

Transformative Citizenship: A Redefinition of Citizenship in a Multicultural Society

Daeill Lee*

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Abstract: Citizenship education has long been recognized as a central goal of schooling. It has been an integral part of the social studies in particular and there have been a number of attempts in the field to outline what its goals should be and how it should be taught. The two conventional approaches to citizenship have discussed: cultural transmission and reflective inquiry into social science knowledge. This paper contends that both the cultural transmission and reflective inquiry approaches to citizenship are inappropriate because they maintain that democracy is a static rather than a constant struggle for equality and justice, and they support a limited socializing role of mainstream citizenship education rather than classroom activities that lead to civic empowerment and civic courage. This critique leads to an alternative concept of citizenship as democratic transformation. The focus of transformative citizenship is a concern for reconstructing society by developing a critical understanding of and engagement with social issues and institutions. Orienting this understanding and engagement are concerns for overcoming relations of domination and promoting a more just and equitable distribution of society's benefits. This approach to citizenship seems to be central to the creation of education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. It is important to note that at the level of practice, the goals and principles of citizenship education tend to remain largely inaccessible. In this spirit, the ultimate significance of this paper lies in the potential connection between social studies educators conceptions of citizenship education and classroom practice—a potentially fruitful area for further research.

Keywords: social studies, citizenship, multiple citizenship, cultural education

I. Introduction

What does citizenship education for a culturally pluralistic, democratic society really mean? The question is easier to ask than to answer. Several authors have discussed the concept of citizenship in social studies education extensively (Angell, 1991; Barr, Barth,

* Corresponding Author Tel: +82-2-880-7705; fax: +82-2-872-4261

& Shermis, 1977; Cherryholmes, 1978, 1980; Foshay & Burton, 1976; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Giroux, 1980; Goodman, 1992; Hepburn, 1983; Kickbusch, 1987; Longstreet, 1985; Maxcy & Stanly, 1986; Oldendorf, 1989; Oliner, 1983; Parker & Jarolimek, 1984; Parker & Kaltsounis, 1986; Parker, Ninomiya, & Cogan, 1999; Popkewitz, 1977; Remy, 1978; Shaver, 1981; Shermis & Barth, 1982; Strike, 1988; White, 1982; Wood, 1984, 1985). They frequently suggest that citizenship as an organizing principle for classroom practice is a problematic, illusive concept (Longstreet, 1985). As Hertzberg (1981) claimed, "The definition of the appropriate education of citizens has been one of the most vexing questions in social studies history" (p. 172).

There are three different conceptions of citizenship canvassed in this paper. This paper begins with discussion of such traditionally dominant approaches to citizenship as cultural transmission and citizenship as reflective inquiry into social science knowledge. Then, I argue that these approaches do not realize true mission of social studies - to prepare students to be active, responsible participation in a democratic and multicultural society - because they maintain that democracy is a static rather than a constant struggle for equality and justice, and they support a limited socializing role of mainstream citizenship education rather than classroom activities that lead "to civic empowerment and civic courage" (Kickbusch, 1987, p. 176). Rejecting the theoretical grounds of both views, I suggest an alternative concept of citizenship as democratic transformation, one that relies primarily on critical theories of education. Further, I relate citizenship education to multicultural education and discuss the implications for making citizenship education important at the practice level.

II. Citizenship as Cultural Transmission

Most contemporary social studies educators view their educational role as passing on or transmitting to their students the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are shaped and determined by the status quo (Leming, 1992). As Sears and Pearson (1991) have observed, "Most teachers view social studies as a vehicle to promote socialization and to prepare students to conform to the existing social structure, both in the school and society" (p. 48). This approach, defined as "citizenship transmission" by Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977), is the generally accepted and historical practice that has dominated social studies throughout our nations schools.

Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977) allude to this possibly confounding factor of socialization:

Social studies has functioned as a mirror for our society. Our society believes and acts as though it must perpetuate its beliefs, values, customs, traditions-as, of course, do all societies. Schools function as just this vehicle for transmission; and of all of the school subjects, the social studies most

insistently lends itself to being the repository of societal values and traditions (p. 9).

Cultural transmission suggests that the essential way in which adherence to American democratic principles has been established is through passing on the ideas and accomplishments of influential persons in American history and in the history of that culture that have most influenced Americans.

