

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

2013

Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Address the Gaps, Exclusions and Oversights in Active Citizenship Education

Louise Gonsalvez
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Gonsalvez, Louise, "Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Address the Gaps, Exclusions and Oversights in Active Citizenship Education" (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 4945.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/4945>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Address the Gaps, Exclusions and Oversight in Active
Citizenship Education

By

Louise Gonsalvez

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Faculty of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
at the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2013

© Louise Gonsalvez

Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Address the Gaps, Exclusions and Oversights in Active
Citizenship Education

By

Louise Gonsalvez

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Jennifer Tupper, External examiner

Dr. Larry Glassford, Committee Member

Dr. Sonja Grover, Committee Member

Dr. Tanya Basok, Committee Member

Dr. George. Zhou, Supervisor

Dr. Sung Hyun Yun, Chair of Defense

June 14, 2013

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my dissertations, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

ABSTRACT

There is great concern that active citizenship policies, curriculum and/or pedagogy are not working effectively, and many researchers are seeking ways to engage students more in public affairs and political realities. In this dissertation, I explore the captivating universe of active citizenship education and the discourses that propel it, using critical theory, documentary method and critical discourse analysis. I analyze over 400 documents that directly or indirectly relate to citizenship education to determine where we have been, where we currently are, and where we ought to go with active citizenship education. As a result of my research, I discovered that the discourses that originally constructed notions of the citizen, citizenship and the rights of the citizen (e.g., Socrates, Machiavelli, Rousseau, Jefferson, Roosevelt, and Martin Luther King, Jr.) differed, but they often shared themes of self-reflection, critique, and emancipation. Unfortunately, these fundamental pillars fell increasingly by the wayside when, for example, globalization spun its web (e.g., mass migration, the Internet, access to faster systems of travel and free trade). Correspondingly, neoliberal discourse penetrated local, state and global systems, and citizenship education like many other aspects of society was altered. A newly designed ‘global’, ‘unregulated’, ‘knowledge society’ claimed a new vision for civil society and thus citizenship and citizenship education. Such discourses became imbedded not only in the corporate world but also in public institutions – education was not immune to this. I discovered that although universal discourses such as sustainability, cooperation, and human rights are promoted in secondary citizenship education via social studies curriculum, little of this discourse is instituted in policy, curriculum and pedagogy. Students are not being given many classroom opportunities to become reflective, engaged and empowered citizens with the capacity to shape society and challenge institutionalized oppressions such as racism, poverty, sexism, ageism, and classism. Based on moral, ethical and

democratic imperatives, I present recommendations on how to move forward to create the citizenship education programs youth deserve. I provide guiding principles, a navigational illustration, and an exemplar of what a revised citizenship education curriculum might look like.

DEDICATION

It was Copernicus who first provided a heliocentric model of the Universe, demonstrating that all does not revolve around Earth, thus generating a paradigm shift not only in science but in how we saw ourselves as beings in the greater schema of things. Our knowledge of the Universe continued to change as astronomers, mathematicians and philosophers such as Newton, Kepler and Hawking revealed new insights, and this awakened us to new ways of seeing our relationships with fellow citizens, life on the planet and the Universe. How does this relate to citizenship education? It was Irving Copi, born in 1922, who once stated, “The success of democracy depends, in the end, on the reliability of the judgments we citizens make, and hence upon our capacity and determination to weigh arguments and evidence rationally” (Copi & Cohen, 1998, p.5). I suggest that this statement needs to be tweaked as globalization has caused a paradigm shift in the socio-economic, political and environmental universe we as citizens experience today.

I suggest that as we increasingly learn more about the complexity of the Universe, and the interdependencies of its bodies and forces, that we apply such learning to our understanding of active citizenship education. We now exist in an ethos where more than ever, we need to rely on active citizenship education that can ethically, physically and mentally engage our youth not only in the struggles they face, but which we all face. We ought to create educational curriculum and pedagogy, political reforms and communication networks that will optimize youth’s energies, talents and/or brilliance, so they can have a voice and help navigate the journey ahead. Our moral conscience urges us to shape good governance and carve a sustainable, peaceful and socially just way forward. It is through scholarly research and reason that I sought to explore the universe of active citizenship education and it is by way of my heart and soul, that I was motivated to complete such a task.

It is my awe of the Universe, my love of the Earth, and my desires of health, happiness and hope for humanity that has aided my exploration of the topic of active citizenship education. A recent article by Jha (2012) states, “Astronomers have found possible evidence for 461 new planets outside our solar system, using measurements from Nasa’s [sic] planet-hunting satellite, Kepler. The data has also been used by scientists to predict that the Milky Way could contain up to 17bn Earth-sized planets orbiting stars” (n.p.). The Universe reminds us that as citizens we have much more to learn, much more to do, and much more to appreciate. I dedicate my dissertation to all those who have struggled to make this world a better place; those family, friends and strangers whose kindness and/or love has nourished my soul; my two children, Jayda and Nicholas, who I cherish so dearly; and my two faithful golden retriever companions, Koda and Cosmo, who were never too far from my side as I plunked away on my computer completing my dissertation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I want to acknowledge my supervisor Dr. George Zhou for taking on the task of being my graduate supervisor. Secondly, I want to acknowledge my academic committee members: Dr. Sonja Grover, Dr. Tanya Basok and Dr. Larry Glassford. I want to also thank Dr. Clinton Beckford, Dr. Lara Dolan and Dr. Darren Stanley for their support and encouragement as I proceeded through my portfolio and dissertation proposal defenses. As well, I want to thank the many instructors I had as I proceeded through my PhD course work. I give thanks to my PhD cohort who supported me in this endeavor and I'd especially like to thank Blessing Igbokwe and her family who showed such great hospitality when I stayed in Windsor to complete my defences. I acknowledge and express great gratitude to my previous instructors Dr. Michael Peters, Dr. Fazal Rizvi and Dr. Nicole Lamers, for their ongoing support during my doctoral years, as their formal responsibilities to me as a student ended when I finished my Masters program at the University of Illinois. I also want to acknowledge my wonderful Masters-degree cohort and BCTF social justice friends who have continued to encourage me in my social justice pursuits. I give recognition to the University of Windsor, which provided me with some financial assistance to attend conferences in Rio, Ottawa, Toronto, Boston, and Vancouver. I want to thank the academic community for the journey I've had. I met wonderful colleagues at various conferences, corresponded with supportive publishers and if it wasn't for peer-reviewers whose names I will never know, I would have never had nine, and potentially ten, academic works selected for publication over the past two years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AUTHOR’S DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Overview of the Research Study	1
Significance of the Study	7
Research Problem	10
Research Questions	11
Theoretical Framework	12
Critical Theory and its Connections to Citizenship Education	14
Special Considerations and Limitations	21
Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	23
Citizenship Education in Various Locations	24
The Significance of Citizenship Education	27
Revising Social Studies Program	31
Citizenship: A Multidimensional, Contested, Dynamic and Contextual Concept	34
Conceptualizations and Models of Active Citizenship	36
Citizenship Education Dynamics	41
Summary	44
Chapter 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	46

The Foundations of Critical Discourse Analysis	46
The Critical Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis	48
Paltridge’s Four Principles of CDA	50
CDA: Cornerstone Aims and Principals	52
Using CDA to Explore Active Citizenship Education	54
Summary	59
Chapter 4: RESEARCH METHOD	61
Chapter 5: RESEARCH FINDINGS	73
ACE: Where Have We Come From?	76
Citizenship and Citizenship Education in Ancient Greece	76
The Greek Philosophers	77
The Legacy of the Ancient Greeks	83
The Magna Carta, Locke and Rousseau	86
The American Revolution and Beyond	91
The Legacies of the American Revolution and the Civil War	95
The French and Haitian Revolution	97
First Nations and Citizenship Education Gone Awry	105
The Suffragettes and their Influence on Voter Criteria	111
The Civil Rights Movement	115
Some Final Thoughts	120
ACE: Where Are We At Today?	121
An Introduction to Contemporary Active Citizenship	123
Youth Engagement and Deficit Model	123
Youth Skepticism	127
Influence of Globalization	129

The Influence of Neoliberalism	131
Invoking the Rights of the Child	135
The Global Citizen Narrative	138
Narratives of Inclusion and Exclusion	141
What Role Should Critical Citizenship Take?	145
The Affect of Shifting Geo Spaces	149
ACE: Where Ought We To Go In The Future?	153
Fostering Inclusion, Equity and Diversity	154
Leveling the Playing Field and Minority Rights	157
Creating a Counter-Culture to Normalized Civic Life	158
Beyond State-based Narratives for Active Citizenship	160
Accountability, Social Justice and Responsibility Narratives	162
Models and Frameworks of Active Citizenship	168
Contemporary Policy, Curriculum and Pedagogy	171
UNESCO	172
European Union	179
United States	190
Latin America	200
Canada	206
Manitoba	219
Quebec	228
British Columbia	233
Chapter 6: RESEARCH ANALYSIS	239
Looking Through the CDA Lens to Analyze Text	242
Where Have We Come From?	250

Socrates, Plato and Aristotle	251
Rousseau, Locke and the Magna Carta	261
The French, Haitian and American Revolution	265
Suffragettes, Decolonization and the Civil Rights Movement	273
Closing Remarks	279
Where Are We Now?	281
Youth Disengagement, the Deficit Model and Distrust	282
Neoliberalism, Globalization and Shifting Geo-governance	296
Inclusion, Rights of the Child and Critical Citizenship	303
Policies, Curriculum and Pedagogy	313
Before Moving On	324
Where Ought We to Be Going?	325
Challenging the narratives	326
Championing Critical Civic Deliberation	327
Championing the Civil Liberties	329
Second-class Citizenship Rights, Be Gone!	331
Championing Emancipation, Equality and Equity	332
Citizenship in a Globalized, Digital and Interdependent World	336
Domesticating the Rights of the Child and other UN Agreements	339
The Need to Transform Citizenship Education	340
Culminating Analysis	344
Chapter 7: CONCLUSION	347
Conclusions from the Research	346
Moving Forward: How Do We Get to Where We Need to Be?	352
Moving Forward: An Overview	353

Twelve Guiding Points for Active Citizenship Education	354
Fundamental Principles to Guide Active Citizenship Education	356
Designing a Positive Future of Active Citizenship Education	357
Moving Forward: Final Comments	358
Moving Forward: What a Program Would Look Like	360
BC Active Citizenship 11 Course	360
Implementation Strategy	360
Course Rationale	361
Important Considerations	362
Foundational Elements	362
Curriculum Overview	363
Curriculum Outline	364
Prescribed Learning Outcomes	367
Closing Statements	374
Appendix: List of Educational Policy, Curriculum and Reports	375
References	379
Vita Auctoris	429

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Figure 1 Simplified AC Model of Active Citizenship
- Figure 2 A Blueprint for Designing Active Citizenship Education

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACE:	Active citizenship education
BC	British Columbia
BCMOE	British Columbia Ministry of Education
CDA	Critical discourse analysis
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CLIL	Content and Language Integrated Learning
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CREA	Children’s Rights Alliance for England
EU	European Union
ICCS	International Civic and Citizenship Study
IEA	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement
IRP	Integrated Resource Package
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NCLB	No Child Left Behind
SMOC	Social Movement Oriented Citizenship
SPLC	Southern Poverty Law Center
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Science, and Cultural Organization
UNRIP	United Nations Rights of the Indigenous Peoples

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

Overview of the Study

To envision the vast intersections that active citizenship education has with the social, cultural, political, economic and environmental dimensions of human life, I consider the vastness of our Universe and the diverse intersecting forces that organize its structure. As I explore what appear to be multiple gaps in secondary school citizenship education I place my concerns in the larger context of youth in the world and their participation in the socio-political universe which we label as active citizenship education. Researchers indicate that there are multiple gaps in civic and citizenship education in many industrialized countries (Crick, 2010; GHK, 2007; Giroux, 2008; Gusheh & Powell, 2010; Nabavi, 2010; Sears, 1996; Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999) and that shifting global dynamics such as the Internet, global capitalism and mass migrations are affecting identify politics, understandings of citizenship and educational policy (Demaine, 2002; O’Sullivan & Pashby, 2008; Torres, 2002). Nabavi (2010) notes that shifting demographics in Canada has spurred a “renewed interest and commitment to citizenship education policy and pedagogy,” and that these events have “fuelled educational theorists, policy-makers, curriculum developers and pedagogues to articulate approaches to citizenship education” (p.1). Constructions of active citizenship education in the past, present and for the 21st century continue to vary substantially, and they remain highly contested as stakeholders groups compete to shape the future of active citizenship education.

I explore the universe of active citizenship education as an astronomer explores the universe we inhabit. My research journey transports me through a metaphorical discourse universe replete with time warps (e.g., historical dimensions), wormholes (e.g., contemporary issues) and force fields (e.g., competing dialogues) which, I deconstruct by way of hermeneutic reflection, critical

critique and critical discourse analysis. While my research took me back in history (e.g., Ancient Rome, French Revolution and the American Civil Rights movement) and through contemporary narratives of active citizenship education (e.g., global, neoliberal and state), it also delivered me to a much more informed place where I could morally, ethically, and authentically critique past, present and future options for active citizenship education. Like our universe which is subject to the “laws of light, gravity, time, matter and energy” (Cox and Cohen, 2011, inside cover), citizenship discourse is vast, expanding, and intersecting with various elements (e.g., socio-political, cultural and environmental). SolarSystemQuick (2013) states,

The vastness of the universe is unimaginable, a massive expanse containing galaxies, stars, planets, and other fascinating objects. Our sun is just one of 200 billion stars in our galaxy, and our home galaxy, the Milky Way, is just one of over 100 billion galaxies.

The universe is large, the distances involved are difficult for us to comprehend, even one of our nearest galactic neighbors, Andromeda...is 2.5 million light years away, a modern day spacecraft would have to travel for around 30 billion years to reach it. (n.p.)

There are many forces such as globalization that are changing our way of being in the world (e.g., within our communities, states and the global community) and therefore our way of being citizens. Our socio-political, economic and cultural spheres are intersecting and our connections with others expanding, quickening and overlapping – similar in some ways to our expanding universe when “stars are born in vast clouds of gas and dust called nebulae” (n.p.). Annan (1998) states, “We are witnessing the emergence of an ever more active and vociferous global civil society, empowered and bound together by the tools of modern information technology. This is changing the very nature of government” (para.10), making it difficult to define the “conceptions and definitions of civics, or citizenship, or civics and citizenship education,” making the study of this topic “problematic at

present” (Hunter & Jimenez, 1998, para. 3). Active citizenship has entered transnational realms, universal rights dimensions and cosmopolitan spheres and these factors, like other diverse factors, will have implications on the directions active citizenship education ought to take.

Advocates of citizenship education are concerned that “revitalized civics curriculum is essential to the revival of democracy,” however “when curricular content and pedagogical issues are broached in any detail, agreement on the nature of substance of civics education ends” (Howard & Patten, 2006, p. 455). Such lack of agreement is evident throughout the literature, policy and curriculum. Highly contested spaces are laden with discourses that serve to marginalize, disenfranchise or exclude certain positions, thus disadvantaging them and advantaging the side of power – this leads to power differences – many which are institutionalized. I use critical discourse analysis to carefully and reflectively unveil the underpinning, overarching and power-laden discourses that lay within texts about active citizenship and active citizenship education. I also look at how this discourse plays out in active citizenship education policy, curriculum and pedagogy.

Ultimately, the purpose of my research is to determine the gaps and oversight in existing active citizenship education programs and to make informed recommendations on how to move forward. Solarsystemsquick (2013) states, “When you look at the stars in the night sky you are looking into the past, the light from some of these stars can take thousands of year to reach us on Earth” (n.p.), while Astronomy 162 (2013) states, “There are many instances where galaxies appear to be interacting with each other enough to cause obvious distortions of the galaxies that interact. These interactions may have a significant connection with the manner in which galaxies evolve with time” (n.p.). New stars and galaxies form and can collide with each other (Astronomy 162, 2013). In my research, I was profoundly moved by the histories of those who fervently fought for citizenship rights and intrigued by current phenomenon, which are strongly shaping citizenship in

our world. Active citizenship, like the Universe, has enduring forces that remain constant while at the same time it is constantly evolving. I aspired to ensure that my research of active citizenship education for youth is comprehensive, compassionate and carefully constructed and I have also given the utmost consideration to remaining ethical, moral and reasoned in my analysis and my critical critiques. I elected to stay with the phrasing ‘active citizenship education’, as opposed to ‘citizenship education,’ throughout most of my dissertation, because the new term is gaining momentum and a degree of power (e.g., citizenship education has moved beyond being a legal status and patriotic duty). I sought to conduct my research with integrity and dignity.

I use critical discourse analysis to help identify the problematic discourses that impede and/or limit our understanding and implementation of active citizenship education. “Discourse analysis challenges us to move from seeing language as abstract to seeing our words as having meaning in a particular historical, social, and political condition” (McGregor, 2003, n.p.). I use “documentary research method” (Mogalakwe, 2006, p. 221) to gather diverse materials for my qualitative research inquiry. “A document is something that we read and which relates to some aspect of the social world” (Hefferman, n.d., n.p.) and they are socially produced. Documentary method allows the researcher to examine, interpret, “elicit meaning [and] gain understanding” (Bowen, 2009, p. 27) from textual materials. I explore the history of citizenship education, contemporary citizenship education knowledge claims and concerns, and potentially new directions for active citizenship. I use critical discourse analysis to identify, how power plays out in citizenship discourse (e.g., marginalization). For example, a citizen education study in the Netherlands by Veugelers (2007) expressed the following concerns:

The critical-democratic type of citizenship [e.g., critical thinker, autonomous and socially aware] has received hardly any attention in education. From our pedagogical

perspective, stimulating humanitarian, social and democratic values and autonomy should be given more attention in education: to educate young people to have a critical, enquiring attitude, to have the courage and the creativity to tread new paths, to question all knowledge—including their own knowledge—for the values and underlying power structures it contains and to educate youngsters who balance autonomy and social awareness. (p.105)

In this study, I explore claims such as these, explore active citizenship using a diverse array of documents, analyse the topic using CDA, arrive at my research conclusions, and provide some ideas for revising curricula and/or pedagogy.

What will become obvious in my research is the foregrounding of neoliberal discourses and the backgrounding of activist state discourse, which I will explain later. According to Huckin (2002), “Foregrounding means the prominence given to parts of a text” while “the opposite of foregrounding is backgrounding. The choice of whether to emphasize or de-emphasize a piece of information” (p. 10). “The ultimate form of backgrounding is omission ... such textual silences are of a broad ideological sort (Chomsky), in others they are more tactical (Jaworski). In any case what is left unsaid is often more important than (sic) what is said” (Huckin, 2002, p. 10). Huckin (n.d.) states that a full discussion of a text “should take into account the larger sociocultural context surrounding it” (n.p.), to provide a more transparent view (e.g., not vague) of the subject matter (e.g., citizenship education), thus I have explored the vast universe of citizenship discourse – from past to present, from policy to socio-political imaginations, from a limited perspective of citizenship education to one that encompasses the many socio-political galaxies that surrounds it. This was done to disrupt any “contextualized interpretations” (Huckin, 2002, n.p.) that may place the citizen in the position of a disadvantaged subject rather than that of an empowered agent. Throughout my

dissertation I refer to an extended metaphor that I created – the dark space and energy of the universe – to illuminate how so many important citizenship related discourses have fallen to the wayside, or become “peripheral” (Huckin, 2002, p. 11), when it comes to many policy and curriculum initiatives.

The research design I have selected triangulates critical theory (e.g., theoretical framework), critical discourse analysis and documentary research method. Critical discourse analysis parallels a critical emancipatory approach for exploring the complexities of modern day citizenship education. Postmodern critical theorists use, as per a critical theoretical framework, a diverse range of theories such as “feminist theory, ecological theory, Foucauldian genealogy, post-structuralist psychoanalysis, Santiago enactivist cognitive theory, complexity theories, post –colonialist theory, discourse analysis, semiotics, hermeneutics, and other concerns” (Steinberg and Kincheloe, 2010, p. 140), to critique such topics as democratic citizenship and citizenship education. As Popkewitz (1999) states:

This is an interesting time in educational and social theory and philosophy as there is great turmoil about the intellectual assumptions and presuppositions of the social sciences, humanities, history and philosophy. The turmoil relates to the rules of truth that are embodied in knowledge, the politics of knowledge, and the relation of intellectual work to issues of change. (p.1)

I select a diverse range of documents (e.g., policy, curricula, textbooks, academic papers, and government reports) from a diverse range of subject areas (e.g., political science, education, public policy, global studies, and philosophy) so that I may capture the social, political and educational milieu (e.g., including the competing voices, turmoil and tensions) that surrounds citizenship and citizenship education today.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is that it addresses a global concern to improve civics and citizenship education, by utilizing different knowledge claims, strategies of inquiry, and methods of data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2003). Second, it seeks to not only deconstruct existing discourse on civics and citizenship, but to conceptualize alternative constructions that specifically address the need to improve citizenship and civics. Third, it is hoped that this work will offer insights for other educational institutes and build upon existing academic research and literature. Fourth, it is hoped that this project will contribute to ongoing pursuits to engage Canadian youth in political life, and especially BC youth in reference to this particular study.

Governments have historically sought to improve youth's engagement in civic affairs by preparing them during their schooling years using social studies curricula, but they have been disappointed with the outcomes of such programs as measured by such determinants as political literacy, voter turnout, and political party participation. My research study seeks to explore the complexities of active citizenship education by opening the discourse and dialogue on what constitutes active citizenship to a larger interdisciplinary, public and transnational space. This study is very timely as Sir Bernard Crick (1998), who is well recognized for the *Crick Report on Education for Teaching Citizenship and Democracy*, died in 2008, leaving behind a research question he sought to explore by way of an edited book entitled *Active Citizenship: What Could it Achieve and How?*

Crick's book is co-authored by Lockyer and consists of a series of essays written by academics who seek to continue a longstanding discussion on active citizenship education. The book is intended to rekindle discussions and exploration, rather than to claim a specific answer to

the question. El-Khairi (2010), in his book review of Crick and Lockyer's book, challenges many of the notions in the book and furthers the discussion:

In an age of precariousness under contemporary globalization there is a necessity to move away from parochial ideas of citizenship and acknowledge the relationships that are being formed outside of formal institutions and bounded territories. A predisposition to regard the nation-state as the primary sphere of citizen's rights and responsibilities not only limits the imagination necessary to bring about substantive change, but it also occludes the outernational relationships and [sic] that are already taking place amongst global denizens in many parts of the world. (n.p.)

My research study will contribute to the ongoing dialogue on active citizenship education, and the pursuit of engaging more youth in civic affairs. As a researcher I situate myself not only amongst other researchers who are on a quest to best understand how to engage youth in critical active citizenship, but rather within a broader interdisciplinary space that allows me to explore the universe of citizenship-related discourse.

When looking at citizenship education it is important to understand its significance in contemporary society. Held (1987) states, "the difficulties of the modern world will not be solved by surrendering politics, but only by the development and transformation of 'politics' in ways that will enable us more effectively to shape and organize human life. We do not have the option of 'no politics' (p. 267). Burke (1997) believes:

The core problems of the future are political problems. We do not lack the natural resources, technology or capital to deliver a sustainable high quality of life for a population of ten billion, but we are woefully bad at putting them together properly. At the heart of so many contemporary crises is the crisis of legitimate authority: how do we construct political

mechanisms, including global ones that have the power to resolve real differences and yet retain enough legitimacy for those resolutions to hold? (p. 47)

Establishing effective active citizenship education is significant to youth, teachers, curricula, institutional educational frameworks, and society.

Gore (2002) writes, “Citizenship education is not new, nor is globalisation, but schools find that the speed of change is causing them to continually review how they can help students make sense of their world and become active citizens” (p. 2). Institutions often feel students lack, or have deficits in the field of active citizenship. Huckle (1997) states,

They are unable to explain how the economy, politics, society and culture work; how everyday events reflect and shape underlying structures and processes operating at all scales from the local to the global; and what changes to these structures and processes might lead to more just, democratic and sustainable futures.(p. 30)

The significance of my research study is that it seeks to gather new and old knowledge about and related to active citizenship education, build upon and challenge existing claims, and address some of the gaps and oversights in the research and the applications of such research. It pragmatically will look at how to implement key dimensions of active citizenship into secondary social studies programs.

Research Problem

More recent distension of the apparent problems in civic and citizenship education has become even more identified as it has been noted in various articles and public discussion. For example, Lundholm (2011) states:

As human beings we ultimately depend on the services that ecosystems provide, such as food production, nutrient recycling and flood buffering, hence, current losses of such ecological goods and services and necessary ecological conditions constitute a real threat ... It is against this background that I will discuss the concept of citizenship and knowledge and point to a need for addressing societal (economic and political) along with ecological understanding, while also raising concern for understanding of the relation between society and nature as being unpredicted, non-linear and complex. (p. 80)

On a more regional level, the British Columbia Ministry of Education (BCMOE) and the provincial government is concerned about citizenship education in the province. The BCMOE conducted a citizenship education research survey which revealed that teachers felt “the curriculum does not adequately help students feel connected to Canadian politics or develop the attitudes and abilities to be active participants in democratic society” while parents felt that inadequate time and attention was “devoted to developing students' citizenship skills” (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 4).

Research is needed to identify the specifics of the citizenship education content being taught in schools and pedagogies for teaching this content, while also taking into consideration today's learner and the overall application of this knowledge and skills in the real world. This research aims to explore existing constructions of active citizenship education, address perceived gaps in Canadian civic and citizenship education (Nabavi, 2010; Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999; Sears, 1996)

and to explore how to begin curriculum and policy revisions. Some of the perceived gaps in citizenship education include for example: (a) gaps between current social realities of citizenship and outdated representations of citizenship in curriculum materials (Nabavi, 2010; Sears, 1996; Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999), (b) gaps between school citizenship education and participation in civic life outside school and after school (Lewis, 2009) and (c) gaps between students lived experiences as citizens (e.g., refugees, aboriginal students) and those depicted in curriculum resources (Conoley, 1989; Hodgetts, 1968; Sears & Hughes, 1996). The purpose of my study is to (a) perform a critical discourse analysis of the existing text on civics, citizen, and citizenship education to understand the historical, contemporary and emerging dimensions of citizenship and citizenship education; (b) conceptualize new pathways for active citizenship education based upon what ought to be; and (c) identify the various ways and means to accomplish these necessary changes using the Canadian context and British Columbia secondary social studies programs as possible examples. I scanned through as many as 400 documents and used the contents of over 200 documents in my research analysis.

Research Questions

This study aims to answer the following five research questions that are interconnected:

1. Where have we, as researchers, educators and policy-makers come from, in regards to citizenship education?
2. Where are we now and what factors have influenced this?
3. Where ought we to be going with citizenship education and why?
4. How might we get from where we have been in our research, education and policy-making and where ought we be?

5. What might a new agenda for active citizenship education look like (e.g., in the Canadian context and British Columbia's provincial curriculum for example) and what considerations should be addressed when moving forward?

Theoretical Framework

I selected critical theory to establish my theoretical framework as it is very fitting for an exploration of active citizenship education. As I study citizenship education I need to be able to identify if policies, curriculum and pedagogies are out of touch with current realities or reproducing deep-seated structural inequalities. A critical theoretical framework demands criticality, deliberation and reflection. Steinberg and Kincheloe (2010) state that,

Critical theory, if nothing else, is a moral construct designed to reduce human suffering in the world. In the critical theoretical context, every individual is granted dignity regardless of his or her location in the web of reality. Thus, the continuation of human suffering by conscious human decision is a morally unacceptable behavior that must be analyzed, interpreted and changed. In this context the genesis of this type of decision-making process is uncovered and new ways of thinking that could negate such activity are sought. (p. 140).

Citizenship education has been a topic of debate, research, and analysis for many decades and critical thinking has been central to many of the discussions about social studies literature. Wright (2003) notes "critical thinking is also required by educators who are determining what qualifies as citizenship education... [and he ponders:] How does a critical thinker go about answering the question, 'What is citizenship education?'" (n.p.). A seemingly simple question is actually quite complex and multi-dimensional. In order to do justice to an exploration of active

citizenship education it is important that the discussion reach outside the “internal politics of schooling” (Hebert, 2004, p. 23), and enter the larger societal, cultural and global realms where rapid changes are taking place. Hebert (2004) states:

The idea of critical theory is not only of the internal politics of schooling but of the social conditions and historical relations in which education for citizenship is positioned ... Critical theory then refers to a broad span of arguments about power – how people are marginalized through the practices of school, how power operates in the various forms, and how evidence, postulates, habits, ways of acting and thinking, commonplace beliefs, are shaken up and re-examined to take a new measure of rules and institutions (Foucault 11-12; Popkewitz 2). (p. 23)

I have created a research design that encompasses a broad range of materials, ideas, and research techniques and which uses a critical framework to explore and analyze these materials.

As I am to determine how active citizenship education can best be conceptualized in policy and curriculum and generally-speaking through pedagogy, I must seriously consider whose voices and what topics should be included in citizenship education discourse and practices. It is therefore prudent that I use a critical theoretical approach to ensure that multiple perspectives are included in my research and that certain stakeholders are not unjustly represented, marginalized or excluded from the shaping of active citizenship educational policy, curriculum and learning resources. There have been multiple studies, reports and curriculum materials completed on active citizenship that have included student, teacher, parent, policy-maker, citizen, government, business and other stakeholders perspectives and I will be including components of these documents in my research analysis.

In the initial phases Critical Theory (when capitalized this refers to the traditional Frankfurt School of German philosophers and social theorists), “A democratic society would be rational, because in it individuals could gain ‘conscious control’ over social processes that affect them and their life chances” (Bohman, 2012, n.p.) and citizens “become producers of their social life in its totality” (Horkheimer, 1982, p. 244). Critical theorists claim that “social inquiry ought to combine rather than separate the poles of philosophy and the social sciences: explanation and understanding, structure and agency, regularity and normativity” (Bohman, 2012, n.p.), and this concept is fitting to my study as it seeks to explore how to best conceptualize, improve, and implement active citizenship education in secondary social studies programs. Active citizenship intends that youth learn how to discern the complexities of civic issues and contribute to the shaping of social realities. As critical theorists Steinberg and Kincheloe (2010) state, “social analysts can extend the project of an emancipatory democracy and the schooling that supports it (p. 141).

Critical Theory and its Connections to Citizenship Education

The idea of a critical theory is not only of the internal politics of schooling but of the social conditions and historical relations in which education for citizenship is positioned. Most of the issues discussed here concern the constitutive role of language in the social construction of knowledge, i.e., knowledge as discourses. (Hebert, 2004, p. 23)

According to Bohman (2012) critical theory has a “narrow and a broad meaning in philosophy;” in the narrow sense it represents the early German philosophers in the “Western European Marxist tradition known as the Frankfurt School” who advocated that “a theory is critical to the extent that it seeks human emancipation” (n.p.). In the broader sense ‘critical theory’

includes “any philosophical approach with similar practical aims... including feminism, critical race theory, and some forms of post-colonial criticism” (Bohman, 2012, n.p.). During the 1940s Horkheimer and Adorno critiqued fascism, capitalism and the “Nazi rationalization of death in the concentration camps” (Kellner, 1993, n.p.). Their theoretical studies were influenced by the social, political and economic conditions that surrounding them. According to Horkheimer (1982) critical theories seek to “liberate human beings from the circumstances that enslave them” (p. 244) and “has as its object human beings as the producers of their own historical form of life” (Horkheimer, 1993, p. 21). Citizenship education is strongly related to this idea as citizenship is about populations creating the democratic form of life they seek.

Critical theory is fitting to a study of citizenship education as it advocates that citizens should engage in the democratic process to create the local, state and/or global conditions (e.g., social, political, economic) they seek. The “normative orientation” of critical theorists is towards the “transformation of capitalism into a ‘real democracy’” (Bohman, 2012, n. p.). Active citizenship education seeks to facilitate the learning of political literacy, critical thinking, and democratic participation and like critical theory endorses a theoretical and practical project that focuses on “immanent critique” (Horkheimer, 1993, p. 39). Jurgen Habermas wrote *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* in which he focused on democratization and emphasized “political participation as the core of a democratic society and as an essential element in individual self-development” (Kellner, 2000, p. 2). Habermas was concerned with “how speaking and acting subjects acquire and use knowledge” (Habermas, 1984, p. 11) and explored “the know-how of subjects who are capable of speech and action, who are attributed the capacity to produce valid utterances, and who consider themselves capable of distinguishing between valid and invalid

expressions” (Habermas, 1990, p. 31). The development of such subject attributes are sought in citizenship education and are significant to a study of citizenship education.

Active citizenship education is not intended to indoctrinate and subordinate citizens (e.g., or students) but rather, like critical theory, it seeks to analyze “the ways in which linguistic-symbolic meanings are used to encode, produce, and reproduce relations of power and domination, even within institutional spheres of communication and interaction governed by norms that make democratic ideals explicit in normative procedures and constraints” (Bohman, 2012, n.p.).

Habermas (1970) refers to materials (e.g., curricula, policy, and press releases) that reproduce relations of subordination and domination as “distorted communication” (p. 205). Critical theory, as does active citizenship education and critical discourse analysis, acknowledges how institutional language shapes and mis-shapes democratic ideals, practices and power distribution. As Foucault (1982) states, “The exercise of power can produce as much acceptance as may be wished for: it can pile up the dead and shelter itself behind whatever threats it can imagine. In itself the exercise of power is not violence; nor is it a consent, which, implicitly, is renewable” (p. 220). In this sense, government is organically changing and a site of power. Citizens should learn how to identify, analyze and respond to social change, political debates and undemocratic abuses of government power. As I seek to explore citizenship education, and what it can/or ought to look like, I need to heed the wisdom of those critical theorists who have been studying the complexities of democracy, citizenship and education for decades.

After Foucault’s influential 1977-1978 lectures “[P]olitical analysis moved away from a consideration of sovereignty as authority above and outside the organization of bounded social relations, towards an analysis of the internal management of the state ... the shift in analysis foreshadowed a transformation in the political form of the state itself” (Curtis, 2002, p. 520). Active

citizenship education looks at ways that schooling can encourage and engage students to participate in the shaping of democratic life and influencing the internal management of the state. Foucault advocated an art of governance, or ‘governmentality’, whereby the art of government “ceased to be seen as existing on the external boundaries of the state; it was inside the state, inside society” (Curtis, 2002, p. 520). The society Foucault refers to in his advocacy for an art of governance, includes youth who deserve a voice and an education that will prepare them to most effectively exercise that voice.

There are differences in thought amongst critical theorists such as Habermas, Foucault, and the critical pedagogues who focus on culture and education such as Freire (1970), McLaren (1999), and Steinberg & Kincheloe (2010). “Critical theory agrees with that of Karl Marx in that ‘... one must become conscious of how an ideology reflects and distorts ... reality ... and what factors ... influence and sustain the false consciousness which it represents – especially reified powers of domination” (Habermas, 1987, n.p.). Habermas (1987) believes in ‘perspective transformation’ in a similar fashion as Freire (1970) who believes in bringing about a transformed consciousness. The difference is that Habermas does not claim a predictable outcome (Mezirow, 1981) while Freire (1970) seeks to empower the oppressed by way of “conscientisation” (p. 109), critical self-reflection and praxis. My theoretical framework is using critical theory in the broadest sense of the term and thus includes critical theorists such as Foucault, who focus on governmentality and the nature of power and others such as Freire (1970), Giroux (1980), Giroux (2008), and Steinberg and Kincheloe (2010) who study critical theories of education and culture. Students need to develop critical citizenship skills and play a strong role in developing an awareness of ideological matters. As I explore the topic of citizenship education and seek to answer my research questions, I want to

be cognizant of what elements are significant to citizenship education and how they have, or could, play out in secondary citizenship studies.

In a more contemporary discussion of critical theorists, Steinberg and Kincheloe (2010) state, “Buoyed by our bricolage, critical theorists can gain new understandings of how power operates and in the process incorporate groups who had previously been excluded by their race, class, gender, sexuality or geographical place (Welsch, 1991; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991; Kincheloe, 2001a, 2008; Steinberg, 2011)” (p. 141). They note that Horkeimer, Adorno, and Marcuse “initiated a conversation with German tradition of philosophical and social thought, especially that of Marx, Kant, Hegel, and Weber (Steinberg & Kincheloe, 2010, p. 141) who were strongly influenced by the political and economic turmoil of World War I, World War II, and post-war times. These critical theorists sought to reinterpret “Marxist orthodoxy” and critically analyze “the mutating forms of domination” that accompanied a “changing nature of capitalism” (Steinberg & Kincheloe, 2010, p. 142). In a similar fashion Steinberg and Kincheloe (2010) also seek to re-conceptualize critical theory to address contemporary changes in capitalism (e.g., global capitalism); they do not seek to abandon traditional critical theory but to advance it.

Steinberg and Kincheloe (2010) offer contemporary insights into critical theory as a theoretical framework for social, political and educational studies: “In this reality [e.g., today’s free market economy] critical theory grapples with issues of power, justice, and moral action and the ways that the economy, matters of race, class, gender, and sexuality, ideologies, discourses, religion, education, and other social dynamics interact to construct the social systems that shape our consciousness” (p. 143). They believe that a “critical moral pedagogy can be constructed – a theoretical orientation that accounts for cultural difference, the complexity of everyday life, and the demands of a rigorous democratic education” and that such a moral pedagogy (e.g., referring to

education in general not the classroom) is possible if grounded in an awareness of multiple ontological, epistemological and disciplinary perspectives (e.g., discourses and texts) such as “Aboriginal ontologies”, “African-American epistemologies”, and “subjugated knowledges” that exist and are/or can be overlooked in Eurocentric middle class citizenship education classes (Steinberg and Kincheloe, 2010, p.145). Given these complexities and critical insights I seek to explore active citizenship using critical theory, discourse strategies and a documentary method.

It is important to note that there are methodological and/or citizenship education researchers who claim there is a definitive difference between critical theory and critical pedagogy. As this debate has been brought into the active citizenship education debate in recent years (e.g., 2010) it is important that I briefly present the argument. Johnson and Morris (2010) state:

Increasingly, countries around the world are promoting forms of ‘critical’ citizenship in the planned curricula of schools. However, the intended meaning behind this term varies markedly and can range from a set of abstract and technical skills under the label ‘critical thinking’ to a desire to encourage engagement, action, and political emancipation, often labeled ‘critical pedagogy’ (p.77).

Some want to not only clearly distinguish the two terms but they also seek to marginalize critical pedagogy and exclude any form of it in terms of critical citizenship discourse, policy and practice. Burbules and Berk (1999) state: “Critical thinking is, at heart, to teach how to think critically, not how to think politically; for critical pedagogy, this is a false distinction” (p.55). DeLeon (2006) claims that critical pedagogues view “education as a political act ... transforming schools towards pursuing social justice ... [and] using education to engender social change and empower educational actors” (p .2). Johnson and Morris (2010) more moderately state that the “boundaries between critical thinking and critical pedagogy have thus become blurred” (p. 80). Hanisch (1969)

wrote *The Personal is Political* and in it she talked about the solidarity meetings, which were then called personal therapy meetings for women in feminist political movements and states:

Can you imagine what would happen if women, blacks, and workers (my definition of worker is anyone who has to work for a living as opposed to those who don't. All women are workers) would-stop blaming ourselves for our sad situations? It seems to me the whole country needs that kind of political therapy. That is what the black movement is doing in its own way. We shall do it in ours. We are only starting to stop blaming ourselves. We also feel like we are thinking for ourselves for the first time in our lives.
(n.p.)

