of creativity and could be integrated across all curricular subject areas, not just social studies.

If citizenship learning is to be assessed, then there are opportunities to assess it across disciplines as well, although nonstandardized assessments offer students the most opportunity to enact their citizenship. Pike (2007) labels testing and assessment forms of disciplinary power that are designed to produce subjects rather than citizens. Citizenship exams undermine the egalitarian principles of democratic citizenship by producing “truths” about students that are used to place them into hierarchies. Pike contends that there is a fundamental tension between assessment practices and an individual’s right to liberty because of the inequalities testing creates based on the way one measures up to norms. Mandatory testing is likely not the best way to engage young citizens in the democratic process, as Pike astutely notes. He prefers portfolio assessment, but argues
that it should be a cross-disciplinary assessment of citizenship learning. Here David Lee Carlson’s (2009) critique of portfolio assessment is relevant because he contends that portfolios are non-innocent pedagogical tools that function as neoliberal political technologies. Pike also argues that not always naming citizenship education as such but integrating it in less visible forms and in more holistic ways is desirable. For example, citizenship skills are important for students to engage in debate about ethical issues that arise from science. Students can be presented with opportunities to “do” citizenship without having to be told they are “doing” citizenship and these opportunities can arise in all subject areas.

It is also worth exploring alternate sites for citizenship education that are not related to schooling. Because the educational system is funded by the state and driven to protect its own interests, perhaps schools are unlikely to ever really go beyond teaching the “rights and responsibilities” of citizenship in very limited ways. While it might be difficult to imagine traditional spaces that could be utilized effectively for citizenship education, digital spaces open up new and exciting possibilities for such an endeavor. Indeed, there has already been some movement in this direction. For example, retired Supreme Court justice Sandra Day O’Connor developed iCivics, an online project that promotes civics education and seeks to encourage children to become active participants in democracy. The Center for Civic Education produces a series of podcasts titled 60 Second Civics that are designed to engage children in civic learning and encourage them to discuss issues in an online forum. These sites are both shaped by traditional citizenship discourses and are designed to be integrated into the classroom, but they are
useful starting points for imagining what digital citizenship learning could become. Social media sites have enormous potential for shaping active democratic participation. Such sites played an important role in both the Arab Spring and Occupy Wall Street demonstrations and serve as new meeting spaces that are not constrained by physical boundaries. Digital spaces have the potential to create citizen-led civic education rather than state mandated training in citizenship.

**Conclusion**

The proposed directions for citizenship education are certainly not without complexities. Concepts such as human rights, multiculturalism and emancipatory education have been troubled and are in flux. An era of post-neoliberalism may be emerging and we do not yet know how this will shape educational policy. It is probably idealistic to imagine that we can incorporate Foucauldian ethics into the curriculum, particularly in states where educational content is heavily influenced by Christian fundamentalists. However, these difficulties should not cause us to give up on the task of transforming citizenship education. If citizenship remains part of the social studies curriculum, which will likely be the case, we will need to think differently about social studies education in order to bring about this transformation. Instead of generating a vibrant and critical social studies, “the social studies wars” (Evans, 2004) have resulted in a watered down and flat approach to curriculum that is reluctant to engage with contemporary social issues. Social studies has the potential to become the most engaging and participatory subject in K-12 schooling, but this will require a vision that exceeds a single-minded focus on standardization and testing.
This study has revealed an area of division and an area of lack in curriculum standards that seek to mandate what citizenship education should be. Some states are expanding their definitions of citizenship while others are stuck in traditional liberal and republican discourses that present an “anemic” “rights and responsibilities” vision of citizenship. Nationalist discourses are still predominant, and when global discourses begin to emerge they are often tied closely to neoliberal economic aims. Where states sit on the political spectrum seems to play a large role in whether or not they move to include more expansive discourses in their citizenship standards. Because state standards are techniques of governance, it is important to understand the “conditions of possibilities” they present to students for citizenship. If we can move away from standards as citizenship “scripts” we may be able to begin viewing young citizens as more than subjects of standardization and foreseeing what a robust citizenship could become for them.
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