According to this perspective, it is by way of the process of studying important historical leaders who embraced and exhibited democratic principles that students become motivated to make the United States a better place. Students are exposed to essential theoretical principles of democracy in such a way that they come to accept and eventually to act upon such tenets. This perspective also suggests that in order to create collective adherence to a particular social and political existence, all students must be exposed to a common body of knowledge. There are certain ideas, persons, events, and facts that all Americans need to reflect upon together in order to establish a sense of community on a city, county, state, and national level.

The importance of cultural transmission has been emphasized by Hirsch (1987), Ravitch (1989), and Schlesinger (1992). Kerry Kennedy (1991) notes that transmission of historical information created inclusive societies and helped to provide a strong sense of community for many Americans. Cultural transmission is a dominant approach to the social sciences, both on American university campuses and at the secondary and elementary school levels (Janzen, 1995). Although most social studies educators who publish articles and make presentations hesitate to commit themselves publicly to the position, one can find, when one looks behind the closed doors of social studies classrooms, teachers adhering to this perspective much of the time.

In sum, citizenship as cultural transmission implies passive student participation; content centered around positive knowledge and uncritical beliefs in loyalty and patriotism; prepackaged textbooks using rote acquisition instruction; reliance upon teacher control and authority, and acceptance of existing or idealized social institutions (Goodlad, 1984; Shermis & Barth, 1982). This approach of citizenship education has been singled out as existing primarily for the purpose of reinforcing cultural myths that protect the status quo (Anyon, 1979; Fitzgerald, 1979; Giroux, 1983; Popkewitz, 1977). Frequently this transmission process is referred to by educators as the hidden curriculum, because it seems to operate beneath the surface of the ostensible curriculum.

III. Citizenship as Reflective Inquiry into Social Science Knowledge

Citizenship as reflective inquiry into social science knowledge suggests active student learning; development of rational decision-making skills, and utilization of a social science knowledge base to test and resolve problems by collecting and using relevant

data, formulating and testing hypotheses, and drawing conclusions (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977; White, 1982). This perspective is based on a conception of citizenship which holds that good citizens know how to participate in public affairs through rational decision-making. That is, democratic citizenship involves not only the acquisition of knowledge and information relevant to social life or political issues, but also active decision-making on matters of social concern (Parker, 1991).

Pratte (1988) argues for a revitalization of civic education. Citizens in a democracy need to possess certain civic virtues such as a commitment to human dignity and mutual respect, and an ethic of obligation and community service. Pratte believes that an intellectual dimension is required as a complement to the moral development of citizens. He states, "Teaching students to be reflective thinkers is to cultivate conceptual abilities, skills, habits, and dispositions that embody the ideal of rationality. Rationality, in turn, is to be understood as being coextensive with the relevance of reasons" (p. 173). For Pratte, what he terms reflective thinking is a key element of civic competence and needs to be taught directly.

In his work defending critical thinking as an important educational ideal, Siegel (1988) presents four major justifications. One of these involves the need for an educated citizenry in a democracy. For Siegel, an educated citizen is a critical thinker who "needs to be able to examine public policy concerns: to judge intelligently the many issues facing her society; to challenge and seek reasons for proposed changes (and continuations) of policy; to assess such reasons fairly and impartially; and to put aside self-interest when it is appropriate to do so; and so on" (p. 60). An education for critical thinking is the education most suited for a properly functioning democratic society (p. 61).

Engle and Ochoa (1988) argue in their curriculum framework for the social studies in which citizens in a democracy are ultimately responsible for the actions and policies of their government. Thus, citizens must make a wide range of decisions from determining the reliability of information to deciding upon the actions that should be taken on a variety of social concerns. "Decision-making skills and all of the knowledge and attitudes that go into the making of intelligent decisions are at the heart of democratic citizenship" (p. 18). Individuals must be empowered to collect, sort, verify, and apply meaningful knowledge to problems and issues under deliberation. To facilitate this end, the authors argue for social studies education in which "we can create for the students an authentic decision-making situation" (p. 62).

Each of the above examples stresses to some degree the importance of decision-making for productive citizenship in a democracy. Despite its noble aims, the reflective inquiry approach tends to merely recycle the assumptions of citizenship transmission by using safe content that promotes an uncritical examination of established values and beliefs (Giroux, 1980; Kickbusch, 1987; Maxcy & Stanley, 1986; Wood, 1984, 1985), where "The selection of problems, the choice of relevant data and the conclusions, solutions or answers" are usually provided for students by curriculum experts, text writers, and

teachers (Shermis & Barth, 1982, pp. 31-32).