As I use my critical theoretical framework for my dissertation I must acknowledge the different perspectives on critical theory, but as I prepare to explore active citizenship education I'm not sure that I can fathom that thinking critically as a citizen can or should be an apolitical process that is mentally, emotionally, or socially void. There needs to be a differentiation between political indoctrination and engagement and I believe research into this matter may address a possible research gap that causes critical approaches to citizenship education to be a highly contested area.

In summary, the goal of critical inquiry is not to control or direct social processes but rather to "initiate public processes of self-reflection" (Bohman, 2012, n.p.) and encourage "reflection upon institutional practices" and transform the "social relations of power and authority into contexts of democratic accountability among political equals" (Bohman, 2012, n.p.). Such reflection includes having citizens reflect upon how power has, and does affect them, and how they can also exert power through democratic channels – it is significant to any citizenship education analysis and to the construction of citizenship education. Critical theory, in its narrow and broadest forms, is "reflexive and finds its foothold in those ongoing, self-transforming normative enterprises such as

democracy” (Bohman, 2012, n.p.). Critical theory helps us explore and examine “the interplay of theory, culture, and society” (Kellner, 1993, n.p.). Critical Theorists “were among the first to analyze the new configurations of state and economy in the social formations of state capitalism” (Kellner, 2000, p. 5). As I seek to understand and improve contemporary citizenship education, critical theory offers me a framework to understand citizenship and citizenship education within a context that understands the new configurations of state, economy, democracy, culture and education. The diversities, complexities and intersectionalities of society today, make my selection of documentary method (e.g., documents), CDA methodology (e.g., discourse) and theoretical framework (e.g., critical theory) a potentially viable research design to explore citizenship education as it exists in our changing societies; presents itself in curriculum, policy, and learning resources; and reflects democratic aspirations.

Special Considerations and Limitations

Citizenship education can be politically charged so I intend that my work is transparent, and that the rights of all are respected. Diversity, history, and human rights must be respected in a research study on citizenship education and this is especially true in Canada where there are three founding peoples of Canada: Aboriginal, French and British. As the final stage of my research looks at British Columbia’s secondary citizenship education as a tangible and familiar site to consider an actual implementation, I will have to also recognize and respect the need to represent universal, state and provincial perspectives of active citizenship. Kymlicka & Norman (1994) posit, “Can citizenship provide a common experience, identity, and allegiance for the members of society?” (p. 355). I must also be aware of any personal bias I may hold and recognize that citizenship is both an individualized and collective experience. It is important that I utilize an inclusive (e.g., multiple and

diverse documents) and a critical (e.g., CDA) approach to capture how citizenship education is presented in educational policy, research, and curriculum. My research intends to expose how power plays into active citizenship education.

Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Kymlicka and Norman (1994), “There has been an explosion of interest in the concept of citizenship among political theorists” and “citizenship has become the ‘buzz’ word among thinkers on all points of the political spectrum” (p. 352). Explanations for the renewed interest in civics, citizenship and citizenship education vary: voter apathy (Johnston, 2001; Lewis, 2009), a grand scale global migration of persons (Castles & Davidson, 2000), concerns about lost and shifting political identities (Nabavi, 2010), and the questioning of rights to citizenship membership (Giddens and Dallmayr, 1982). Governments and political scientists are seeking answers to rising discord among its citizens (Haderer, 2005) and are recognizing that citizens need to have a sense of their own political identity, a respectful understanding of competing “national, regional, or religious identities” (Kymlicka and Norman, 1994, p.353) and an earnest belief that their participation can make a difference.

Research indicates that despite repeated attempts to reform high school civic and citizenship education (Lewis, 2009) students continue to have limited knowledge, skills, and engagement in the area of civics and citizenship. Dewey (1916) wrote, “Democracy has to be born anew every generation and education is its midwife...education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind” (p. 40). Abbowitz and Harnish (2006) question how political life is portrayed in Western democracies and state, “Meanings of ‘citizenship,’ a concept that has informed teaching practices since nation-states first institutionalized schooling, are shaped over time and through cultural struggles” (p. 653), while Lewis (2009) warns that “the endless quest for effective and ideal civic education will continue [and] the artful connection of youth apathy, civic education and political engagement will remain” (p. 29).

Concern about civics and citizenship is evident at the state level in Canada (Hodgetts, 1968, 1978; Lewis, 2009) as well as at provincial levels in Canada where ministries of education are charged with providing civic and citizenship education for their students (Lewis, 2009). Despite numerous federal programs over the years and provincial curriculum revisions intended to engage youth in political affairs (Lewis, 2009), voter apathy is distinct and still exists among society (Johnston, 2001). Rudyard Griffiths, Dominion Institute co-founder and advocate for civic education “warns that Canada is becoming a nation of civic slackers whose focus is on consumption opposed to responsibility” (Campbell, 2007, p. 10). Such information does not constitute fully objective data, but it offers heuristic insights by individuals who are directly involved in citizenship matters. Lewis (2009) notes that past revisions to British Columbia’s curriculum neglected to make the curriculum relevant in terms of ongoing socio-cultural and political struggles and that the new Civics 11 course failed to pique the interest of students and teachers: “Out of the roughly 50,000 Grade 11 course students in British Columbia, only 645 students were enrolled in the course in 2005-2006” (Lewis, 2009, p. 25-26). These numbers omit to mention that teachers were not willing to surrender their SS 11 courses for Civics 11, but given the actual numbers there is still reason for concern about the place that civics and citizenship has in students’ lives.

Citizenship Education in Various Locations

Civics and citizenship education in British Columbia is interconnected to all aspects of the current global reexamination of what it is to be a citizen, what role citizenship education should play, and what content school programs should include. It is crucial that the inadequacies of civics and citizenship education to notably improve students’ knowledge, skills and engagement, be addressed at a variety of levels (e.g., community, provincial, national, federal, and global).

Abbowitz and Harnish (2006) claim that citizenship education taught in school today does not do enough to teach democratic politics and both the content and approach is failing our youth. Critical reconstructionists are assertive in that the content and teaching of civic and citizenship education should be one that mirrors real life expectations and experiences (Abbowitz and Harnish, 2006). Abbowitz and Harnish (2006) recognize that schools are “powerful socializing institutions” (p. 673), while Giroux deems that “a culture of discussion and dissent is necessary to “inform public citizenship and legitimate access to decent health care, housing, food, meaningful employment, child care, and childhood education” (2003, p. 25). There are many steps that need to be taken towards improving secondary civics and citizenship in social studies programs.

The content of civic and citizenship education in BC has been a point of concern in recent years. The school system has adopted and implemented various content and curriculum programs in an effort to improve the results of student performance as measured by test results and responses to questions about their involvement in civic affairs. However, as research and evidence suggest, what is current in these schools simply needs to be improved. A new framework and approach to the issue is what may be needed. In order to begin to collect evidence to devise a plan one must first be cognizant of the diverse students of today. The plan should take into consideration the types of learners and their lived experiences in order to begin to make real change in curriculum and content, as well as, the style of teaching civic and citizenship education. Demographic statistics (e.g., Statistics Canada) along with socio-cultural reports that have included student, parent, and community input will provide insights into these areas.

The following perspectives help to provide a basic overview of a learner today. According to Luke (1997):

Large-scale immigration and the emergence of multicultural, multilingual nation states have marked the postwar era. In urban and suburban areas, schools and educators are facing new student bodies and rapidly changing community demographic profiles. These new conditions have called into question the relevance and efficacy of longstanding administrative, curriculum, instructional and evaluation practices, many of which were developed in early and mid-century secular school systems designed for monoculture, homogenous nation-states. The recognition and enfranchisement of linguistic and cultural minority students has generated a host of practical issues around new dynamics of ethnic, cultural and gender difference in communities, families and institutional life, differential power in pedagogic relations in classrooms, and the knowledge and epistemological claims of historically disenfranchised groups over what should count as curriculum knowledge (“Language and Discourse in Contemporary Education,” para. 3).

Citizenship education must take into consideration the changing demographics of local communities and the hegemonic nature of existing programs. Apple (1996) is concerned with what is deemed ‘legitimate knowledge’ and what is excluded in curriculum; the author claims no citizenship curriculum is neutral. “The very idea of a common culture upon which a national curriculum – as defined by neoconservatives – is to be built is itself a form of cultural politics. In the immense linguistic, cultural, and religious diversity...it is the cultural policy of the Right to ‘override’ such diversity” (p. 34). Luke (1997) and Apple (1996) raise significant concerns about reproducing systemic oppressions through hegemonic curriculum.

A more recent view of the current issues shaping Canadian youth has been summed up by Nabavi (2010), and serves as the overall basis of this study. Nabavi (2010, p. 2) indicates that the changes in population in Canada have led to the most recent acts to initiate change:

In the field of education, the discourses of *citizenship education* are more than at any other period of Canadian history hold centre stage (Hughes & Sears, 2008). Despite the provincial mandate of public education, citizenship education, both practically and conceptually, is central to educational policy across Canada. This emphasis is informed by the longstanding view that public schooling must strive to “train citizens in the widest sense of the term” (Conoley, 1989, p. 134)...There is, however, limited shared understanding of what citizenship education should entail. Factors such as the historical context of citizenship education, the influences of the policy of multiculturalism, nationalist versus global tensions, economic influences, and the relationship between social and substantive citizenship all contribute to the gaps in citizenship education (Sears, 1996; Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999). (p. 1)

The studies of Nabavi (2010) and Sears (1996) identify that data supports the argument that gaps and many programmatic needs are not being met in the civic and citizenship education curriculum. Moreover, a renewed context to exploring ways in which citizenship learning takes place is needed. This need is what this study proposes to address - that is determining what changes are necessary to improve the teaching of active citizenship education.

The Significance of Citizenship Education

Hebert and Sears (2001) discuss citizenship education and explain the various concepts and areas of the curriculum. More importantly, they provide a rationale for why citizenship is so important. “Citizenship is about who (sic) we are, how we live together, and what kind of people our children are to become. As such, it is a normative concept meaning that it stems from a moral point of view. There are many competing proposals about what is necessary for good citizenship

and effective citizenship education” (p. 3). The authors indicate that the youth in Canada are in crisis regarding the issue of knowledge and skills of citizenship education. This information helps to determine the need for the current research study and corroborates other relevant studies (e.g., Conoley, 1999; Hebert & Sears, 2001; Nabavi, 2010; Tupper, 2007; Westheimer 2005, 2008). This aspect will be significant to the design of the new framework to move forward with the content/curriculum and teaching method.

Giroux (2012) provides further insights into the seriousness of the issues for the youth of Canada, the United States, and society in general. He provides the perspective that the education system is responsible for not only teaching the content (such as civic and citizenship) of curricula, but also the critical thinking processes and actions needed to achieve an effective citizenry. His work also critiques policy makers alike for their ill-advised ways of setting policy and restricting decision making. He argues that education does not do enough to encourage and enable youth to broaden their work in community, government, and politics (Giroux, 2008). The work of Giroux (2008), Herbert and Sears (2001), and Nabavi (2010) also signify how the crux of the problem initiates with the lack of sound knowledge and skills which is a direct result of the education system, perhaps more of the core content that is expected and its model and method of teaching it.

What has often entered into debate and serves as part of the problem facing the curriculum in civic and citizenship education is the act of what constitutes this sphere of curriculum. According to Rose (2011),

The government [Britain] plans to return the national curriculum to what it calls ‘its intended purpose – a minimum national entitlement organised around subject disciplines’, and Michael Gove is expected to announce a review imminently. Supporters of citizenship education – who held a campaign event in the House of Commons last week attended by

MPs, peers, teachers, pupils and others – fear the subject will be cut from the core curriculum. (para. 2)

Westheimer (2008) argues “that in many states, virtually every subject area is under scrutiny for any deviation from one single narrative, based on knowable, testable, and purportedly uncontested facts” (p.4).

Westheimer indicates that much of the recent direction in education abandons history and focuses primarily on reading and math; this is often due to the federal regulations of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) that mandates requirements in reading and math. Westheimer (2008) also notes that teachers admit that subjects that are not tested by the state, such as civics and citizenship, are often the first to go because of the need to focus on those subject areas where there will be state exams. Furthermore, the study documented the following conclusions about civic and citizenship education. Westheimer (2008) concludes after studying dozens of schools of programs that students need to learn how “to examine social, political, and economic structures and explore strategies for change that address root causes of problems” (p. 7). This type of citizen is often referred to as the Social-Justice Oriented Citizen because “the programs fostering such citizenship emphasize the need for citizens to be able to think about issues of fairness, equality of opportunity, and democratic engagement” (p. 7).

Westheimer (2008) claims that the current views of many schools, including those presented in this study, often widely supports programs that teach citizenship and good behavior, often sold as themes or canned programs, while fewer schools teach students to think for themselves. Character education is one such example that has been under great scrutiny. Schugurensky (2005) states, “Character education programs ... claim to teach respect, responsibility and autonomy, but in practice they typically tend to use a pedagogy of indoctrination that fosters blind patriotism,

uncritical obedience to authority, industriousness, faith in the status quo and the like” (Kohn, 1997, p. 6). Such concerns need to be critically analyzed. As I look at new trends in active citizenship education I will need to keep in mind two interlocking and very important questions: Where ought citizenship education to go and how can we get there?

Westheimer (2008) claims that the challenging of existing social, economic, and political norms is an important means for strengthening democracy. The teaching and learning of this concept is significant to this author. It is perhaps Westheimer’s aim at returning to democratic goals, as the most prominent importance of his study. Westheimer (2008) argues,

For more than two centuries, democracy in the United States has been predicated on citizens’ informed engagement in civic and political life and schools have been seen as essential to support the development of such citizens. “I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves,” Thomas Jefferson famously wrote, adding that if the people are “not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.” Belief in the fundamental importance of education for democracy has been long-standing. And yet these beliefs are at risk in schools today. Relentless pressures from the business community to link the goals of education to the needs of corporations, for example, jeopardize the democratic foundations of education. Educators concerned with the narrowing goals of schooling should continue to pose publicly the kinds of question former president of the American Educational Research Association Larry Cuban asks: Do schools geared to preparing workers also build literate, active, and morally sensitive citizens who carry out their democratic civic duties? (p. 1).

The work of Westheimer is critical to the current study. His study focuses on the future of civic and citizenship education with relevance to how and what youth learn in school, all in a process that places youth as agents of change. His work supports that of similar findings. Tupper's (2007) study asserted that the issue is with the social studies curriculum. The curriculum does not do enough because it "encourages students to interpret reality in seemingly objective ways, when in fact the reality that they encounter through the curriculum is anything but objective" (p. 5).

Revising Social Studies Programs

Westheimer and Tupper both indicate that a revised or alternative plan to social studies curriculum should include components that foster a universal construction of civic and citizenship education by the engagement and practices of students in real life situations. Grelle and Metzger (1996, as cited in Tupper, 2007) argue that social studies curriculum and teaching practices overwhelmingly support a standard socialization approach that discounts the realities of cultural pluralism. They maintain,

The socialization approach in social studies has also often contributed to the transmission of an overly narrow, uncritical, and chauvinistic conception of citizenship that tends to equate being a good citizen with the acceptance and defense of the status quo—a conception of what it means to be a good citizen that amounts to "my country right or wrong, love it or leave it" (p. 150).

Tupper's study also included the interviewing of 5 teachers who taught social studies. The study indicated that the teachers did discuss how their teaching of social studies curriculum was aligned to standardized tests that students must write. More importantly, each of the teachers recognized the

fact that the curriculum of social studies could be more immersed in daily learning that is most representative of society.

Furthermore, Tupper's study (2007) concluded with what she claims as the next steps to action in regards to addressing systemically and institutionally oppressive citizenship education programs:

Care-full citizenship may be realized in part through an interrogation of the conditions of oppression and privilege that operate to (re) produce inequities in the world. Schools are one such potential site of interrogation. However, a politics of care, or care-full citizenship, becomes tangled up in a curriculum that requires little, if any, accountability for privilege, falsely universalizing citizenship by ignoring how difference shapes the experiences one has as a citizen. Care-less citizenship is further supported through educational structures that privilege standardization and high-stakes testing. I would propose that a central challenge before us is how in the face of standardization, oppressive curriculum, and constructions of citizenship that seem to support rather than subvert conditions of oppression, we educate our students to be care-full citizens within and beyond the classroom. As educators, we need to reengage with the concept of citizenship, particularly with how it is constructed and understood in social studies classrooms and curriculum, in an effort to move from care-less to care-full citizenship. (p. 270)

Tupper (2007) suggests existing citizenship is already fraught with hegemony, institutionalized oppressions and inequities. Wright (2003) indicates that critical thinking in citizenship education should allow youth to learn how to "deliberate with others about the nature of the public good and how to bring these goods about. Deliberation about the good will often involve conflict; will always involve argument, and judgments and predictions" (p. 2). Wright's argument indicates that we not

only want to teach children to think critically but we must show fidelity in our actions and mirrored in our daily life.

A study by Rogers, Kahne, and Middaugh (2007) expressed concern for the future of democracy and urged more robust citizenship education. “Current practices do not attend sufficiently to the quality of civic life that the civic role of schooling promotes. Such attention is critical to the future of democracy. Civic education suggests that unless high schools move proactively to assure a robust program in civic education, students will not develop essential civic skills” (Rogers, Kahne & Middaugh, 2007, p.4). The authors suggest from their study that the work of change will need to include legislative efforts as well as direct efforts from schools to utilize opportunities for students to work and learn, similar to that of what many schools formally did as vocational schools. This approach not only matches the student interest to needs but is practical in the daily functions of learning and contributing to society. The study points out the work of John Dewey who is known for his contributions to vocational educational. Rogers, Kahne, and Middaugh also draw questions about globalization and the need to infuse change in the current content and approach to teaching it. The authors assert, “that integrating career and technical training into the high school can re-engage students by promoting more active learning and giving students a sense of how their learning is tied to future goals” (p.5). I am skeptical of this work experience approach, but I recognize that my research may shed light on the significance of various types of community engagement.

The study by Rogers, Kahne, and Middaugh (2007) is similar to that of Wright’s study in that both studies distinguish that the content and pedagogy of teaching civic and citizenship education to be one that provides critical thinking opportunities in real life settings and situations. Such critical thinking is seen as incorporating higher order thinking skills in both intellectual

deliberation and community practice. They strongly encourage community engagement. I plan to explore possible avenues for civic engagement and to examine the possible benefits or disadvantages of such community based practices as a means to civics and citizenship learning. The inclusion of this type of new pedagogy or approach will not only need the support of schools and teachers, but perhaps a broader sense of community and society too. The learning would be natural, occurring with real dialogue, language, and actions from students and others involved.

Citizenship: A Multidimensional, Contested, Dynamic and Contextual Concept

According to Schugurensky (2005) citizenship is an idea that is multidimensional, contested, dynamic and contextual. It has meanings and characteristics that change over time in history and is therefore considered to be dynamic. It has no standard meaning accepted by all and thus is considered a contested concept. It has different applications and interpretations in different nations and communities and thus is considered contextual. It connotes four different dimensions, and is hence considered multidimensional. The dimensions of citizenship are; “status, identity, civic virtues and agency” (Schugurensky, 2005). Citizenship as status is all about membership issues; as identity is all about a sense of belonging to a nation/community or state, as civic virtues is all about behavior, character and values; and as agency is all about political efficacy and engagement (Schugurensky, 2005). GHK (2007), a professional group who were hired to conduct a Pan-European active citizenship study, notes that citizenship is used to express three concepts which are; what the citizen is (status), what the citizen can do (considering the rights and duties) and what activities the citizen carries out (activities that define the citizen’s membership to a society). Active citizenship therefore depends on such aspect as status, political identity, social agency and civic virtues (Schugurensky, 2005).

Being a citizen by status for example, means being a member of a specific nation or community and being entitled to obligations derived from such membership. The citizen belongs to a state or a nation, that is regulated by duties and rights codified in constitutions and national laws (Schugurensky, 2005). For one to be an active citizen therefore; he or she has to have the knowledge and understanding of his or her rights and roles/duties, that make him or her, a member of that community or nation, then participate actively in them. Being a citizen gives one the right to participate in social, economic and political life, but does not mean one will participate in such citizenship rights, nor does it mean having the resources to participate in them (GHK, 2007).

Many claim that citizenship education as a phenomenon has and continues to change. Johnson and Morris (2010) write:

While historically the primary role of citizenship and civics education in nation-states was linked with the process of state formation and designed to build a common identity, inculcate patriotism and loyalty to the nation (Green 1990), it is now often to achieve a far more complex set of purposes which broadly reflect changing conceptions of what it means to be a good citizen. Major shifts which have contributed to this change, and the consequent reform of citizenship curricula, beyond a concern for membership of a nation-state include: the emergence of global and cross-national bodies such as the UN and the EU, creating pressures for schools to promote forms of supranational citizenship; multiculturalism, limiting the validity of ethno-nationalistic forms of identity; and associated attempts to promote forms of citizenship based on the promotion of a common set of shared values (e.g., tolerance, human rights and democracy), which prepare young people to live together in diverse societies and which reject the divisive nature of national identities. (pp. 77- 78)

What an active citizenship education should look like, ties very much into a number of factors: politics, ideology, power, morality, ethics, worldviews, economics, ontology, paradigms, and epistemologies. Thus, what constitutes active citizenship education will consider serious, self-reflective and fair deliberation on my part.

Conceptualizations and Models of Active Citizenship


There are differing frameworks that have been constructed to explain active citizenship. Some of the earlier models categorized types of citizens as autarchic (e.g., obedient to government) and autonomous (e.g., has a critical perspective on government) (Galston, 1989) or similarly minimal (e.g., law abiding) or maximal (e.g., public spirited) (McLaughlin, 1992). Interestingly, Kerr (2000) talks about three types of citizenship education: “education about citizenship,” “education through citizenship,” and “education for citizenship” (p. 10). Westheimer and Kahne (2004) and Veugelers (2007) conceptualized three similar categories of active citizenship. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) identify adapting, individualistic and critical democratic categories while Veugelers (2007) correspondingly refer to personally responsible, participatory and justice-oriented citizens. Davies and Issitt (2005) differentiate civics, citizenship, and social studies, by claiming civics is more about “formal public institutions”; citizenship is more about “a broad-based promotion of socially useful qualities;” and social studies is about “societal understanding that emerges from the development of critical thinking skills (p. 389). I will explore diverse constructs in my research.

Three contemporary models of active citizenship are the active citizen continuum, the active citizenship model (AC model) and the civic pulse model. The active citizenship model depicts the growth of citizens or students from just being a member, to being an active citizen.

According to the AC model there are four incremental stages or levels of development, to being or becoming a fully engaged active citizen. These stages, or categories, of citizenship in the AC model consist of a) being an inactive community member where the member is not troubled by the social problems b) being a volunteer in which the member has good intentions but does not have the appropriate education for social issues c) being a conscientious citizen where the member is aware of the social problems and works towards determining their cause and d) being an active citizen where the member makes the community a priority when making decisions about life and values (Break Away, n.d).

This active citizenship continuum, or AC model, postulates that there are different conditions of active citizenship and this is best assessed (e.g., or explained) by the values that the target groups have. In the AC model individuals are categorized according to where they are positioned in terms of two integrating scales (passive/active engagement; individual/community focus; poor/strong civic literacy). What is referred to as, an ignorant citizen, in this example, has the lowest values in competence, activity and participation (AC-Model). The AC-Model systematically assesses active citizenship according to three progressive stages and is somewhat complex (Active Citizenship Training, 2007).

The following Figure 1 is my simplified drawing of the AC Model. Item one in the graphic represents stages one and two combined, while item two represents the more advanced stage three version of the AC Model (Active Citizenship Training, 2007).



**Figure 1: Simplified AC Model of Active Citizenship
(Adapted from Active Citizenship Training, 2007, p. 53)**

In the stage one assessment of the AC Model passive is the minimum stage of the activity scale while active is the maximum; and individual/isolation is the minimum in the citizenship scale while community participation is the maximum (Active Citizenship Training, 2007). The characteristics that a citizen bears can be used to describe the condition of activeness, competency and participation. In the AC-Model description for example, the following characteristics are considered as active in the activity scale; self-confidence, persuasion of others and inventiveness. Having these other characteristics however, is considered passive and has the lowest score in the activity scale: fear, lack of inventiveness, too much devotion to authorities, troubled by past experiences and lack of self-confidence.

Stage two, adds another dimension to looking at one's active citizenship placement. It is a three dimensional model (also known as explanatory cube model), in which learning/training is incorporated as a scale into the coordinate model. The scale ranges from ignorance, located at point 0, to well-trained located at the highest point of the scale. A citizen with no knowledge of social

issues and is characterized as passive, will be placed at point 0; while a citizen that actively contributes to the civil processes, and is well trained, is placed at the upper right back of the three dimensional model. Figures of these positions can be obtained from the original document (Active Citizenship Training, 2007). Civic literacy skills would comprise this dimension, and in the model, raise or improve the individual's ability to effectively understand, critically analyze, and take action to support or confront civic change.

Stage 3 consists of a three dimensional model which essentially overlaps the stage two explanatory cube model and the first stage model, but with nested cubes explaining the levels of citizenship included. In other words, it specifies in more detail, criteria to use to determine one's level or stage on each scale, and it ascribes a civic label to the person. The three dimensional model captures the relationship between the citizenship scale, the learning scale and the activity scale. The citizenship scale is composed of civic knowledge and competencies and learners' attitudes; activity scale is composed of different levels of activity ranging from paralysis (lowest), absorption, imitation, decision making, action taking to development (highest); and the learners scale is composed of levels of knowledge ranging from novice (lowest), beginner, competent, savoir-faire, to expert (Active Citizenship Training, 2007).

Nested cubes are then developed from these characteristics to explain the different levels of citizenship. An individual with lowest activity, lowest civic knowledge and learning attitude and lowest level of competence is considered ignorant and belongs to the ignorance level of citizenship. This approach has produced five levels of citizenship namely; ignorance, partial obedience, conformity, transient participation and integrative participation (AC-Model). Overall, the AC model uses a series of high-low assessment scales, intersects these on a grid, and then overlaps them with another determinant to determine one's citizen-type or profile. The source document for the AC

Model includes diagrams of these details. The number of dimensions and classifications in this model can be overwhelming, but it may have possibilities as an instrument to self-identify one's citizenship grouping.

This Civic Pulse Model (CPM) is used to understand, identify and measure active citizenship at various times; it is designed to capture the pulse of citizenship engagement at a particular time – like a snapshot. It has four parts: theory, framework, survey and intervention. The theory component considers active citizenship according to the republic and liberal citizenship dimensions. It states that active citizenship is about participating in collective activities that aim to support the common good. Active citizenship is considered a moral responsibility and a social right in this model. The model looks at elevating engagement through evidenced-based engagement.

The main aim or framework of the CPM model is to identify, measure, and understand the drivers of active citizenship. The model subsumes a definition of active citizenship, and from this, the drivers can be identified. Identification is done through structure, choice and capacity models. The drivers are considered to be common social assets that aid participation and empower citizens to engage in issues aimed at solving social problems. Citizens are considered to have effective participatory mechanisms such as emotional resilience and trust that are important in the development of civic life. There are four types of drivers measured in this model: institutional, attitudinal, relations and know-how drivers (McLean and Dellot, 2011).

The aim of the civic pulse survey is to collect information for developing frameworks that can be used to classify citizenship into levels. Information is collected from already identified drivers, which are then measured, and these are used to develop civic pulse profiles that are then used to identify citizenship levels (McLean and Dellot, 2011). With information about the different

levels of citizenship, levels that lack certain drivers can be identified and interventions developed to deal with such problems. According to McLean and Dellot, the civic profiles show areas that need improvement and this in turn leads to redesigning of training or education methods that lead to improvement in active citizenship (2011).

Rather than a visual model (e.g., continuum or cube) Osler and Starkey (1999) established a checklist for effective citizenship projects which includes three categories: “cooperative practice,” “independent reasoning and critical awareness,” and “intercultural communication” (p. 213). According to Johnson and Morris (2010), Osler and Starkey’s focus tends to be more on women and ethnic minorities “rather than considering the many types of oppressed peoples” and their work “stipulates the teaching of information about human rights, but ignores any corresponding social responsibilities” (p. 86). Giroux (1983) advocates for an approach that includes an “emancipatory rationality” (p. 168) and encourages dialogue that encompasses “how notions of consciousness, ideology, and power enter into the way human beings constitute their day-to-day realities” (Giroux, 1980, p. 348). Johnson and Morris (2010) establish a “framework for critical citizenship education” which includes four key elements: “politics/ideology, social/collective, self/subjectivity and praxis/engagement” and cross-reference it with “Cogan et al’s (2002, 4) useful definition of citizenship/civics education as the formation of ‘the knowledge, skills, values and dispositions of citizens’” (p. 87). The framework is constructed like a rubric for learning outcomes and is user friendly, accessible, and noteworthy of further investigation.

Citizenship Education Dynamics

Citizenship education typically focuses on normalized dimensions of citizenship or features (Schugerenky, 2005). Various criteria, features and dimensions are used to define the roles, duties,

responsibilities and rights of the citizens. Citizenship education revolves around such things as status (e.g., having the rights and freedoms associated with a country), identity (e.g., refugee or immigrant adjusting to a new home), civic virtues (e.g., being a respectful law-abiding citizen), and agency (e.g., voting). Curricula often focus on these elements and emphasize one aspect over others.

Citizenship as status education programs focus on what makes one a citizen of a particular nation/state or community formally. The programs educate people on facts about laws of the nation, geography, government institutions and national history (Schugurensky, 2005). Citizenship as identity education programs focus on adaptation of minority groups into leading groups and nation building. Some programs involve the development of intercultural and multicultural elements within a diversified curriculum. Citizenship as civic virtues requires one to have attitudes, behaviors and values that a good citizen should have. Education programs of this kind of citizenship therefore, focus on developing certain values and characteristics such as international solidarity, love for the nation, autonomy, critical reflection of doctrines, acceptance of racial equity, and many other values that aim at moral education (Schugurensky, 2005). Citizenship as agency education programs focus on educating citizens on how to be active, committed, and engaged in the activities of the nation. Students are often taught to be economic consumers, producers and “masters of their own destiny” (Schugurensky, 2005).

Active citizenship education involves teaching the citizens or students about active participation in matters of economic, social, political and cultural life. It is teaching students about being active citizens. It aims at creating inventiveness that promotes social transformation, self reliance, democracy and empowerment. It also aims at encouraging citizens to be political subjects so that they have a broad knowledge and critical understanding of day to day issues, and the ability

to propose new ideas and influence decisions both as individuals and as a group (Schugurensky, 2005). The aim of most citizenship education is to educate students on how to think and participate responsibly on social, economic, cultural and political matters of a nation (HPCEU, 2011). In order to achieve such aims, a nation's training and education systems must have appropriate frameworks. According to the Hungarian Minister of State for Education of the Ministry of National Resources, the best framework is active citizenship education. The current century is experiencing challenges that require certain skills and attitudes to help meet these challenges effectively (HPCEU, 2011).

For one to be an active citizen, knowledge of the different dimensions of citizenship is appropriate as well as how to be active in the rapidly changing world. Active citizenship education includes the learning of knowledge, but it is more to do with skills that will help solve problems and achieve the needs of the nation/state or community. Some of the newer active citizenship education programs focus on current global issues and the critical analysis of government structures, systems, and policies that may be reproducing systemic inequalities. These programs seek to involve, empower, and encourage young citizens to challenge existing systems so that they become more inclusive, accessible and equitable in nature. These kinds of citizens cannot be produced without active involvement into what could get them to be involved in the economic, political and social matters. According to Changes (2011) active citizens should be able to recognize inequalities in cultures, structures and processes of governance and make changes so that equality is achieved. People need to be active and critical citizens for this to happen (Changes, 2011).

According to an article by Changes (2011), an independent consultancy firm, active citizenship should involve active learning for political subjects to be politically literate and empowered to address power relations and structures; citizens should be capable of making changes when necessary, in order to achieve social justice and social inclusion. In this construct active

citizenship requires more than knowing “how to participate in systems and structures” and understanding “the rules of the game” (Changes, 2011). Active citizenship as the Changes organization presents it, is about working to ensure effective delivery of public services through building a more engaged and active civil society. Active citizenship education in this regard, aims to identify current challenges and make necessary changes. It helps students develop the ability to think for themselves, adapt to the changes of the world, and get involved in the systems of governance to make appropriate contributions. It empowers students to collectively connect and establish collective goals.

Active citizenship, as presented in academic narratives, is one of the features that define democratic governance (Norris, 2011). It acknowledges that people have the right to create and recreate a democratic society if it is to be a democratic society. It recognizes the importance of the role of institutions in shaping the society to be a democratic one, the rights of the people to participate in democratic activities, and their responsibility to ensure equity in participation in such activities (State of Queensland Department of Education, 2004). Because of such values, an active citizenship education program would be appropriate for citizenship education, which in the current world, focuses mostly on supporting existing democratic structures (e.g., voting). Many traditional and contemporary theories and models have influenced citizenship education and the pursuits to improve youth’s participation in the engine of citizenship – this is the fundamental goal of active citizenship education research.

Summary

The literature review reinforces the aim and goal of my research study, which is to address the perceived gaps in Canadian civic and citizenship education and to explore how to refashion an

active citizenship education that is reflective, motivating and honoring of democratic ideas (e.g., equality). This research study seeks to explore the discourse of active citizenship and correspondingly active citizenship education, so as to explore new alternatives and new directions for active citizenship education. The research review indicates that scholars, politicians, educators, private corporations and society frequently disagree on what exactly civic and citizenship content should include and exclude. A long-standing disappointment with turnouts at the voting polls, have spurred many governments worldwide to develop educational programs that promote and spur active citizenship. Despite these ongoing investments to improve civic engagement and political literacy of youth, governments still feel that this research problem requires substantial time and attention. The purpose of this study is to (a) perform a critical analysis of a diverse range of documents (b) identify where we ought to be going with active citizenship education, and (c) and to make general recommendations for a revised version of active citizenship education in secondary social studies courses.

Chapter 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Critical discourse analysis is a way of understanding the meanings of the texts in order to determine areas of inequality, domination, and marginalization. Discourse can not only shape society, but it can also reproduce or recreate societies; it is often used to expose inequities, domination and outright oppressions. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an analytical methodology used in research. CDA is “a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 352).

Critical discourse analysis is used to explain, describe and interpret the relationships between language and the society (Rogers, 2004). CDA is always associated with empowerment although any CDA does not specifically aim at finding out the oppressed or the unfairly treated. Saint (2008) notes that an analysis does not focus on a specific group selected by the researcher out of pity or empathy; or a feeling that he/she should defend the group. CDA analysis instead, focuses on a location to criticize, or an incarnation of power. CDA reveals the manner in which dominant forces, try to achieve their interests by oppressing the weak or through versions of reality that favor their interests (Luke, 2008). When such information is revealed, people are made aware of the manners and this encourages them to transform their lives and resist the oppressive forces (McGregor, 2003). For the purpose of this study CDA will be used as a research methodology.

The Foundations of Critical Discourse Analysis

It is important to understand some of the history of CDA as it provides a premise for understanding why and how it can be used. The conception of CDA began during the late 1990s, at a time when society was experiencing social problems related to inequity in various areas, such as

education, labor, and socio-economic development (Luke, 1997). The unequal access to opportunities for personal and professional development was most felt by minority groups in developed countries and a majority of the populations in developing countries. The growing gap between the social classes prompted scholars to conduct research studies to determine the root cause of the problem and develop solutions in order to close the socio-economic gap and allow populations to gain equal access to health, education, and career opportunities. Many research studies conducted then were guided by the neoclassical approach of Tollefson (2006), which highlights the important role of language and language policies in solving various social problems through effective and directed communication. Moreover, the traditional research studies that were implemented, viewed language and communication as valuable factors in closing socio-economic and political gaps by fostering national unity, and consequently, economic development (Ricento, 2006).

Scholars reviewed traditional research studies and expanded the approach in order to integrate how theories and concepts in previous studies could be applied in practical situations. Moreover, the critical approach sought to understand real life events and situations that relate to social policies. Various research studies proved that some policies are ineffective in addressing social inequality because they support the interest of dominant social groups instead of allowing minority groups to gain equal access to opportunities. Theorists and researchers worked on developing critical theory, which was primarily based on Marxist theory. Studies that were guided by the critical theory sought to determine why and how social inequality occurs and identify solutions that could be implemented to diminish inequality. Critical theory was applied across disciplines, including the area of language-policy research. In the field of language development and policy research, critical theory provided a means for researchers to view the problem of

inequality as a result of social and cultural differences. For instance, research studies that were initially conducted within the context of critical theory, viewed gender and race as primary factors that lead to social inequalities and gaps. The studies were designed to look for ways to implement social justice and achieve high ethical and/or moral standards in practice (Ricento, 2006).

CDA within the context of ethics is thoroughly discussed by Jurgen Habermas. Habermas utilized Locke and Rousseau's social contract theory in order to establish morality as an important issue in CDA. Habermas integrated ethics to the critical theory in order to prove that the inability of individuals to communicate or participate in discourse freely affects the public sphere. According to Habermas (2003), all human beings should be granted equal opportunities to communicate their thoughts but if their freedom to communicate is limited, social problems and gaps ensue. The arguments by Habermas lead back to social inequity. To solve the problem, Habermas proposed that discourse should be fostered in society. Through discourse, "citizens can raise issues in the public sphere, assess the universality of the issue, and arrive at consensus regarding the proper public position" (Boje, 2008, p. 62). Based on the arguments by Habermas, balance and equality in society could be achieved if all people acquire the capacity to participate in discourse.

The Critical Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).

Ultimately, critical theory focuses on the goal of meeting ethical standards and implementing social justice. Therefore, critical theory, when applied to discourse studies, focuses on how discourse or language processes can be used to close social gaps and resolve social inequities through the guidance of morality. Van Dijk, one of the proponents of CDA said, "CDA is concerned with studying and analyzing written texts and spoken words to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias and how these sources are initiated, maintained

reproduced and transformed within specific social, economic, political, and historical contexts” (Van Dijk, as cited in McGregor, 2003, n.p.).

Prior to 1997 a series of research studies were conducted about CDA. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) contributed to this existing body of literature by proposing several underlying concepts of CDA: (1) CDA is interdisciplinary, (2) CDA is problem-oriented, (3) theories and methodologies are integrated to explore and understand the issues or themes in research, (4) ethnography and field work are common methods of investigation and data collection, (5) theories and empirical data are necessary in exploring the subject or theme of research, (6) studies involve multiple public spaces and the problems of research are from multiple areas or genres, (7) the historical underpinnings of the subject or theme of research are always explored, and (8) results of the study should be practicable in the real world and establish continuity by guiding future research.

CDA is based on the social theory of language, which states that discourse is an important element in socialization. Socialization is based on communicative and interactive practices in a network of individuals, and the goals and purpose of socializing are achieved through discourse. Moreover, discourse is used as an instrument in realizing the roles of external factors that influence social interaction, such as culture, politics, and socio-economic conditions, among others, in socialization (Blackledge, 2009). CDA acknowledges that language in discourse facilitates changes in social interaction, and therefore, is important in understanding social change and social organization. Fairclough and Wodak (1997), two proponents of CDA, claim, “Discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned. It is constitutive, in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the status quo, and in the sense that it may contribute to transforming it” (p. 258).

Paltridge's Four Principles of CDA.

Paltridge (2006) presents four principles of CDA: (1) “social and political issues” are reflected and constructed in discourse; (2) power relations are “negotiated and performed” through discourse; (3) “discourse both reflects and reproduces social relations”; and (4) “ideologies are produced and reflected in the use of discourse” (p. 178-184). A number of researchers apply these principles when using CDA methodology in their research (e.g., Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Paltridge, 2006; Van Dijk, 2001). According to the first principle, discourse constructs and reflects social and political issues, structures and boundaries. For example, a debate arose as to whether teachers should always use plain English language when teaching students whose primary language was not English, or to use the students’ native language on occasion to clarify or explain things (Paltridge, 2006). CDA was used to analyze the difficulties and struggles non-native speakers were having with classroom work. It was determined that students were having difficulty communicating their needs, frustrations, and queries in a classroom setting that reproduced language and power structures that already disadvantaged them (e.g., the teacher had the authority to dictate how they could convey their frustrations and in what language that could present their queries).

The idea that discourse negotiates power between or among individuals involved in the discursive process is the third principle that supports CDA. The idea that power is a means of control for dominant groups in societies supports this principle. Van Dijk (2001) discussed the concept of social power as a group or institution’s ability to control the actions and behaviors of other people through various discursive methods or tools, like using force or sharing knowledge and information, bribing or taking advantage of social status to provoke others, and other similar means. Therefore, the groups or individuals that can influence powerful tools of discourse like the media,

has the power to control a target audience. CDA acknowledges the power of groups and institutions to use discourse to control other people and suggest this does not relate to the primary purpose of language. Language was not meant to control, but to communicate, so the potential of discourse to influence other people depends on how individuals or institutions choose and/or utilize language (Wodak & Meyer, 2010). For this reason, research studies that utilize CDA often focus on minorities and how they are being influenced by the discourse that is controlled by one or more dominant groups; the analysis, generalizations and conclusions are primarily aimed at alleviating the hardships and difficulties of those who are in the minority (e.g., based on race, class, sexual orientation).

Furthermore, Paltridge (2006) emphasized that individuals who can openly communicate are the ones who are in power during discourse. Therefore, in social situations where the population is comprised of dominant and minority groups, power is wielded, by those who are privileged with opportunities to communicate and share their ideas. The principle could be explicated by the relationship between the government and the public. If for one instance, the government implements a policy that benefits dominant groups like large corporations and the upper classes, it creates an imbalance of power in society where minority groups are neglected. However, discourse could serve as a means of negotiating power when minority groups are provided with the opportunity to dispute those policies by stating reasons for injustice or inequities. Minority groups could retaliate by staging a protest or demonstration, or participating in a forum. In handling situations like this, it is important for those individuals or groups who are controlled by dominant groups and institutions to look for various opportunities for discourse.

Discourse also reflects and reproduces social relationships and interactions. The third principle of CDA endorses the idea that discourse not only reflects social relations, but also

reproduces and reconstructs it. The reproduction and reconstruction of social relations are consequently attributed to the fourth principle, which is the reproduction of ideologies. When people discuss ideologies during discourse, the exchange in ideas and the subjective analysis and interpretation of ideologies influence how other people think, and the level of change influenced by the movement of thought or ideas dictates the direction and reflection of social interaction. CDA “uses language as a means of understanding the ideology, and hence social and political relations, while the study of language ideologies turns this relationship in on itself by asking how ideologies that are *about* language, and not merely expressed in language, may themselves carry ideas about the social distribution of power” (Bocholt, 2003, p. 59).

CDA: Cornerstone Aims and Principals.

CDA is primarily used in sociological and anthropological research studies. According to Van Disk, CDA is commonly used as a research methodology in gender inequality related studies and media studies. CDA plays an important role in understanding gender issues because these are primarily rooted on inequality between men and women. As a result, primary arguments about feminist issues within the context of discourse emphasize that gender inequality exists because men are dominant. CDA includes a number of different approaches some of which are: discourse historical method, French discourse analysis and socio cognitive studies. All these approaches according to Rogers (2004) can be used in education research. The variety of CDA approaches share common aims and principles. According to van Disk (1993, 1995) the aims and principles of CDA generally are the following:

A) Aims of CDA

- i. To help uncover the social problems due to power relationships and beliefs

- ii. To help people understand the real meanings of the texts so that they appreciate their exercising of power or resist it.
- iii. Explains the role of relationships between the processes, relations and structures of the society, and events, texts and discursive practices in securing domination and power
- iv. It aims at encouraging people to take corrective actions after disclosure of any power imbalances and inequalities or non democratic practices

B) Principles of CDA

- i. It addresses social problems
- ii. Society and culture are historical
- iii. It deals with discursive power relations
- iv. Discourse represents culture and society
- v. It is a socially devoted scientific model
- vi. It uses the socio cognitive approach to understand the mediation between texts and the society
- vii. It is an interpretive and explanatory methodology

These principles have to be used when using CDA as a research methodology (Rogers, 2003). Van Disk (1993) notes that by focusing on inequalities and dominance, the methodology does not focus on a specific model, discourse theory, discipline or school as the primary aim like in other approaches, instead, it focuses on the social issues that are important. It aims at understanding the social problems through analysis.

CDA is multidisciplinary and does not distinguish between theory, application and description because of the complex nature of social problems being studied. In this methodology,

such distinction has reduced relevance. Complex relationships between discourse and dominance are analyzed using complex theories that explain relationships and so, it does involve theoretical issues. The aim of critical discourse analysis is to bring about change through critical understanding and because of this critical discourse analysts take sociopolitical stands. It means that they make their perspectives, point of view, and aims and principles, explicit and clear in the society and in their disciplines. The methodology targets the leaders of power that legalize, ratify, maintain and overlook social inequality and justice. The results show serious problems that people face and how such issues can threaten their daily lives.

Critical discourse analysis also results in more than just disclosure of serious social problems of the day. It analyzes even the long term and indirect causes of such problems, the conditions of such issues and even their impacts. The main focus is on the role of discourse in contributing to the problems of the society and replication of inequality and dominance (Van Dijk, 1993, 1995). The aims and principles of CDA are also very important for research studies. They scrutinize empirical research procedures, theory formation and analytical methods, which in turn guide the choice of topics of study and relevancies. In this case, the study is about citizenship education. If some citizens still suffer discrimination, racism, prejudice or any form of action that portrays inequality, such actions will be classified as according to the actions, for example, racism-racist. A critical analyst will make clear his or her point of view (the action being racist) irrespective of denial by the action performer (State of Queensland Department of Education, 2004).

Using CDA to Explore Active Citizenship Education.

In order to understand why CDA is suitable for studying active citizenship education, it is important to understand what studying active citizenship education requires or the characteristics of

the education programs, and what CDA offers. Although scholars have different perspectives on what should be included in the curriculum of citizenship education, there are however, common features to citizenship education and according to McKenzie (1993) these are:

- Acquiring knowledge of the nation/state's history, social studies and geography
- Education on social values and attitudes
- Developing participatory skills (necessary social attitudes and literacy)
- Understanding of one's identity in the nation and the relationship between nations in the world

The aim of the education programs (e.g. curriculum and emphasis of the teacher) is also another factor to be considered. As explained earlier, different education programs (e.g., social studies curriculum and pedagogy) are adopted depending on such things as the learning outcomes, achievement indicators, and assessment criteria. Some curricula focus on, or prioritize, specific information about citizenship (e.g., citizenship as status, identity, as agency and/or virtues and values)). Other curricula focus on, or prioritize, creating responsible, justice oriented and/or participatory citizens. Studying active citizenship education therefore, depends on the aims of the researcher. In the second above scenario, the assumption is that, the researcher aims at studying active citizenship education. The main focus here is the process, priorities and programs of education. So the question is; what is in this type of education that CDA will answer?

One common citizenship education feature is to make citizens of a nation know their history, philosophy and literature. It builds the confidence of the people in the nation as one of the equal players of the world economy. Studying a nation's history and social values plays a major role in developing individual judgment. It helps the students understand a lot about society, culture and the individuals living in a society. According to McKenzie (1993), students develop shared

humanity, understand different stereotypes, understand the complexity of the nation's historical cause, develop respect for distinctiveness, develop an understanding of speculation and fact and are able to tell the difference, and develop the ability to distinguish between false analogy and real answers. Critical discourse analysis of this nature (e.g., students knowing their history, philosophy and literature) can show if the aims of these learning features have been accomplished or not, if there are inequalities in the material being presented or how they are presented, and whether the impact of acquiring knowledge on the nation's history, social values and geography, helps develop a sense of citizenship.

Another common feature of citizenship education is to educate students about social values and attitudes (e.g., civic attitudes). In this framework education aims to teach morality and instill the value of searching for a common good. It aims at instilling values, encouraging cooperation, development of mutual respect and understanding others. With these achieved in a society, it is expected that the structure will thus be democratic (McKenzie, 1993). Narrow positions on active citizenship primarily being about building moral character are contested. Active citizenship in the larger context provides space for critical critique, challenging the system and character development.

McKenzie (1993) identifies a fourth feature of citizenship education. Literacy can promote development in a country and also encourages participation, which is the main aspect of active citizenship. Literacy can in many cases enhance active citizenship and further enable citizenship participation. To achieve democracy, citizens have to participate in decision making about the society, politics, economic issues as well as important issues about governance. Literacy, and especially civic literacy, can empower people socially and psychologically, and increases the capacity of participation. Citizenship research, in the area of developing participatory skills, would

focus on such things as why literacy is encouraged, what it has achieved, its effects and how it shapes the society. Active citizenship shapes the society according to the actions taken by active citizens (McKenzie, 1993). CDA will give the direction taken by active citizenship education focusing on literacy alone. It will show how literacy has changed the systems of governance, structure, the role of the citizens and so many more issues on social problems depending on the aim of the researcher.

By acquiring a diverse range of interdisciplinary materials related to citizenship education (e.g., multiple texts) and analyzing discourses that may expose exclusions to the discourse (e.g., CDA of more than existing citizenship discourse), new elements and features that ought to, could, or should be included in citizenship education may be discovered. For example, education on respect for the environment and responsibility towards it is considered a value of good citizenship, as well as respect for one's country and the world as a whole. The citizen should be well informed on issues concerning the environment so that he/she can make moral decisions concerning environmental preservation and respect (McKenzie, 1993). An understanding of one's identity and the relationship between nations in the world is another common feature of citizenship education. McKenzie's five features of citizenship reveal that there are multiple dimensions of active citizenship; the gathering of multiple texts will facilitate the compilation of these multiple dimensions.

Every aspect of active citizenship education involves discourse. It is the discourses that form center stage in citizenship education. As indicated above, active citizenship education is a suitable framework for citizenship education and so discourses still form the major source of active citizenship education. In Corson and Davie (1997) it is indicated that active citizenship requires participation in decision making, which cannot be done without debate, persuasion, discussion and

negotiation. All these form the oral strategies of active citizenship. Discourse is a way of expressing oneself by use of words, and participation requires discourse. Any studies involving active citizenship education requires an approach that analyses the main aspect of the subject.

Active citizenship also implies that participants need critical understanding of the consequences of their actions, arguments and inferences when promoting and challenging the systems, social values and power relations that they think are inappropriate for the wellbeing of others and them. Active citizenship obviously, has to involve approaches that help the students or people understand such actions. These actions are expressed through discourse and it is discourse analysis that can give answers to questions raised by researchers, on various areas of research, involving active citizenship education (Corson & Davie, 1997).

Discourse analysis helps in the understanding of how language shapes the concept of citizenship, which also influences the citizenship education. This might be the major role that this methodology (Critical Discourse Analysis) can play in helping understand issues of active citizenship education. As discussed above, citizenship education is influenced by the perceptions that educators, policy makers and scholars have about what citizenship is. It is also influenced by different perceptions about what a good citizen should be, which moulds what curriculum is developed to produce such citizens. CDA can reveal the underlying motives, narratives and beliefs that influence or could influence the direction active citizenship education has taken, is taking, or will take. It can provide insights into what type of citizen programs aim to develop.

According to Westheimer and Kahne (2004) there are three types of citizens: the justice oriented, personally responsible citizen and the participatory citizen. Ultimately, there are multiple perspectives on what the ideal citizen, citizenship and citizenship education consists of. Critical

discourse analysis can be used to identify these perspectives and to determine where inequalities in citizenship education exist. Critical discourse analysis being a suitable approach/methodology, means deep meanings to such perceptions can be exposed providing researchers with research gaps, areas that are misrepresented, inequalities and inappropriate dominance. Again as indicated earlier, such disclosures encourage active citizens to participate in shaping a democratic society.

Nabavi (2010) indicates that in Canada, more immigrants are being accepted in the country and this means that they undergo a shift in their citizenship and their sense of belonging. This also leads to a change in the demographics of the nation as well as students, which in turn should in term be taken into consideration in regards to citizenship education policy and teaching pedagogy. Curriculum developers, policy makers, and educational theorists need to ensure that those involved in citizenship education development act in response to the economic, political and social economic realities of the time (Nabavi, 2010). Studying such changes and the texts that report, represent and respond to these changes requires a critical framework and an awareness of how discourse is shaped and shapes policy. CDA provides a means to analyze existing policy, curriculum and citizenship education discourse; socio-economic changes that currently impact the nature of citizenship; and where active citizenship education ought to go next. It provides a means to evaluate text that not only explores active citizenship education but also the larger universe of citizenship which includes such things as universal rights (e.g., Convention on the Rights of the Child), transnational agreements (NAFTA) and state structures (e.g., youth representation in parliament).

CDA: Summary

CDA is a viable method of studying active citizenship education. Active citizenship education is meant to help students think on their own and to find solutions to challenges in the

current world. CDA addresses social problems and deals with discursive power. It means that there is critical understanding of how power is created and active citizenship education involves that as well. Discourse represents the society and culture. It is used to understand society and culture, and these two features are the main ones in understanding social problems. In CDA, discourse is historical, it means the trend taken by culture and society is analyzed. This methodology provides a wide range of approaches to studying active citizenship education.

Critical discourse analysis also allows detection of strategies and actions that shape the wider perception of citizenship educators. It allows connection of local communication characteristics studied, to social characteristics. It helps in understanding power movement from one level to another, hence understanding the deeper meaning of such actions (collaboration and interaction of power between different levels) (Saint, 2008). Because of a wide variety of research material that the methodology has, CDA is suitable for active citizenship education studies which involve different perspectives, content and direction perspectives of research depending on the aim of the study (Saint, 2008). Given the multiple state uprisings (e.g., Middle East), student protests (e.g., Montreal), and ‘occupy’ movements in North America notions of citizenship versus entitlement, and other discourses, will make this study interesting, relevant and significant (e.g., critical discourse analysis).

Chapter 4: RESEARCH METHOD

Documents that may be used for systematic evaluation as part of a study take a variety of forms. They include advertisements; agendas; attendance registers; and minutes of meetings; manuals; background papers; books and brochures; diaries and journals; event programs (i.e., printed outlines); letters and memoranda; maps and charts; newspapers (clippings/articles); press releases; program proposals; application forms, and summaries; radio and television scripts; organizational or institutional reports; survey data; and various public records. (Bowen, 2009, p. 27)

A document is “a written text” (Ahmed, 2010, p. 2). According to Scott (1990), documents “must be studied as socially situated products” (p. 34). Documentary research is “a reflexive process in which we confront” (Ahmed, 2010, p. 2) what Coles (1997) refers to as the “moral underpinnings of social inquiry” (p. 6). Documentary research method is used “in multiple fields such as business, anthropology, communications, economics, education, medicine, political science, social work, and sociology” (Ahmed, 2010, p. 1). Karl Marx made extensive use of documentary method in his research (Mogalakwe, 2006). The documentary method is fitting for a study of active citizenship education as there are a number of documents (e.g., curricula, policy, teaching resources, interdisciplinary studies and government initiatives) that can provide textual research evidence.

Mogalakwe (2006) states:

A document is an artifact which has as its central feature an inscribed text (Scott 1990). Simply put, a document is a written text. Documents are produced by individuals and groups in the course of their everyday practices and are geared exclusively for their own

immediate practical needs (Scott op cit). They have been written with a purpose and are based on particular assumptions and presented in a certain way or style and to this extent, the researcher must be fully aware of the origins, purpose and the original audience of the documents (Grix 2001) ... Documents range from public through private to personal documents. The list of public documents include government publications such as Acts of Parliament, policy statements, census reports, statistical bulletins, reports of commissions of inquiry, ministerial or departmental annual reports, consultancy reports, etc. Private documents often emanate from civil society organizations such as private sector business, trade unions and non-governmental organizations, as well of course from private individuals. (pp. 222-223)

Documentary method has a long but overlooked history in the social sciences. “The documentary research method is used in investigating and categorizing physical sources, most commonly written documents, whether in the private or public domain” and it is “just as good as and sometimes even more cost effective than the social surveys, in-depth interview or participant observation” (Ahmed, 2010, p. 2).

Documents can be an excellent representation of ideas, purpose and intent; they can reveal conflicts, tensions and oversights. Mogalakwe (2006) states,

Whilst the use of documentary sources may not be very popular in mainstream social research, documentary research is not new, having been extensively used by such classical social theorists as Karl Marx and Emile Durkheim. Marx made extensive use of documentary sources and other official reports such as Her Majesty Inspectors of Factories Reports made between 1841 and 1867 (that is spanning over 26 years!), reports by the

Medical Officer of the Privy Council, Royal Commission and Inland Revenue Reports, reports on the employment of children in factories, the Banking Acts, the Corn Laws, Hansard, and Census Reports for England and Wales... Marx also used newspapers and periodicals such as *The Times*, *Economist*, *New York Daily Tribune* etc., (Harvey 1990). For his part, Durkheim, who is credited as one of the founding fathers of the discipline of sociology, relied on official statistics in his study of suicide. Durkheim made extensive use of statistical information on suicide waves in a number of European countries, looking amongst other things at suicide rates by religious affiliation, race, age group, gender, marital status, class and economic position and occupation (Simpson 1952). (p. 224)

Documents are an excellent representation of ideas, purpose and intent; they can reveal conflicts, tensions and oversights. They have the unique ability of being able to present phenomena in past, present and potential future contexts. The use of documentary sources is fitting to a research design that seeks to explore active citizenship education as it has presented itself in the past, present and ought to present itself in the future. As Marshall and Rossman (2006) indicate, we conduct research to “adequately capture the complexity of the problem we are examining” (p. 48).

The documentary method is regaining attention in the research world and its use is expanding in more disciplines such as logistics, marketing, and intercultural studies (Anderson, 2010). “The documentary research method is used in investigating and categorizing physical sources, most commonly written documents, whether in the private or public domain (Payne and Payne 2004)” and it is “just as good as and sometimes even more cost effective than the social surveys, in-depth interview or participant observation” (Ahmed, 2010, p. 2). The umbrella categories I have used in my active citizenship education document sorting are a) where we have been, b) where are we now, c) and where ought we to be going. In the quest to answer my “where”

questions I selected a method and methodology which, like any scientific enquiry, demands “systematic, critical and self-critical enquiry, which aims to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and wisdom” (Ahmed, 2010, p. 2).

In my research study, documents were first selected based on five primary sets of terms: citizen, citizenship and citizenship education, active citizenship and active citizenship education. A secondary set of terms was then used to intersect with the primary findings: youth, democracy and political engagement. Finally, a third set of terms was used to interconnect with either the primary or secondary citizenship-related terms: history, globalization and social media. Over three hundred and seventy five documents were initially collected. Based on their relevance to the research topic and questions, excerpts were selected and placed in my research findings. My collection intentionally includes curriculum, policy and research materials representing various geographic regions (e.g., British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec), states (e.g., Canada, United States, and the United Kingdom) and international hubs (e.g., European Union, Latin America, UNESCO).

As there have been numerous state, international and supra-national studies (e.g. EU) on citizenship education I thought it would be very beneficial to revisit these studies along with policy documents, curricula, government documents, recommended learning resources, and interdisciplinary items. According to Toots, De Groof & Kavadias (2012):

The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) conducted its first study of civic education covering 10 countries in 1971. However, cross national education studies flourished only in turn of the Millennium when the number of studies and countries involved increased remarkably. The last IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) in 2009 had already 38 participating countries, among them 12 non-European countries and 16 emerging democracies. (p. 3)

Accumulating intersecting details on civic education (e.g., community engagement, knowledge, political participation) in an IEA study (e.g., where demographic documents are used) is comparable to the studies by Durkheim (e.g., suicide studies) whereby multiple indicators such as: “religious affiliation, race, age group, gender, marital status, class and economic position and occupation” were collected (Mogalakwe, 2006, p. 224). In Durkheim’s study the information was used to provide a very comprehensive study of. As Mogalakwe (2006) notes, “original research can be done using old data” (p. 228), but such research requires that the researcher ensure documents are credible and authentic (e.g., official reports). Academic studies (e.g., documents) on suicide, along with other interdisciplinary studies, helped shape Durkheim’s research.

Policy research is often dependent on the use of formal text (e.g., reports, legal materials, and government reports) and less formal textual materials (e.g., newspapers). Bryant (2004) conducted a study of the 1985 Tenant Protection Act in Ontario to discover that,

[T]he political ideology of the government played a significant role in determining the influence of opponents to legislation. The research concludes that while the neo-liberal political ideology of the government did not consistently influence policy making in all areas, housing policy was particularly sensitive to political ideology. While the views of tenants did not influence the Conservative government, they did influence the policies of the Opposition parties that called for the restoration of social housing and rent control. On 2 October 2003, an Opposition party supporting these positions was elected in the Ontario general election. (p. 635)

Bryant’s (2004) case study examined the Tenant Protection Act, official briefs prepared by housing advocates, and interviews of the seven tenant activists who submitted briefs, to understand “how

tenant advocates in Toronto used knowledge and other strategies to influence the legislation” to determine that “housing policy was particularly sensitive to political ideology” and that tenant action (e.g., briefs) “did influence the policies of the Opposition parties that called for the restoration of social housing and rent control” (p. 635). A bricolage of documents facilitated Bryant’s study.

Policy documents along with other interrelated documents can be used to capture insights into how citizens of modern civil society can and do shape socio-political, environmental, economic, and cultural landscapes. Gunzenhauser and Hyde (2007) explored and analyzed the value of public school accountability:

[T]hree recent edited collections that address the potential value of public school accountability policy [are]: Kenneth Sirotnik’s *Holding Accountability Accountable: What Ought to Matter in Public Education*; Martin Carnoy, Richard Elmore, and Leslie Santee Siskin’s *The New Accountability: High Schools and High-Stakes Testing*; and Linda Skrla and James Scheurich’s *Educational Equity and Accountability: Paradigm, Policies, and Politics*. Taken together, the texts provide a snapshot of current scholarly discourse about the phenomenon of accountability policy and provide educators with conceptual tools for analyzing and responding to accountability pressures. (p. 489)

Gunzenhauser and Hyde (2007) piece together bits and pieces of these various works to put into question “whether and to what extent the push for greater and higher stakes accountability for public education is what is needed” (p. 507). They offer various textual items to support their claim and offer alternatives to the accountability agenda (e.g., building capacity).

Documentary method is being used in intercultural studies of youth (Bohnsack, Pfaff, and Weller, 2010) and it should be very suitable to a research study that is exploring how to improve youth's civic engagement via improved active citizenship education. According to Pfaff, Bohnsack and Weller (2010) documentary method is being used in inter-cultural contexts, "(e)specially in the field of youth research studies investigating young people's experience and orientations guiding action in different cultural and socio-economic settings" (p. 25). As well, "Another field where cross-cultural studies have been carried out using documentary method, are investigations of educational institutions and careers" especially as they relate to "underprivileged young people in Germany and Sao Paulo" (Bohnsack, Pfaff, and Weller, 2010, p. 25). Documents can expose discriminatory narratives, policies, and structures that exist in institutional arrangements.

With documentary method, diverse texts are collected to establish a textual base for analysis. Texts shape our understandings and our understandings are shaped by text (e.g., Bourdieu, 1991; Fairclough, 1992; Mogalakwe, 2006). According to Maw (1993):

All curriculum texts develop from, and contribute to, a particular discourse or set of discourses. It has been clear for some time that those engaged in understanding and analysis of various forms of curriculum documentation, from policy statements to classroom materials, can productively employ methods of discourse analysis. (p. 57)

Text can be used to explore active citizenship policy and curriculum for youth, as well as those socio-political, technological and cultural elements that may be affecting youth's engagement in public life (e.g., massive unemployment rates in some of the European states). In my research findings I present, in a systematic and orderly fashion, a number of unadulterated citizenship -

related text in order to provide a comprehensive picture of ACE in the past, present and potentially in the future.

Documentary research seeks to locate and analyze texts and two possible ways to analyze and critique such text are critical discourse analysis which seeks to deconstruct passages to identify discourses of power (e.g., oppression) and stakeholder intents (e.g., narrative frames). Maw (1993) notes when examining Britain's National Curriculum Council (NCC) documents,

[T]he ambiguities and contradictions in NCC texts cannot be examined solely by an analysis of the discursive strategies within the texts themselves. They require recognition of the political nexus in which the institutional site of the texts' production is located, and the powerful counterbalance of constraints and requirements within which their production has to be negotiated. Therefore after some initial clarification of the assumptions about the relationship between text, author and context which underlie the substantive analysis, much of the paper will be devoted to examining, firstly, the political complexities of the institutional site (the National Curriculum Council) within which text on 'the whole curriculum' have been produced, and secondly, the re-emergence of a discourse of the whole curriculum as embodied in a variety of texts. (p. 57)

Fairclough (1992) states, "The meanings of words is the medium through which we may explore the meaning of others. The meaning of words and the wording of meanings are matters which are socially variable and socially contested and the facets of wider social and cultural processes" (p. 185), while Bourdieu (1991) notes that language, like written tests, is an instrument of power.

Yanow (1993) states that "explicit critique" is important as "meaning is not universal or determinant; it depends on context and on the perception and interpretation of the participant"

(p.47); Laswell (1971) notes that such critique helps enable us to “remove the ideological blinders from our eyes” (p. 220); while Callahan and Jennings (1983) remind us that human beings “are purposive agents who inhabit symbolically constituted cultural orders, who engage in rule-governed social practices, and whose self-identities are formed in those orders and through these practices (p. 148). Active citizenship curriculum, policy, and learning resources are derived from negotiated intents (e.g., Ministries of education, government initiatives, and input from civil society) and may or may not bring in interdisciplinary knowledge (e.g., globalization, sustainability, and peace initiatives) to policy and curriculum decision-making tables. As Taylor (1997) states, “There seems to be general agreement among most policy researchers that there is a need to take account of both ‘micro’ and ‘macro’ levels, and that critical work needs to place educational policy making within its broader economic, social and historical context (p. 32).

I will bring multiple and differing narratives to my research, meaningfully piece them together, and hopefully glean new insights as to where citizenship education ought to go. Bonnet (2012) used documentary method to explore Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) which is of high interest to the European Union Commission as it is seen as a means to facilitate European integration. The study explored previous quantitative and qualitative studies, which provide macro and micro perspectives on CLIL (e.g., theoretical ideas and educational practice), to bridge the gap between the two and create new knowledge (Bonnet, 2012). Bonnet (2012) states,

[T]he documentary method can indeed be seen as a hub for integrating a functional-pragmatic and a reflexive-emancipatory approach to competence, because it provides two points of convergence. First, the idea of the frame of orientation is similar to the reflexive-emancipatory concept of competence in that it is also located on a deep structural level and as it includes ideas, beliefs, procedures, etc. that guide individuals’ actions. Second, in the

same way as competence, this structure is brought about by social practice in conjunctive spaces of experience... This is very relevant to CLIL, because recent articles (e.g. Breidbach, 2007; Hallet, 2004; Marsh, 2009) have argued that these approaches still wait to be included in empirical research on CLIL. (p. 73)

Document research is well suited to a study aimed at exploring the complexities of active citizenship education and how we ought to proceed with it in the future. Extensive research has been conducted on this topic in an attempt to improve ACE and increase youth's engagement in political affairs. Exploring existing research on the topic, policy, curriculum and other types of documents will provide useful insights.

According to Sarantakos (2012), "Documentary methods are the methods that help gather data without direct participation of the respondents. They are also called unobtrusive methods or indirect methods (n.p.). For example, Kjellin and Stier (2008) used documentary method (e.g., official documents, guide documents for teachers, and school documents) to complete a comparative study of citizenship education of five European countries. Kjellin and Stier (2008) were primarily looking to see if "values and attitudes" were congruently included in official, teacher, and student documents and/or learning (p. 42). Peterat (1989) used documentary method to determine home economics curriculum guides included global concepts. Merriam (1988) states, "Documents of all types can help the researcher uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the research problem" (p.118). There are a number of reports, curricula, and learning resources on citizenship education that I can peruse and/or analyze to explore my research questions. Given the changing nature, dimensions, and understandings of citizenship due to globalization (e.g., Appadurai, 1996; Habermas, 1987; Held, 1996; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt & Perraton, 1999; Hurrell & Woods, 1999; McCarthy et.al, 2004) and the great

concern for an alleged disengagement of youth in citizenship despite extensive research, educational programs, and learning resources (e.g., Nabavi, 2010; Sears, 1996; Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999), an exploration of a very diverse range of inter-disciplinary materials will be beneficial to an inquiry on contemporary citizenship education.

In this study I aim to gather a robust and comprehensive selection of documents so that I may glean new insights and ways of conceptualizing, problematizing, and critiquing active citizenship education so that it can be improved. Boundless (2013) states that documentary method can include “primary sources” or “secondary sources, that cite, comment, or build upon primary sources” (n.p.). The documentary method can help me identify concrete examples of how citizenship education plays out in curricula, learning resources, formal reports, educational policy, and government initiatives. Such items can serve as primary source documents. “The documentary method yields data – excerpts, quotations, or entire passages – that are then organized into major themes, categories, and case examples” (p. 2). As Merriam (1988) states, “Documents of all types can help the researcher uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the research problem” (p. 118).

My study of active citizenship education includes a collection of excerpts from textbooks, curriculum outlines, policy, learning resources and teacher guides designed for citizenship education in secondary schools. As well, I will be looking at citizenship education reports, flyers, and resource materials released by federal governments, the United Nations and the European Union. I will be collecting a number of documents that relate directly or indirectly, to the topic of active citizenship education. These resources will provide an opportunity to showcase a textual discourse base for understanding how active citizenship and active citizenship education are constructed in diverse fields of theory, practice and legislation, but they will also provide an overall

depiction of the citizen, citizenship and citizenship education over time and within a broad interdisciplinary space. Documentary method will help me establish a comprehensive collection of text so that I can accurately problematize, critically critique, and make recommendations for reconstructing active citizenship education programs for youth.

Chapter 5: RESEARCH FINDINGS

To present my research findings I have constructed a metaphorical journey, a broad sampling of documents with short accompanying explanations, a logistical ordering of my findings, and a series of unadulterated short or long discourses (e.g., quotations) that provide evidence of my findings. The metaphor I will use is to think of active citizenship education is to think of active citizenship as a cosmos of interrelated stars, planets, black holes, supernovas and worm holes that interconnect and influence one another in differing ways. According to the American Heritage Science Dictionary (2010) the universe is “The totality of matter, energy, and space, including the Solar System, the galaxies, and the contents of the space between the galaxies. Current theories of cosmology suggest that the universe is constantly expanding” (n.p.).

In the first section of my research findings I present documentary samples of citizen, citizenship and active citizenship education discourse dating from Ancient Greece up to and including the American Civil Rights movement. Such discourse travels through the universe in a timeless and endless manner –having an impact on past and future. The second section of my findings, are presented as a journey through the cosmos as I explore the factors, dimensions and intersections that citizenship has with the activities of larger society. I present the findings of some of these intersectional elements (e.g., globalization, neoliberalism, power, contested notions of active citizenship and active citizenship education, skepticism of political institutions and representatives).

Before I introduce the logistics of how I sequentially organized my research findings I want to refer to the quotation below, as it reminds us of the topic I am exploring, its intricacies, and the need to carefully, respectfully and ethically explore this very important topic. I don't deem that this quotation is necessarily accurate in all that it claims, but rather, I present it because it requires us to

give great consideration to the topic at hand and the need to critically examine it, and the discourse that represents it, very carefully.

Care-less citizenship denies or ignores the false universalism embedded in liberal democracies, and so fails to be aware of and thus understand the deep inequities that exist in the world. It divests individuals of their accountability to the physical and social world, and it does not require any interrogation of privilege or power. Care-full, on the other hand, is marked by a deep sense that individual and group actions may have profound sociopolitical effects and that we must take care to understand as best we can how differences shape the degree to which we are able to engage as citizens in the world. We must also come to recognize our own privileges (or lack of privilege), grappling with the degree to which over privileges inform our own experiences of citizenship. In turn, this understanding has the potential to create spaces for the subversion of dominant forms of meaning. Care-full citizenship also entails a certain degree of attentiveness, a level of caring for self and others, for the world that may evoke a need to act in ways that ameliorate the conditions of oppression. In this respect, care-full citizenship is in and of itself an action, a way of being. (Tupper, 2007, p. 260)

In the research findings of my dissertation I sought to coherently present the discourses and socio-political forums that have contributed to what has come to be known as, active citizenship education. In essence, in my research analysis I scan some historical milestones of citizenship and citizenship education, to capture the various notions of these concepts that have emerged over time, and to identify some of the underpinnings, tensions and contradictions that have surfaced. I present my discourse findings as unadulterated as possible, thus providing numerous quotations with

minimal discussion. The analytical component of my study is saved for the research analysis section of my dissertation.

The discoveries I make will illuminate the organic nature of citizenship education and how various constructions of the concept and practice have hermeneutically emerged out of discursive circles, re-emerged, and how they have or could be used, to expose and identify the gaps, oversights and exclusions in contemporary active citizenship education. As indicated in my introduction I will be using critical discourse analysis to analyze my findings in the research analysis section. It is important to reiterate that I am approaching my research inquiry from a rational idealist position, which infers that I am rationally and optimistically seeking an in-depth understanding of active citizenship education so that through my research I can motivate and illicit change. I utilize an interdisciplinary research strategy that relies on the research of historians to glean insights into the early philosophical and pragmatic making of a citizen, citizenship and citizenship education. As I proceed with my research I will more directly cull my evidence from primary documents and amass interdisciplinary knowledge claims (e.g., globalization, universal human rights instruments and sustainability dilemmas) that relate to the status of contemporary citizenship and ways to move forward.

Coming from a social justice oriented paradigm that values equality, the role of universal human rights instruments, and environmental, social, cultural and economic sustainability, I seek not only a “care-full” construction of citizenship that “seeks to ameliorate the conditions of oppression” (Tupper, 2007, p. 260), but I also seek to inform, motivate and recommend the development of educational policy, curricula, pedagogy and learning resources that will promote active citizenship as a way of being in the world, seeing the world and creatively imagining and shaping the world. Active citizenship education in this regard seeks a moral and ethical ontology,

transformative praxis and a critical rationality that acknowledges and confronts oppressive structures. Examining citizenship education constructions of the past enables me to reflect “in a systematic way on commonalities and differences between antiquity and modernity so that modern societies can extract useful lessons from the past” (Palaiologou, 2011, p. 263) and improve citizenship education in the future.

ACE: Where We Have Come From

Citizenship and Citizenship Education in Ancient Greece

To understand some of the early roots of citizenship education I am going to refer back to Ancient Greece and what Kreis (2009a) refers to as the “Athenian Origins of Direct Democracy” (n.p.). I will begin my discussion with a brief discussion of the polis, or city-states, which were “small, independent communities which were male-dominated and bound together by race” (Xiuguo and Zhang, 2005, p. 10). Race, is a socially constructed concept, as opposed to a scientific phenomenon (Gardenfors, Wolenski and Placek, 2003), was not the only criteria used to exclude populations. Women, children and peasants were excluded from full citizenship and citizenship education activities. As well, slaves and foreign residents were not considered to be citizens of the Polis and they had no citizen rights as such. During the city-state period, the polis comprised not only the capital city or town (polis), but also its adjacent territory. The polis was configured to include rural groups so they could participate in state affairs – the level of participation actually extended to the rural areas is not clear. All members of the territory, both those who lived in the capital and those who lived in the countryside, were called politai (members of the polis) as if they were all living in the polis (city)” (Pomeroy, Burstein, Donlan and Tolbert, 1999, p. 84).

To the people of Greece the polis was much less about a geographical territory and far more about a sphere of influence, power and control, which included a collective of multiple sub-spheres of power and a sense of unity. According to the Encyclopedia Britanica (as cited in Palaiologou, 2011),

Many 'polis' citizens lived in the suburbs or in the countryside. Greeks did not regard the polis as a territorial grouping. *Polis* was more a religious and political association with great power. Since polis controlled territory and colonies beyond the city itself, it could not simply consist of a geographical area. *Each city was characterised by its multicultural mosaic within it: it was composed of several tribes or phylai, which were in turn composed of phatries and gentes. Foreigners who were residents of the city (called: Metics) as well as slaves (called: douloi) were not part of this organization.* (p. 267)

There was a hierarchy of unequal privilege even amongst the citizens of the state. Citizenship rights, or lack thereof, were tiered according to socio-economic standing, bloodlines, and ascribed levels of participation. According to Pomeroy et al. (1999), "In general, three groups of inhabitants lived in a polis: (1) the highest in the social hierarchy included citizens with political rights; (2) citizens without political rights and (3) non-citizens" (p. 267). The disenfranchisement, marginalization and/or exclusions of certain Greek populations impacted citizens, educational systems and citizenship education during this time period (Palaiologou, 2011).

The Greek Philosophers

Three prominent philosophers who interpreted, influenced and intervened on citizenship-related issues in Ancient Greece were Aristotle, Socrates and Plato. According to Kreis (2009a):

When the philosopher Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) came to discuss the origins of the polis in his book *POLITICS* in the early 4th century B.C. he suggested that "it is necessary for the citizens to be of such a number that they knew each other's personal qualities and thus can elect their officials and judge their fellows in a court of law sensibly." Before Aristotle, Plato fixed the number of citizens in an ideal state at 5040 adult males. For Plato (c.427-c.347 B.C.), as it was for Aristotle, the one true criteria of the size of the polis was that all the citizens know one another. The issue at stake here is between public and private worlds. The ancient Greeks did not really see two distinct worlds in the lives of the citizenry. Instead, the public world was to be joined with the private world. (n.p.)

A sense of belonging, community and public discourse was integral to the structuring of "direct democracy" (Kries, 2009b, n.p) and citizenship, in the early phases of Ancient Greek governance. Unfortunately, equality was not afforded as much consideration. For example, foreign residents were referred to as Metics while slaves were referred to as *doubloi* in Ancient Greece. Both the discourse and structures of citizenship reveal their diminished status.

In his book, *Politics III*, Aristotle wrote about his political theory of constitutions, whereby the city-state is by nature a collective entity composed of a multitude of citizens, and is somewhat defined by the resident aliens and slaves it excludes; "the citizen as a person who has the right (*exousia*) to participate in deliberative or judicial office" (Miller, 2012, n.p.). The bedrock of democracy in Ancient Greece was based on having a role in the community, but not all playing these roles held equal status, rights or privileges. This held true for the female gender.

Female citizens in Ancient Greece did not have equal rights as their masculine counterparts but they did have a unique designation. "While female citizens had important roles in the religious

worship of the community, they were completely barred from participation in political, judicial and military affairs. Female citizens (not slaves, foreign residents, or those with other bloodlines) were distinguished as *politai*, afforded legal protection (e.g., from slavery) and the right to recourse in the court, but they “could not represent themselves and had to have men speak for their interests” (Palaiologou, 2011, p. 269). According to Martin (2000), “Women became citizens of the city-states in the crucial sense that they had an identity, status,” (p. 61) protection and legal representation. All female citizens were required to have “an official male guardian (*kyrios*) to protect them physically and legally” (Palaiologou, 2011, p. 269). Children of male citizens were paternalistically granted similar rights of participation and protection as their mothers but children of slaves and foreign residents were only afforded the same limited rights as their parents.