IV. Problematizing Citizenship Education: A Critique

Educational discourse has promoted the goal of enhancing democratic citizenship for schooling, and social studies in particular. These proposals take the general forms of the cultural transmission or reflective inquiry which contributes to the public good of a community. Some feminist and poststructural thought shows, however, that conceptions of citizenship must be approached with caution.

As Cherryholmes (1992) notes, the power base of support for reflective inquiry is much weaker than that of the traditions of citizenship transmission and social science education. As such, reflective inquiry has not found its way into social studies textbooks, except for the rare exceptions of "new social studies" of the 1960s. Cherryholmes (1980) criticizes a number of assumptions of the rational decision-maker model of citizenship education. One of these is that "knowledge claims can be made independently of substantive value commitments" (p. 123). A second assumption is that "knowledge claims are grounded in an objective, given reality" (p. 123). Neither of these assumptions hold, and the conception of the citizen as rational decision-maker, Cherryholmes argues, is misconceived. Somewhat ironically, this conception ignores significant political and ethical components of citizenship and envisions it as more of a technical problem.

Conceptions of citizenship as reflective inquiry presuppose some level of agency for the individual. Davies (1990), however, cautions that the notion of universal, inherent individual agency should be rejected. Rather agency should be construed as discursively constructed, and she investigated the problem of whether students in a particular classroom setting are developing a sense of themselves as agentic. For example, she asks if they are "developing a sense of themselves as people who can and should make choices, act upon them, and accept moral responsibility for those choices" (p. 358). In her analysis of primary classroom, some students are discursively constituted as agents and others as non-agents. Davies' work points up the fact that some prior conditions are necessary and these may vary by race, gender, class, etc.-that allows and encourages the decision-making citizen to enter rational debate on public policy.

The question of whether rational debate on public policy issues is possible needs qualification. Assumptions of equal access to and adequate information for these debates are problematic. As Ellsworth (1989) asserts, rationalist, analytical debate in a racist society "has not and cannot be 'public' or 'democratic' in the sense of including the voices of all affected parties and affording them equal weight and legitimacy" (p. 302). Fraser's (1989) theorizing demonstrates that the notion of citizens confronting public problems warrants caution as well. The gender-based separation of the masculine public sphere from the feminine private, or domestic, sphere has served as a major support of women's subordination, and sustains the image of participation as a masculine role. These definitions have also depoliticized areas relevant to human dignity, child rearing for instance. That is, because of the separation of private and public spheres, certain

needs must exceed domestic or personal category boundaries in order to become public or political issues. Thus, there is a "gendered subtext" (p. 122-129) to the role of social citizen that merits attention.

Appeals to the common good and community in dominant conceptions of citizenship can be deceptive. These ideals have as an underlying strategy the search for unity. As Young (1990) argues, however, "unity generates a logic of hierarchical opposition. Any move to define an identity, a closed totality, always depends on excluding some elements, separating the pure from impure" (p. 303). The impact of this on civic participation is destructive: "Such a desire for community often channels energy away from the political goals of the group and also produces a clique atmosphere which keeps groups small and turns potential members away" (p. 312).

Critiques of notions such as rational, public debates and public-private spheres have shown that these can restrict civic participation, especially for people of color and women, and divert attention from ethical considerations. These critiques are consistent with a transformative citizenship that is concerned with overcoming relations of domination and promoting a more just and equitable distribution of society's benefits.

V. Citizenship as Democratic Transformation

Citizenship as democratic transmission suggests a classroom climate that engages students in the "processes of critical thinking, ethical decision making and social participation" (Stanley & Nelson, 1986, p. 532) in order to improve the quality of their lives and their communities (Goodman, 1992; Parker & Jerolimek, 1984; Parker & Kaltsounis, 1986; Wood, 1985).

This view rejects both the cultural transmission and reflective inquiry approaches to citizenship as inappropriate because they maintain that democracy is a static rather than a "constant struggle for equality and justice," and they support a limited "socializing role of mainstream citizenship education" rather than classroom activities that lead "to civic empowerment and civic courage" (Kickbusch, 1987, p. 176). In these formulations, democratic citizenship may include skills and dispositions to examine issues and information, and to make sound decisions in the political arena, but it also entails some explicit form of opposition or resistance to the existing order and attempts to transform it into a better one.