Citizenship rights among males were unequal. Initially, only the rich males and their adult male descendants were granted full citizenship rights and privileges. Over time, more males were granted the right “to vote and speak in the assembly, hold office, serve as judges [and] fight in the army” (Palaiologou, 2011, p. 269). Kreis states (2009a) that around 600 B.C, Athens was facing a desperate political crisis:

[Farmers] who supplied the city-state with food could not keep up with demand because the Athenian population had grown too quickly ... The crisis was solved in 94 B.C. when the Athenians gave control over to Solon (c. 640 –c.559 B.C.), a former high official. In his role as archon Solon cancelled all agricultural debts and announced that all slaves were free. He also passed constitutional reforms that divided Athenian subjects into four classes based on their annual agricultural production rather than birth. Members of the three highest orders could hold public office.” (Kreis, 2009a, n.p.)

There always was a substantive requirement for citizens to assume a role in state-affairs, even if that role was quite limited or unequal (e.g., children and women). Despite significant inequalities in citizenship, the Athenian democratic system instituted a form of deliberative democracy that, although elitist, engaged a fairly large body of representatives (e.g., Council of 500 and the Assembly). By 430 B.C. the Athenian city-states reverted back to “an aristocracy under Pericles” and a war with the Spartans spelled “the death of Athenian direct democracy” (Kreis, 2009a. n.p).

There were many philosophers such as Socrates, Plato and Aristotle who emerged from the Athenian ranks. Socrates introduced a form of critical dialectical thinking to his students and people on the street. According to Kries (2009a)

A Socratic dialogue takes the form of question-answer, question-answer, question-answer. It is a dialectical style as well. Socrates would argue both sides of a question in order to arrive at a conclusion. Then that conclusion is argued against another assumption and so on. Perhaps it is not that difficult to understand why Socrates was considered a gadfly!
(n.p.)

Socrates, as an educator who advocated for always-questioning-everything-about-their-state citizens faced dire opposition from those in power. Socrates, for not clearly-determined reasons, was given the choice between “exile and death and he chose death” (Gundara, 2011, p. 232). According to Gundara (2011) the trial of Socrates (399 B.C.) is considered an “indication of the fallibility of democracy, which is not equal to the task of achieving legal justice or legal correctness” (p. 232). Although, it is no clear why Socrates was tried and executed, scholarly research substantiates that leaders believed he was corrupting the youth, demonstrating impiety (e.g., not believing in the gods most revered) and possibly committing political crimes (Linder, 2002). He was forced to drink a poison that was laced with hemlock when he refused to be exiled.

Linder (2002) asks, “Why, in a society enjoying more freedom and democracy than any the world had ever seen, would a seventy-year-old philosopher be put to death for what he was teaching?” Socrates, as a philosopher and street-side educator, challenged the notions of freedom, democracy, and citizenship and encouraged his students to do the same. Linder (2002) indicates that Athens’s politically turbulent past, contributed to political tensions during Socrates lifespan (e.g., Pericles lost his throne, Athens fell to Sparta and Socrates was sentenced to death). Waterfield (2009) notes that one of the primary reasons Socrates was condemned was because of his association with a politically controversial group of young men, some who were his students.

Socrates’ death poses several pertinent questions about citizenship and citizenship education. What made Socrates teachings so controversial, threatening and/or illegal? What made Socratic questioning so intolerable? What role should education play in preparing students to understand the complex “policy ecology” (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, p. 155) of public policy where multiple stakeholders joust for position using power-loaded discourse and power-based decision-making. Law professor Elkins (2008) when writing about the significance of Socratic philosophy to the teaching of law states:

With Socrates we imagine teaching as conversation. We engage our students in inquiry and struggle and do it by conversation. The Socratic inspired teacher is "committed to the rigorous examination of the faith and morals of the time, giving pride of place to those convictions which are widely shared and rarely questioned. Reliance on consensus and prestigious paradigms are prime targets." In following Socrates "it is a point of honor to swim against the stream" (Kaufman, 1995, p. 22). In Socratic teaching we explore "compelling alternatives to current fashions." We "ask how various orthodoxies of our time look from the outside, how well grounded our common sense and all sorts of

scholastic as well as non-academic consensuses are, and what might be said for and against each alternative." [Id. at 29] Socratic teaching asks us to confront and re-vision the philosophy we enact in the discourse of everyday life, a discourse revealed in the way we speak and regard others in conversation. For Socrates, who lived in the context of an oral culture, helps us see and re-vision the philosophy that we enact in the discourse of everyday public and private life, a discourse that we construct by the way we speak and regard others in conversation. (n.p.)

Socrates sought to encourage the Greeks to critically explore their own assumptions; the society they had and were creating; and the moral imperatives that are intrinsic to being in the world. He encouraged questioning, rhetoric, mindful-discourse, rigorous evaluation and the formulation of new ideas for socio-political re-constructions. This is what citizenship education was to Socrates and what he encouraged among his students. As I explore contemporary active citizenship I must ask myself what role citizenship education was meant to play in the past, how it plays out in today's society and how we want it to play out in the future.

Plato is commonly cited as being one of Socrates favourite students. As Socrates never scribed his discussions Plato took it upon himself to write about his teacher's lessons. Although Plato had little regard for the democratic state that destroyed his teacher, he wrote about what he thought the ideal state should be and what citizenship education should look like. In his writing of *The Republic* he offered a "blueprint for a future society of perfection" (Kreis, 2009b, n.p.). He was a strong advocate for education, community, and philosophical questioning. "In *The Republic*, Plato asks what is knowledge? what is illusion? what is reality? how do we know? what makes a thing, a thing? what can we know? These are epistemological questions – that is, they are questions about knowledge itself" (Kreis, 2009b, n.p.).

Plato favoured the idea of leadership by a group of “Philosopher Kings” as he felt that “power and wisdom had traveled divergent paths” and needed enlightened thinkers to bring it back on course (Kreis, 2009b, n.p.), but he also imagined the possibilities and believed that a functional, democratic state could be achieved. Plato, as cited in Heater (2004), outlined what citizenship education should consist of:

[W]hat we have in mind is education from childhood in virtue, a training which produces a keen desire to become a perfect citizen who knows how to rule and be ruled as justice demands. I suppose we should want to mark off this sort of training from others and reserve the title ‘education’ for it alone. (p. 3)

He saw education as the pathway to prepare an elite group of philosopher kings to rectify the divergence of power and wisdom that he witnessed during his time. It wasn’t the learning of languages, math, and sciences that he selected as the route to a better society, but rather he valued the use of Socratic methods to achieve a better society. He hoped that a group of enlightened philosopher kings could pave the way for a more inclusive grouping of citizens and leaders.

The Legacy of the Ancient Greeks

In Ancient Greece, citizenship and citizenship education changed over time. Much of this was related to ongoing social problems, political turmoil and leadership turnover. The Ancient Greeks excluded many from full citizenship rights, but they still encouraged many to play an important role in socio-political affairs. Palaiologou (2011) expresses concern that conversely in modern times “indifference or rejection towards socio-political issues is disappointing” (Palaiologou, 2011, p. 272). Gundara (2004) suggests that a self-selected indifference to civic affairs is prevalent despite the fact that “at the international level there are issues of rights which are

[now] enshrined within conventions, protocol and treaties” (p. 1). He recommends a path forward is to bridge differences and promote universal standards:

States, therefore ought to safeguard citizenship rights of all groups to ensure not only an equitable resolution of conflicts but to establish prophylactic public and social policies which strengthen democratic ideals. Such national policies ought to bridge ethnic, religious, linguistic and racial differences and negate the rise of narrow nationalism and xenophobia. (Gundara, 2007, p. 179-180)

Are there societal changes taking place in today’s democratic societies (e.g., mass migrations, neoliberal economics and technology) that are affecting the nature of citizens, citizenship and citizenship today? How might we address citizenship education given globalization and the rapid changes accompanying it (e.g., mass transit, migrations and trade)? These are factors of active citizenship education (ACE) I can explore and analyze as I proceed with my research.

Citizenship as a policy, political reality and/or practice, or lack thereof, can strongly influence how members of a society will respond to emergent issues. Palaiologou (2011) states, “History has shown that any revolutionary attempt to restructure or reshape society, if not based on human values, morality and service to the common good, will generate rivalry, violence, inequality, exclusion and degradation of human dignity” (p. 273). The Athenian philosophers encouraged students to explore government processes rather than blindly fit into the existing political structures. This was not well received and attempts to elicit change were not tolerated (e.g., Socrates and some of his students). The perceived purpose of citizenship education in Ancient Greece varied, and often conflicted.

As in Ancient Greece, today's philosophers seek to clarify the purpose of education and the role that citizenship should play in education. Winton (2007) claims that there is a schism that currently divides people's views on the purpose of citizenship education:

The purposes of citizenship education are debatable (Clark & Case, 1999). Should it enable students to fit into society or prepare them to change it?... Approaches to citizenship education that adopt social *initiation* as their purpose believe citizenship education should pass on "the understandings, abilities, and values that students require if they are to fit into and be productive members of society" (Clark & Case, 1999, p. 18). These approaches imply that society is functioning well and is worthy of reproduction. Citizenship for social *reformation*, on the other hand, assumes that society is in need of improvement and aims to empower students "with the understandings, abilities, and values necessary to critique and ultimately improve their society" (Clark & Case, 1999, p. 18). These two opposing purposes have given rise to dualist models of citizenship education including elitist/activist (Sears, 1996), minimal/critical (DeJaeghere, 2005), and traditional/progressive (Parker, 1996). (n.p.)

Perhaps Socrates was perceived as a threat as he sought the continuous transformation of one's society as opposed to merely wanting to reproduce it. Researchers believe such two opposing notions of the purpose of citizenship (e.g., ACE is designed to reproduce or reform society) not only create dualistic models of citizenship education, but also competing stances.

What can be gleaned by Ancient Greece was that citizenship structures and discourse changed over time. Citizenship policies served to exclude certain populations (e.g., slaves and foreign workers) and all citizens did not have equal rights, status, or privileges (e.g., children, were not tolerated women, and the economically marginalized). The meaning of citizenship changed

over time and the ability to participate in civic affairs and decision-making became increasingly significant over time. Citizens were expected to assume various responsibilities (e.g., serving as good mothers, military personnel or court official) and it became a cultural norm to do so.

Democracy was in constant flux as various leaders overthrew the regime to replace it with anti-democratic structures or new versions of democracy, and thus citizenship was in a state of constant upheaval. Considerable debate was encouraged in the democratic state but some forms of citizenship education (e.g., Socrates) that scrutinized, problematized and critiqued existing structures were not always tolerated. Socrates, his teachings, and his students were considered controversial, and perhaps even a threat to the reigning elite, and for this he paid with his life.

The Magna Carta, Locke and Rousseau

Three historical writings from the 11th to 18th century that substantially influenced our constructions of citizenship are the Magna Carta and the writings of John Locke and Jean Rousseau. The Magna Carta created a paradigm shift in social understandings, politics and law and strongly influenced the subsequent writings of John Locke (1632-1740 A.D) and Jean Rousseau (1712-1778). Channick (2009) states:

Since education itself is the art of producing fiction in which the child is taught to assume his character, Rousseau relies on generic innovation to overcome the challenges of producing an ordinary citizen who is, paradoxically, unlike all others.⁶⁴ Emile's hetero-generic form—a treatise on education, a demonstration of social contract and a novel⁶⁵—provides a self-conscious meeting ground for the educational, the political and the artistic. The interplay of formal conventions reconciles the goal of critiquing society while simultaneously presenting how society ought to be. (p. 39)

Rousseau and Locke explored what citizenship had been, was and ought to be. They agreed on various aspects citizenship and citizenship education and disagreed on others, but they both sought to clarify, provide insights and influence citizenship and how it was taught.

In regards to the Magna Carta, President Franklin D. Roosevelt (1941) once stated in an inaugural address “The democratic aspiration is no mere recent phase in human history... It was written in Magna Carta” (n.p.). Some of the key phrases in The Magna Carta (1215) are, “No freeman shall be taken, imprisoned, disseised, outlawed, banished, or in any way destroyed, nor will we proceed against or prosecute him, except by lawful judgment of his peers and by the law of the land” and “To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny, delay, right or justice” (n.p.). The Magna Carta, which was constructed by oppressed subjects (e.g., barons), and articulated by experts (Vincent, 2007), required King John of England to proclaim certain liberties and rights for his people. It ensured that government could not arbitrarily punish, incarcerate or take over people’s possessions. Lord Denning claimed it was “the greatest constitutional document of all times – the foundation of the freedom of the individual against the arbitrary authority of the despot” (Danziger & Gillingham, 2004, p. 278). The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution which states that “no person shall...be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law” derives from the Magna Carta's guarantee of proceedings, according to the “law of the land” (Wilkes, 2006, p.10). The Magna Carta was used to anchor many subsequent documents such as the Declaration of Independence and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen. It could help anchor future designs of active citizenship education.

Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527), famous for his *Discourses on Livy*, advocated for an “ethos of devotion to the political community sealed by a practice of collective self-rule and self-defense” (JRank Science & Philosophy, 2013, n.p.). He was a proponent for the republic and the

equivalent of state patriotism. He claimed that the protection of individual rights could best be established when all worked together for the benefit of the republic. “Understanding of the internal and external challenges to the survival of the free state led him to recognize that the duties of successful leadership of a free state would necessitate actions that would, at times, contravene the precepts of conventional morality (JRank Science & Philosophy, 2013, n.p.), thus putting into the question how virtuous his utopian ruler and state would be. Although Machiavelli’s assertion promoted the public good, it do so at great cost and as citizenship debates entered the global sphere and ethical domains, his ideology became increasingly questioned. Until this day, his ideas emerge in present debates about such topics as global citizenship, tribalism and immigration.

John Locke advocated that a government’s job is to protect citizens’ natural rights, which during this time period were considered to be life, liberty, and the ownership of property. Locke believed that citizenship entailed the establishment of a social contract between the state and its citizens, and it entails an ongoing exchange of rights and responsibilities. Locke believed the state should provide citizens with access to certain privileges and protections, “meanwhile the citizen is obligated to follow laws, pay taxes, or serve in the military if called on by their state” (Colbern, 2010, n.p.). This is in contrast to the republican tradition that prioritizes civic virtues (Colbern, 2010). Locke’s liberal platform emphasized citizens’ rights rather than their responsibilities (Colbern, 2010, n.p.).

Locke’s liberal conceptualization of citizenship contrasts to other conceptualizations of citizenship. Colbern (2010) claims there are three conceptual types of relationships between “individuals and the polity”: a) ascribed - whereby criteria are used to determine if you receive status or not), b) republican - whereby citizenship requires virtuous behavior and c) liberal – whereby citizenship is based on natural rights. In the liberal tradition, as that of John Locke’s, an

individual has the right to engage in political life so that such rights are institutionalized (e.g., Declaration of Independence). His liberal arguments on citizenship spread across Europe and to some of the colonies where the Declaration of Independence was later decreed.

Jean Rousseau, another influential thinker and Enlightenment philosopher, reflected on citizenship concepts that emerged from Ancient Greece and posited new ideas about the meanings of citizenship and what it means, or ought to mean. Rousseau claimed that citizens of Ancient Rome and Sparta identified themselves first as Romans or Spartans and secondly as individuals and that such emotional patriotism combined with reason contributed to their success with building state citizenship (Raborg, 2008, n.p.). Rousseau, as cited by Neuhouser (2008) states:

Natural man exists entirely for himself. He is a numerical unity, the absolute whole that exists in relation only to itself ... Civil man is merely a fractional unity dependent on the denominator; his value is found in his relation to the whole, which is the social body. Good social institutions are those that best know how to denature man, to take his absolute existence from him in order to give him a relative one and transport the I into the common unity, with the result that each individual believes himself no longer one but a part of the unity and no longer perceptible (sensible) except within the whole.... A citizen of Rome was neither Caius nor Lucius; he was a Roman; he even loved the country exclusive of himself. (p. 3)

Patriotism and rationality were significant to Rousseau's conceptualization of citizenship. Jefferson supported such patriotic ideals and practice: "Every citizen should be a soldier. This was the case with the Greeks and Romans, and must be that of every free state" (The Quotations Page, 2013, n.p.).

Rousseau favoured a strong education as is evidenced in his novel *Emile*, which focuses on the education of a young woman and thematically highlights the significance of intellectual emulation to develop wisdom. Rousseau (as cited in Neuhouser, 2008) philosophically ponders about citizenship education in the following excerpt:

[W]hat is to be done when our [different educations] are opposed? When instead of raising a man for *himself*, one wants to raise him *for others*. Then their harmony is impossible.

Forced to combat nature or the social institutions, one must choose between making a man or a citizen, for one cannot make both at the same time. (p. 2)

In essence, Rousseau suggests that domestic (e.g., self) and citizenship (e.g., state politics) education are different and at odds with one another. As Neuhouser (2008) states, “Both of these points [making a man or a citizen] could be summed up by saying that what characterizes the citizen is a certain kind of dependence on others, whereas the hallmark of the man is self-sufficiency” (p. 3).

To reconcile these competing interests, Rousseau claimed that the citizen assumes a “relative” stance in regards to political affairs (Neuhouser, 2008, p. 3). A citizen in this regard is responsible both to him/her self and to a larger community and through political reasoning, education and participation the citizen must reconcile self-interest and the public good. According to Neuhouser (2008),

[T]he guiding aim in forming a child into a citizen is to instill in him the character traits he will need in order for political association to be possible. Civic education, then, would aim at cultivating the desires, beliefs and self-conceptions of individuals in a way that would enable them once educated, to endorse or affirm their polity’s general will, or what is the

same, to embrace the good of their political community – the good of Rome, the good of Sparta – as their own. (pp. 6-7)

Citizenship education in this regard recognizes the significance of self-interest, but urges the subordination of self-interest for the larger collective. Rights, responsibilities and patriotism form a triad in the logic.

The American Revolution and Beyond

But of all the views of this law none is more important, none more legitimate, than that of rendering the people the safe, as they are the ultimate, guardians of their own liberty. For this purpose the reading in the first stage, where they will receive their whole education, is proposed, as has been said, to be chiefly historical. History by apprising them of the past will enable them to judge of the future; it will avail them of the experience of other times and other nations; it will qualify them as judges of the actions and designs of men; it will enable them to know ambition under every disguise it may assume; and knowing it, to defeat its views. [Thomas Jefferson, Notes on the State of Virginia, Query 14, 1781]

(Jefferson, 1781; as cited by The Quotations Page, 2013, n.p.)

The writings of Rousseau and Locke influenced political and revolutionary leaders (e.g., the American Revolution) and their conceptual notions of the citizen, citizenship and citizenship education. Their thoughts spread to the British living in the colonies who felt victimized by their own state. As Breen (1997) states, “Americans understood that they were being treated differently from ordinary men and women who happened to live in England” (p. 33). The colonists did not feel they deserved to be treated as second class citizens. “What, my Lord [William Pitt],” asked the

members of the Massachusetts Assembly, “have the colonists done to forfeit the character and privilege of subjects, and to be reduced in effect to a tributary state?” (Cushing, as cited in Breen, 1997, p. 33)

In what is referred to as *A Letter to the People of Pennsylvania* Anonymous asked, “Can the least spark of reason be offered why a *British* subject in *America* shall not enjoy the like safety, the same protection against domestic oppression” (Anonymous, as cited by Dickenson, 1767, n.p.). Similarly, Breen (1997) rhetorically questioned the minimized rights and status of the colonists: “Were they freeman in *England* and did they become slaves by a six-weeks’ voyage to *America*?” (p. 32). The discourses of citizenship (e.g., Plato, Rousseau, and Locke) that circulated throughout Britain and the colonies influenced and shaped new understandings of citizenship, ways of being a citizen, and new structures of citizenship.

During the American Revolution, there were a number of Acts such as the Stamp Act, Quartering Act and Tea Act that agitated colonists of the Thirteen Colonies and provoked rebellion. According to Breen (1997),

[T]he Stamp Act seemed an especially poignant reminder for the Americans of their new second-class status. Of course, much of the colonial rhetoric directly addressed the constitutional issues raised by taxation without representation ... From the American perspective, therefore, the Stamp Act was viewed as a calculated insult, clear declaration of exclusion, a denial of English Rights to Americans. (p. 32-33)

American colonists felt disenfranchised, marginalized and mistreated by these Acts. In response to the Stamp Act, John Hancock (1765), who is noted for his fanciful signature on the Declaration of Independence stated: “I will not be a Slave, I have a right to Liberty & privileges of the English

Constitution & as an Englishman will enjoy them” (n.p.). In 1768, John Hicks wrote in his book *The Nature and Extent of Parliamentary Power*. Hicks, (as cited by Breen, 1997), the following statement: “As a colonist, my most ambitious views extend no further than the rights of a British subject. I cannot comprehend how my being born in American should divest me of these ... If we are entitled to the liberties of British subjects we ought to enjoy them unlimited and unrestrained” (p. 33). Colonial citizens felt that their identity, status, rights, and privileges were being disregarded, overlooked and blatantly ignored, thus they retaliated and events such as the Boston Tea Party and the American Revolution resulted.

For many revolutionary colonists, the American Revolution was about the freeing of themselves from a life of oppressive subjugation and establishing a new sense of belonging, identity and status. They imagined a citizenship for themselves that was separate from British rule. Countryman (2003) asserts that,

From the Treaty of Paris of 1763 until the Treaty of Paris 1783, Britain maintained that everybody in eastern North America “belonged” to it. *Belonging* can imply membership, participation among fellows for the sake of a common goal; the idea of citizenship expresses that sense perfectly. But *belonging* also can mean being possessed, in the way that an object belongs to its owner. For a human being, belonging in this way implies some combination of accepting one’s subordination while also claiming the protection of somebody more powerful in a dangerous world. Theoretically, that is the sense in which subjects belonged to a king, wives and children belonged to husbands and fathers, and slaves belonged to masters. For adult white males who chose the American side, the [American] Revolution brought a shift from subjection to citizenship. (p. xviii)

In 1776, the American Declaration of Independence was signed. Later in 1787 the Constitution was signed. Unfortunately, not all liberties, equalities and freedoms were protected by these documents (e.g., slaves, women and children). Mary Hay Burn, in 1776, wrote to her husband: “Why should I not have liberty whilst you strive for liberty” (Burn, 1776, n.p.). Thomas Jefferson, a stellar activist for equality, maintained slaves at his home in Virginia. “By 1790 the long global destruction of slavery was under way” (Countryman, 2003, p.xx), but it was not until after the American Civil War (1861-1865) that the Bill of Rights (e.g., ratified in 1791) was amended to abolish slavery in America (e.g., Amendment 13, 1865).

Many revolutionaries sought to use education as a vehicle to impart the awareness, values, and practices of citizenship. The third president of the United States, Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826), “believed in the education of the common man as the most effective means of preserving the democratic ideal. He consistently advocated for free public schools” (Gelbrich, 1999, n.p.). In 1820, Thomas Jefferson, as cited in Cornwell, 2012, stated,

I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education. (n.p.)

Horace Mann, a lawyer, senator, and school board member, also believed in public education. In an education report submitted in 1848, Mann stated, “Education, then beyond all other devices of human origin, is the great equalizer of the conditions of men, -- the balance-wheel of the social machinery” (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2013, n.p.). Noah Webster (1758- 1853) developed student

textbooks, that were “promoting a curriculum that advocated the ideals of democracy and independence from England” (Gelbrich, 1999, n.p.)

Afro-Americans and Indigenous populations suffered many inequities despite the many new freedoms others were enjoying. Some Indigenous peoples today, still seek to self-govern and to determine if they want to belong/or dis-belong from the North American constructions of state citizenship. Treaties regarding property and ways of being on North American lands still are highly contested (National Centre for First Nations Governance) issues. Native American children in North America received a racially biased education from Christian missionaries, other assigned Native-Americans and/or Quakers. Education was often used as a weapon to assimilate native culture. In contrast in many states laws were passed to prevent Afro-Americans gaining citizenship and/or an education. “[M]any southern states passed laws forbidding people to teach slaves how to read and write (Gelbrich, 1999, n.p.). Compulsory education started in Massachusetts in 1852 and spread to most states within the century. Reading, writing and the learning of democratic ideas (e.g., citizenship) played a dominant role in learning. Children (mainly Anglo-American males) learned about the citizenship aspirations of their forefathers as well as about their own rights, obligations and privileges. Unfortunately, such a ‘so-called’ liberal curriculum perpetuated the marginalization of Blacks, Indigenous peoples and women.

The Legacies of the American Revolution and the Civil War

The study of citizenship as it pertains to the United States of America and the American Revolution raises many perplexing, intersecting and rudimentary questions about what it means to be a citizen, what citizenship looks like and/or should look like, and subsequently what citizenship education is and should entail. Bradburn (2010) while exploring the emergence of citizenship during the American Revolution raises some important questions:

From pieces of an empire of subjects, the United States of America became a republic of citizens, which promised real changes in the relationship of the government to the governed. Why did the vision of ‘citizens’ have such appeal? What did it mean to be a citizen, and who in fact could be an American citizen? How can we understand the limits placed on the boundaries of citizenship? Historians have struggled to find the best route to answer those questions. Dealing with a concept which impacts intellectual, political, legal, and cultural histories of the moment, and drawing upon scholarship on race, nationalism, ethnicity, and regionalism, the problem of citizenship opens and combines seemingly distinct literature in numerous ways. (p. 1093)

The study of the American Revolution is part of many secondary history classes. This milestone in history reveals how significant being a citizen, achieving citizenship and establishing citizenship is now and was then. It reveals how intellectual thinkers such as John Locke and Jean Rousseau influenced how colonists thought, experienced and responded to their constructions of citizenship.

The American Revolution demonstrated that citizenship is not only an abstract concept or ideal, but also an attainable achievable goal that can over time be improved upon. Through the spread of ideas, consciousness raising and socio-political mobilizing (e.g., a revolution), colonists sought to separate from a state that oppressively “Other[ed]” (Said, 1994, p. 1) them. The colonists fought to achieve a republic which would allow them to establish their own identity, status, and sense of belonging as citizens. Citizenship education during this term period (e.g., during and after the revolution) focused on the learning of democratic principles but it also systemically perpetuated and institutionalized discriminatory principles, practices and processes.

The French and Haitian Revolutions

According to Wallerstein (2002) the French Revolution left a “legacy to the whole world-system: Sovereignty now belonged to the people, the nation; and political debate and political change were their normal consequence” (n.p.) and nations thus felt compelled to institutionalize a less hierarchical system of governance (e.g., exempt of aristocratic titles) that was based on universal principles.

The great symbolic gesture of the French Revolution was the insistence that titles no longer be used, not even that of Monsieur and Madame. Everyone was to be called "Citoyen" (Citizen). This gesture was intended to demonstrate the repudiation of traditional hierarchies, the incrustation of social equality in the new society that was being constructed. The French Revolution came to an end. Titles were reinstated. But the concept of "citizen" (if not its use as a title of address) survived. It did more than survive. It thrived. It became adopted everywhere, to the point that by 1918 the world found it necessary to invent the concept of "stateless" persons, to describe the relatively small portion of humanity who were unable to claim citizenship anywhere. (Wallerstein, 2002, n.p.)

As with the Ancient Greeks, France's citizenship requirements disenfranchised, marginalized and/or excluded certain groups and a great deal of emphasis was placed on citizenship education. The Declaration of the Rights of Man, which was adopted by France, August 26, 1789, strongly influenced citizenship education in France during the 18th, 19th, and subsequent centuries.

According to Starkey (2000)

Citizenship education has traditionally been high on the political agenda in France having its roots in an attempt to consolidate national support for the Third Republic when democracy was restored in 1871. Indeed, before that, in the early days of the French Revolution there were human festivals and pageants, even board games designed to instruct the public about their rights. Primary school teachers of the early days of compulsory universal education (1881) were considered to be shock troops of the Republic with a mission to instil Republican virtue into their charges. Citizenship education has therefore always been intended to help integrate a diverse population into a single national culture defined as Republican, in other words based on the principles of freedom, equality and solidarity (*liberte, egalite, fraternite*) and on human rights (p. 42)

It would be inaccurate to claim that the Republic automatically adapted, implemented or embraced the principles of the declaration in their citizenship initiatives.

But, the rights-based Declaration did not automatically result in the implementation of a rights-based citizenship education plan. In fact such a notion was undermined, contested and even averted in various circumstances. To begin with, scripts that previously normalized the divide between the rich aristocrats and the poor peasants were to be re-scripted by a new norm, thus citizenship notions and citizenship education were also to be re-scripted. Wallerstein (2002) states:

When inequality was the norm, there was no need to make any further distinction than that between those of different rank, generically between noble and commoner. But when equality became the official norm, then it was suddenly crucial to know who was in fact included in the "all" who have equal rights, that is, who are the "active" citizens. The more equality was proclaimed as a moral principle, the more obstacles - juridical, political,

economic, and cultural - were instituted to prevent its realization. The concept, citizen, forced the crystallization and rigidification - both intellectual and legal - of a long list of binary distinctions which have formed the cultural underpinnings of the capitalist world-economy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: bourgeois and proletarian, man and woman, adult and minor, breadwinner and housewife, majority and minority, White and Black, European and non-European, educated and ignorant, skilled and unskilled, specialist and amateur, scientist and layman, high culture and low culture, heterosexual and homosexual, normal and abnormal, able-bodied and disabled, and of course the ur-category which all of these others imply - civilized and barbarian. (n.p.)

The French Revolution led not only to new concepts of the citizen, citizenship, and citizenship education, but it also led to new discourses that sought to exalt, undermine and/or manipulate how such norms would be actualized or prevented from being actualized. For example, after Napoleon Bonaparte rose to power, he institutionalized new lycees [schools] that were expected to synthesize “intellectual traditionalism and apolitical modernism with a two-fold aim: to gear the children of the bourgeoisie to the business of running a modern, rationalized state system; and, simultaneously, to provide these same children with a veneer that would separate them from the canaille” (Higonnet, 1980, p. 66)). Napoleon Bonaparte’s lycees privileged the bourgeois, disenfranchised the poor, and sought to advantage new generations of bourgeois children (Higonnet, 1980, p. 66),

As with much policy and/or legislation (e.g., implementing the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizens) gaps between the policy and practice occurred in France. According to Wallerstein (2002)

[T]he concept of citizenship [in revolutionary France] was meant to be liberating ... and it did indeed liberate us all from the dead weight of received hierarchies claiming divine or natural ordination. But the liberation was only a partial liberation from the disabilities, and the new inclusions made sharper and more apparent the continuing (and new) exclusions. Universal rights turned out in actual practice to be somewhat of a linguistic mirage, an oxymoron. The republic of virtuous equals turned out to require the rejection of the non-virtuous. (n.p.)

A deconstruction of privilege was occurring and many were being excluded from full participation. Women, children and foreigners were considered to be passive citizens and their rights were limited to the protection of their property, person and liberty. After the French Revolution, the French colony of Haiti still actively endorsed slavery.

In 1789, the National Assembly decreed that citizens (e.g., primarily male land owners) who “paid a minimum of 3 days wages in direct taxation,” were to be granted “active citizenship” status which entitled them to “play an active role in the formation of public authorities” (Wallerstein, 2002, n. p.). As more persons became citizens, it was noted that an increasing number of citizens did not speak French which was the language that the “Revolution[ary] political elites expressed” and was considered to be “the language of liberty and equality” (McPhee, 2002, p.31). In 1791, Talleyrand, known to be a French diplomat and a clergymen, spoke out in the National Assembly and declared, “In schools all will be taught in the language of the Constitution and the Law and this mass of corrupt dialects, these last vestiges of feudalism, will be forced to disappear (as cited in McPhee, 2002, p. 31). Late 18th century France sought to inculcate the nation as a French-speaking nation and mandated the use of the French language by all citizens and in all

schools. Citizenship education in France was used for various reasons over time: to advantage some groups while disadvantaging others (e.g., the lycees); to suppress the use of multiple dialects in order to make French a national language of the citizens; and to promote the principles of liberty, freedom and equality that were engrained in their Constitution while negating the rights of certain groups (e.g., African Americans, women and the economically disenfranchised).

The French Revolution sparked a demand for citizenship rights in the French colony of Haiti. An uprising in the French colony of Haiti led to the abolishment of slavery and subsequent changes in citizenship rights and citizenship education in France. According to Dubois (2000),

In 1789, at the beginning of the French Revolution, the Caribbean islands of Guadeloupe, Martinique and St Domingue represented the world's most valuable colonial possessions. There, an order based on the enslavement of 90 percent of the population produced sugar and other commodities for metropolitan consumption, powering the economic transformations of eighteenth-century France and the emergence of a new merchant bourgeoisie. Between 1789 and 1794, the social order of the most prosperous colonial possessions of the Americas was completely reversed ... Even those who advocated slave emancipation were unprepared for the radical implications of the slave revolt of 1791, and tended to argue that political rights could only be granted to ex-slaves ... Ultimately, emancipation was decreed locally in St Domingue [Haiti], and this decision was ratified by the National Convention in Paris in 1794, so that slavery was abolished through the French empire in the first national experiment in slave emancipation. (p. 21-22)

Dubois (2000) claims that slave insurgents seeking citizenship and racial equality in the French Republic "ultimately expanded – and 'universalized' - the notion of rights ... a new colonial order

emerged, one in which the principles of universalism were put into effect” (p. 22). Race was no longer to be considered legitimate criteria for determining citizenship identity, status or participation. The concept of emancipation and “the idea that the rights of citizens were applicable to all people within a nation” (Dubois, 2000, p. 22) spread to the Americas and Europe. An anti-slavery uprising in the French Antilles “transform[ed] the possibilities embodied in the idea of citizenship” (Dubois, 2000, p. 25). The question arose as to whether these new born freedoms would extend to the slaves not only residing in territories occupied by the French, but also to other imperial outposts?

Many of the bourgeois (e.g., merchants and plantation owners) grew relatively wealthy because of the slave labour their businesses relied upon. Smith (2009) notes that San Domingue (e.g., French colony), had become “the most profitable colony the world had ever known,” (n.p.) and the envy of the Western imperial powers. Smith (2009) recollects the circumstances,

By 1789, its plantations produced half the world’s coffee, 40 percent of its sugar, and a host of lesser commodities like indigo. Over two-thirds of France’s trade flowed in and out of San Domingue. The colony became the envy of all the other imperial powers—Spain, Britain, and Holland. Based on this wealth, the French bourgeoisie would overthrow the monarchy, transform all of Europe, and (inadvertently) trigger a slave revolution that would remake the New World and lead to the eventual abolition of slavery. As one liberal Frenchman named Mirabeau put it, the colonial system was “sleeping at the edge of Vesuvius. The eruption would begin among the 500000 slaves that labored on San Domingue’s plantations.”⁽⁵⁵⁾ (n.p.)

The Haitian revolution to abolish slavery was in many ways an extension of the French Revolution as it was a result of the outcomes of the revolution. The events in the French Caribbean contributed to how “race and citizenship [were] imagined in the Republican political culture ... and French ‘universalism’ was in fact in many ways produced through the actions of slaves in the Caribbean” (Dubois, 2000, p. 15).

Some historians assert that the universalistic discourse used to phrase the French and Haitian demands for political equality, emancipation and a new socio-political identity contributed substantially to not only the success of these movements, but also to a new national identity and terms of citizenship (Brubaker, 1992; Dubois 2000). Brubaker (1992) asserts that the French Revolution contributed to the “the institutionalization of political rights” and created the “link between citizenship and nationhood” (p. 35). Unfortunately “the abstract universality of the discourse of citizenship became layered with practices of racial exclusion” (Dubois, 2000, p. 24) and what was to be a “project of liberation” (Dubois, 2000, p. 24) became tainted with contradictory practices.

When Napoleon took power he aimed to restore slavery on the French colonial islands and “appointed his brother-in-law General Leclerc, a vile racist in his own right, to command sixty-seven ships transporting 20,000 troops – the largest marine force in French history” (Smith, 2009, n.p.), to overthrow the Blacks. As cited by Smith (2009), General Leclerc claimed, “All the niggers, when they see an army, will lay down their arms. They will be only too happy that we pardon them” (n.p.). Such comments tie into the racist elements of colonialism that were pervasive during these times.

The new colonial order, which marked a powerful blow to the system of slavery, was a crucial step in the broader march towards slave emancipation throughout the Americas and Europe. It was also the foundation for later attempts at colonial reform – most fully put into practice in 1946 – which were based on the idea of assimilating the colonies more fully into a metropolitan system of law. (Dubois, 2000, p. 22)

The Haitian revolution forced the French to extend the freedom and equality, they proclaimed for their mainland citizens, to the colonies. The slaves and colonists rejected their subject status and won the rights to be equal citizens. The rest of the world observed this transition and pondered the fate of the colonial jewels that they profited greatly from.

The French Revolution paved the way for the ideals of the Enlightenment philosophers to be institutionalized, implemented and itemized (e.g., The Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen). Pursuits for equality, liberty and freedom were launched via citizenship discourse, activism and reforms. Education was nationalized; more children had access to education; and curriculum officials had to embark upon a route to decide how historical memories, peoples and events would be portrayed and taught. Officials had to reconsider the purpose of their educational systems and the role that egalitarian decrees and commitments would have on their educational philosophy and practices. The educational system was obliged to transform itself and to adjust to new norms, expectations and practices. A society had to adjust to a new meaning of citizenship and transform educational philosophy, policy and curriculum so it would be more in alignment with these changes. It was an ongoing process as it is in many regards today. What we can glean from this is that the concepts of citizen, citizenship and citizenship education were continuously re-evaluated, reassessed and transformed during the French and Haitian Revolutions. Calls for

equality, freedom and liberty permeated mainland France and its colonies. In contemporary citizenship today, are those core principles of governance explored to the depth, richness and pragmatic levels they ought to be?

First Nations and Citizenship Education Gone Awry

In 1938, C.L.R. James wrote the book *The Black Jacobins* and spoke of the European conquest of the New World and the occupation of the island that is today referred to as Haiti. Smith (2009) states:

The Spaniards, the most advanced Europeans of their day, annexed the island [Haiti], called it Hispaniola, and took the backward natives under their protection. They introduced forced labor in mines, murder, rape, bloodhounds, strange diseases, and artificial famine (by the destruction of cultivation to starve the rebellious). These and other requirements of the higher civilization reduced the native population from an estimated half-a-million, perhaps a million, to 60,000 in 15 years. (pp. 3-4)

Records such as these reveal the cataclysmic impact of colonial policies, practices and perspectives. Whether it was the Indigenous populations and/or native inhabitants of Haiti, Australia, Canada, the United States or New Zealand, assimilative policies denigrated, demoralized and debilitated Indigenous populations. The residential schools of Canada were started in the 1840s, and funded by the federal government. The intent of these schools, as indicated in policy, was to assimilate the Indigenous Peoples of Canada (Partridge, 2010). Children were removed from their families and not allowed to speak in their mother tongues and told their languages were primitive; many children

forgot their languages. “With the loss of language came the loss of the ability to communicate with their parents, extended family and Elders back home (sic)” (Partridge, 2010, p. 50).

Students were taught that their parents were pagans, their storyteller’s teachings were false and that they would be taught Christian beliefs so they may rid themselves of the false and/or satanic spiritual beliefs their communities may have led them to believe. Such teachings were very detrimental to the well-being of many students. As McKenzie and Morrisette (2003) state:

Residential schools had a specific goal which was ... institutionalized assimilation by stripping Aboriginal people of their language, culture and connection with family. [T]he results for many, have included a lifestyle of uncertain identity and the adoption of self-abusive behaviours, often associated with alcohol and violence, reflect[ing] (sic) a pattern of coping sometimes referred to in First Nations as, ‘The Residential School Syndrome’. (p. 254).

Residential schools served as citizenry training centers for Aboriginal children and organizers sought a pompous perpetuation of Eurocentric world views (e.g., colonial attitudes, beliefs and philosophies).

Students were expected to succumb to an abhorrent form of citizenship education that was prompted by Social Darwinism and a nihilistic ideology that promoted and purported the need to build a more advanced and civilized society (e.g., an oxymoron in some regards). According to Cleary and Peacock (1998)

What people didn’t understand is that those boarding (residential) school terrorists thought that it [e.g., spirit, culture and/or bonds] could disappear in a generation and they would

have white thinking children. They couldn't erase it, and therein lies the hope. Right there. And when that spirit is reawakened it is more powerful than anything that I have ever met in my whole life. I am impressed with the strength of culture. Even though the missionaries tried, the boarding schools tried, all the well-intentioned little white people tried ... But something hasn't died. (p. 102)

Students were taught that white teachers needed to rid them of their cultural ways of being, so that they may become more desirable members of the colony and/or state. The abusive events that took place in many residential schools remain in the psyche of many Aboriginals.

The residential schools were established to train Aboriginal children to normatively behave like good citizens, while at the same time to recognize that, they by birth, were not actually worthy of it, and only tolerated within it. According to McKenzie and Morrissette (2003)

A world-view can be defined as a set of related ideas or view to which members of a distinct culture subscribe. World-views represent religious, political, social and physical information about people and the societies they create. Once accepted, a world-view becomes a 'recognized reality' that serves to socialize its citizens and to create a political culture. A particular world-view is transferred to citizens through institutions such as the family, teachings, and religion; in that process, particular values, attitudes, beliefs, and opinions are adopted. Although specific beliefs and practices vary among different groups of Aboriginal people, it has been demonstrated that several common traditional values exist. (p. 258)

Residential school children were expected to conform to a worldview and form of citizenry which robbed them of the socio-cultural upbringing they would have otherwise had with their family and community. As Antone, Miller and Myers state, as cited by Partridge (2010), “Holistically, culture should be viewed as a living dynamic composed of all the social institutions that ensure the transference of beliefs, values, language and traditions” (p. 41). In the case of residential schools, the federal government of Canada sought to annihilate the traditional beliefs, values, languages and traditions of the Indigenous Peoples so as to rid the nation of those who held alternative socio-cultural practices which they deemed to be demonic, primitive and unworthy of recognition.

In 1909, the general medical superintendent for the Department of Indian Affairs), Dr. Peter Bryce, reported to the Department of Indian Affairs, that between 1894 and 1908, the mortality rates of children at residential schools in Western Canada were very high; these statistics were not revealed to the public until 1922, when Bryce, personally published *The Story of a National Crime: Being a Record of the Health Conditions of the Indians of Canada from 1904 to 1921*. Bryce (1922) states:

In 1906 the report of the Chief Medical Officer shows that statistics collected from 99 local medical officers having the care of a population of 70,000 gave a total of 3,169 cases of tuberculosis or 1 case for every seven in a total of 23,109 diseases reported, and the death rates in several large bands were 81.8, 82.6, and in a third 86.4 per thousand; while the ordinary death rate for 115,000 in the city of Hamilton was 10.6 in 1921. (p. 11)

High mortality rates were attributed to unsafe exposure to those with tuberculosis. What is placed in greater question is the inaction of government to respond to the crisis in a timely judicious manner.

The residential school debacle raises serious questions about the underpinning motives of some citizenship education programs and serious concerns regarding the intent of such programs, especially in respect to excluded and/or marginalized populations. The government tried numerous ways to disassemble Canada's Aboriginal populations. In 1857, the Province of Canada (not yet the nation of Canada), passed the Gradual Civilization Act in the Legislature. This Act detrimentally enfranchised Aboriginal men that were willing to extinguish any tribal affiliation or treaty rights in exchange for a 50 acre tract of land. Upon confederation, Prime Minister Sir John A. Macdonald, commissioned the Davin Report, also referred to as the Report on Industrial Schools for Indians and Half-Breeds (Davin, 1879). The purpose of the inquiry was to establish training and work for Aboriginal men via what was known as the "aggressive policy" ... inaugurated by President Grant in 1869" [and now brought to Canada by Davin] which advocated that, "The experience of the United States is the same as our own as far as the adult Indian is concerned. Little can be done with him" (Davin, 1879, pp. 1-2), other than to tempt them off the properties they inhabited. The industrial school offer was part of Canada's scheme to assimilate the Aboriginal population by means of bribery, urban relocation and off-reserve temptations (Davin, 1879). Even within a democratic state, educational institutions can be used to promote atomistic world views and prejudices, and thus be damaging to the socio-cultural preservation of traditional languages, traditions and ways of being.

Individual and institutionalized racism still continues in Canada today. Neil Stonechild, an Aboriginal male, was left roadside by police officers in freezing weather to die of hypothermia, and if it wasn't for a witness and a subsequent official inquiry, no one would have known (Tupper, 2009). According to Chisholm and Gonsalvez (2012),

The life experiences of First Nations women and their families in reserve communities in particular, are significantly inferior when compared to other communities in Canada, especially in relation to water conditions, housing quality, health services (Auditor General 2004; 2008; 2011; Harden and Levalliant 2008), and child welfare services and funding (Assembly of First Nations 2010; n.d.; FNCFCS 2005). (p.75)

I was involved in researching and recommending a provincial and then a national anti-trafficking program for British Columbia, called the Blue Blindfold campaign, and one thing that was so alarming was the number of vulnerable Aboriginal girls suspected of being trafficked. Also, despite Amnesty International's (Amnesty International, 2004) and CEDAW's (Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women [CEDAW], 2008) reports on the longstanding crisis, an official Inquiry has not be launched; a glimmer of hope is all that is in the making: "Nine of Canada's provinces pressed Wednesday for a national inquiry into missing and murdered aboriginal women across the country" (Paul, 2013, n.p.). As Tupper (2009) states,

While I accept universalism as an important aspiration, my concern is that if it is regarded as an accomplishment, then differing experiences of citizens based on particular and multiple identifiers are negated. Feminist scholars Carole Pateman (1989), Nira Yuval-Davis (1997, 1999), Ruth Lister (1997), Madelaine Arnot (1997, 2002), and Rian Voet (1998) emphasize that liberal democratic citizenship has not lived up to its claims of universality, and is in fact infused with "false universalism". (p. 79)

Essentialist, minimalist and false representations (Tupper, 2009) of marginalized groups (e.g., women, Aboriginals, immigrants, the poor, and youth), not only exist in discourse (e.g., media and

citizenship education), but they are being systemically reproduced by the same institutions that promote universalist ideals of equality.

The Suffragettes and their Influence on Voter Criteria

With less than two-thirds of the membership voting, the House [United States] late today adopted by 181 to 107 a special rule to create a Committee on Woman Suffrage....

Representative Walsh of Massachusetts opposed the measure, declaring that in creating the committee the House would be yielding to “the nagging of iron-jawed angels,” and said the White House pickets were “bewildered, deluded creatures with short skirts and short hair... Representative Jeannette Rankin of Montana made the principal speech for the rule. She quoted the Constitutions of some of the States to show the difficulty of gaining woman suffrage State by State. “Perhaps it is news to you to know that some of the women of the United States can never be enfranchised except by a Federal amendment. (New York Times, 1917, n.p.)

Suffragette movements took place in a number of countries and most notably took place in Britain, the United States and Canada where women won the right to vote. Suffragists (e.g., both male and female) used moderate and/or radical means to advance their cause. It was the island of New Zealand that in 1893, first granted women over the age of twenty one, the right to vote. Surprisingly, “New Zealand, Australia and Canada gave Municipal suffrage at early dates, extending from 1867 in New South Wales to 1894 in the Northwest Territories of Canada”(Harper, 1922, p. 752).

American suffragists often lobbied outside the gates of President Woodrow Wilson's home. One such protestor was, Alice Paul, and she was considered a thorn in President Wilson's side. Alice Paul was well educated, had a PhD and knew how to effectively strategize. Alice Paul stated in a National Women's Party Press release on June 22, 1917, as cited by Graham (1984):

It is those who deny justice, and not those who demand it, who embarrass the country in its international relations ... The responsibility therefore, is with the government and not with the women of America, if the lack of democracy at home weakens the government in its fight for democracy 3000 miles away. (p. 668)

She lobbied for women's right to vote and often premised her argument upon an unwavering support of democratic principles, such as those being used to build support for the troops during World War I.

President Wilson was angry that the suffragettes chose to fight for their voting rights at a time when the country was at war, and he was very harsh on suffragette protestors, who put into question why women's freedoms were not as significant as the other freedoms soldiers were going to Europe to fight for. Graham (1984) states,

Woman's Party strategists led by Alice Paul welcomed [President] Wilson's new status of world leader. As one woman activist observed, "His own statements of faith in democracy and the necessity of establishing it throughout the world left him open to attack." Paul decided to mount the attack on the administration's weakest point: the hypocrisy of waging a war for democracy abroad while denying the vote to women at home. Most woman suffrage associations, including NAWSA [National American Women's Suffrage

Association], supported the war effort. They hoped to convince the president and Congress that as patriotic citizens they were entitled to the ballot. Paul's group, however, remained a single-issue organization throughout the war. NWP members used Wilson's war goals to point out his hypocritical attitude toward woman suffrage, but refused to lend their services in any way to the war effort. "We will not bargain with our country for our services," a NWP official stated. "We will not say to our government: 'give us the vote and we will nurse your soldiers,' but we will insist on suffrage now." (p. 667).

Paul was sentenced to seven months in jail for mocking a slogan intended to support Wilson's Liberty Bonds: "THE TIME HAS COME TO CONQUER OR SUBMIT" (Graham, 1984, p. 676).

Several American suffragettes were put in jail, and like their British counterparts some engaged in hunger strikes while there. As incarcerated militants, the women were expected to adjust to deplorable living conditions and work while in the jail to support the war effort (Graham, 1984). A small minority of radical suffragettes escalated their opposition to include "forms of terrorism, including window smashing, arson, and bombing" (Mayhall, 2003, p.10), while others avoided violence and provided a forum to explore the role, place and ethics that civil disobedience can have in terms of citizenship rights. Alice Paul declared that she would engage in a to-death hunger strike and shortly after was transferred to a psychiatric wing where she was held down for forcible feeding. Paul described her ordeal stating that the wardresses held her down while "one doctor from behind forced my head back, while another doctor put a tube in my nostril. When it reached my throat my head was pushed forward" (Paul, 1909, n.p.).

Sympathy for the imprisoned women grew over time and even the treasurer of the Woodrow Wilson Independent League protested, “It is absolutely essential that the American people be united at this time. But unity is not to be obtained by dragging women to filthy jails for the crime of bearing banners upon which are inscribed the words from the President’s lips” (Graham, 1984, p. 676). Alice Paul was released from jail in November, 1918. A Joint Resolution of the Sixty-sixth Congress of the United States of American, which is referred to as the 19th amendment, was declared. It states “The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation” (Congress of the United States of America, 1920, n.p.).

The suffragette movements demonstrate that women were initially excluded from having full citizenship rights and status. Patriarchal structures existed and it was only due to the efforts of suffragists that women were granted the right to vote. Interestingly enough, Alice Paul demonstrated how one group of suffragists refused to gain citizenship rights by engaging in patriotic activities, and chose instead to challenge the state to uphold the principles of equality, freedom, and democracy, that it claimed to be fighting for in World War I, and apply them to the women’s suffrage movement. “The war it is argued, solidified division of suffragists into two camps, the liberal and the radical independent. Liberal suffragists embraced a model of citizenship valuing service to the nation, whereas radical independent suffragists adopted a model encouraging women’s resistance to authority as long as their right to vote was not acknowledged by the state ” (Mayhall, 2003, p. 9). As I explore active citizenship education for youth I need to consider what place gender inclusiveness, radicalism and dissent are given, or should be given, in programs. As well, I must recognize that different ‘camps’ of thought will exist even in regards to what active citizenship education ought to look like.

The Civil Rights Movement

The African American civil rights movement focused primarily on eradicating discrimination, segregation, and overt racial oppression; it was an extension of the emancipation movement (King, 1963). Various timelines have been established to define this time period and in general they include a time frame that extends between 1896 and 1968. Martin Luther King Jr., a legend of the Civil Rights Movement once stated:

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of captivity.

But one hundred years later, we must face the tragic fact that the Negro is still not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languishing in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land. So we have come here today to dramatize an appalling condition.

In a sense we have come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall

heir. This note was a promise that all men would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness [Martin Luther King Jr.]. (King, 1963, n.p.)

Various timelines have been established to define African American civil rights movement and for the purpose of this study the time period of 1896 to 1968, which is generally accepted, will be used. The African American civil rights movement focused primarily on eradicating discrimination, segregation, and overt racial oppression; many consider it an extension of the emancipation movement. In my dissertation I am exploring the American Civil Rights Movement to inform my understanding of the historical foundations of citizenship education.

Vox (2012) states, “King’s [Martin Luther King, Jr.] writings and speeches, in particular, have endured over the generations for their eloquent expression of the injustices and hopes for the future that impelled a people to direct action” (n.p.). King and other activists were sometimes criticized, even by their own supporters, for not exercising more patience with the court system and they urged the desistance of the demonstrations and claimed them to be unwise and untimely (Vox, 2012). This was especially true in regards to the Birmingham children’s marches as King encouraged the children to continue with their protests despite police brutality and jail time. King stated that the Americans of Birmingham were left with no choice and stated, “I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro’s great stumbling block in his stride toward freedom is not the White Citizen’s Counciler or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate, who is more devoted to ‘order’ than to justice” (King, as cited in Vox, 2012, n.p.). While in the Birmingham jail King (1963) claimed that inside us all is a burgeoning fire to claim our rights and freedoms:

Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The yearning for freedom eventually manifests itself, and that is what has happened to the American Negro. Something within has reminded him of his birthright of freedom, and something without has reminded him that it can be gained. Consciously or unconsciously, he has been caught up by the Zeitgeist, and with his black brothers of Africa and his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America and the Caribbean, the United States Negro is moving with a sense of great urgency toward the promised land of racial justice. (n.p.)

As I explore active citizenship I ponder whether active citizenship education adequately explores the intimate nature of civil rights – how it pertains to personal struggle. Active citizenship education isn't just learning about how 'others' have overcome oppressions, but it is also about understanding the needs of the human soul, and the right to live with dignity, quality and a voice. It's also about shaping the future, not just fitting into it. Are youth engaged in making these connections?

The Children's Crusade, which took place in Birmingham, Alabama, began with young African American children and adolescents exiting their classrooms to protest the oppressions they, and their families, were enduring, only because of their colour. The Martin Luther King Jr.

Research and Education Initiative (2012) states:

On 2 May, more than a thousand African American students skipped their classes and gathered at Sixth Street Baptist Church to march to downtown Birmingham. As they approached police lines, hundreds were arrested and carried off to jail in paddy wagons and school buses. When hundreds more young people gathered the following day for another march, commissioner Bull Connor directed the local police and fire departments to

use force to halt the demonstration. Images of children being blasted by high-pressure fire hoses, clubbed by police officers, and attacked by police dogs appeared on television and in newspapers and triggered outrage throughout the world. On the evening of 3 May, King offered encouragement to parents of the young protesters in a speech delivered at the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church. He said, “Don’t worry about your children; they are going to be alright. Don’t hold them back if they want to go to jail, for they are not only doing a job for themselves, but for all of America and for all of mankind” (n.p.)

Malcolm X was critical of engaging the students in the issue and stated, “Real men don’t put their children on the firing line” (Martin Luther King, Jr. Research and Education Institute, 2012, n.p.)

King disagreed with Malcolm X and encouraged the children to claim their future. King stated, “Looking back, it is clear that the introduction of Birmingham’s children into the campaign was one of the wisest moves we made. It brought a new impact to the crusade, and the impetus that we needed to win the struggle” (Martin Luther King, Jr. Research and Education Institute, 2012, n.p.). King did not advocate violence or anticipate fatalities, but rather he encouraged the young to participate in non-violent resistance that may involve harsh retaliatory government reaction (e.g., many faced jail time). The children persisted with their protests despite police brutality and jail time. An outpouring of national outrage over the violence used by the police against the school children, “energized the civil rights movement and highlighted the need for reforms that would soon be seen in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The children’s courage inspired countless other individuals and groups to continue the fight for equality and justice” (Martin Luther King, Jr., Research and Education Initiative, 2012, n.p.).

President John F. Kennedy did not set out to construct a Civil Rights Act, but he recognized that reform needed to take place. Kennedy is noted for his many contributions:

Throughout JFK's presidency, civil rights advocates struggled to effect change in the racially segregated South, where whites controlled state governments and denied African-Americans basic rights. Although Kennedy opposed segregation and had shown some support for the civil rights movement (most notably through a 1960 phone call to Coretta Scott King), he did not make civil rights a major priority of his presidency until his last months as commander-in-chief. JFK, who had had few personal interactions with blacks in his life, was reluctant to address civil rights concerns for fear of exposing American racism to the international community, alienating southern voters in his quest for re-election, and straining relations with southern Democrats in Congress (and thus making it harder to pass legislation). (Shmoop Editorial Team, 2008, n.p.)

The Civil Rights Act of 1963 guaranteed that all people were entitled to equal access to hotels, restaurants, and other public places and supported black voting rights and school desegregation. President Kennedy didn't see the Civil Rights Act of 1963 as he was assassinated before it became law.

From the American civil rights movement, much can be learned about peace and security, social injustices, and citizenship rights. Martin Luther King wrote the following on April 16, 1963, while in the Birmingham jail:

Consciously or unconsciously, he has been caught up by the Zeitgeist, and with his black brothers of Africa and his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America and the Caribbean, the United States Negro is moving with a sense of great urgency toward the

promised land of racial justice. If one recognizes this vital urge that has engulfed the Negro community, one should readily understand why public demonstrations are taking place. The Negro has many pent up resentments and latent frustrations, and he must release them. So let him march; let him make prayer pilgrimages to the city hall; let him go on freedom rides -and try to understand why he must do so. If his repressed emotions are not released in nonviolent ways, they will seek expression through violence; this is not a threat but a fact of history. So I have not said to my people: "Get rid of your discontent." Rather, I have tried to say that this normal and healthy discontent can be channeled into the creative outlet of nonviolent direct action. (Martin Luther King, Jr., Research and Education Initiative, n.p.)

By exploring the complex ecology of active citizenship education, including its history, I gain much appreciation of the construct, and in the case of the civil rights movement, much greater understanding of the relationship it has to peace, security and the human spirit.

Some Final Thoughts

The story of the nineteenth century (and indeed of the twentieth) has been that some (those with privilege and advantage) have been attempting to define citizenship narrowly and that all the others have been seeking to validate a broader definition. It is around this struggle that the intellectual theorizing of the next 200 years centered. It was around this struggle that the social movements were formed. (Wallerstein, 2002, n.p.)

I have provided a snapshot of events that challenged and shaped early concepts of the citizen, citizenship and citizenship education. I explored the Ancient Greek philosophers of

citizenship; the Magna Carta and the writings of Locke and Rousseau; citizenship and citizenship education as they presented themselves in the American, Haitian and French revolutions; and the marginalization, disenfranchisement and/or exclusion of various populations such as the Indigenous Peoples, women and African Americans and their struggles to overcome such indignities. My exploration of the historical dimensions of citizenship and citizenship education has brought out some interesting background information and discourse. Before I continue to share my research findings, I want to share some questions that have emerged as a result of my research on citizenship education's historical foundations. How often are youth informed about the citizenship accomplishments of their peer mentors (e.g., the Children's Crusade)? How often are youth expected to reflect upon their rights, liberty and representation? How are civil disobedience, resistance and unrest presented in an active citizenship education? What role does citizenship education play in the schema of educational purpose? How much are students encouraged to explore what citizenship has meant in different contexts and what it means to them? Are students encouraged to explore what gaps and exclusions exist in constructs citizenship education? I will not have time to explore all of these questions in depth, but they will influence my exploration as I proceed in gathering information on where we are currently with active citizenship education.

ACE: Where Are We At Today?

An Introduction to Contemporary Active Citizenship

In this section of my research findings I present contemporary discourses on the citizen, citizenship and active citizenship education that are currently circulating. I explore factors affecting citizenship (e.g., globalization, neoliberalism and shifting geo-governance); differing constructions of citizenship (e.g., global, neoliberal, social justice-oriented, democratic and/or state); youth

attitudes towards civic affairs (e.g., skepticism, distrust, and disengagement); the rights of youth (Convention on the Rights of the Child, inclusion and belonging) and marginalized youth populations. These topics compose the discourse narratives of contemporary citizenship, inclusive of its complexities and competing narratives. I have sorted the information on contemporary citizenship, grouped it into various categories, and assigned subheadings to them. Like an astronomer I have identified clusters in the discourse universe of contemporary citizenship education.

As previously indicated, I compare my research journey of active citizenship education to that of a journey through the universe – the parts are seemingly disconnected but when considered as a whole it all makes sense. Alibi (1999), describes Creswell’s book *Magnificent Universe* in the following way,

There, floating before us, within the ship itself, is our very own magnificent spiral galaxy, 120,000 light-years wide and only 2,000 light-years flat, chock full of billions of stars, many of which may be similar enough to our Sun ... Take a closer look. In the middle of the Milky Way is an enormous black hole, millions of times more massive than our Sun and so dense that its gravity sucks everything, even light, into its impenetrable core. Dense clusters of stars and gas orbit rapidly and closely around this black hole. Our Sun is far from this center, about halfway to the Milky Way's outer edge... Here we witness the quasars, galactic centers that can radiate a trillion times more brightly than our Sun. And far beyond the quasars is the very beginning of the universe itself. This is because our journey has been less a trip across vast distances than a trip back through time.

(1999, n.p.)

Rather than conducting a narrow atomistic study of active citizenship education and its discourse I explore the universe of ACE discourse, to pursue a deeper understanding of all that it entails, so that I can best explore not only where it has been, where it is, and the factors affecting its journey; but also where it ought to go, why, and how to get there. As I reveal my discourse findings, on contemporary citizenship and citizenship education in the sections below, I want to reiterate that some of the discourse quotations are very short while others are longer, thus allowing me to hermeneutically rethink their content, prior to entering the research analysis stage of my dissertation.

Youth Disengagement and Deficit Model

Evidence of disengagement of young people from conventional political activity has become apparent in recent years. Perhaps most strikingly, voting in UK general elections among 18–24 year olds amounted to only 39 and 37 per cent of those eligible in the 2001 and 2005 elections, respectively. Only half of schoolchildren declare an intention to vote in general elections when they become eligible.¹ Other evidence suggests serious supply side problems. Politicians are the most mistrusted category of persons in the perceptions of young people and political institutions are not held in high regard.² The term ‘politics’ elicits negative reactions from many young people, who tend to associate the term with national government and leading politicians. Although the need for the invigoration of politics is one without demographic boundaries, the problem is often seen as being particularly acute among young people. (Tonge and Mycock, 2009, p. 182)

Many hold civic engagement as paramount to democracy and the active participation of youth as the lifeline to its future. There is great concern among academics, governments and policy makers

in regards to alleged youth disengagement in civic life (e.g., Crick & Lockyer, 2010; Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999; Sears, 1996; Tonge & Mycock, 2009).

The concern is not limited to one geo-political area or a time frame consisting of the last few years. In the United States, concern has been expressed over the last two decades. As Palmer (2003) states:

- Only one in ten Americans between the ages of 18 and 29 can name both of their senators, as compared with one in five adults between the ages of 30 and 45 (Delli, Carpini & Keeter, 1996).
- In 1997, 27% of college freshman reportedly think keeping up with public affairs is very important, as compared with 59% of college freshmen in 1966 (Sax, Astin, Korn, & Mahoney, 1997).
- 32.3% of young adults reported that they had voted in the 2000 presidential election, compared with 54.7% of the entire voting age population (CIRCLE, n.d.).
- Less than four out of ten 15-25 year olds report that "citizenship entails certain responsibilities" (Keeter, Zukin, Andolina, Jenkins, 2002).

(p. 1)

Youth disengagement in these studies has been primarily measured in terms of voting rates, political literacy tests and political and/or community participation.

A background paper for the Canadian parliament warns us to be cautious not to assume that there are not other factors at play in regards to youth participation in civic affairs. Menard (2010) reports:

Today, however, young people seem to exhibit disengagement from the civic sphere and a general loss of interest in public affairs. This phenomenon has been reported in numerous

countries, including the United Kingdom¹, the United States² and Canada.³ However, we should not be too hasty to declare this disengagement absolute or irreversible. A number of factors are working against this trend, the education process chief among them. While the international context may have changed since the 1960s – the Cold War, for example, is no longer a source of tension – various other major issues, such as environmental protection, have come to the fore. Nor should anyone underestimate the fact that the Internet and social media have changed the way in which young people communicate among themselves and, very likely, the ways in which they can and want to engage in civic life.⁴

(p. 1)

Menard (2010) also notes that youth living in poverty and/or coming from non-mainstream socio-cultural backgrounds often feel alienated, unsafe, and disenfranchised from socio-political life, and even more so than mainstream youth, they feel their participation in civic affairs will not influence political leaders or make much difference.

Just as important, though, it is important to note that the “[t]he term ‘politics’ elicits negative reactions from many young people, who tend to associate the term with national government and leading politicians” (Tonge & Mycock, 2009, p. 182). Dalton, like Tonge and Mycock (2009) who allege that “a myth of political apathy had developed, which wrongly conflated disenchantment with certain politicians and aspects of the political system,” suggests that “America is witnessing a change in the nature of citizenship and political participation leading to a renaissance of democratic participation – rather than a decline in participation” (Dalton, 2008, p. 85).

Schultz and Guimaraes (2012) suggest that the term ‘active citizenship’ or existing constructs of the term are inadequate, and they offer a completely new alternative narrative and construct, to move forward with. Schultz and Guimaraes (2012) state:

We draw on Isin’s (2008: 38) distinction between active and activist citizenship: ‘We contrast *activist citizens* with *active citizens* who act out already written scripts. While activist citizens engage in writing scripts and creating the scene, active citizens follow scripts and participate in scenes that are already created. While activist citizens are creative, active citizens are not.’ If education is to contribute to improved participation and a strengthened public sphere, there must be education experiences that are foundations for activism and solidarity to be learned into being. In order to reach democratic legitimacy, social institutions, including education, must be arranged so that decisions reflect both common interests but also the political will of free and equal citizens (Benhabib, 1996; Fraser, 1997, 2009). This calls for forms of citizenship representation and participation that are inclusive and generative. ‘Deliberation is a particular kind of communication that involves recognizing the reasons advanced by those with whom one disagrees, even though one does not share them ... Deliberative processes are important because they emphasize the public sphere rather than the institutions of the state and encourage engagement of discourses across the different sites in society. Such empowerment, of what we might consider civil society, opens space at the local and international level for citizens to truly participate in negotiations and political decisions that influence their lives and the lives of others directly or indirectly. (p. 245)

Active citizenship education and programs are strongly interconnected to the fundamental purpose and/or aims of education – this is something that may be overlooked or intentionally dismissed by

governments who want to establish educational agendas that prefer economic priorities and narratives.

As I explore active citizenship education, and the active or activist citizen, I will be able to tease out the underpinnings, tensions, layers, exclusions and reflectively arrive at a better understanding of what the ‘active citizen’ is or ought to be and what an ‘active citizenship program’ is or ought to be. For this reason, I never selected a rigid definition of either, as I will be able to better capture and articulate what these concepts mean and what they can look like. As I explore alleged gaps between ACE and youth participation in civic affairs I need to tread carefully in regards to claims of youth disengagement. As Inglehart (1997) states “allegations of apathy are misleading” and indicates a shift in understanding is arising as “mass publics are deserting the old-line oligarchic political organization that mobilized them in the modernization era,” and instead are becoming more active via “elite challenging forms” (p. 307).

Youth Skepticism

Perhaps not surprisingly given the findings above, large majorities of young people report that they lack trust in democratic institutions, as well as those individuals and agencies that inhabit them.⁹ There seems to be a somewhat varied view with respect to democratic institutions. Only 15% said that they considered that, on balance, UK governments (past and present) tend to be honest and trustworthy, while the view of the overwhelming majority (66%) was that they were not. (Henn & Foard, 2011, p.13)

Studies indicate that a significant number of youth have little regard for and/or distrust their political figures and political systems (Dalton, 2008; Henn & Foard, 2011; Tonge & Mycock, 2009). Schultz and Guimaraes-Iosif (2012) note that,

It is claimed that young people are not interested in politics and government because they distrust politicians and the political system, and do not believe that their votes will make a difference. For example, in national focus groups conducted for Communication Canada in 2001, the common lament from young Canadians was the lack of political leadership to inspire and help youth to believe there is something and someone worth voting for. Recent government scandals surrounding improper contracting and misuse of money have only helped fuel this perception. The lack of interest is also generated by a perception that government does not understand young people's needs and interests. This was confirmed by Communication Canada's *Listening to Canadians: Focus on Young Adults* report (2002), which indicated that 70 percent of young adults do not believe that the federal government understands what is desirable to them. (p. 241)

It is not clear whether students are apathetically avoiding mainstream channels because of their distrust and disdain for the system, or if they are electing to find alternative routes of engagement.

Dalton (2008) states that,

Rising levels of education, changing generational experiences and other social forces are decreasing respect for authority and traditional forms of allegiance as represented in duty-based citizenship. Simultaneously, these forces are increasing self-expressive values as well as the ability and desire to participate more directly in the decisions affecting one's life. And it is noteworthy that solidarity norms are part of this dimension, since this process of value change is often described in terms of new left-libertarian values.” (p. 82)

There are potentially some gaps in the research in regards to determining if there is a wide-spread apathy of youth towards civic affairs (e.g., or is it merely in some regards, such as voting), if the

political understandings of youth have declined (e.g., or are they more literate in a post-Cold-War discourse that might be more rights-based) and whether they are participating less in civic life (e.g., or are they more engaged via alternate forums). Perhaps, youth are engaging in alternative ways of civic engagement as Reid (2010) suggests:

The paradox of our times is that citizens are more actively engaged in issues than ever before. Party membership [Scotland] has fallen (sic) however, from one in eleven people in the 1950s to one in eighty-eight (Phillips, 2007:1) and engagement is largely through voluntary and campaigning, organisations outside the political process. If we really want trust and turnout, therefore, there is a case for asking whether the answer may lie in returning more power both to parliamentarians and to the people. (Reid, 2010, p. 40)

Or, are such claims of indifference not unique to youth, but to the nation at large, as “there is an apparent consensus among contemporary political scientists that the foundations of citizenship and democracy in America are crumbling” (Dalton, 2008, p. 76). As I proceed through my dissertation, I will have to wrestle through these concerns, and using CDA, more closely analyze the studies and discourses that exist on these pertinent issues.

Influence of Globalization

Given the complexity of globalized understandings and practices of citizenship, there is a need to explore how we can educate for a more vibrant public sphere with citizens who participate as activists and emancipated citizens. Can education contribute to a democracy beyond democratic elitism? If democracy can be found in the spaces between citizens (the public sphere) then educators’ work can be examined through this conceptualization of

citizenship. Concerns by educators, policymakers, global civil society and multilateral organizations are increasingly raised about the diminishment of citizenship spaces and citizenship action and in order to understand the urgency of this interest, it is important to examine its context. The struggle for democratic citizenship in times of global inequality, environmental destruction, and the intentional diminishment of public spaces to make room for ever-increasing privatization, demands more than obedient citizens with good intentions. (Shultz & Guimaraes-Iosif, 2012, p. 242)

Some of the forerunners in globalization discourse are Arun Appadurai, David Held and David Harvey. They explored the shifts the social, political, economic and cultural shifts that were only beginning to shrink the planetary disconnectedness we once knew. They identified shifts that were occurring (e.g., mass migrations of people, new political identities, the rise of corporations) and some of the factors associated with such shifts (e.g., global capitalism, greater global mobility via rapid transport, and an explosion of global communication networks). David Harvey (1996) described a process of “time-space compression” (p. 377) that sped up our way of being. Appadurai (1990) spoke of a series of disjunctures that were occurring:

The complexity of the current global economy has to do with certain fundamental disjunctures between economy, culture and politics which we have barely begun to theorize. I propose that an elementary framework for exploring such disjunctures is to look at the relationship between five dimensions of global cultural flow which can be termed: (a) ethnoscaples; (b) mediascaples; (c) technoscaples; (d) finanscaples; and (e) ideoscaples... This is not to say that there are not anywhere relatively stable communities and networks, of kinship, of friendship, of work and of leisure, as well as of birth, residence and other

filiative forms. But that is not to say that the warp of these stabilities is everywhere shot through with the woof of human motion, as more persons and groups deal with the realities of having to move, or the fantasies of wanting to move. What is more, both these realities as well as these fantasies now function on larger scales, as men and women from villages in India think not just of moving to Poona or Madras, but of moving to Dubai and Houston, and refugees from Sri Lanka find themselves in South India as well as in Canada, just as the Hmong are driven to London as well as to Philadelphia. And as international capital shifts its needs, as production and technology generate different needs, as nation-states shift their policies on refugee populations, these moving groups can never afford to let their imaginations rest too long, even if they wished to. (n.p.)

The nature of the citizen and the dimensions of citizenship have changed and continue to change and this must be recognized in the realm of citizenship education. Not only do educational policy and curriculum makers need to prepare students to understand their own citizenship and/or becoming citizens, but they also need to take into consideration the political identities of the students they are seeking to educate, as in many Western worlds, these are no longer homogenous groups. As well, it is important to note that youth as citizens, want and need to feel that as citizens they are not only subjects of a rapidly-changing global scenario, but also agents within it (e.g., as citizens with rights).

The Influence of Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism profoundly challenged and destabilised post-1945 political projects, policy arrangements and practices of governing. In particular, there were concerted efforts to roll back existing guarantees to social protection and practices of interest intermediation,

in the name of a larger role for the market, families and communities ... Ideas about ‘social investment’ began to spread from the beginning of the mid 1990s’... The announced goals of the social investment perspective are to increase social inclusion and minimize the intergenerational transfer of poverty as well as to ensure that the population is well prepared for the likely employment conditions (demand for higher educational qualifications; less job security; more precarious forms of employment) of contemporary economies. Doing so will allow individuals and families to maintain responsibility for their well-being via market incomes and intra-family exchanges, as well as lessening the threats to social protection regimes coming from ageing societies and high dependency ratios. (Jenson, 2009, p. 27)

According to Kennelly and Llewellyn (2011) liberalism, is based on the following principles:

“[T]hat every individual is free and equal under the law; that freedom is based on the human capacity to reason; and than an inviolable right to property and the sale of one’s labour within the free market flow from these tenets” and that “the ‘neo’ in neoliberalism – or what is ‘new’ about it – is its extensive emphases on self-regulation” (pp. 898-899). Brown (2005) argues that, “neoliberal rationality not only foregrounds the market but it also *“involves extending and disseminating market values to all institutions and social action”* (p. 39-40). Neoliberal governmentality usurps this logic further by “detaching the systems of authority from political rule” (Kennelly and Llewellyn, 2011, p. 899) and locates them “within the market governed by the rationalities of competition, accountability, and consumer demand” (Miller and Rose, 2008, p. 24).

Thus as Kennelly and Llewellyn (2011) states: “Neoliberal ideologies carry specific implications for conceptualizations of citizenship within the state” (p. 899). In this structure, active citizens are responsible to themselves for the choices they make and not to the larger public sphere,

or for the crumbling fragments on the periphery. According to Mitchell (2003), “[E]ducating a child to be a good citizen is no longer synonymous with constituting a well-rounded, nationally oriented, multicultural self, but rather about the attainment of the ‘complex skills’ necessary for individual success in a global economy” (p. 399). Collective rights and the exercising of such rights take a backseat in neoliberal citizenship structures. Such neoliberal discourse enters educational policy and curriculum as I will later discuss in my research analysis.

According to Harris (2011), “with neoliberalization, citizens are increasingly asked to rely less on state services to meet their own needs and to take on responsibility for resource governance to realize efficiencies (sic)” (p. 853). Feminist legal scholars Condon and Phillips (2005) state:

The assumption underlying our previous work was that neoliberal philosophy delegitimizes the project of “social citizenship,” in which the nation-state is assigned a central role in providing baseline economic security to all members of society.⁴ Neoliberalism instead privileges markets as the superior distributive mechanism for goods and services and it rests on a heightened responsibility imposed on individuals to manage their own welfare and well-being. We argued that this is problematic from a gender point of view, creating increased economic disadvantage for many women and rendering such social policy immune to democratic accountability because it was being accomplished increasingly by way of market mechanisms.⁵ While feminist analysts have engaged vigorously with this development by uncovering the discriminatory effects of neoliberal policies in various state domestic contexts, less work has been done on the gendered implications of neoliberalism in the context of transnational economic governance, much of which take place outside formal state institutions. (p. 106).

Neoliberal agendas are increasingly based on deregulation, privatization and non-welfare state (e.g., social protections) agendas; “economic citizenship”: and “the discourse of economic citizenship” (Condon & Phillips, 2005; p. 107).

The narratives that circulate in neoliberal economic spheres can find their way into citizenship discourse. According to Aldenmyr, Wigg and Olson (2012),

What stands out as central in the active citizen’s choice-making is a logic of choice that is linked to principles of consumerism rather than to a logic of rights and democracy. It does so by stressing the need for the young student to ‘become someone’ by taking up a consumer’s attitude through education ... The agency promoted in this kind of citizen ‘activeness’ stands out as a question of self-making through constantly on-going navigation in a bazaar marked out by competition and transactional assessment. (p. 258)

Neoliberal discourse can transfix on individualism, competition and the self-made individual rather than on the common good and the marginalized. Researchers such as Wodak and her associates “[m]ost extensively and explicitly” use analytical strategies, “within a clear CDA framework” to study an issue and they “integrate a broad range of disciplines and analytical notions in their ‘discourse-historical’ approach, including (social and cognitive) psychology, socio-linguistics and history” in their inquiries (van Dyck, 1998, p. 364). Such CDA can reveal the influence of neoliberal philosophies and the impact they can have on the citizen, citizenship and the democratic ideal.

In a similar manner, I am exploring the complexities, tensions and competing-notions of active citizenship, to more fully grasp the intentions behind active citizenship education designs. Citizenship education is shaped by socio-political factors and visa versa, but how each is shaped by the other is complex. As Mason (2009) states:

Notions of cosmopolitan and environmental citizenship have emerged in response to concerns about environmental sustainability and global inequality. But even if there are obligations of egalitarian justice that extend across state boundaries, or obligations of environmental justice to the resources in a sustainable way that are owed to those beyond our borders, it is far from clear that these are best conceptualized as obligations of global or environmental citizenship. (p. 280)

Neoliberal discourses have impacted and framed aspects of active citizenship education via curriculum and policies (Condon & Phillips, 2005), thus I need to consider the place, prominence and priority that neoliberal discourse has played and should play when considering how to improve and/or transform existing ACE programs for youth.