Freire's (1970, 1973) work has influenced a number of critical educational scholars and practitioners in the United States. Based on his endeavors in Brazil, he outlined a project which attempted to move adult students from "naiveté to a critical attitude at the same time we taught reading" (1973, p. 43). He unreservedly rejected the notion that the proper role for students was one of passive receptor of established knowledge and information. For Freire, education for democracy involves developing a critical

consciousness which leads to socially transformative action.

This conception of citizenship stresses a citizenship education that teaches both what our culture is, including its diversity, and how it can be improved. Citizens cannot be taught to assume that, for example, the republican form of government represents all Americans or that people of color and women have made sufficient progress towards equality, in spite of some of the prevalent cultural messages. Thus, as Butts (1988) recommends, common civic values should be emphasized for they do carry meanings that support a more democratic order. On the other hand, there are continual struggles over their meanings and they mean different things in different contexts. Therefore, we cannot focus only on socialization of these cultural values. Citizenship education must go beyond the glorification of cultural values. Osborne (1988) puts it this way, "Since national awareness and identity are not so much givens but rather subjects of continuing debate, this means not inducting students into some official orthodoxy but rather initiating them into what might be called the great debate of who we are, where we are, and where should be going" (p. 12).

Citizenship education, for Banks (1990), should help students develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes for participation in society. Importantly, however, it should also encourage students to transform and reconstruct society. If future citizens are not prepared to take on this transformative role, problems of racism, sexism, poverty, and inequality will probably escalate in this multicultural society. To become effective citizens, students need to be taught to "formulate their own knowledge and perceptions of various groups and their roles in society and to develop the ability to justify rationally the validity and accuracy of the knowledge and concepts they acquire" (1990, p. 212). Students become active producers, as well as consumers, of social, political, and historical knowledge.

Wood (1984) argues that schools in general and citizenship education in particular teach students a very limited view of democracy. To broaden and extend democracy, he proposes an alternative pedagogy for democratic participation which fosters the following conditions: participants are decision-makers rather than merely influencers, participants have access to the necessary information upon which decisions will be based, and participants have equal power to determine outcomes of decisions (p. 232). Teaching students to think in this type of pedagogy entails that they become "critically literate" so they are able to understand their own histories, analyze socially oppressive social structures, and evaluate alternatives to the existing order.

Giroux (1981, 1987) argues that critical thinking is a political act. Civic education, however, typically teaches a form of rationality that frames knowledge and learning in simply technical terms. The effect of this is the construction of the citizen who participates in the social arena to further his or her own self-interests. It also tends to defend or maintain, rather than transform, oppressive social structures. Giroux advocates for a critical pedagogy that permits "teachers and students to engage in critical dialogue, to recover dangerous memories and subjugated knowledges, and to affirm and critically interrogate the traditions that are taught in classrooms throughout

the United States" (1987, p. 118). In short, students are to be empowered as both "critical thinkers and transformative actors" (1987, p. 120).

In his formulations for curriculum for social action, Newmann (1975) emphasizes fostering students' competence to influence public affairs. This influence, supported by in-depth study, reflection, and discussion, should be in accordance with democratic and ethical principles. Citizens should deliberate and work to generate agreement on the nature of the public good. Actual participation by students can contribute to the welfare of the community, to students' sense of competence, and to the empowerment of disenfranchised groups. These frameworks are consistent with the critical and empowered citizen, and one could argue that the commitment to democratic and ethical principles implicitly highlights the opposition or resistance to social structures and practices that reproduce relations of domination among certain groups (the most prominent being race, class, gender, and sexual orientation), key aspects of a socially transformative citizenship. Making explicit what is typically implicit in schooling is one of the important components of pedagogy aimed at social change.