Invoking the Rights of the Child

If citizenship is conceived passively to be a legal status conferring state identity, it can be considered straightforwardly as an issue of state and international law. However, when it is viewed as a substantive set of social, economic and political expectations, conventions and obligations informing the relations between individuals and the communities in which they live, citizenship becomes open to multifaceted and malleable construction. To what extent citizenship is then compatible with childhood depends both on what are taken to be its essential elements, or building blocks (Lister 2008), and on how childhood is understood. There is growing insistence both in the literature on childhood and amongst agencies representing young people, to incorporate them within the ambit of citizenship. But to view them as active citizens rather than merely legal citizens requires closer examination. (Lockyer, 2010, pp. 154-155)

There are a number of international human rights instruments that most developed countries are signatory to, such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). It is expected that countries domesticate the intent of the conventions, covenants and resolutions into their state laws – the extent to which states do this varies. Article 12 (1) of the CRC indicates: “States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child” (United Nations Assembly, 1989, n.p.). Article 3 of the CRC states: “In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration” (United Nations Assembly, 1989, n.p.). According to the Children’s Rights Alliance for England (CRAE) (2012)

The right to participate in elections by universal and equal suffrage without distinction of any kind is protected by international law. Any restriction on the right to vote should meet international legal requirements...At 16, young people can pay taxes, leave home, consent to medical treatment, get married or enter a civil partnership, join the armed forces and make lots of other major decisions. However, they are denied the basic rights of citizenship - they have no say in how the country is run, how their taxes are spent and whether the country goes to war. Lowering the voting age would send a clear and positive message to young people that their views count. It would provide a seamless transition from compulsory citizenship education to the opportunity to vote, avoiding what can be for some a seven-year gap between their formal education about voting and their first national election. Thousands of young people have expressed their support for Votes at 16. (n.p.)

Suffrage for sixteen and seventeen year olds is gaining momentum in the global sphere and many arguments are being based on the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). As well, according to the Rights of the Child UK (2012), “The Convention has been incorporated into the law in a variety of ways in two-thirds of 69 countries studied in 2008 by UNICEF’s Innocenti Research Centre” (p.5); the practice is quite feasible if the political will and/or pressure to do so is strong enough.

The Rights of the Child UK (2012) indicates that not only would domesticating the CRC (e.g., international law) into state law facilitate youth engagement in civic affairs and affirm their citizenship rights (e.g., lowering the vote to 16) but that it would also spur the government to address the socio-political inequities that marginalized youth (e.g., those living in poverty and dropping out of school early to work) endure. By honouring and domesticating international agreements such as the CRC and other UN instruments (e.g. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights) states may be more likely to seriously integrate programs to address such socio-cultural woes as childhood poverty, homelessness, and political disenfranchisement. *In their report Why Incorporate? Making Rights a Reality for Every Child* the Rights of the Child UK (2012) stated that it “calls on the UK Government to demonstrate commitment to children’s rights by giving force and full effect to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in UK law” (p. 3). When exploring the directions active citizenship education should take, it is important to consider the rights of youth as citizens, how these play out (e.g., in legislation, curriculum and school culture), and how it could play out, in their active citizenship education. As the Rights of the Child UK (2012) indicates,

An overarching and comprehensive children's rights law would allow sustainable improvements in children's rights and bring about change for children far more quickly than the current piecemeal approach to reform ... Incorporating the Convention would require the systematic consideration of all children's rights in every piece of legislation and policy affecting children. (p. 3)

By exploring active citizenship education as being a galaxy among a much broader universe, it opens the discourse on the issue, to new dimensions which may not have been previously explored – the domestication of CRC, or the further domestication of CRC in domestic laws, could strongly impact state ACE policies as well. According to Grover (2011), “States ought to abide by international human rights law and grant sixteen year olds the right to vote because “it is a pre-existing inherent basic universal human right” (p. 50), but also because it offers enfranchisement to youth at an age when they are searching for spaces where they can feel enfranchised.

The Global Citizen Narrative

Citizenship is central in discussions of educational responses to the global imperative, a premise that defines the contemporary moment. A growing sense of interdependency and interconnection within “the global” coupled with increasing diversity within the nation state places particular demands on extant notions of citizenship and schooling. There is a desire for schooling to equip students with an awareness of global connectedness and thus to encourage young people to develop a consciousness of themselves as citizens of the world. In this sense, the global imperative is associated with a development of a sense of global responsibility and a heightened sense of a need to respond to globalization in educational theory and practice. At the same time, the global imperative is related to

existing and developing issues around diversity within the nation. On both fronts, much is desired of a notion of citizenship. (O'Sullivan & Pashby, 2008, p. 9)

Developing notions of the global citizen include narratives that promote such things as a more interconnected global citizenship (e.g., via trade, technology and communications), inclusive nation-state citizenship (e.g., recognizing new forms of political identities and mass migrations of people), sustainable forms of citizenship (e.g., social, cultural and environmental sustainability), universally-normative citizenship (e.g., based on international human rights instruments, and a more transformative form of citizenship (e.g., based on a need to transform our way of being on the planet). Such narratives can overlap and they can be seen as being at odds with state-based narratives and/or more rigid conceptions of citizenship (e.g., legal citizenship narratives). Some feel that important global narratives for citizenship are marginalized “instead of being mainstreamed” (e.g., climate change, intergenerational sustainability, children’s rights) (Arts, 2010, p. 24). What citizenship education has been and where it is going will depend on a number of factors, one of which hopefully will be an in-depth inquiry into the “policy ecology” (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, p. 155) of the competing interests, discourses and philosophies which incorporates the use of a critical lens. Part of that policy ecology includes discussion on the global citizen.

Discussion on global citizenship is not limited to the dynamics of international and transnational trade, communication and socio-political interactions. It can also involve elements of deliberative inquiry which include discussions about the public good. As Orhan (2008) states:

Even in a less-than-perfect regime, however, the common good can and must be discerned and factored into deliberation to the extent possible. In the face of the present environmental challenges, we can speak of sustainability as the common good of not only

each and every political community on earth but also of the whole human family itself, including both present and future generations. (p. 38)

When I present the analysis of my researching findings I will relate such statements to other aspects of my findings such as historical, contemporary and policy discourses; socio-economic changes related to globalization, and emergent calls for more sustainable decision-making. It is important though to present some of the logic behind the inclusion of global concerns in citizenship and the construction of the ideal citizen.

The rationale for including global dimensions in active citizenship varies. According to Chikwe (2012), “Because of globalization, our educational system and civic education should no longer focus on forming the national identity and national citizenship alone but to look beyond our frontiers to the global public. Students should be taught the new way of being in the world and the way to deal with the accompanying complexities. Possessing multiple identities by no means is easy and we owe our children the obligation to empower them to step beyond the boundaries of race, nationality, privilege, first world, third world, black, white and all the other binaries (p. 21).

Such discourse is not necessarily outside the realm of state policy, legislation, law and/or citizenship. There are a number of United Nations conventions, treaties and covenants that states are signatory to such as United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which governments are responsible to integrate into their own systems of governance. Rather than being external factors of citizenship they may be slowly finding their rightful place in state laws and citizenship programs.

Some argue that the world has changed in terms of its relationships with other countries and to the environment. Mehlinger (1977), for example, argues the following:

The world is different from what it was fifteen or twenty years ago. Global interdependence is a fact of life....What does this have to do with civic education? Civic education has traditionally been concerned with promoting nationalism. While nation-states will not suddenly disappear or lose their influence, nevertheless students must increasingly find identification with the species as a whole and not with American citizens only, be loyal to the planet as well as the fifty states, and be committed to policies and goals intended to ensure the survival of the species rather than merely increasing American power and prestige at the expense of others. (p. 69)

Invoking moral, ethical and intergenerational imperatives to justify an expanded notion (e.g., beyond the state) of the citizen and citizenship is not unusual. In their discourse some postsecondary programs advocate for a transformational approach to education for global citizenship which is based on tenets of shared humanity, taking care of the planet and preparing for the future (Shultz, 2007). Aboagye (2007) notes that, "There is growing evidence of interest by students in global engagement [postsecondary]. College and university campuses have become sites for youth run non-profit organizations that are all seeking to change the world one way or another" (p. 4). It may be that beyond moral, ethical and intergenerational imperative there is a youth imperative to support a construction of citizenship that includes a global paradigm (Ball, 1998).

Narratives of Inclusion and Exclusion

Racial, ethnic, cultural, and language diversity is increasing in nation-states throughout the world because of worldwide immigration. The deepening ethnic diversity within nation-states and

the quest by different groups for cultural recognition and rights are challenging assimilationist notions of citizenship and forcing nation-states to construct new conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education. A delicate balance of unity and diversity should be an essential goal of citizenship education in multicultural nation-states. Citizenship education should help students to develop thoughtful and clarified identifications with their cultural communities, nation-states, and the global community. It also should enable them to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to act to make the nation and the world more democratic and just. (Banks, 2004b, p. 289)

Citizenship education often focuses on creating a sense of membership into a state-based space which confers shared rights, responsibilities and a sense of common state identity and belonging. Banks (2011) expresses concern that,

The movement of people across national boundaries is as old as the nation-state itself. However, never before in the history of the world has the movement of diverse racial, cultural, ethnic, religious, and linguistic groups within and across nation-states been as numerous and rapid or raised such complex and difficult questions about citizenship, human rights, democracy and education ... However, the development of citizens who have global and cosmopolitan identities and commitments is contested in nation-states around the world because nationalism remains strong. (p. 243)

Some researchers have expressed concern that themes of unity can be laden with elements of assimilation, colonization and/or mono-culturalism (e.g., Banks, 2004a; Jakubowicz, 2009). In reference to postwar European emigration to Australia, Jakubowicz (2009) recalls how the state system was “assimilationist, rationalist and nationalist” (p. 2) to create homogeneity. Policies of assimilation in places such as Canada and Australia alienated, harmed and seriously oppressed target groups; both countries made national apologies to their Aboriginal populations for the

atrocities that occurred. Diversity and multicultural narratives later became important to state initiatives (e.g., in Australia, Britain, and Canada) and citizenship strategies (Jakubowicz, 2009).

Unfortunately, many identifiable minority groups including Indigenous populations and those living in poverty, still remain disenfranchised as citizens (e.g., Chisholm and Gonsalvez, 2012). This remains true for students as well, as they come from many of these demographic groups. As Banks (2011) states,

Members of identifiable racial groups often become marginalized in both their community cultures and in the national civic culture because they can function effectively in neither. When they acquire the language and culture of the mainstream dominant culture, they are often denied structural inclusion and full participation into the civic culture because of their racial, cultural, linguistic, or religious characteristics (Abba and Nee 2003). Teachers and schools must practice democracy and human rights in order for these ideals to be internalized by students (Dewey 1959). When schools and classrooms become microcosms and exemplars of democracy and social justice they help students acquire democratic attitudes, learn how to practice democracy, and to engage in deliberation with students from other ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and religious groups (Gutmann 2004; Osler and Starkey 2009). (p. 247)

Scott-Bauman (2003) suggests that in some regards citizenship is seen as an antidote to existing socio-political ills, which can include pessimism, while Crick (1999) suggests that nations introduced citizenship education to address some nature of state crisis.

To resolve what citizenship education ought to be Scott-Bauman (2003) suggests the following:

The most challenging way of thinking about the way we live, is to think ontologically. Ontology, I believe, is the analysis of what we think is worth believing in. One way of testing the strengths and weaknesses of ideas (in this case citizenship and postmodernity) is use philosophical means to tackle the real core of what we think is worth believing in, so that we can act on our beliefs (the “ontology of action” as Ricoeur calls it). The wisdom of this French hermeneutical philosopher (1913-) spans nearly a century... Citizenship and postmodernity seem to embody the extremes that many individuals struggle with. On the one hand, as members of a community we have the desire to play a part in society and, on the other, we despair of ever being able to make a difference, the feeling of hopelessness that it is all too much. (p. 356)

For Scott-Bauman (2003) citizenship is seen as a “transformative force” and means to overcome the “skepticism of postmodernity,” (p. 361). It also is seen as an “ethico-practical action” to “rehabilitate hope” and in the following of Ricoeur’s philosophical way of thinking, it offers “a reconstructive antidote to the confusing moral maze drawn by so-called postmodern thinking” (Scott-Bauman, 2003, p. 362). Given this train of thought, citizenship is seen as a means to address socio-political issues such as poverty, pollution and overpopulation. Similarly, a citizen is expected to remain aware of global interdependencies but also recognize that local action can counteract both local and global issues. As Scott-Bauman (2003) suggests, “Yet if we accept that we can believe in our actions and make a difference, we can move forward constructively from the critical point of creative tension created where the scepticism born of circumstances faces up to the optimism latent in conscience” (p. 365). According to Scott-Bauman (2003) this will require a paradigm shift from being a consumption-based society (e.g., consumerism) to a more compassionate pluralistic society

that embraces universal human rights and rejects relativism and the “othering” (Said, 1994) of persons from different backgrounds to one’s own.

What Role Should Critical Citizenship Take?

In the past five years, hundreds of schools, districts, states, and even the federal government [US] have enacted policies that seek to restrict critical analysis of historical and contemporary events in the school curriculum. In June 2006, the Florida Education Omnibus Bill included language specifying that, “The history of the United States shall be taught as genuine history ... American history shall be viewed as factual, not as constructed, shall be viewed as knowable, teachable, and testable.” Other provisions in the bill mandate “flag education, including proper display” and “flag salute” and require educators to stress the importance of free enterprise in the U.S. economy. (Westheimer, 2008, p.4)

Various assumptions, beliefs and mandates influence how active citizenship education is constructed. Policy-makers, curriculum designers and educational leaders explore these narratives to select the thematic narrative(s) that will guide their programs. Some programs focus on critical skills, thinking, citizenship, pedagogy and/or action. Johnson and Morris (2010) state that, “The promotion of ‘critical citizenship’ has become a key objective of official school curricula around the world” (p.1); their research included a comparative analysis of critical citizenship education in England and France. There are differences among scholars, practitioners and policy-writers as to what is meant by critical citizenship education, which I will discuss under another subheading of my research findings, but for now I want to explore the concept of critical citizenship more.

Generally speaking, most citizenship education programs want students to be able to critically think, but what they means varies substantially as do the arguments that are used to promote some forms while berating other forms. Nikolakaki (2008) claims that,

Education in both content and delivery has been promoting a passive and exclusive habitatus. According to Freire (1970-1990), in societies that are characterized by injustice and oppression, the owners of power define the methods, the programs, the content of education, so that the dominant culture is internalized by the masses and their oppression is continued. Thus, education in both content and delivery becomes a weapon whereby the subjected learn to adapt to the oppressor. (p. 227)

Nikolakaki (2008) draws from scholars such as Freire (1970), Giroux (1983), McLaren (1999) and Ranciere (2004), to formulate his/her interpretation of what critical deliberate citizenship is about. Giroux believes that citizenship education should offer students the “opportunity to engage in deeper understanding of the importance of democratic culture while developing classroom relations that prioritize the importance of cooperation, sharing and social justice (1983, p. 3). Freire (1970) is well known for his advocacy for a non-static space of praxis where critical reflection and political action motivate one another and claims that, “Deliberative critical citizenship education is about learning how to connect with one’s fellow citizens to confront power and authority” (p. 299).

Ranciere (2004) sees citizenship education in the democratic public sphere as being one of challenge and meaningful disruption. Ranciere (1999) sees deliberating citizens as “political animal[s]”(p. 37) that are ““capable of embracing a distance between words and things which is not a trickery, but humanity; a being capable of embracing the unreality of representation” (Ranciere, 2007, p. 51). Using Ranciere’s logic, Nikolakaki (2008) states, “Since democracy in education is

never in place, but always *enters* the scene of inequality, in schooling (or other institutions); it inserts itself, intervenes and interrupts” (p. 229). Given this idea of citizenship as not being static, or not being merely a state of knowing, citizenship in this regards becomes a site of operations, one in which one identifies, critically analyzes, and acts upon emerging issues within the democratic state.

One of the reasons I included discussions on the critical citizen and critical citizenship education in this section of critical citizenship is because concepts of the critical citizen are often interchanged with that of the critical thinker and/or critical thinking. Such a citizen is seen as capable of critical thinking and/or capable of taking critical action to transform historic, contemporary and emerging issues that present themselves within the mandates of the public and/or democratic spheres. In regards to critical citizenship education the ‘critical’ aspects of this designation often emphasize “personal responsibility in exchange for individual rights” or “personal responsibility for leading a moral life and contributing to the community in cooperative and positive ways (i.e., volunteering at a soup kitchen, picking up trash” (James & Iverson, 2009, p. 34). James and Iverson (2009) refer to a shift in citizenship discourse from one that is “justice oriented” to one that is “change-oriented,” and state that, “We believe that only critically thoughtful, change-oriented, socially active citizens aware of socio-political contexts within which they live and work are capable of rising” (James & Iverson, 2009, p. 34) to a level where “humanity may improve” (Dewey, 1916, p. 39).

Given the December 14, 2012 Connecticut schooling shooting where 20 children between the ages of five and ten were killed, I present a statement made by James and Iverson (2009), “The complex issues that continue to plague the U.S. (and the world) – homelessness, poverty, hunger, to name a few – demand that higher education develop citizens committed to justice and social

change” (p. 44). Hamrick (1998) states that college graduates need “to situate themselves as citizens with attendant responsibilities to identify and deal with social problems” and “use [their] energies and abilities in service to a collective society” (p. 450). In the aftermath of the tragic mass murder many Americans spoke about how evil the event was, while others gave challenge to existing gun legislation in the United States. If one is to apply Hamrick’s logic, perhaps citizenship education, whether at college or high school, needs to prepare students to constructively discuss contemporary social issues. As Edmund Burke once wrote, “All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing” (QuotationsBook, 2012, n.p.). Perhaps, the dimensions of critical citizenship should invoke individual and collective reflection and action.

A number of scholars indicate that global, deliberative, and/or critical citizenship refers in some way to citizenship as being a way of being, behaving and acting. This brings me to consider whether there is an ontological nature of citizenship, that is, to what degree is citizenship considered to be a way of being and/or being part of one’s local, state and/or global community. Giroux (2008) states,

What separates an authoritarian from an emancipator notion of education is whether or not education encourages and enables students to deepen their commitments to social justice, equality and individual and social autonomy, while at the same time expanding their capacities to assume public responsibility and actively participate in the very process of governing. As a condition of individual and social autonomy, education introduces democracy to students as a way of life – an ethical ideal that demands constant attention – and, as such, takes seriously the responsibility for providing the conditions for people to exercise critical judgment, reflexiveness, deliberation and socially responsible action. Education is always political because it is connected to the acquisition of agency. As a

political project, education should illuminate the relationship among knowledge, authority and power. It should also draw attention to questions concerning who has control over the production of knowledge, values and skills, and it should illuminate how knowledge, identities and authority are constructed within particular sets of social relations (n.p.)

Interestingly enough, Giroux also indicates that there are universalities and particularities of citizenship. Giroux (2008) states,

I would like to conceptualize education as a form of provocation and challenge, a practice rooted in an ethical-political vision that attempts to take people beyond the world they already know in a way that does not insist of an fixed set of altered meanings, but instead provokes and expansion of the range of human possibilities and provides the conditions for the development of an informed, critical citizenry capable of actively participating in a Democratic society. This suggests forms of knowledge and pedagogy that enable rather than subvert the potential of a Democratic culture. (n.p.)

Such a conceptualization of critical citizenship opens the citizenship sphere to include space for creativity, change, hope, healing, resolution, equity and transformation.

The Affect of Shifting Geo Spaces

The dynamics of contemporary citizenship have been influenced by rapid changes in governance, communication and political identities. Traditional state borders can be hurdled over by way of governance, technology and travel. Paquet (2003) states,

The shift from a geo-government based on the old trinity of state-nation-territory to a new and more fluid, mobile, slippery, shifty, evasive geo-governance has created new challenges. In this new game where geographical space plays a lesser and difference role,

where the state has lost its full grip on governing, and the nation and various other territories of the mind have woven a multiplicity of powerful reciprocal extraterritorialities of determining consequence, the game is without a master, and collaboration is the new imperative. This is eminently subversive since it amounts to nothing less than an expropriation of the power base of most of the traditional and well-established potentates.

(p. 2)

International trade agreements such as the (MAI), North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) have influenced international relations as well as state operations. For example, the Council of Canadians (2009) claims that Article 11 of NAFTA gives unwarranted license to transnational corporations while jeopardizing state citizens and their home-state environments:

When the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was implemented in 1994, it introduced new corporate investment rights and protections unprecedented in scope and power. While there are many aspects of NAFTA that threaten social and environmental priorities, the investor-state dispute process found in Chapter 11 puts public policies aimed at protecting people and the environment at the most risk. Chapter 11 gives corporations the right to sue the Canadian government, often for tens of millions of dollars, if any public policy or government action denies them investment or profit opportunities. (p.1)

The purpose of noting this is not to get into the intricacies of the agreement, but rather to indicate that a citizen's ability to address emerging issues, such as environmental pollution, in post-NAFTA times, is far different from pre-NAFTA times. Citizens have been brought into the transnational context via trade agreements and thus, the space of geo-governance that the citizen now lives in, has enlarged greatly, as has the power-base that one has to contend with to initiate change.

As well, the citizen's geo-digital space has also significantly grown, as technology has leapfrogged state borders, and entered multiple aspects of their everyday life. For example, citizens may expect that the working conditions of the factories that manufactured the merchandise they purchased, operate according to state and/or international standards, but this may not be the case as we have seen in the case of sweatshops (e.g., child labour and/or unsafe work places). At the same time, citizens may be interacting with agents from overseas (e.g., call centers) when wanting to address what appear to be, for example, multiple corporate billing errors. The reach of the average citizen has extended beyond state borders, even though the emergent issue is experienced locally.

Many global scholars claim an inadequacy in current education practice to teach students about the world's people, places, events, and the ways in which individuals and states are connected to a sophisticated global system ... schools are beginning to take an active role in developing students that are effective players in an increasing pluralistic, interdependent, and changing world. (Maguth, 2012, p. 76)

A citizen's home computer can be invaded by unwanted solicitations coming from outside state boundaries, yet the citizen can connect outside those boundaries as well. We live in a world of increasing interdependence (Maguth, 2012), but I question if one as a citizen, has increased or decreased power, as a citizen in the global context. And, if their power has been diminished, what rights does a citizen have in the global text they have been moved into. If the state has entered a transnational sphere has it not by commission also taken its citizens there? By allowing transnational entities to enter one's own state has the state not allowed the global sphere to enter the citizen's space? Does the state citizen not have multiple roles and identities in a new geo-digital sphere?

Even within state boundaries the complexities of citizenship are interacting, overlapping and intersecting. There are socio-political contestations, collisions and crossovers that take place at the junctures where local, regional and state governance meet. This holds especially true when centralized power is challenged, questioned or under constant scrutiny. Barker (2010) gives a Canadian example of this:

It is a truism to say that any collective identity is multifaceted and complex. However, in the fluid constitutional and political environment of multinational Canada this is especially true. Given the unresolved character of Quebec's nation- and state-building, ongoing contestation and negotiation of the national identity will continue to be central features of Quebec political life as long as the national political majority that asserts itself as a confident actor on the world stage exists alongside an apprehensive minority on another, domestic, stage. To the extent that this ongoing constitutional debate about the appropriate balance between unity and diversity is conducted according to liberal democratic principles, then Quebec may, as James Tully suggested, be well equipped for future debates about accommodating multiple identity groups.¹⁰⁸ For this reason, it is worth taking more seriously the ideal, expressed by political theorists, that the politics of identity in multinational societies such as Quebec should be viewed and valued as an 'unending political activity',¹⁰⁹ rather than as a definitive 'end-state' of recognition and entrenchment of any single version of the collective identity of Quebec. (Barker, 2010, p. 36)

Citizens have local, sub-state and or regional, state, and supranational "sense(s) of themselves" (Bartlett, Craig, & Sass, 1989, p. 170) – their political identities are multifaceted, diverse and complex (Levesque, 2003).

ACE: Where Ought We To Go In The Future?

Positions on what active citizenship education is or ought to be are very diverse. Some have created models of active citizenship and/or active citizenship education to provide rubric-like devices to measure active citizenship, improvements in active citizenship education, and to guide policymaking, curriculum development and teaching pedagogies. Some are seeking to transform active citizenship education altogether. Hebert and Sears (2001) state that,

Views of citizenship and of citizenship education must move beyond a focus on human rights, parliamentary democracy, national ideology, and peace education, to one that allows for multiple identifications and democratic participation. Research on these topics must utilize a range of research methodologies, blend paradigms or ways of seeing, and redefine the field of citizenship education itself. (p. 16)

I have brought in a diverse range of materials on the ideal citizen, citizenship and active citizenship but I intentionally opened my discussion up to a number of other interrelated topics (e.g., neoliberalism, globalization and colonization). These discourses (documentary method) were used to broaden, enhance and enrich the conversation on active citizenship education. I explored materials that discussed the constructions and/or interpretations about the citizen, citizenship and active citizenship education that might reveal oppressive structural and discourse tendencies that need to be addressed (e.g., who or what items are being marginalized, disenfranchised or excluded). All of these materials will be significant to my analysis. This section will look at the narratives that propel active citizenship education and it will include an exploration of narratives aiming to foster equality and inclusion; constructs and models of active citizenship education; and concerns about the need to broaden and transform what has come to be known as active citizenship education.

Fostering Inclusion, Equity and Diversity

However analyses of the contributions which schooling makes to the transmission of such citizenship knowledge, identities and the promotion of particular values have been shaped predominantly by philosophical interpretations of what should be achieved in citizenship curricula (e.g., Keating et al. 2010; McLaughlin 1992). Here the emphasis is upon normative democratic values; attention is rarely given to the controversiality and the political framing of civic virtues and values by unequal power relations and social inequalities in relation to education. The use of citizenship education as a political strategy to unite populations characterised by social inequality and division, or to promote particular gendered power relations, is rarely addressed in such writing. Indeed even the inequalities of access to education and formal schooling itself are often neglected by such proponents of citizenship education, even though these are outcomes of unequal citizenship. There is some evidence that young people from disadvantaged backgrounds with lower levels of achievement are likely to have less civic knowledge and engagement in civic action even in developed countries (Youniss et al., 2002). On the whole though, this link between social class, ethnicity and gender, and citizenship knowledge and the shaping of citizenship identities has been seriously neglected. (Arnot and Swartz, 2012, p. 2)

An important aspect of active citizenship is to recognize that the youth audience is not homogeneous and that some groups feel disenfranchised by or are excluded from mainstream educational experiences (e.g., some drop out before taking senior level social studies, history and/or civics) courses. Nabavi (2010) notes that the “varied experiences of immigrant youth in formal and

informal contexts become increasingly important for gaining a better understanding of their changing societal and material conditions and how that informs their experiences with citizenship learning,” and encourages research to be conducted on “immigrant youth experiences of identity, belonging, social, and political learning” (p. 1).

Interestingly, Gagnon and Page (1999), as far back as 1999, noted the significance of “transnational belonging” (p. 6) to citizenship frameworks. From this perspective it is not only a longing in some citizenship education frameworks for youth to be part of transnational affairs, but that many individuals such as immigrants already have such a sense that needs to be acknowledged, and transitions put in place so they feel part of the new state they have moved into. Given the cosmopolitan nature of many large cities today (e.g., multicultural cities in Canada) some researchers note that it is important that citizenship education facilitate the development of a “citizenry respectful of multiple identities, sharing a common sense of belonging and having full parity of rights and obligations and duties and responsibilities” (Lee & Hebert, 2006, p. 517). Basok (2008) recognizes that citizenship is not only about acceptance, but that it is a place of ongoing struggle:

In fact, Engin Isin contends that citizenship must be defined “as a social process through which individuals and social groups engage in claiming, expanding or losing rights.”

Daiva Stasiulis and Abigail Bakan similarly regard citizenship as a “negotiated relationship.” Over the last two centuries, abolitionist, feminist, and other social movements have challenged state notions of citizenship. They have demanded the extension of political, civil, social, and cultural rights for such excluded groups as racialized minorities, women, aboriginal people, gays and lesbians, poor people, and others. (p. 265)

It is important that citizenship education is not presented as a stagnant destination, but rather that it is presented as a site of ongoing struggle, equality and “critical praxis” (Kress, 2011).

Many youth, become marginalized in the realm of citizenship education due to circumstances beyond their control (e.g., poverty, health, and the need to work). As Tonge and Mycock (2009) state:

Yet in many societies not all youth attend school and therefore do not have access to such political education. Undereducated youth are positioned outside the ‘citizen space’ where poverty and marginalisation contribute to their exclusion from civic entitlements and democratic participation. Rather than being the focus of research, the existence of a large pool of such undereducated and underemployed ‘lumpen’ youth is represented as potentially apathetic or disengaged and as weakening the foundations of stable democratic societies (cf. Youniss et al. 2002, 136). The unequal gendered and social transitions and civic conditions under which young people attempt to build their citizenship, trying often but not always succeeding in using the school system to help them achieve their entitlements, are not well understood. (p.182)

As I continue to explore active citizenship education it is important for me to consider what is or ought to be taught, but who is being taught and for whom are programs being designed. It is important to consider how ought ACE be designed, but in that framework it is also important to consider not only the intended audience but also the traditionally excluded audiences and perhaps alternative delivery methods for those, for example, who have exited the formal school system for whatever reason. How can mainstream programs be more inclusive of their needs as well, thus in essence making them less mainstream and more naturally inclusive?

Leveling the Playing Field and Minority Rights

New waves and forms of migration and technologies that make a transnational living possible, not only for the global elites, undermine the naturalness of single membership in social and political communities on a horizontal dimension (Glick Schiller et al. 1992).

Whereas the vertical pluralisation of sources of membership and rights has been a phenomenon that is most relevant within the Western world (minority rights and multiculturalism had its strongest impact in North America while supranational membership and rights are most prominently established in the European Union), the horizontal pluralisation of membership and rights is a phenomenon that spans the world as it is most relevant and politically salient when multiple citizenship is facilitated or accepted for people who migrated from the developing to the developed world (e.g. in the relationship between the USA and Mexico and between Germany and Turkey, Hansen and Weil 2002, Martin and Hailbronner 2003). (Blatter, 2011, p. 771)

The European Union illustrates how “horizontal pluralisation” and “supranational membership” can occur, and Blatter (2011) indicates that similar types of memberships may emerge over time. S/he notes how forms of dual-like supranational memberships, whether formal or informal in nature, occur as more people immigrant to new places of residence. Interestingly enough, recently I saw an advertisement whereby if one purchased a home in coastal Spain, they also could achieve some form of citizenship status in the country (Daily Mailer Reporter, 2012). The nature of citizenship(s) is changing, thus active citizenship education policymakers and curriculum writers will need to respond in their frameworks and constructions of active citizenship education.

Creating a Counter-Culture to Normalized Civic Life

Those living in the cycle of poverty, from generation to generation, often do not just remain outside the channels of civic engagement, but they choose to create an alternative sense of identity, belonging and community – a form of counter-citizenship (Swartz, Harding & DeLannoy, 2012). Such a phenomenon was documented in the post-apartheid state of South Africa, which is still socio-economically divided along similar lines as during Apartheid. Groups choose to reject mainstream structures that marginalize or exclude them (e.g., residing in distant Bantus) and adapt by creating their own sense of belonging and inclusion – sometimes this is counter-inclusionary. Swartz, Harding & De Lannoy (2012) explored how this manifests itself in South Africa:

Inclusion in the collective is an integral part of the process of becoming, of subjectification (Ong et al. 1996). Through integration into social and economic systems, an individual becomes a social agent who is active in the processes of defining both the collective and the self. Poverty is associated with alternative methods of subjectification that exist in the place of normative social inclusion ... black township youth, living through the experience of exclusion, engage with the process of subjectification to gain access and agency in their immediate social environment and the larger South African collective. Firstly, they aspire to upward mobility ... Secondly they achieve this mobility (if it is not available by conventional means) via what the township, similar to hood, ghetto, *el barrio*, *banlieue*, slum of *favela* found elsewhere in the world. *Ikasi style* refers to the ways in which youth rationalise their participation in behaviours which are not socially acceptable in order to attain markers of belonging by alternative means. This style comprises violence, sex, alcohol and substance abuse as well as music recreation, fashion and other diversions. Youth explain that it is this style that forms the setting of township life, the foundation of

township identities, and serves as a ‘moral ecology’ (Swartz, 2010) adapted to the realities of poverty. (p. 28)

Such a narrative indicates the importance of recognizing counter-normative adaptations of citizens who have little sense of belonging and/or identity in the larger collectives of citizenship identity (e.g., the state). Perhaps, such counter-normative citizenship identities, can or should be part of the larger citizenship identity, giving them space and forums to be part of the larger collective while recognizing their self-selected and adaptive form of citizenship. Such inclusion could potentially promote dialogue and potentially curb notions of anarchy.

Researchers note that creating a sense of identity and belonging is essential to vibrant citizenship education as is commitment. Individuals are expected to assume responsibility as citizens and demonstrate some degree of commitment to their communities, regions, state and in many cases to a global imperative. Taking local action, as in the ancient Greek polis, in many ACE frameworks is very important. Blunkett and Taylor (2010) state,

As E.P. Thompson pointed out in his seminal work *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963), around 10 per cent of the population in the mid-nineteenth century were members of mutual societies – despite levels of illiteracy, poverty and political exclusion. Membership of societies varied from craft unions (savings against likely unemployment) through to the Goose and Burial clubs, which as their name implied, were about savings for Christmas and for a ‘decent burial’. Above all people came together literally in the act of survival. They supported each other through times of joy and untold misery, they started the early reading circles and self-help groups and they bolstered the ‘municipal socialism’ (which led the large cities to invest in clean water, the removal of sewage and the

development of utilities such as gas and electricity). Democracy cannot survive and society cannot be sustained without civil and civic engagement. The importance of civil society goes beyond underpinning political action, formalised institutions and processes of decision-taking. It reflects the Greek polis: that the essence of a functioning human being is a participation and engagement with the world around them. (p. 26)

Many ACE programs place an emphasis on making a commitment to bolster the well-being of other citizens and the state itself, and to take action to do so. This type of engagement is encouraged in many citizenship programs and some refer to such engagement as service work. Others refer to citizen engagement in terms of actively participating in political affairs so that structural inequalities can be addressed and policies improved.

Beyond State-based Narratives for Active Citizenship

A state-based narrative of citizenship education traditionally often focuses on such items as state institutions and history; parliamentary vocabulary; rights and duties and state values. James Lynch, in 1999, (as cited in Keet, 2007) states:

In Canada, as elsewhere, citizenship in this context usually contains four elements. The first is national consciousness or identity... The second element of citizenship consists of political literacy, a knowledge of and commitment to the political, legal and social institutions of one's country... The third element of citizenship consists of the observance of rights and duties... The fourth element of citizenship education consists of values. (p. 195)

A number of narratives have opened this framework to include an exploration of the citizen's place in the global context and a basic overview of the universal freedoms and rights and how these are used to protect the vulnerable in less fortunate nations. Nichol and Boon-Yee Sim (2007) warn that citizenship education policy texts, which are often initially guided and informed by academic discourse, can be later co-opted and laden with political codes for such themes as “nation building and racial cohesion” (p. 20).

A states' ideology affects how active citizenship is constructed and presented in policy and curriculum. In a presidentially commissioned report on citizenship education in Zimbabwe, Sigauke (2011) states:

The consistent and repeated use of inclusive and persuasive language and suggestions for a compulsory programme raises questions about the nature of democratic values to be included in the proposed citizenship education. As Kennelly (2006) warns, ideological messages in policy texts can easily be overlooked unless a deeper analysis of the reason behind them is done. Debates on issues of citizenship and citizenship education sometimes reflect ideological and conflicting interests of those involved. These may also reflect collaborations between the politically powerful and those who are appointed to carry out these duties. The report stresses a citizenship education which is not only about knowledge of the country's political structures and processes but also about complying with and conforming to authority. This analysis also questions the extent to which the ‘moulding process’ would empower young people so that they are able to challenge structures and processes that contradict democratic citizenship values. (p. 82)

Citizenship education often promotes patriotism, compliance, conformity and as Sigauke indicates a “moulding process” (Sigauke, 2011, p. 82). To the extreme, the moulding process could spell full

indoctrination. Grelle and Metzger (1996) argue that there is a socialization component in citizenship education which, “contribute[s] to the transmission of an overly narrow, uncritical, and chauvinistic conception of citizenship that tends to equate being a good citizen with the acceptance and defense of the status quo – a conception of what it means to be a good citizen that amounts to “my country right or wrong, love it or leave it” (p. 150). Tupper (2007) considers that “[C]are-full citizenship may be realized in part through an interrogation of the conditions of oppression and privilege that operate to (re) produce inequities in the world,” but too often this curriculum “becomes tangled up in a curriculum that requires little, if any, accountability for privilege, falsely universalizing citizenship by ignoring how difference shapes the experiences one has as a citizen” and that programs too often “privilege standardization and high-stakes testing” (p. 270 – 271).

Accountability, Social Justice and Responsibility Narratives

There are many narratives that propel active citizenship discourse, policy and curriculum. In the following section I am going to discuss some of these narratives: competencies and accountability; social justice; and rights and responsibilities that influence citizenship education constructions. Alongside these narratives are models of active citizenship that have emerged. Then I will expand on some of the active citizenship and active citizenship education models that I previously mentioned, expand upon them, and mention some new models I have encountered in my most recent research. When I analyze these narratives in my research analysis I need to keep in mind some of the assumptions that might blur our understanding of youth’s alleged disengagement in political affairs. Porfilio and Gorlewski (2012) write:

At today's historical juncture, the corporate and political elite in North America wield their power to scapegoat youth for the social and economic problems, (such as poverty, crime, violence, and homelessness), that they create through globalizing capital and outsourcing labor across the globe as well as gutting social rights (such as full employment, housing, public transportation, and health care for children and other citizens). The dominant elite's chief outlet for lulling the public to believe youth are utterly redundant and disposable, waste products is through media-driven spectacles, where they falsely characterize youth, especially youth marginalized by their racial class status, as aberrant social creatures who are violent, anti-intellectual, lazy or out of control and 'up to no good' (Giroux, 2010). Consequently, through this (mis)information, the elite has (sic) swayed the public to support what Giroux calls a "war against youth." This involves the ruling elite implementing spates of draconian educational policies and practices, such as high-stakes examinations, scripted curricula, zero-tolerance initiatives, and corporate advisement/marketing strategies. This "warfare" is designed to position youth to become compliant spectators in decisions and events that perpetuate not only their alienation and oppression, but also generate the stark social realities encountered by the vast majority of global citizens. (p. 49)

There are many different perspectives on youth's disengagement and/or engagement in political life and how to improve citizenship education to improve, alter and/or reform their civic attitudes, behaviours and skills. In this dissertation, I am collecting a very broad collection of narratives, policies and curriculum (e.g., documents) so that as I conduct my critical analysis I am aware of the 'big-picture-universe' of active citizenship education.

In the pursuit of making students, teachers, and educational boards accountable for solid

citizenship education programs, a strong competency narrative emerged. The establishment of competencies required the identification of citizenship knowledge, skills and/or attitudes.

According to Biesta (2011),

Activities from a large number of working groups led to the formulation of the European Reference Framework of Key Competences for Lifelong Learning. A version of this was eventually adopted by the European Parliament in 2006 (European Council, 2006). It identified the following eight key competences (see Deakin Crick, 2008, p. 312): communication in the mother tongue; communication in foreign languages; mathematical competence and basic competences in science and technology; digital competence; learning to learn; social and civic competences; sense of initiative and entrepreneurship; and cultural awareness and expression. (p. 42)

This competency narrative reflects an EU agenda that was designed to foster rapport within the new EU supranational state and establish a means to measure progress. Other accountability projects have focused on knowledge of historical events and government structures (e.g., BC Social Studies 11)

A human rights narrative has entered into the realm of active citizenship education discourse. Some claim that we have and/or are experiencing a rights revolution (e.g., Ignatieff, 2007) and that this narrative is penetrating social, economic and cultural domains. According to Ignatieff (2007)

Everybody has the same rights, and everybody has the right to be heard. Democracy is supposed to belong to everyone. No wonder Western elites have worried since the 1960s that our societies are becoming ungovernable. What they mean, of course, is that we citizens are less obedient, less willing to leave politics to them. The rights revolution makes society harder to control, more unruly, more contentious. This is because rights

equality makes society more inclusive, and rights protection constrains government power. Countries with strongly defended rights cultures are certainly hard to govern. Democracy is rough and tumble; conflict is built into the process, but provided the conflict stops short of violence, it is better than bland or managed consensus. To paraphrase Bette Davis, fasten your seat belts, because the rights revolution makes for a bumpier ride. (p. 6)

State policymakers can influence whether human rights discourse will be part of active citizenship education, to what extent it will be incorporated and/or how it will be incorporated. Others suggest that a rights based citizenship can be hazardous. Crick (2010) warns that,

The idea of universal human rights is good human invention and, of course, such rights can be made and remade. But this is a cautious digression. My main point is that the civic republic tradition always saw rights and duties as reciprocal ... People should still have rights even if they have no sense of civic duty, sometimes even moral duty. But the theory was that rights *should* inspire duties, just as we have a duty to respect the rights of others. Some teachers in schools are now teaching human rights, especially the UN charter of the Rights of the Child, as if that is citizenship. It is not. Alone it is liberal individualism pushed to a delusionary extreme. Do we want a litigious right culture? Citizenship is individuals voluntarily acting together for a common purpose. Class actions in courts can protect rights but will not create democracy or a civic culture. (p. 23)

Crick's (2010) concern that a social justice based citizenship will only promote liberal individualism (e.g., a rights-demanding, litigious and narcissistically-individualist youth culture) is extreme, but it does reflect concerns that a human rights agenda does not adequately encompass all that citizenship embraces.

Shultz (2009) suggests that a social justice based citizenship ought to be based on the

teaching of deliberative democracy which acknowledges the global dimensions of everyday life.

Schultz (2009) states the following:

This article has argued for a reconceptualization of citizenship education based on an understanding of deliberative democracy in a globalized and globalizing system of structures and human relations. This global citizenship education can be a project of social justice if consideration is given to the embeddedness of conflict and justice within all aspects of the public sphere and if this renewed sphere is cast as a generative citizenship commons. Education is a key to learning the citizenship and just peace needed to ensure full and inclusive global citizenship into being. If education is to achieve its transformational potential it will not be education about citizenship and not education for citizenship, but education as citizenship that includes an understanding of the global aspects of our political subjectivities. We are educated to be citizens through our citizenship, which is based on being active political subjects. It is time to do things differently. The urgency is real as we can understand by listening to those who live most closely to the realities of marginalization and a diminished public agency, whether from an oppressive economic system, through the legacies of racism and colonialism, or through a location on the planet where the impacts of climate change present catastrophic daily challenges. It can be time when change is hosted in ways that will actually make a difference to each and all of these challenges that we share as humans on a finite planet and to the social justice that must exist as a foundation of human relations. Such change will only come about if we learn new ways to engage in the conflict that is inherent in finding and creating justice whether at the local or global level. (p. 13)

Active citizenship is contested, complex but a critical discourse analysis of the many narratives can

inform how to best move forward with active citizenship education. Schultz (2009) advocates for social justice and globally oriented citizenship education programs – this is one possible strategy.

Active citizenship education often promotes service learning and advocates that it is an important element of active citizenship learning. Service learning is defined by Wilczenski and Coomey (2007) as “an experiential approach to education that involves students in meaningful, real-world activities that can advance social, emotional, career, and academic curricula goals while benefitting communities” (p. viii). According to Jerome (2011) service learning “has a long and varied history with roots in Dewey’s ideal of experiential learning ... a service learning project includes a connection between the academic curriculum and an experience that meets real community needs in some context” (p. 59). Many see service learning as a significant component of their ACE programs and the type of experiences and required can vary substantially. Many of these programs work on the theme of making a contribution to the common good and local community.

Some active citizenship education programs encourage social movement oriented citizenship. Such programs promote open discussion, engagement in emergent issues and a curriculum based on how to mobilize change. Edwards (2012) states:

Social movement oriented citizenship (SMOC) centers on peaceful protest, proactive community involvement and participation in activities to support human rights and environmental protection. Research generally on SMOC is extremely limited; even more so is research that analyses the influence of school- and student-level, policy-relevant variables on SMOC. Using 1999 survey data on student civic knowledge, attitudes and behaviors, this study looks at this relationship in the context of Colombia. Controlling for background characteristics and student personal disposition, findings from regression analysis suggest that pedagogy and curriculum which encourage discussion, promote an

open classroom climate, and implement a social movement-centered curriculum are positively and significantly related to the development in students of SMOC, while after school-related activities are not. (p. 117)

What makes SMOC different from other rights-based citizenship is the emphasis on social movement. The degree to which social movement history, theory and techniques are incorporated in such programs is not clear.

Models and Framework of Active Citizenship

The importance of affect in citizenship debates has not been seriously considered, because citizenship has been a white, male enterprise that emphasizes reason and rationality. White women and people of color are disenfranchised in the public sphere, because of the white, masculinist notion that assumes subordinated groups cannot act with reason but only according to feelings. We cannot fully belong in the public domain, because the emotional state of disenfranchised groups will disrupt the rationality and reason that should control the public sphere. By contrast, I argue that affect assists in Native peoples' empowerment and struggles to belong. (Ramirez, 2007, p. 19)

There are a wide variety of models and frameworks used to represent citizenship, and citizenship education. In this section I present some of the well known models and frameworks. I will also be considering how these models may marginalize certain groups, but will save my critique to the analysis section of my dissertation. Three of the models focus on identifying components of citizenship and/or citizenship education and exploring how these can be used to advance a citizen's involvement of civic affairs using a various instruments (e.g., incremental spectrum, a quadrant rubric, and a three dimensional cube. There are other variations of these

models and frameworks which I will briefly mention. Another measurement tool is the Active Citizenship Composite Index that was developed in Europe.

In my literary review I briefly mentioned three models of active citizenship: the Active Citizenship (AC) Continuum, the Civic Pulse Model and the AC Cube. The AC spectrum is very straightforward, as a person advances from merely being a member citizen, to being: a volunteer, critically-conscientious citizen, and then an active citizenship. Unfortunately, the chart lends little room for degrees of participation and the overlapping of different citizenship participation. The Civic Pulse Model presents four drivers of active citizenship: relations, know-how, institutional and attitudinal. McLean and Dellot (2011) state the following about their Civic Pulse design:

By identifying the ‘conditions of possibility’ for active citizenship, the Civic Pulse Survey would help local policymakers (i.e. local authorities and public services) to:

- *Identify* and direct efforts to demographic groups and geographical areas of highest need where current levels of active citizenship are lowest and where drivers are most lacking.
- *Re-engineer* existing services and develop new initiatives which seek to promote participation by plugging any gaps in underlying drivers and making use of existing social assets.
- *Evaluate* the impact and cost-effectiveness of existing services which are intended to nurture active citizenship.
- *Highlight* the strengths and weaknesses of their own activity and facilitate public scrutiny of these efforts.

(p. 18)

The continuum provides a simplistic shift from social responsibility to active citizenship, while the Civic Pulse Model and Framework provides tools for practitioners to review, improve, and measure the impact of various changes.

The Active Citizenship Cube provides multiple gradients to measure active citizenship and it is both simple and complex in nature. The instrument identifies if one is active or passive in their citizenship and whether they individually or collectively engage in citizenship. The model then introduces a third dimension, intercultural participation, to construct a three dimensional cube. Hoopes' 1980 citizenship model, (as cited in Active Citizenship Training, 2007) introduces an abstract system of citizenship levels that are brought into the Active Citizenship Cube:

Level I: Ignorance

Level II: Partial obedience

Level III: Conformity

Level IV: Transient participation

Level V: Integrative participation

(n.p.)

These categories are integrated into Active Citizenship Training's (2007) ACT Cube Model:

In the resulting 3-dimensional model the 5 levels can be identified as idealised conditions... The ultimate, "ideal citizen" (*Level VI = Integrative Participation*) has reached the highest level of knowledge and attitudes towards citizenship – the person is expert and able to develop new strategies and actions. The lowest level (I: *Ignorance*) is located in the lower left corner representing marginal knowledge, maybe even bad attitudes (e.g. discrimination), paralyse or very small activity without or only with very little learning output. (n.p.)

An inventory of competencies (e.g., civic knowledge, attitudes, and participation) is used to ascertain where individuals or groups may sit. The nested cube model provides a three dimensional perspective on the citizen.

The Active Citizenship Composite Indicator (ACCI) structures active citizenship into four main categories and each of these categories is substantially subdivided into a number of subcategories. The four main groups are a) “representative democracy”; 9 basic indicators b) “protest and social change”; 19 basic indicators c) “community life”; 25 indicators and d) “democratic values”; 11 basic indicators (Mascherini and Hoskins, 2008, p. 3). The indicators include such criteria as the following: protest, environmental organizing, social organizing, union organizing and human rights (Mascherini and Hoskins, 2008, p. 3). The ACCI was developed “in cooperation with the Council of Europe” as the union of the European countries “put social cohesion at the heart of the European policy agenda” (Hoskins, Jesinghaus, Mascherini, Munda, Nardo, Saisana, Van Nijlen, Vidoni & Villalba, 2006, p. 6). The ACCI was used to identify, compare and contrast active citizenship in the European Union.

Such instruments can be helpful in determining levels of civic engagement and establishing determinants for such engagement. Some of the instruments are being used by the European Union as they continue to socio-politically engineer their new supra-national state. For the purpose of this study the criteria, spectrums and indicators provide insights into the types of citizenship skills, attitudes and themes researchers are exploring. This information informs my understanding of where we are at with active citizenship today.

Contemporary Policy, Curriculum and Pedagogy

In this section I present policy, curriculum and pedagogical discourses on active citizenship that have been gathered from various locations and institutions. The documents I selected come

from a broad range of global organizations (UNESCO), supranational states (e.g., the European Union), nation states (United States, Canada and some of the Latin American countries) and sub-national regions such as the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba and Quebec. I have included samples of policy and curriculum guides that include such items as rationale statements, prescribed learning outcomes and recommendations for implementation. I have selected these groupings so as to include samples from diverse democratic regions. I selected states and regions that have, or had, pursued active citizenship education improvements via curriculum, policy and/or practice. As I live in British Columbia, I wanted to explore active citizenship education as offered through this province. I then selected documents from other provinces, nations and international organizations to provide a diverse collection of discourses. As this is still part of my research findings I refrain from any significant analysis. In my research analysis I will use critical discourse analysis to read my findings and later synthesize my findings in my conclusion.

UNESCO

Member States should promote, at every stage of education, an active civic training which will enable every person to gain a knowledge of the method of operation and the work of public institutions, whether local, national or international; and to participate in the cultural life of the community and in public affairs. Wherever possible, this participation should increasingly link education and action to solve problems at the local, national and international levels. Student participation in the organisation of studies and of the educational establishment they are attending should itself be considered a factor in civic education and an important element in international education.

(UNESCO, 1974, as cited in UNESCO, 2010, n.p.)

The purpose of UNESCO (2007) is to “advanc[e], through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind, for which the United Nations Organisation was established and which its charter proclaims” (n.p.). Their policies and statements often influence state policy, law and education.

UNESCO (2010) clearly delineates that the citizen has rights and responsibilities and carefully links these to a rule of law intended to guide social relationships and human interaction. It also clearly delineates citizenship education and human rights education:

A knowledge of the nation’s institutions, and also an awareness that the rule of law applies to social and human relationships, obviously form part of any citizenship education course.

Taken in this sense, citizenship education is based on the distinction between:

- the individual as a subject of ethics and law, entitled to all the rights inherent in the human condition (human rights); and
- the citizen – entitled to the civil and political rights recognized by the national constitution of the country concerned.

All human beings are both individuals and citizens of the society to which they belong. In this regard, human rights and citizen education are interdependent.

(n.p.).

According to UNESCO active citizenship education and human rights education are interdependent of one another but also complementary to one another. UNESCO (2010) further explains its position on this:

Men, women and children all come into the world as individual human beings. Thanks to the immense historical conquest of human rights, we are equal, in rights and dignity, to all

other human beings. When citizenship education has the purpose of ‘educating future citizens’ it must necessarily address children, young people and adults, who are living beings, having the status of human beings endowed with conscience and reason. It cannot, therefore, exclude consideration of individuals as subjects, each with individual characteristics.

Moreover, human rights include civil and political rights, the latter obviously relating to the rights and obligations of citizens. Thus a comprehensive human rights education takes account of citizenship, and considers that good citizenship is connected with human rights as a whole.

Conversely, citizenship education which trains ‘good’ citizens, i.e. citizens aware of the human and political issues at stake in their society or nation, requires from each citizen ethical and moral qualities. All forms of citizenship education inculcate (or aim at inculcating) respect for others and recognition of the equality of all human beings; and at combating all forms of discrimination (racist, gender-based, religious, etc.) by fostering a spirit of tolerance and peace among human beings.

Thus, when we speak of the purposes to be ascribed to either citizenship education (producing citizens with moral qualities) or human rights education (comprising a knowledge of the social and political rights of all human beings, and their recognition) we inevitably end up with the complementarity between citizenship and human rights.

(n.p.)

Such a pronounced division of human rights and citizenship education can be perceived as quite discombobulating given the many agreed-upon United Nations covenants, conventions and declarations that recognize (e.g., UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, UN Declaration on the

Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights), but at the same time citizenship has a state nexus (e.g., citizens of a state) within the larger context of the United Nations (e.g., human rights). This somewhat arbitrary division, given the level of global interdependence today, ought to be researched more thoroughly to determine if it is detrimental to the aims of the United Nations and/or UNESCO more specifically.

UNESCO designs citizenship education resource materials for member states, based upon international agreements that support the importance of such education. A clause in the UNESCO (1995) Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy, as cited in UNESCO (2010) states:

We, the Ministers of Education (of the world) strive resolutely to pay special attention to improving curricula, the content of textbooks, and other education materials including new technologies with a view to educating caring and responsible citizens committed to peace, human rights, democracy and sustainable development, open to other cultures, able to appreciate the value of freedom, respectful of human dignity and differences, and able to prevent conflicts or resolve them by non-violent means.

[I]t is necessary to introduce, at all levels, true education for citizenship which includes an international dimension.

(n.p.)

Active citizenship education therefore, in this context, prepares student to prevent and resolve conflict; support and maintain democratic structures; and promote and uphold sustainable practices.

UNESCO strongly supports the ideals of democracy and believes them to be quintessential to citizenship education. It recommends that educational institutions become more democratic in their administrative structures. UNESCO (2010) states:

If there is one idea inherent in civics education, because it concerns politics and institutions, it is the idea of democracy. Comprehensive citizenship education cannot dispense with this concept or with a knowledge of the institutions that enable a country to function democratically... One of the major flaws in civics instruction has been that it fails to bring democracy to life in schools, and remains at the stage of merely enunciating principles and describing institutions. When the organization of a school does not lead to a democratic mode of operating on which pupils can give their opinions, children and adolescents lose interest in citizenship and see only the mismatch between what adults say and what they do, between knowledge and action, a mismatch which they usually call 'hypocrisy'. Schools should therefore set up 'governing boards' with representatives of pupils and staff, and other bodies in which pupils express their views and in which decisions are taken in consultation with everyone, both young people and adults. The representation of pupils in these various bodies can and should be achieved by an open election system which has the same qualities of transparency as in any democracy worthy of the name.

(n.p.)

There are a number of recommendations in this UNESCO document, which have potentially profound implications for policies, curriculum and pedagogy at municipal, regional and state levels. This is especially true in regards to the broader context of citizenship education as it may require major shifts in school structures. Such recommendations such as youth representation in district governing boards, school-based administration, and political governance (e.g., local, regional, state, and international) ought to be explored. As well, greater transparency and larger forums of discussion ought to be established, so youth can be more informed and inclined to participate.

UNESCO (2010) also advocates for citizenship education that promotes respect, understanding and awareness of ‘Others’ (Said, 1994) that might come from different ethnic, religious or cultural backgrounds:

If we are to develop a credible civics education, respect for others – pupils and teachers, and minor employees – and non-violence in attitudes and behaviour must be the rule in schools.

Respect for others, and their dignity, in the same way as the self-respect of a free autonomous individual, springs from each individual’s personal ethic, the will to ‘live together, with and for others in just institutions’.

These qualities, whether described as ‘moral’ or ‘ethical’, are required of all human beings and all citizens. They form part of both civic ‘virtues’ and individual ‘virtues’. They enable each individual to live as a ‘good’ citizen.

In other words, in citizenship education, respect for the ‘Other’, regarded as one’s equal, with his or her individual differences and distinctive physical, intellectual and cultural features, is to be explained and above all experienced in daily life in all schools. Based on these principles of equal dignity and respect for others, citizenship education has the task of combating all forms of negative discrimination and racism, sexism and religious fanaticism. (n.p.)

Not only does the doctrine encourage the fostering of dignity, respect and caring, but it expects the development and reinforcement of such behaviours. Citizenship education programs developed at state or regional levels are entrusted with the responsibility of confronting oppressive forms of discrimination and preparing students to also do so, while they are in school and when they leave school. How to fully implement such a mandate ought to be explored using a critical framework so

as to not only improve citizenship engagement, but to also ensure that all educational programs are promoting equality, dignity and respect in all aspects of their operations.

UNESCO also expects that citizenship education instruction permit students to critically deliberate about emergent and/or significant issues, so that students can formulate their own conclusions within the frameworks of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. UNESCO (2010) states:

The introduction and continuance in schools of a democratic culture forbid dogmatism in any kind of civics education. The methods and approaches chosen are those based on discussion among pupils and between pupils and teachers, and make provision for children and young people to speak and express themselves. Modes of expression may be varied: in addition to oral exchanges, drawings, songs, poems, different kinds of written material are excellent instruments for reflection on citizenship, democracy, justice, freedom and peace. In a democracy, citizenship education seeks to educate citizens who will be free to make their own judgments and hold their own convictions. Compliance with existing laws should not prevent citizens from seeking and planning better and ever more just laws. Respect for law, which is one of the objectives of civics education, calls not for blind submission to rules and laws already passed but the ability to participate in drawing them up. One of the practical tasks of citizenship education is therefore to look at the rules governing a school, improve them and reformulate them.

(n.p.)

Laws, regulations and policies are presented as socially constructed instruments that are put in place to facilitate processes, governance and the rule of law. UNESCO suggests that citizenship education should not be presented as locked and absolute, but rather as malleable. Students in this

pedagogical paradigm are taught to research, question and even confront policies that enable socio-political, cultural and economic inequities. In accordance with this mandate, government policies, laws and institutional structures, are meant to be scrutinized, and in some cases improved, reformed or transformed. Students, in this pedagogical approach, are called to not only explore and participate in state and global structures but also in school, school district and regional level socio-political structures. Teachers are expected to inculcate respect for the law but not to advocate for “blind submission” (UNESCO, 2010, np.).

European Union

The country level features that facilitate greater participation in active citizenship are equality, wealth and tolerance towards diversity. In terms of equality the results show that the more equal societies are in terms of distribution of wealth the higher the levels of active citizenship. The high performing countries in Europe on active citizenship also tend to be the wealthy countries measured by their GDP, in this regard there are two groups of countries: poorer countries that are below the GDP average and have below average participation in active citizenship and more wealthy countries that have a higher levels of active citizenship. (Mascherini, Manca & Hoskins, 2009, p. 6)

It is important that I take into consideration important research on citizenship engagement, but it is also important that I critically analyze the discourse of such information, the purpose and/or orientation of the research and what problem the researcher was hoping to resolve through such research. For example, do wealthier countries produce better citizens as these results suggest? If so, in what ways are they allegedly less competent? Are less educated blue collar workers less capable and competent citizens? If they are less capable - how, according to whom and based upon what

criteria? As well, are governments aware that greater wealth distribution within a country will produce better citizens, or that the research suggests this? Do their citizenship frameworks and policies reflect such vision?

In 2007, the Lisbon Treaty or the Treaty of Lisbon was signed by twenty seven European member states, and in 2009 this international agreement took effect. According to the European Commission (2009),

Today, members of the EU enjoy a wealth of benefits: a free market with a currency that makes trade easier and more efficient, the creation of millions of jobs, improved workers' rights, free movement of people and a cleaner environment. The existing rules, however, were designed for a much smaller EU, and an EU that did not have to face global challenges such as climate change, a global recession, or international cross-border crime. The EU has the potential, and the commitment, to tackle these problems, but can only do so by improving the way it works. This is the purpose of the Lisbon Treaty. It makes the EU more democratic, efficient and transparent. It gives citizens and parliaments a bigger input into what goes on at a European level, and gives Europe a clearer, stronger voice in the world, all the while protecting national interests. (p. 1)

The European unionization also intends to serve individual members' "interest better" and provide a "direct say in European matters through the new Citizens Initiative" (European Commission, 2009, p. 2). Universities are considered to very important in the process of amalgamating the states. According to Gornitzka (2009), "With the launching of the Lisbon Strategy the University came to the centre of attention within the EU. In the Lisbon Strategy the University, as part of education and research systems in Europe, was envisioned as a core institution of the 'Europe of knowledge' (Gornitzka, 2009, p. 155). Universities became the heart of much policy reform and this remained

especially true in the field of citizen education as the political sphere was undergoing reform, rapid change and new 21st century realizations (Gornitzka, 2009).

The Council of Europe (2010) established the legal dimensions for a European Union citizenship education plan and provided parameters for its development:

The Committee of Ministers, under the terms of Article 15.*b* of the Statute of the Council of Europe, Recalling the core mission of the Council of Europe to promote human rights, democracy and the rule of law; Firmly convinced that education and training play a central role in furthering this mission; Having regard to the right to education conferred in international law, and particularly in the European Convention on Human Rights (ETS No. 5), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Convention on the Rights of the Child...

The present Charter is concerned with education for democratic citizenship and human rights education as defined in paragraph 2. It does not deal explicitly with related areas such as intercultural education, equality education, education for sustainable development and peace education, except where they overlap and interact with education for democratic citizenship and human rights education (Council of Europe, 2010, p. 5-7)

The European Union found common ground for their citizenship education programs in United Nations covenants, conventions and declarations (e.g., Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Convention on the Rights of the Child). These United Nations documents serve as legal instruments within the domain of international law. Interestingly, education for equality, sustainable development and peace are not implicit in European notions of active citizenship education.

The Council of Europe (2010) also defined what they meant by education for human rights and democratic citizenship:

“Education for democratic citizenship” means education, training, awareness raising, information, practices and activities which aim, by equipping learners with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviour, to empower them to exercise and defend their democratic rights and responsibilities in society, to value diversity and to play an active part in democratic life, with a view to the promotion and protection of democracy and the rule of law.

b. “Human rights education” means education, training, awareness raising, information, practices and activities which aim, by equipping learners with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviour, to empower learners to contribute to the building and defence of a universal culture of human rights in society, with a view to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

(p.7)

Interestingly, the European Union conjoins citizenship and human rights education as a singular initiative and seemingly presents one as a responsibility and the other as a right in their definitions, but this unqualified assertion will have to be analyzed in my analysis. As well, the Council of Europe document on human rights and citizenship education raises concerns about whether or not member states, who are signatories to these international legal instruments, are abiding by the terms, and how do nation states ensure that their sub-nation states (e.g., provinces, states, territories) are abiding to internationally agreed upon legal instruments.

Based on the Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education, European studies were established to investigate what civic competencies its citizens

would require and how best (e.g., best practices) to develop such competencies. According to the Commissioner responsible for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth [Europe], Androulla Vassiliou, as cited by the European Commission (2012),

Civic competencies can enable individuals to participate fully in civic life but they must be based on sound knowledge of social values and political concepts and structures, as well as a commitment to active democratic participation in society. Social and civic competences have, therefore, featured strongly in European cooperation in the field of education; they are among the eight key competences identified in 2006 by the Council and the European Parliament as essential for citizens living in a knowledge society ⁽¹⁾. Promoting equity, social cohesion and active citizenship through school education is also one of the main objectives of the current Strategic Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training... In 2010, all the Member States of the European Union adopted the Council of Europe's Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education.

(p. 3)

The implementation of the Charter and the Eurydice report on citizenship education offer a timely contribution to the 2013 European Year of Citizenship, citizenship research and active citizenship education.

The EU has spent a significant amount of time and money on active citizenship education research, policy, and implementation strategies. The major impetus for the formation of the EU is stated in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union, or what is also called The Maastricht Treaty:

The Community shall have as its task, by establishing a common market and an economic and monetary union and by implementing common policies or activities referred to in Articles 3 and 4, to promote throughout the Community a harmonious, balanced and

sustainable development of economic activities, a high level of employment and of social protection, equality between men and women, sustainable and non-inflationary growth, a high degree of competitiveness and convergence of economic performance, a high level of protection and improvement of the quality of the environment, the raising of the standard of living and quality of life, and economic and social cohesion and solidarity among Member States. (The European Union, 1995, p. 2.)

Increasing international competition spurred the European block to find ways to be more competitive and economically sustainable. The formation of the EU had strong economic motives and correspondingly it promised a higher standard of living and quality of life to citizens. In order to achieve this, a newly unified sense of supranational citizenship was to be orchestrated. Given that other nations (e.g., Canada, United States and China) have and are continuing to enter economic agreements and/or trade blocks (e.g., North American Free Trade Agreement), which profoundly impact state affairs because of their legal clout, one must wonder if citizens have been and continue to be launched into international, global and/or transnational citizenship without a paradigm shift in their citizenship rights and spheres of influence.

A comparative study of various European nations conducted by Mascherini, Manca and Hoskins (2009) determined that,

Countries with lower number of years of education belong to southern Europe, as Portugal, Greece, Spain and Italy, while countries with the highest number of years of education are Denmark, Norway and Germany. The relation between the years of education and the level of active citizenship ... shows that low years of education are associated to low level of active citizenship; there is an exception for Great Britain which has on average high

numbers of years of education but lower levels of active citizenship. (Mascherini, Manca & Hoskins, 2009, p. 67)

At the same time, Kuepper (2012) notes that those nations that allegedly demonstrate lower levels of active citizenship and have lower levels of education, are similarly experiencing severe economic trauma. According to Kuepper (2012), “Many of the so-called PIIGS [Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Greece and Spain] countries were hit hard by the EU sovereign debt crisis” (n.p). The joining of the European nations has been difficult for member state citizens and requests to bailout those nations edging on bankruptcy (e.g., those nations derogatorily referred to as the PIIGS) has generated considerable disaccord. According to a European Commission (2012) report one factor that must be considered in studying what is happening in Europe is the high rate of youth unemployment:

The youth unemployment rate in the EU-27 was more than double the overall unemployment rate in 2011. At 21.4 %, more than one out of every five young persons in the labour force was not employed, but looking and available for a job. In the euro area, the youth unemployment rate was marginally lower at 20.8 %. The unemployment rate among young persons was higher than the rate among those aged between 25 and 74 in all of the Member States. In Spain (46.4 %), Greece (44.4 %), Slovakia (33.2 %), Lithuania (32.9 %), and Portugal (30.1 %) youth unemployment rates were particularly high. The Netherlands (7.6 %), Austria (8.3 %), and Germany (8.6 %) were the only Member States with a youth unemployment rate below 10 %. (n.p.)

When assessing youth involvement in civic affairs this information shouldn't be overlooked. What impact has youth unemployment had on European youth's participation in civic affairs?

In a very controversial article posted by a controversial website a pseudo-named author named Durden (2012) writes:

[T]he one chart that truly captures the latent fear behind the scenes in Europe is that showing youth unemployment in the continent's troubled countries (and frankly everywhere else). Because the last thing Europe needs is a discontented, disenfranchised, and devoid of hope youth roving the streets with nothing to do, easily susceptible to extremist and xenophobic tendencies: after all, it must be "someone's" fault that there are no job opportunities for anyone. Below [referring to a chart] we present the youth (16-24) unemployment in three select European countries (and the general Eurozone as a reference point). Some may be surprised to learn that while Portugal, and Greece, are quite bad, at 30.7% and 46.6% respectively, it is Spain where the youth unemployment pain is most acute: at 51.4%, more than half of the youth eligible for work do not have a job! Because the real question is if there is no hope for tomorrow, what is the opportunity cost of doing something stupid and quite irrational today? (n.p.)

Although the numbers indicated by Durden are debatable, they are very similar to the statistical report on youth unemployment submitted by the European Commission. Durden's article demonstrates one type of dialogue that is being circulated on the Internet about youth citizens in Europe. The article suggests that youth in high employment states feel despondent, disillusioned and disenfranchised by socio-economic banter that chimes as meaningless to them.

Unemployed European youth are not only feeling despondent about their socio-economic futures but they are disappointed and angry with their governments. Youth are taking to the streets in fragile European states (e.g., PIIGS) and protesting against their governments. Youth are

exercising their political voices by rebelling against what they feel are failing government structures. As Rucinski (2011) states,

Solidarity with Spain's "los indignados (the indignant)" has sparked a wave of protest across Europe as jobless and alienated young people show their frustration over their bleak futures. Faced with dwindling jobs, opportunities and benefits and bearing the burden of previous generations' overspending, this "lost generation" of young Europeans is taking the lead away from weakened labour unions and ineffectual politicians in voicing the discontent felt by many from London to Athens. Tens of thousands of demonstrators packed squares across Spain ahead of local elections in May to make clear they rejected the mainstream politicians blamed for the country's prolonged economic woes and 45 percent youth unemployment. Like similar movements in London, Paris and Athens, the protests were largely leaderless and amorphous and reflected a drift from leftist parties that are either powerless or have supported austerity pacts rather than denounce spending cuts arising from the euro zone debt crisis. "When almost half of a country's youth is unemployed ... and when they feel abandoned by the political system ... It's fair to say this is no longer just an economic crisis," said David Bach, a professor at the IE Business School in Madrid. (n.p.)

European youth's involvement in formal politics (e.g., voting) may be dwindling in what are referred to as the PIIGS states, but they are also showing up in droves to protest. As the European Union seeks to measure and improve active citizenship education it quite likely will have to address youth's discontent with the EU and member state political systems.

The Eurydice report commissioned by the European Commission (2012) indicates there are a number of measures that can be taken to improve active citizenship education in the European Union such as paraphrased below:

- Training specialist teachers
- Increasing student and parent participation in school governance
- Address human rights, democratic values, cultural diversity and sustainability
- Establishing strong community links
- School principals should provide promote active citizenship activities
- Standardize assessments for citizenship skills and attitudes

The report made important recommendations regarding classroom teaching, school and district governance, community involvement and curricula. Community and service learning was considered integral to a citizenship education project. According to Wilczenski and Coomey (2007) service learning is “an experiential approach to education that involves students in meaningful, real-world activities that can advance social, emotional, career, and academic curricula goals while benefitting communities” (p. viii).

According to the International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS) report by Schulz et al. (2008) few teachers identified “‘development of active citizenship’ as an important objective of civic and citizenship education” (p. 11). This is summarized in a European report by what is referred to as the Eurydice Unit:

The ICCS study proposed ten aims of civic and citizenship education. The teachers surveyed had to select which they considered to be the three most important. The aims included promoting or supporting students in their acquisition of knowledge or development attitudes or skills in the following areas:

1. Social, political and civic institutions
2. Respect for and safeguarding the environment
3. Defending one's own point of view
4. Conflict resolution
5. Citizens' rights and responsibilities
6. Participation in the local community
7. Critical and independent thinking
8. Participation in school life
9. Effective strategies to combat racism and xenophobia
10. Future political engagement

(European Commission, 2012, p. 34)

The report indicated that teachers supported the teaching of critical thinking, citizen's rights and the responsibilities of citizenship, but "preparing students for political engagement"; only 4.4 % considered this to be an important aim of civic and citizenship education" (p. 34).

Researchers, such as Shephard and Patrikios (2012) suggest that youth should be engaged in present political systems as opposed to being just prepared to do so. Such engagement can take place at community, municipal, regional, national, international and transnational levels. According to Shephard and Patrikios (2012),

Comparative trends in political participation in the West draw a pessimistic picture: younger generations tend to avoid formal politics, opting instead for radical forms of political engagement or opting out altogether from the political process. This trend poses an obvious threat to the core democratic idea of popular control of government. One remedy for this problem, proposed in recent years, has been the creation of youth

parliaments. This article explores features of youth parliaments and their impacts in the European Union. Among considerable variety and comparative discussion of a myriad of measures, we find that youth parliaments fulfil a range of functions from political education, skills acquisition to political engagement, participation and even policy impact.

(p. 1)

Shephard and Patrikios (2012) examined Youth Parliaments (YP) in the EU to conclude that “the apparent popularity of radical forms of expressing grievances point to the need to develop ways that help young people to build up and practice civic skills and to express their voice in a structured manner that feeds into the policy-making process “ (p. 17) and in reference to young parliamentarians in Scotland, they state that they [youth] are becoming more active s in agenda setting and influencing policy, but there are concerns that youth parliamentarians may come only from privileged backgrounds (Shephard & Patrikios, 2012), thus perpetuating systemic suppressions (Siguakwe, 2012) and oppressions (e.g. already disenfranchised groups) and further distancing those already on the political fringes .

United States

It is always a good idea to look back upon a few quotes that may, or may not have, inspired the direction that active citizenship education took in America and where policy and curriculum is taking it today. In the 1950's, the American Civil Liberties (1957) advocated that, “Liberty is always unfinished business” (n.p.). President John F. Kennedy (1963) (as cited by the National Conference of State Legislatures, 2012, n.p.); and at the turn of the century Barack Obama (2009) advocated that, “the way to solve the problems of our time, as one nation, is by involving the American people in shaping the policies that affect their lives" (n.p.). Leaders have advocated for

the active involvement of citizens and declared that the nation's future, as a democracy, relies upon such engagement. Yet, Schemo (2010) claims that the promotion of active citizenship education is currently not a priority in American educational planning:

At a time when educators and parents, politicians and advocates are all focused on re-inventing public education — ushering charter schools into the mainstream, formulating new models of what and how teachers should teach, experimenting with everything from class size to teacher pay — one subject has remained strangely absent from the national discussion, left behind, with a handful of exceptions, by education activists on the left and right. That is preparation for active citizenship: an understanding of the nation's founding principles and documents, the structure of government, and the ability to analyze and think critically about politics and power. Education in these tools of democracy is not among the subjects tested under No Child Left Behind, the massive federal law that demands schools close the achievement gap in reading and math by 2014. It is not a part of the Obama Administration's Race to the Top, which offers billions of dollars to states that raise academic standards and tie teacher salaries to student performance, in the drive to make students "college- and career-ready...The idea that education is democracy's incubator has deep roots in the United States, going back to the belief of Thomas Jefferson, considered the nation's father of public education, that "democracy cannot long exist without enlightenment." Why, then, aren't education groups, or the federal government itself, demanding a third "c" alongside "college- and career-ready?" What about insuring that students are "citizenship-ready?" (n.p.)

There are mounting fears that democracy is at an ever-increasing risk of being sidelined in American educational policy, curriculum and classrooms.

Several scholars and practitioners posit that the No Child Left Behind policy places far too much emphasis on standardized testing, accountability and other academic subjects rather than on developing the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to become responsible and engaged citizens . According to a National Education Policy Center article by Howe and Meens (2012),

While certainly important in their own right, disputes over the appropriate content of social studies—for example whether it ought to involve a traditional discipline-focused approach or a more problem-centered, activist progressive approach—need not be resolved in order for us to see that NCLB diminishes the place of civics education in any curriculum.

Finally, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) published a recent study of the state of civil rights education in the United States.⁷⁴ Only 2% of 2010 high school seniors had the most general and rudimentary knowledge of the *Brown* decision: that it had to do with segregation in the schools. This is “no surprise,” according to the study, for, “across the country, state educational standards virtually ignore our civil rights history.”⁷⁵ The findings indicated that most states do not view the civil rights movement as an essential subject for all American citizens to be conversant with; rather, it is viewed as a topic primarily of interest to African American students. The SPLC findings provide a dramatic indicator of a profound lack of understanding of and commitment to citizenship education in U.S. education policy today. (p. 12)

Howe and Meens (2012) express concerns about American citizenship education’s diminutive role in contemporary educational aims, the absence of civil rights teachings in curriculum and/or curriculum instruction and that students exhibit civic deficits both in knowledge and voting practice. There are also concerns “with the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), however, the

politics of education have been nationalized to an unprecedented degree, and local control has all but disappeared as a principle framing education policymaking” (Howe & Meens, 2012, n.p.).

The No Child Left Behind Act (2002) reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to make standardization the priority in educational reform. Under the Act states were required to establish rigorous assessments of basic skills (e.g., math and reading), administer the tests at various grade levels and report the results back to the federal government to maintain federal school funding (NCLB, 2002). The Act has been revised over the years. In 2010, President Obama unveiled his blueprint for further revisions to the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (2010):

This blueprint builds on the significant reforms already made in response to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 around four areas: (1) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness to ensure that every classroom has a great teacher and every school has a great leader; (2) Providing information to families to help them evaluate and improve their children’s schools, and to educators to help them improve their students’ learning; (3) Implementing college- and career-ready standards and developing improved assessments aligned with those standards; and (4) Improving student learning and achievement in America’s lowest-performing schools by providing intensive support and effective interventions. (United States Department of Education, 2010, p. 3)

According to the United States Department of Education, the reformed Elementary and Secondary School Act (2010) is a new approach whose aims are:

- Strengthening instruction in literacy and in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, aligned with improved standards that build toward college- and career-readiness.

- Supporting teachers and students in teaching and learning to more rigorous standards that prepare students for college and a career.
- Improving access to a well-rounded education for students in high-need schools.
- Expanding access to college coursework and other accelerated learning opportunities for students in high-need schools

(p. 25)

The new approach is similar to the 2001 NCLB in regards to the emphasis on rigorous standards, addressing achievement gaps for students in high need schools and aiming to prepare students for college and careers. Both initiatives include very little about developing citizenship skills, attitudes and knowledge.

The 2010 blueprint moves beyond accountability, standardization and testing and introduces performance incentives and penalties:

Competitive grants will be awarded to states, school districts, and community-based organizations to leverage models that comprehensively redesign and expand the school day or year, provide full-service community schools, or provide services before school, after school, or during the summer. All programs will focus on improving student academic achievement in core academic subjects, ranging from English language arts, mathematics, and science, to history, the arts, and financial literacy, as part of a well-rounded education, and providing enrichment activities, which may include activities that improve mental and physical health, opportunities for experiential learning, and greater opportunities for families to actively and meaningfully engage in their children's education... Grantees will use funds under the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program to carry out strategies

designed to improve school safety and to promote students' physical and mental health and well-being, nutrition education, healthy eating, and physical fitness.

(Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary School Act, 2010, pp. 32-33)

The program seeks to uplift disadvantaged students by providing grants to schools where increased supports for at risk students are being put into place or proposed to be put into place. Such grants are to be administered by the Successful, Safe and Healthy Students program that place an emphasis of using education to address some of the socio-economic gaps that impede marginalized youth. There was considerable criticism of the program as many claimed the program did little to address the educational or social needs of marginalized students (e.g., those living in poverty) and the emphasis on testing negatively impacted the quality of learning (e.g., little time was provided for rich discussions and addressing individual needs).

According to the State University Education Encyclopedia (2013), "For over 200 years – from the time of the country's founding to the early twenty-first century—Americans have believed that the primary purpose of U.S. schools is to educate young people for responsible citizenship ... [and] that schools must foster the qualities of mind and heart required for successful government within a constitutional democracy" (n.p.). According to the State University Education Encyclopedia (2013) active citizenship education is an integral part of all education:

The formal curriculum has three major tasks: providing students with civic knowledge, developing their civic skills, and fostering those dispositions or traits of private and public character essential for citizens in a constitutional democracy:

[A] Civic knowledge... Formal instruction in civics and government seeks to provide a basic and realistic understanding of civic life, politics, and government...