Coming from somewhat of a different perspective than the previous authors, Barber (1984, 1989) advances a notion of strong democracy. In the strong definition of democracy, politics is done by, not to, citizens. Among the principal characteristics of citizenship in a strong democracy are activity, involvement, commitment, obligation, and service. Political judgment is crucial to this form of democracy since conflict is fundamental to politics and because citizenship, rather than epistemology, is the key to their resolution. This resolution arises out of common talk, decision, and work; communities making their own histories through shared discourse and action. In contrast, individualism, and liberal democratic theory from which it derives, form what Barber (1984) calls "thin democracy." Values of a thin democracy are means to "exclusively individualistic and private ends" (p. 4). Thus, politics is concerned more with enhancing and protecting personal interests and individual liberties which ultimately undermines democratic practices. The results of this civic orientation include "apathy, alienation, and anomie" (p. 24), and a disregard for the community and interdependence essential to a strong democratic order. In his formulations, Barber promotes decision-making in civic participation but advocates that educators nourish in students the capacities for "public talk." This kind of discourse is "not talk about the world; it is talk that makes and remarks the world" (1989, p. 356).

A transformative citizenship does not necessarily entail the denial of personal interests, goals, or preferences. It does involve the linking of one's private life and personal experiences with the social, communal, or public realm. Raskin (1986) makes clear the interconnection of these two realms, "In its best sense, citizenship...allows the person to fulfill his or her natural abilities in social, economic, and political benefit with others" (pp. 296-297). This type of citizenship is one "in which all members of the nation seek to work out individual destinies and common projects, with the latter taking precedence where there is a contradiction between the two" (p. 275).

Transformative citizenship requires, especially in the modern world, a civic education that emphasizes the interdependence of human beings. Bellah et al. (1985) uses the concept "social ecology" to show that, "Human beings and their societies are deeply interrelated, and the various actions we take have enormous ramifications for the lives of others" (p. 284). Thus, stimulating an understanding of this interdependence and a shared concern for, and a willingness and ability to contribute to, the welfare of the community should be a central concern of citizenship education. Previous work in the field is consistent with an emphasis on social action, critical deliberation of public issues, and the furtherance of a greater sense of interdependence and community as a goal of citizenship education (e.g., Conrad & Hedin, 1977; Newmann, 1975; Oliver & Shaver, 1966). The conception of citizenship advanced here extends these formulations to include an activism geared to progressive social change.

Some recent work in the curriculum field has provided direction for the implementation of this type of citizenship education. For example, Purpel (1989) believes that the teacher can become an "educator-as-prophet" who works with students to create visions of social life that will satisfy basic commitments and be rewarding for all. To this end, the educational program should be organized around important social questions, dilemmas, and problems such as racial discrimination, gender oppression, and income disparities. Osborne's (1988) proposed curriculum framework entails a shift from an individualistic view that sees self-interest as the guiding principle in life and individuals as separate from one another to an emphasis upon connection and interdependence. And Newmann (1989) presents a framework for civic education intended to help to reconstruct civic life from the dominant, privatistic view to a more public-minded democracy. These can inform the creation of specific curricular and pedagogic proposals to promote a public perspective in students which has as its aim social change.

The focus of transformative citizenship is a concern for reconstructing society by developing a critical understanding of and engagement with social issues and institutions. Orienting this understanding and engagement are concerns for overcoming relations of domination and promoting a more just and equitable distribution of society's benefits. This approach is consistent with multicultural education that reflects these goals and principles, and this approach is defined as an education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist (Sleeter & Grant, 1994), trying to challenge institutional inequities and to envision social contests that are more humane, equal, and just. In this sense, strong parallels exist among the goals, visions, and purposes of this approach to citizenship education and multicultural education.

VI. Transformative Citizenship: A Redefinition of Citizenship in a Multicultural Society

Social and cultural diversity, having been driven away from cultural assimilation, had to find attention in what, remarkably, became an altogether different literature: multicultural education. Both citizenship education and multicultural education has similar missions. I turn to these now.

A. Linking to Multicultural Education: Similar Mission

Multicultural education and citizenship education shares the same interests and concerns for equality, equity, democracy, and social justice for culturally diverse population.

The idea of "critical multiculturalism" (MaLaren, 1994) provides multicultural education with the conceptual rationality of fighting against the master narrative and Eurocentric version of universal truth. Critical multiculturalism further allows multicultural education to form a theoretical foundation for making curriculum and pedagogy multicultural, incorporating issues of dominant and subordinate power relations, generating multiple voices and 'truths," and developing transformative identities and commitments.

The concept of "border pedagogy" (Giroux, 1992) suggests how multicultural educators can deal with the cultural politics in classrooms. The border pedagogy aims to develop critically and culturally literate citizens who engage in creating a democratic society where centers and margins of power are reorganized and reshaped in order to ensure multiple cultural codes, language, and experiences and identities. Schools and classrooms become democratic communities where diverse cultural practices, values, codes, and experiences are incorporated, shared, and negotiated to remap the current unequal configuration of cultural politics in a multicultural society.

Nieto (1992) argues that the highest level of multicultural education is "affirmation, solidarity, and critique" of cultural diversity, and she emphasize the importance of critique by saying: "Culture is not fixed or unchangeable, and thus one is able to critique its manifestations and outcomes...Without critique, the possibility that multicultural education might be used to glorify reality into static truth is a very real danger" (p. 277).

Multicultural education has to develop a sophisticated critical competence which understands, interprets, and critiques cultural codes, languages, and experiences, so that students can be border crossers who can function in different cultural codes, perspectives and system for remapping cultural domination. Gay (1995) put it: "Multicultural might call these border-crossers multicultural persons, cultural code-shifters, cultural brokers, or individuals who are bicultural because they have developed skills to function effectively in more than one cultural system" (pp. 168-169).

The concept of border crossing, in this way, clarifies the meaning of multicultural competence as cultural interpreters, translators, and negotiators for social transformation. The transformative intent, which is the ultimate goals of critical multiculturalism, makes multicultural education more social constructionist in its orientation. Under critical multiculturalism, students need to develop a critical perspective regarding how cultural politics in everyday lives reproduces the unequal social structure based on race, class, and gender. Moreover, actual actions are also required for transforming the current socially stratified society. Transformative nature and incorporation of cultural power politics in critical multiculturalism contributes to enhancing the elements of social reconstructionism in multicultural education. These goals and principles of multicultural education are highly consistent with those of citizenship education.

B. Rethinking the Practice of Citizenship Education in a Multicultural Society

Although the literature reflects support for the theory of citizenship as democratic transformation, research (Cuban, 1991; Fancett & Hawke, 1982; Shaver, 1987) on the daily practices of social studies teachers reports that this philosophy is not practiced widely, particularly in comparison to use of citizenship as cultural transmission, which appears to permeate most social studies classrooms. Partly because of unsupportive school environments, inadequate curriculum, skills, strategies, and the occasional inability to move beyond ideals or rhetoric with practical effect (Kickbusch, 1987), teachers who seek to introduce elements of a more democratic citizenship instruction often are hindered by the paucity of exemplars to guide their efforts.

To make citizenship education important at the level of practice, we need the detailed examination of the pedagogic approaches which might bridge the gap between theory and practice, such as Mississippi Freedom School (Chilcoat & Ligon, 1994) and culturally relevant teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1994). They might provide a brief exception to this damaging pattern.

It is important for all students to develop the tools for active participation in democratic public life (Banks, 1997; Giroux, 1988). This is particularly essential for people of color who are marginalized in the political process and in many aspects of social and economic participation. This is in accord with Perry and Fraser's (1993) conception of transforming schools into sites which foster the tools and dispositions to participate in a multicultural and multiracial democracy.

To accomplish these goals, "[W]e need in education a transformation as far as the one that has seized Eastern Europe and what was once the Soviet Union, as radical as the abrupt ending of the Cold War, as profound as the metamorphosis of Americas vanquished enemies in World War II into its most dependable allies and most formidable rivals" (Barber, 1992, pp. 9-10)

VII. Conclusion

Citizenship education has long been recognized as a central goal of schooling. It has been an integral part of the social studies in particular and there have been a number of attempts in the field to outline what its goals should be and how it should be taught. Two conventional approaches to citizenship have been discussed: cultural transmission, an approach that views the primary purpose of social studies as a inculcating youth with the fundamental knowledge, values, and skills to be responsible citizens; and reflective inquiry into social science knowledge, an approach that encourages value analysis and decision making through the exploration of significant problems and issues in society.

This paper contends that both the cultural transmission and reflective inquiry approaches to citizenship are inappropriate because they maintain that democracy is a static rather than a constant struggle for equality and justice, and they support a limited socializing role of mainstream citizenship education rather than classroom activities that lead to civic empowerment and civic courage. This critique leads to an alternative concept of citizenship as democratic transformation.

The focus of transformative citizenship is a concern for reconstructing society by developing a critical understanding of and engagement with social issues and institutions. Orienting this understanding and engagement are concerns for overcoming relations of domination and promoting a more just and equitable distribution of society's benefits. This approach to citizenship seems to be central to the creation of education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist.

It is important to note that at the level of practice, the goals and principles of citizenship education tend to remain largely inaccessible. In this spirit, the ultimate significance of this paper lies in the potential connection between social studies educators' conceptions of citizenship education and classroom practice—a potentially fruitful area for further research.

REFERENCES

- Angell, A. V. (1991). Democratic climates in elementary classrooms: A review of theory and research. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 19*(3), 242-266.
- Anyon, J. (1979). Ideology and United States history textbooks. *Harvard Educational Review, 49*, 361-386.
- Apple, M. W. (1986). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Banks, J. A. (1990). Citizenship education for a pluralistic democratic society. *The Social*

Studies, 81(5), 210-214.

Banks, J. A. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Barber, B. (1989). Public talk and civic action: Education for participation in a strong democracy. *Social Education*, 53(6), 355-356, 370.

Barber, B. (1992). *An aristocracy for everyone: The politics of education and the future of America*. New York: Ballantine.

Barr, R. D., Barth, J. L., & Shermis, S. S. (1977). *Defining the social studies (Bulletin 51)*. Arlington, VA: National Council for the Social Studies.

Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitments in American life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Butts, R. F. (1988). *The morality of democratic citizenship: Goals for civic education in the republic's third century*. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1978). Curriculum design as a political act: Problems and choices in teaching social justice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 6(4), 60-82.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1980). Social knowledge and citizenship education: Two views of truth and criticism. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 10(2), 115-141.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1992). Knowledge, power, and discourse in social studies education. In K. Weiler & C. Mitchell (Eds.), *What schools can do: Critical pedagogy and practice*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Chilcoat, G. W., & Ligon, J. A. (1994). Developing democratic citizens: The Mississippi freedom schools as a model for social studies instruction. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22(2), 128-175.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1977). Citizenship education through participation. In *National Task Force on Citizenship Education, Education for responsible citizenship*. New York: Penguin Books.

Cuban, L. (1991). History of teaching in social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 197-211). New York: Macmillan.

Davies, B. (1990). Agency as a form of discursive practice: A classroom scene observed. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 11(3), 341-361.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297-324.

Engle, S., & Ochoa, A. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship: decision making in the social studies*. New ork: Teachers College Press.

Fancett, V., & Hawke, S. (1982). Instructional practices in social studies. In I. Morrisset (Ed.), *The current state of social studies: A report of project SPAN* (pp. 207-263). Boulder, CO: Social Studies Education Consortium.

Fitzgerald, F. (1979). *America revised*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

- Foshay, A. W., & Burton, W. W. (1976). Citizenship as the aim of the social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 4(1), 1-22.
- Fraser, N. (1989). *Unruly practices: Power, discourse, and gender in contemporary social theory*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Gay, G. (1995). Mirror image on common issues: Parallels between multicultural education and critical pedagogy. In C. E. Sleeter & P.L. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of differences* (pp. 155-189). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1980). Critical theory and rationality in citizenship education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 10(4), 329-366.
- Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology, culture and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Giroux, H. A. (1987). Citizenship, public philosophy, and the struggle for democracy. *Educational Theory*, 37(2), 103-120.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Granby, MA: Bergin and Garvy.
- Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossing: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodman, J. (1992). *Elementary schooling for critical democracy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hepburn, M. A. (Ed.). (1983). *Democratic education in schools and classrooms*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Hertzberg, H. W. (1981). *Social studies reform, 1880-1980*. Boulder, CO: Social studies Education Consortium.
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Janzen, R. (1995). The social studies conceptual dilemma: six contemporary approaches. *The Social Studies*, 86, 134-140.
- Kennedy, K. J. (1991). The contributions of history to citizenship education. In R. Gross & T. Dynneson (Eds.), *Social science perspectives on citizenship education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kickbusch, K. W. (1987). Civic education and preservice educators: Extending the boundaries of discourse. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 15(3), 173-188.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1991). Returning to the source: Implications for educating teachers of Black students. In M. Foster (Ed.), *Readings in equal education: Qualitative investigations into schools and schooling*, 11 (pp. 227-243). New York: AMS Press.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American students*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Leming, J. S. (1992). Ideological perspectives within the social studies profession: An empirical examination of the two cultures thesis. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 18(3), 293-312.
- Liston, D. P., & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Longstreet, W. S. (1985). Citizenship: The phantom core of social studies curriculum. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 13(2), 21-29.
- Maxcy, S. J., & Stanly, W. B. (1986). Reflective inquiry, reconstructionism, and positivism: A re-examination of the process of social education. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 19(3), 62-71.
- McLaren, P. (1994). White terror and oppositional agency: Towards a critical multiculturalism. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: A critical reader*. (pp.45-74). Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Newmann, F. M. (1975). *Education for citizen action: Challenge for secondary curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Newmann, F. M. (1989). Reflective civic participation. *Social Education*, 53(6), 357-360, 366.
- Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity: The sociological context of multicultural education. *American Journal of Education*, 98(2), 147-174.
- Oldendorf, S. B. (1989). Vocabularies, knowledge and social action in citizenship education: The Highlander example. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 17(2), 107-120.
- Oliner, P. (1983). Putting community into citizenship education: The need for prosociality. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 11(2), 65-81.
- Oliver, D. W., & Shaver, J. P. (1966). *Teaching public issues in the high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Osborne, K. (1988). *Educating citizens: A democratic socialist agenda for Canadian education*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation.
- Parker, W. C. (1991). Achieving thinking and decision-making objectives in social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 345-356). New York: Macmillan.
- Parker, W. C. (Ed.). (1996). *Educating the democratic mind*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Parker, W. C., & Jarolimek, J. (1984). *Citizenship and the critical role of the social studies*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Parker, W. C., & Kaltsounis, T. (1986). Citizenship and raw-related education. In V. A. Atwood (Ed.), *Elementary school social studies: A research guide to practice* (pp. 14-33). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Parker, W. C., Ninomiya, A., & Cogan J. (1999). Educating world citizens: Toward multinational curriculum development. *American Educational Research Journal*, 36 (2),

117-145.

Perry, T., & Fraser, J. W. (Eds.). (1993). *Freedom's plow: Teaching in the multicultural classroom*. New York: Routledge.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1977). The latent values of the discipline-centered curriculum. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 5(1), 41-60.

Pratte, R. (1988). *The civic imperative: Examining the need for civic education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Purpel, D. E. (1989). *The moral and spiritual crisis in education: A curriculum for justice and compensation*. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Raskin, M. (1986). *The common good: Its politics, policies, and philosophy*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Ravitch, D. (1989). The plight of history in American schools. In P. Gagnon (Ed.), *Historical literacy*. New York: Macmillan.

Remy, R. C. (1978). Social studies and citizenship education: Elements of a changing relationship. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 6(4), 40-59.

Schlesinger, A. M., Jr. (1992). *The disuniting of America*. New York: Norton.

Sears, A., & Parsons, J. (1992). Towards critical thinking as an ethnic. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 18(1), 45-68.

Shaver, J. P. (1981). Citizenship, values, and morality in the social studies. In H. D. Mechlinger & O. L. Davis, Jr. (Eds.), *The social studies* (pp. 105-125). Chicago: University of Chicago

Shaver, J. P. (1987). Implications from research: What should be taught in social studies? In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), *Educators handbook: A research perspective* (pp. 112-138). New York: Longman.

Shermis, S. S., & Barth, J. L. (1982). Teaching for passive citizenship: A critique of philosophical assumptions. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 10(4), 17-37.

Siegel, H. (1988). *Educating reason: Rationality, critical thinking and education*. New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1994). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender (2nd ed.)*. New York: Merrill.

Stanley, W. B., & Nelson, J. L. (1986). Social education for social transformation. *Social Education*, 50(7), 528-530, 532-534.

Strike, K. A. (1988). Democracy, civic education and the problem of neutrality. *Theory Into Practice*, 27(4), 256-261.

White, C. S. (1982). A validation study of the Barth-Shermis social studies preference scale. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 10(2), 1-20.

Wood, G. H. (1984). Schooling in a democracy: Transformation or reproduction? *Educational Theory*, 34(3), 219-239.

Wood, G. H. (1985). *Schools that work*. New York: Plume.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.