[B] Civic skills. If citizens are to exercise their rights and discharge their responsibilities they not only need to acquire a body of knowledge, they also need to develop intellectual and participatory skills. Intellectual skills essential for citizenship sometimes are called *critical thinking* skills...

[C] Civic dispositions. Civic dispositions are the traits of public and private character essential to democracy... (Branson, 2002, para. "Formal Instruction")

This overview identifies an emphasis on knowledge, skills and attitudes and I will discuss the discourse at greater length in my analysis.

A great deal of emphasis is being currently placed on literacy, numeracy and technology skills and in some ways these priorities have become an umbrella to the classic disciplines and core subjects. The Common Core State Standards Initiative (2010), that establishes American standards in English, history, social studies, science and technology, for K- 12 students, states:

Students who meet the Standards readily undertake the close, attentive reading that is at the heart of understanding and enjoying complex works of literature. They habitually perform the critical reading necessary to pick carefully through the staggering amount of information available today in print and digitally. They actively seek the wide, deep, and thoughtful engagement with high-quality literary and informational texts that builds knowledge, enlarges experience, and broadens worldviews. They reflexively demonstrate the cogent reasoning and use of evidence that is essential to both private deliberation and responsible citizenship in a democratic republic. (p. 3)

Critical literacy is presented as the key element necessary to develop responsible citizens who are ready to exit to college and/or careers. Active citizenship knowledge, skill and engagement are not

given any form of prominent position in the standards, but rather they are subsumed under critical literacy skills as indicated here:

The Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (“the Standards”) are the culmination of an extended, broad-based effort to fulfill the charge issued by the states to create the next generation of K–12 standards in order to help ensure that all students are college and career ready in literacy no later than the end of high school. (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, p. 3)

The priorities in American educational policy and leadership are shifting towards literacy and numeracy.

There are some local, state and national citizenship education initiatives in the United States that focus on vulnerable populations (e.g., new immigrants struggling with the English language, bureaucratic processes and socio-economic structures). These programs are often designed to support individuals, families and/or identified community groups as they navigate, or plan to navigate their way, as new citizens of the United States. For example, The English Literacy/Civics Online Project (n.d.), a collaborative program designed by the U.S. Department of Education/Office of Vocational and Adult Education and the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services/Office of Citizenship, states:

The EL/Civics Online is a collaborative project of the U.S. Department of Education/Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) and the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services/Office of Citizenship (USCIS). EL/Civics Online (English Literacy and Civics Education) is a four-part series of online courses to prepare ESL instructors and volunteers to integrate U.S. History, U.S. Government, Civic Engagement,

and the Naturalization Process into adult ESL classes. Teachers who complete these courses will learn strategies to further their students' knowledge about the United States along with increased English language acquisition. (EL Civics, 2012, n.p.)

There are a number of informal and formal support systems that exist outside the American school jurisdiction which serve to facilitate active citizenship education and development (e.g., organizations). Such projects could be significant to active citizenship education reforms, revisions and reconstructions.

Individual states create and implement their own active citizenship education programs. The Education Commission of the States (2008) provides comparative reports on civics and citizenship education frameworks being used by the individual states. For example, Alabama “prescribes a course sequence that includes one semester on Citizenship at grade 7 and one semester on American Government at grade 12” (p. 1). The Colorado Academic Standards established standards based on graduation competencies and states “Prepared Graduate Competencies in the Civics standards are: 1) “Analyze and practice rights, roles, and responsibilities of citizens,” and 2) “Analyze the origins, structures, and functions of governments and their impacts on societies and citizens” (Colorado Department of Education, 2009, p. 15). In Georgia programs are expected to bridge the past and the present, consider multiple perspectives and help students “speculat[e] about the known and unknown motives and actions of historic figures,” and “integrate the strands of social studies” (Georgia Department of Education, 2011, n.p.). Humanities teachers are also expected to select, use and integrate literature that have social studies themes similar to what the students are studying. As can be seen, curricula, content and implementation strategies vary substantially from state to state.

The state of Connecticut has a very interesting approach to citizenship education. A draft document explores what the Connecticut Social Studies Framework PK-12 should look like:

At all grade levels and in all subjects, it is essential to provide students with skills and understandings to best prepare them for today's world. As districts develop curriculum for social studies based on this framework, consider a 21st century learning environment where interactive learning, higher-level thinking skills, and student engagement are pervasive. Curriculums, teaching strategies and learning tools must be continually adapted to incorporate the changing demands of our 21st century societies. To meet the expectations, students are asked to think critically and set up and solve real-world problems; they are challenged to create and innovate; they learn to communicate effectively with a variety of audiences and in a variety of ways; they use technology strategically and effectively to learn and to convey ideas; and they understand their part in our global community. Particularly in social studies, these 21st century skills are *essential skills* and must be integrated into all aspects of the curriculum in meaningful ways.

(Connecticut Department of Education, 2011, p. 2)

Students are to be prepared to address 21st century skills. The Social Studies program is broken down into three strands: 1) "Content knowledge", 2) "History/ Social Studies Literacy Skills", and 3) "Civic Engagement" (Connecticut Department of Education, p. 1). Programs are expected to place an emphasis on "current events as part of the Civic Engagement standard," "responsible student engagement with real problems in the school, community and world around them," and as they mature "they need to consider taking a more active part in solving local problems and weighing in on national and global issues" (Connecticut Department of Education, 2011, pp. 1-2). The framework emphasizes that students come from diverse backgrounds and the significance of

“reflect[ing] and capitaliz[ing] on the belief, values, customs and perspectives of the students,” while at the same time ensuring “biases do not adversely affect the teaching, learning and assessment” (Connecticut Department of Education, 2011, p. 2).

Latin America

Tibbits and Torney-Purta (1999) submitted a report on citizenship education for the Education Unit of the Inter-American Development Bank and recommended the following guidelines for Overall Program Designs:

- “Clear goals need to be set for any citizenship program” (p. i)
- “Central agencies should cooperate with district and local organizations, including governmental, non-governmental and religious organizations ... Many social justice organizations are suitable partners” (p. i)
- “Any single uniform approach in citizenship education should be avoided” (p. i)
- “[M]oving away from an ‘inputs based’ approach education to one focusing on learner outcomes” (p. i)
- “[M]ore vulnerable populations in rural and urban poor areas should be given careful attention... in these circumstances, citizenship education might be linked with other, high priority agendas, such as literacy, health education and community development” (pp. i-ii)
- “[I]t is desirable to develop citizenship education programs that foster community involvement and, in fact, seek to address community development” (p. ii)
- “[A]ny citizenship education program that is to be successful in the long run will motivate ‘teachers as learners’ and will give them valuable professional development tools” (p. ii)

- “Ideally, central agencies will foster ‘networks of learning’ among educators participating in national citizenship education programs.” (p. ii)
- “Overall education achievement is related to the support of democratic value, political participation, voting behavior and being politically informed in society” (p. ii)

The program aims to engage students in current issues, address the diverse backgrounds and demographic locations of students, community engagement, and as I begin to explore the various discourses presented I will seek to note their commonalities and differences. The report also recommends that the following approaches should be avoided: a) using a single civics book b) a reliance on traditional lecture, rote memorization and/or inaccessible abstractions c) values-focused curriculum. It also notes that a failure to link citizenship education to communities, other networks and discussion on society and power will be detrimental to programs.

According to Cox, Jaramillo and Reimers (2005), who studied education for citizenship and democracy in the Americas,

The weaknesses that educational institutions have in training citizens to use good judgment, understand the needs of others, and be willing to work for the common good, erode democratic culture as a way of life. The weaknesses of democratic institutions hamper effective actions to foster the role of schools in strengthening human development and train students in democratic skills. These problems are recognized for what they are, precisely because the region today is more democratic than it has ever been. When authoritarian regimes prevailed, institutionalized intolerance could not be acknowledged as a problem. The current dynamism of Latin American democracies is what makes possible the urgent placement of democracy and citizen participation on the public agenda, and

links this urgency to the goals in public education systems to foster stronger skills of democratic citizen participation. (p. 2)

Cox, Jaramillo and Reimers (2005) clarify the socio-political dynamisms they refer to in the following statement, “Today’s generation of youth, the best educated in the region’s history, shows signs of moving away from politics and democratic participation. At the same time, the combination of old problems such as poverty and inequality, along with new problems from post-modernism and globalization, demand as never before an active and capable citizenry” (p. 35). The Latin American countries are, like many developing nations, having to address the complexities of globalization, and the realizations it brings to their nations. These nations, are also seeking to address apparent and/or alleged gaps that exist between active citizenship education schooling and post-schooling civic engagement.

Cox, Jaramillo and Reimers (2005) recommend the following measures to address the perceived gaps in Latin American active citizenship programs:

Based on relevant innovative experiences from countries in the region and developed countries outside the region, the work proposes a change in civic education to citizenship education, which means: i) moving from a single-subject focus on political institutions to a three-part focus on: a) political institutions, b) current events in the society, and c) competencies in conflict resolution, ii) moving from a curriculum predominantly taught in the last years of secondary school to one expanded throughout the entire school cycle, and iii) shifting the focus from acquisition of knowledge (focus on content) to one aimed at acquiring knowledge, abilities, and attitudes in contexts and practices based on participatory democratic relations. While all curriculums for citizenship education

have specific aspects from the country where taught, a universal moral base exists that should underlie all curriculums, based on the doctrine of human rights and the common need for education to develop the dialectic competencies that uphold such a(n) (sic) operational ethic. (pp. 35-36)

Cox, Jaramillo and Reimers (2005), also note that in some cases “young people attribute a different meaning to democracy than does the adult generation. Young people accord importance to issues of diversity and safeguarding political minorities, whereas adults identified democracy with concepts of order and electoral competition” (p. 5). These differences can be significant.

Cox, Jaramillo and Reimers (2005) also note that as much as the interpretations of citizenship vary, so to do the interpretations of what constitutes political engagement:

The meanings of democratic citizenship and notions of democracy are also diverse. Ideas of who is a citizen diverge. In practice, clear constraints exist on the full exercise of citizen rights for women, the poor, indigenous people, people of African descent, religious minorities, and immigrants. What it means to be a citizen, what the rights and obligations are that attend citizenship are open to different interpretations, reflecting diverse concepts of democracy (such as republican, federalist, and communitarian positions); so too the meaning of political participation (with concepts fluctuating between a minimalist view that identifies the right to vote and the idea of more direct everyday participation in the public affairs of the community and of other spheres). (p. 7)

Is it possible that governments seek a paradigm shift toward everyday participation in civic life, but are unwilling to accept the consequences (e.g., greater social mobilization and resistance)?

As much as citizenship education programs seek to construct the active, good and/or ideal citizen what this means is socially constructed and these constructions will influence programs.

Cox, Jaramillo and Reimers (2005) note how important it is that those selecting what type of ACE students will receive need to be able to understand how public issues create both unity and division, but nevertheless they need to be discussed, critically deliberated, and such processing supported.

Cox, Jaramillo and Reimers (2005) state:

The first challenge is political. It consists of achieving widespread and deep agreement in society on what it means to be a “good citizen” and consequently, how to form good citizens. The agreed-upon definition must be sufficiently precise to help orient its translation into education. In societies with inequality and political cultures with great internal disagreement, this can be especially difficult. But it is not possible to avoid it. Without an adequate level of agreement in a society that citizenship education is what should organize a school system, teachers cannot achieve anything significant. Teachers need the support and authority from the political system— not only from the government—to be able to effectively teach in this dimension. To address with the next generation both what unites as well as what divides a social order, the norms and values that inspire it, and the realities that complicate it. (p. 33)

Given the mass migration that has and is taking place with globalization and the number of conflict zones, many nations are seeking ways to build harmony amongst newly formed groups or previously-in-conflict zones. I wonder if citizenship education programs are trying to reconstruct citizenship as much as it is trying to advance participation.

If it is true that European nations are facing a new phenomenon of reverse migration to some of the Latin American countries and other parts of the globe, dimensions of citizenship may change considerably. Chindia Alert (2012) claims that,

There are two trends unfolding in the world. The first is that many hundreds of thousands who emigrated from what was once called the developing world to Europe and the United States are now being drawn back by the resurgent economies of their homelands. ... Nowadays it is an eerily quiet place with giant razor-wired pens all empty of Mexican illegals. Instead, as the US economy wobbles uncertainly, Mexicans are heading home for work. For the first time since the Great Depression more Mexicans are leaving the US than entering it — and most of them are finding jobs. There is huge reverse migration, too, by overseas Chinese and Indians. Almost 135,000 Chinese students returned home in 2009-10 after finishing their education abroad, an increase of 24.7 per cent. Zhang Peizhuo, a 45-year-old chemical researcher who stayed in Britain for 12 years after graduating there, has now gone back to China, in part because of government incentives. “Huge growth potential and increasing government subsidies have made returning home to start a business an attractive option for many overseas Chinese,” he said. According to the recruitment company Kelly Services India, as many as 300,000 Indian professionals are expected to return to their homeland in the next four years: “Hype or reality, people do believe that the BRICs [Brazil, Russia, India, and China] are the future and that there are a lot more job opportunities in India than elsewhere.” (n.p.)

If such migrations are occurring, or will be occurring, citizenship education could become much more complicated. Citizenship and active citizenship education are very complex, changing and challenging as they are subject to changing demographics and political arrangements.

Canada

There are a number of concerns expressed about citizenship education in Canada. Scholars search to determine where the problems lie, what the gaps and/or deficits are and how to reform citizenship education and education for citizenship and democracy. According to Nabavi (2011),

The emphasis on nationalism reflects the neoliberal model of multiculturalism in which all who contribute to making the nation diverse are benefiting. Castles (2004) calls this the *controllability of difference*, whereby policy approaches are used as a tool to hinder the ways in which ethnic diversity can be a source of social transformation. To this end, citizenship education, as positioned within the dominant paradigm, is based on strengthening the concept of nation rather than the individuals who are members of the nation. This is reflected in the attempts to position citizenship education within the *social cohesion* framework – a liberal-democratic approach to citizenship. (Nabavi, 2011, p. 22)

The discourse around active citizenship education in Canada intersects with a number of other topic areas such as: global education, international experiences, peace and sustainability, multicultural education, critical thinking, human rights education, globalization, pedagogy, education for democracy, historical events, cultural traditions, and social cohesion. The framework under which these factors are synthesized is significant.

Although citizenship education programs aspire to invoke a collective identity and individual rights, they can overlook vulnerable youth. In a dissertation about how Iranian immigrant youth experience Canadian citizenship education Nabavi (2011) states:

The theoretical and empirical landscape highlighting contemporary institutionalized racist and exclusionary practices toward immigrants in Canada (Bannerji, 2000; Burke Wood & Wortley, 2010; Nabavi & Lund, 2011) reveal the ways in which immigrants are positioned

to defend themselves within the bureaucratic webs of exclusion of the nation. These cultural everyday experiences of power and oppression inform not only individuals understanding of the nation but more so, how they situate themselves within the nation... Thus, for immigrant youth, despite identities that evolve based on the particular moment of their experience as a youth or the multiple choices afforded to them within a global landscape, within the institutionalized frameworks of the nation, they remain simply 'an immigrant', or the Other. While it has been earlier argued that various models of nationalism are used to manage diversity (such as the social cohesion framework), institutionalized exclusions further perpetuate the nationalist project where the immigrant citizen exists as someone who contributes merely to exotic flavours of the Canadian mosaic but is otherwise a burden on the structural frameworks undergirding the nation. (p. 142)

As Nabavi indicates, many immigrants feel they are marginalized and/or dispossessed from being fully accepted for who they are – they always feel like they are labeled as 'immigrants'.

Some groups, such as the Indigenous groups of Canada, also feel dispossessed from the mainstream dialogue, practices and policies of citizenship education. Shawn Atleo, National Chief of the Assembly of Nations, as cited by The Office of the Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth (2011) states:

It is unacceptable in Canada that First Nations children cannot attend a safe and healthy school. It is unacceptable in Canada for First Nations education to languish with outdated laws, policies and funding practices that do not support basic standards. It is time for fairness and equity. Shannen Koostachin stood up for justice so the young people coming behind her might have an equal opportunity for a quality education in her community, just

like young people have in communities throughout Canada. Now is the time for fairness, justice, and equity. Now is the time to realize Shannen's Dream."

(p. 4)

Provincial citizenship curriculum includes Indigenous components about various topics: the early history and cultures of Aboriginal groups; residential schools; treaties; and 20th century disputes over land, hunting rights and fishing rights. The secondary curriculum varies from province to province, but most include such topics in their social studies curriculum. Unfortunately, some of the more current issues about Indigenous rights (e.g., United Nations Rights of Indigenous Peoples), inequities (e.g., education) and socio-political struggles (e.g., water, health and education) do not play a strong role in prescribed curricula.

Shannen Koostachin, a young Attawapiskat First Nation child chose to challenge Canada's alleged inability to provide her reserve with a safe, functional and equitable school to that of other children in Canada. It had been determined that First Nations schools receive "\$2000 to \$3000 less per student, per year for elementary and secondary education" (The Office of the Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth, 2011, p. 74). Shannen lobbied the Canadian government for monies and after her tragic death in a car accident, many carried forth her concerns to Canada's third and fourth periodic reviews to the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child. The issue was taken to the courts and as Hanson (2012) reports:

In a much-anticipated ruling Wednesday morning, the court has rejected the federal government's attempts to prevent First Nations groups from arguing for better funding for child welfare on reserves. The ruling means First Nations and the federal government will have a full-blown hearing about whether Ottawa is treating native children unfairly. "It's a real victory for all the children who have waited so long for this," said Cindy Blackstock,

who heads the First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada and spearheaded the legal challenge. (n.p.)

The Canadian government is arguing against any substantive funding increase to First Nations educational allotments. In response, Conservative Member of Parliament Carolyn Bennett (2012) commented that:

Canada's Aboriginal peoples are the youngest and the fastest growing segment of our population. The Aboriginal population in Canada grew 45% between 1996 and 2006 – six times faster than the non-Aboriginal population — and almost half (48%) of the Aboriginal population is age 24 and under, compared with 31% of the non-Aboriginal population. Despite this, the Conservative government has effectively turned its back on this tremendous resource and potential source of future prosperity for all Canadians. (n.p.)

It is important that such details are included in an exploration of active citizenship education, and especially in regards to Canada, as Indigenous children are citizens, and they deserve to have equitable rights, opportunities and voice as other citizens of the state, let alone as children that are to be protected by universal standards such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Some researchers, such as Moores, have concerns that ineffectual policies and curriculum are promoting a Pollyanna sense of multicultural citizenship, which is undermining the complexities of citizenship construction that for immigrants, often include multiple notions of belonging, identity and responsibility. Moores (2009) discusses some of the prominent views on active citizenship education and its links to multicultural projects and anti-racism training:

Schugurensky and Myers (2003) categorize citizenship education into two broader types which share overlapping definitions and criteria with Westheimer and Kahne's three types

of citizens. Conservative citizenship education (most similar to the personally responsible model) perpetuates the existing social order by encouraging students to be “good producers, good consumers, and good patriots” and instilling in them national loyalty, obedience to authority, and voluntary service (Schugurensky & Myers, 2003, p. 2). This type of citizenship education favours assimilation of immigrants into the dominant culture as students are taught to accept the existing social structures and “ensure social cohesion.” (Schugurensky & Myers, 2003, p. 2). Their progressive concept of citizenship contains both virtues present in Westheimer and Kahne’s participatory and the more critical aspects of the social justice-oriented citizen types. In the progressive model the citizen’s ultimate responsibility is to further democratize his or her state through dialogue, participation in civic life, and a general concern for social justice. (pp. 7-8)

Active citizenship education curriculum, pedagogy and teacher preparation, in this scenario, would require that both students and teachers receive anti-oppressive training (e.g., anti-racism) and professional development pertaining to social justice concepts.

Moore (2009) suggests that a more critical approach to racism, multiculturalism and citizenship is essential for active citizenship education programs to improve in Canada. As Moore (2009) states,

A more critical attitude might see students questioning the adequacy of ‘tolerating’ other cultures, examining equity in a way that acknowledges their potential social advantages as members of the cultural majority, or attempting to think about how and by whom notions of law and safety are constructed before they decide that those should simply be the limiters of cultural accommodation... the skills and capacities needed by students for

effective anti-racism learning are the same or very similar to those advocated in a progressive citizenship education model. (p. 38)

A progressive and critical form of active citizenship education in Canadian schools, according to Moores (2009), would create more critical Canadian citizens, alleviate tensions and improve the possibilities that multiculturalism brings to the Canadian scene.

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) conducted a project entitled Educating for Global Citizenship in a Changing World that was designed for Canadian secondary school teachers addressing any or all of the following learning outcomes:

- Increase knowledge of international-development and cooperation issues (e.g. rights of children, gender inequities, human rights, environmental global issues).
- Instill an understanding of global interdependence and Canada's responsibilities as a member of the global village (and other related concepts e.g., globalization, rights and responsibilities, social justice, diversity, equity, peace and conflict).
- Raise awareness of the role Canadian individuals and organizations play in overseas relief and development assistance.
- Instill a sense of global citizenship and increase awareness of the difference that individual and collective actions can make on issues of global importance.
- Promote tolerance and respect for the many diverse cultures in Canada and around the world.

(Johnston, Hughes, Bopp, Paul, Rowlands, Bowers, Schumm, Manko & Tanner, 2004, pp. 99-100)

There appears to be a wide chasm between global citizenship education initiatives and mainstream federal citizenship initiatives. This is not surprising given a study by Pike (2008) which states

“Citizenship, in a constitutional sense, may continue to be granted by the nation state for a long time to come, but that should not negate the exciting possibilities for the development of an *ethos of global citizenship* in our schools” (p. 46).

The federal government is presently placing considerable emphasis on increasing youth involvement in parliamentary affairs, voting, and on presenting publications and service announcements that portray the Canadian citizenship experience in an informative and inviting way. A parliamentary brief by Menard (2010) states:

The low rate of youth electoral participation is a problem that requires serious attention, in order to secure the future of democracy in Canada. Governments need a minimum level of legitimacy in order to make decisions that have a major impact on the lives of Canadians. Elections Canada is well aware of the situation and has taken a series of initiatives to attempt to reverse the trend. However, it is clear that research is needed to understand all aspects of the problem. (p. 5)

The federal government has instituted programs that encourage schools to participate in elections by holding mock votes and engaging in the electoral process via online designs; there has been some limited success with these but youth engagement in federal elections is still low. A Canadian study by Milner (2007) indicates that gaps in youth engagement were caused by poor political knowledge and this may be why the Canadian government still places a heavy emphasis on improving youth engagement by making them more informed and politically literate.

Menard (2010) states that the Constitutional Act of 1867 “limits the federal government[’s] ability to intervene” in provincial education programs, but the report also notes that in light of a report by the Canadian Policy Networks that a “national civics education strategy be developed by the Council of Ministers of Education Canada” and that such a program could be integrated into “its

Literacy Action Plan” (p. 5). The Literacy Action plan encourages provincial collaboration to improve literacy and MacKinnon, Pitre and Watling (2007) see this as a wave that political literacy and citizenship education initiatives could ride. A study conducted by Richet (2007) concludes that:

The most immediate impact that could be made by the federal government is that of increased funding, which would help to provide citizenship education programs with the flexibility and resources necessary to be able to deliver both quality language and citizenship instruction to newcomers. As it stands now, programs across the country are finding it increasingly difficult to provide those services in an effective manner, with some even in danger of ceasing operations altogether because they lack adequate resources to continue on. In a time where immigration levels in Canada continue to rise and as more and more people are interested in becoming Canadian citizens, the status quo as far as funding is concerned is just not acceptable. (p. 50)

There appears to be a gap between provincial, federal and possibly even municipal citizenship education initiatives. Other international studies have discussed the need to establish networks to address the complexities of citizenship education. This will be discussed later in my research analysis.

The Canadian government produced, *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship*, a colourful and informative booklet about the joys and responsibilities of becoming and/or being a Canadian citizen. There are a number of key historical events and artifacts covered in the Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012) booklet including for example: Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Royal Proclamation of 1763, residential schools, Quebec Act, underground railway, war of 1812, rebellions of 1837-1838, Canadian Pacific Railway, Canada’s role in WWI and WWII, and the Governor General. The booklet also includes information on levels

of government, national symbols and civic responsibilities and informs potential citizens about women's rights, religious tolerance and leaving behind conflict-based discord. The booklet from Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012) specifically outlines what the government considers to be the responsibilities that accompany the right of citizenship (e.g., obeying the law, jury duty, voting in elections, community volunteering and protecting heritage and the environment). There is only brief mention of Canada's ties to the United States, Britain and other countries. The discourse mentions volunteering as a means of civic engagement and meeting others. The new Citizen and Immigration Canada booklet (2012) represents how the federal government contextualizes the Canadian citizen, Canadian citizenship and the elements of citizenship education. It is primarily designed for individuals pursuing citizenship in Canada as it contains practice questions for a citizenship entrance exam.

The booklet is very state-centric in its presentation of citizenship. In regards to advancing the global dimensions of citizenship, Canadian researcher Pike (2008) states,

The challenge, however, is to imbue the concept of citizenship with an ethos – a set of moral principles and codes of conduct – that is global in its scope. While the state will confer the constitutional rights and duties of citizenship, education should play a critical role in expanding young citizens' understanding of the responsibilities, and potential pleasures, of living in a global community. The result will be active national citizens with an informed global conscience. (p. 46)

Are the dimensions of global citizenship something the Canadian government should partake in regards to its immigration and citizenship education initiatives? Although, education programs are provincially mandated could not the federal government lead the way in advancing both the state's

moral responsibilities towards global citizenship (e.g., sustainability, peace and universal standards) as well as the individual's sense of global responsibility.

A direction that the Canadian government is taking in regards to education in Canadian schools is in regards to international students. A report entitled, *International Education: A Key Driver of Canada's Future Prosperity*, was able to pull together provincial and territorial ministers of education to complete a study on this topic. Panel members for the study state:

We recognize the jurisdiction of the provinces/territories in education: we met with or spoke to senior officials from all provincial ministries of education active in international education to ensure alignment and reduce duplication of efforts. Education associations and institutions from K-12 through post-doctoral programs were consulted and remained dynamic sounding boards throughout our process. Our engagement process confirmed that Canada has the opportunity and capacity for strong growth in attracting international students. It is feasible to double the number of international students by 2022 while maintaining high-quality standards. Further, it is imperative that we actively seek co-operative arrangements to encourage Canadian students to spend time abroad either in a study, internship or service learning experience. (Advisory Panel on Canada's International Education Strategy, 2012, p. ii)

The document indicates that such a program is significant because it will bolster economic activity:

Canada now needs to take the next steps. The opportunities are immense and ready for a sustained Canadian response. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) estimates that the global demand for international higher education is set to grow from nearly 3.7 million students (in 2009) to 6.4 million in 2025. On top of

this is a huge market potential in high school students. The K-12 sector can make a significant contribution, as the students who attend these schools can decide to pursue post-secondary education in Canada. Further, international students at the K-12 level can shape internationalization by bringing a diversity of experience the classroom. The more Canadian students are exposed to an internationalized curriculum and intercultural experiences at an early age, the greater the impact on their development. (Advisory Panel on Canada's International Education Strategy, 2012, p. ix)

In this context the significance of global interdependence is highlighted as is the need for provincial and territorial meetings and funding. As well, the global/international narrative is deemed to be important to development even for those of an early age.

Within the Canadian context the global dimensions of citizenship fall under the banner of global education and typically global/sustainability education is infused by the classroom teacher as there are only a few locally and/or regionally designed global citizenship courses offered. In a world study on citizenship education and teacher training, by the Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe (CICE), Cappelle, Crippen and Lundgren (2011) state the following about Canadian citizenship education programs:

Global citizenship education is intended to be transformative in nature. This has meant the adoption of pedagogical practices which encourage:

- critical thinking activities,
- issue-based inquiries and analysis,
- cross-cultural experiences,
- managing instances of conflict,
- the exploration of multiple values,

- beliefs and attitudes that underpin viewpoints on global issues,
- experiential opportunities for authentic learning,
- engagement in one's community(ies) to address various forms of injustice.

(p. 3)

Participatory forms of learning that actively involve young people in meaningful civic engagement with real public issues are also receiving more attention in Canadian education.

According to the study, pedagogical approaches to teaching global citizenship are diverse and progressive (e.g., case studies, model town councils, peace building programs, youth forums, and community projects) and they credit CIDA's Global Classroom Initiative for sparking an interest in bringing global perspectives to Social Studies curriculum. Teachers indicated that it was difficult to infuse global citizenship into "already overloaded curriculum" and that there was "little room for innovation in the official curriculum" (Cappelle, Crippen and Lundgren, 2011, p.7). Such an argument supports imbedding citizenship education in social studies programs.

Various ways to incorporate a global narrative into Canadian citizenship education programs are being explored. Cappelle (2011) states:

There has been substantial discussion about the scope and breadth of citizenship education in recent years in Canada and elsewhere... understandings of what it means to educate for global citizenship in Canada are often intertwined with these broader conceptions of what it means to educate for citizenship... theoretical perspectives such as Kymlicka's "multicultural" model, Osborne's "12Cs" framework, Sears' "Conceptions of Citizenship Education" model, and Strong-Boag's "pluralist" orientation, each acknowledge citizenship's global dimension in varying ways in relation to the particular perspective of citizenship that each advocates... Recent provincial curriculum policy developments show

a heightened attention to the global citizenship component of student learning. These perspectives on global citizenship education all include some attention to understanding global interdependence, and some sense of membership, identity, and responsibility in relation to local and transnational actions affecting that interconnected world. At the same time, these curriculum perspectives differ in their relative emphases on elements such as individual learner self-discovery, values, knowledge of world systems, questions of rights and justice, and equipping students for political advocacy roles. (p. 6)

Considerable research has been done in Canada on global citizenship education, active citizenship education and various combinations of the two. The term ‘infuse’ is often used to describe the place that global citizenship takes in relation to the more formal citizenship curriculum and its prescribed learning outcomes.

In the next section I am going to explore active citizenship education in three provinces: Manitoba, Quebec and British Columbia. I have selected Manitoba because of its long history of struggle in terms of its citizenship programs, Quebec because of its historical right to a distinct language, culture, religion and legal system, and British Columbia because I have taught there for many years and I am familiar with social studies and citizenship programs there. I will also explore Aboriginal (e.g., First Nations, Metis and Inuit) perspectives on Canadian citizenship education, but as this is such an immense subject area in and of its own, I will only be able to provide a snapshot. I will refer to some curriculum from other provinces in my research discussions. Upon completion of the above research, I conclude my collection of discourse materials and proceed into my research analysis.

Manitoba

As previously mentioned education is provincially and territorially sanctioned in Canada thus each region has its own policies, curriculum and pedagogical designs. In an article written for the Manitoba Association of School Superintendents, Osborne (2005) writes of the turbulent past Manitoba's citizenship education has undergone,

The official version of citizenship, in Manitoba as elsewhere, was, by today's standards, often narrow and coercive. It was in the name of citizenship, for example, that in Manitoba First Nations children were sent to residential schools; that French-speaking Roman Catholics lost their right to publicly-supported schooling; that Mennonite schools were closed; that the Polish, French, Ukrainian, and Mennonite Normal Schools were shut down; that French was prohibited as a language of instruction and, in defiance of Canadian history, treated as a "foreign" language; that girls and women were confined to restrictive social and political roles. We think of citizenship as a good thing and a good word but it can have dangerous consequences. The horrors of ethnic cleansing and genocide are the obverse of a certain kind of citizenship. Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin all thought highly of citizenship as they defined it. Mussolini's thugs administered the castor oil treatment and worse to those they deemed unworthy of citizenship. Stalin sent them to the gulags as so-called antisocial elements. Hitler exterminated them as *untermenschen*. As these examples demonstrate, citizenship can be a very dangerous word. We need to use it carefully. Not the least of the service we can perform for students is to introduce them to the continuing debate over what citizenship means and how it has been used and abused over the years.

(pp. 1-2)

Osborne (2005) reminds us that citizenship education design, a contested domain, must be explored, examined and evaluated with great respect, caution and reflexivity.

Similarly, in a study of secondary history curricula and textbooks (e.g., three selected social studies/history textbooks in Ontario) Glassford (2010) notes how history education, like citizenship education, is both a product of change and an instrument of change and thus must be carefully constructed:

The content of history textbooks and curriculum is an important factor in the political socialization of succeeding generations of students. This study of representative classroom textbooks authorized for use in Ontario at three distinct eras of the 20th century shows how the main lines of interpretation have shifted over time. During the pre-World War II era, the persistent underlying tone was one of reverence for Canada's connection to Britain. By mid-century, the main theme was Canada's bilingual dualism within North America. As the end of the 20th century loomed, the textbook authors were focusing much more on previously marginalised groups within the Canadian multicultural mosaic. Each era produces its own historical narrative, but within the school context, an authorized interpretation impacts the beliefs of the generation to follow... Democratic citizenship, to be meaningful in today's inter-connected postmodern world, must be global in scope. From the Great Peace of Hiawatha to the International Court at The Hague, the next generation of Canadians must be educationally immersed in the full breadth and depth of their rich cultural heritage. (n.p.)

How citizenship and/or history is constructed in education policy, curriculum and pedagogy can have profound implications, thus the discourse must be carefully selected.

Osborne (2005) claims that, “In the Canadian setting, the debates of the last hundred years have created a broad consensus that citizen education consists of some eight, or possibly nine, elements,” but they disagree somewhat on their rankings, definitions and applications. These nine elements are paraphrased as the following:

- Sense of Canadian identity that has been established by debate (e.g., shared struggles)
- A distinct Canadian identity within the international community (e.g., League of Nations)
- Awareness of one’s rights and the rights of others (e.g., Charter of Rights and Freedoms)
- Commitment to be dutiful and service-oriented citizenship (e.g., voting and volunteering)
- Commitment to international and/or universal values (e.g., tolerance)
- Political literacy (e.g., skills, discernment and engagement)
- Civic knowledge, skills and attitudes (e.g., taking political action)
- Reflective capacities (e.g., critically think through situations)
- Respect for and stewardship of the environment (emerging) (e.g., environmental ethic)

(Osborne, 2005)

Although these elements are debatable, they identify some important foundations necessary for the sound architectural structuring of citizenship education. These points reveal how citizenship education includes looking at the state as an identity; the state in relation to other countries; the citizen’s relationship to community, state, the world and the community; the citizen’s rights, responsibilities and reflective abilities; and the exercising of political skills to help shape the state.

Of great interest, to me, is the first element listed by Osborne. S/he refers to a quote by Jeremy Webber, which I followed up on. Webber (1994) states:

The core of any democratic community is not ethnicity or language or some catalogue of shared values. It is the commitment to a particular debate through time. The specific

character of that debate is of real importance to individuals. Members come to care about issues through the terms of that debate. It sets the framework for the positions they take on questions affecting the community as a whole. Using those terms they define their place within society. (p. 223)

This is an insightful way to describe the self-identification aspect of civic identity and/or nation-state identity. It also informs us that active citizenship education, like democracy, is shaped by the struggles of the people. Osborne (2005) states:

However defined, once citizenship had been inscribed on the educational agenda, it took on a life of its own. In Manitoba, for example, critics of the kind of citizenship education promoted by government did not so much reject as seek to redefine it. To take only one example, when the Winnipeg business elite held a national conference on citizenship education in 1919, the labour movement boycotted it, with the One Big Union calling it a “most sinister meeting” and suggesting it be renamed “Dope the Kiddies.”⁴ From the 1890s through the 1930s, the farmers’ movement, the cooperative movement, the trades unions, social democrats and socialists, feminists, internationalists, and others broadened the definition of citizenship beyond the instilling of ideological orthodoxy and character training to include the possibility of a critical examination of social realities and the exploration of social change. Some, perhaps many, teachers agreed. As the long-time principal of the Winnipeg Normal School William A. McIntyre, declared in 1932, “The only hope for curing the ills of the world is that young people may picture a better one and strive to realize it. To frame this picture and to cultivate this ambition is the greatest duty of the school.” (p. 1)

If the design of active citizenship education – that is, how it is being created, revised and/or transformed – does not take into consideration the historical, social and political ethos that it is located in, it quite well may be rejected by the citizens who ultimately will struggle to ensure it is constructed in a way that reflects their values, beliefs and traditions as citizens. This is not to say that cultural relativism should be the orders of the day, as Canada does have a Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and since the 1920's, has agreed to abide by a number of universal human rights standards and obligations.

Osborne (2005) suggests that citizenship education usually inserted into social studies and history courses and to avoid it being “ghettoized” (p. 4) within these, that the “12 C's” (p. 4) be followed. Osborne's 12 C's are paraphrased as follows:

- Canadian. Are they prepared to debate who as Canadians they are, who they want to be, and how do they get there
- Cosmopolitan. Are they aware they are citizens of both Canada and the world?
- Civilizations. Are they aware that civilizations are a form of achievement that needs to be cherished and protected?
- Content. Are they receiving a broad spectrum education in the socio-political and cultural domains?
- Communication. Are they able to effectively articulate ideas via various media?
- Criticism. Are they able to think critically?
- Creativity. Are they curious and able to explore and manifest new ideas?
- Community. Are they informed about and engaged in their community?
- Concern. Do they demonstrate an ethic of compassion?
- Commitment. Are they willing to act to do what is right?

- Competent. Are they prepared to be competent citizens when they graduate?

(Osbourne, 2005)

Osborne provides an extensive list to develop and assess active citizenship curriculum, learning and pedagogy. He strongly advocates that “the spirit of democracy” (p. 6) exist in school culture and that students are engaged in supporting and developing the schools and communities they want and that are socially just.

Osborne emphasizes that critical thinking, activism, and social justice are paramount to active citizenship education and claims that,

We too easily teach our subjects as studies of impersonal causes and results, laws and concepts, algorithms and formulas, rules and procedures, and chunks of factual knowledge to be memorized. What is lost is any sense of human agency, any sense that subjects and disciplines are in fact records of how men and women have tried to understand and shape their environment. (Osborne, 2005, p. 1)

He also notes that there are subtle but significant hierarchies, types and/or categories of civic engagement. To do so he refers to a statement made by Joel Westheimer that I researched and explored further. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) states, “if participatory citizens are organizing the food drive and personally responsible citizens are donating food, justice-oriented citizens are asking why people are hungry and acting on what they discover” (p. 241). Osborne (2005) declares that Manitoba schools are faring well in many aspects of citizenship education but that they need to explore justice-oriented agency in terms of how it has, does and ought to democratically shape schools, communities and governments.

Manitoba Education (2012d) recently revised some of its secondary social studies courses and introduces their revised grade eleven social studies course on its website:

The new Grade 11 History of Canada (30F) curriculum supports citizenship as a core concept and engages students in historical inquiry. Guided by essential questions, students focus on the history of Canada from pre-contact times to the present. Through this process students become historically literate and better able to understand the Canada of today.

(n.p.)

The Manitoba Education (2012e) site lists the themes that are covered in the course and indicates that it is hoped that students will acquire “Enduring Understandings” (n.p.) related to the following five themes in Canadian history:

1. *First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Peoples*
2. *French-English Duality*
3. *Identity, Diversity, and Citizenship*
4. *Governance and Economics*
5. *Canada and the World*

(n.p.)

The framework that is used to structure Manitoba’s History 11 course (Manitoba Education, 2011) is based on the work of Dr. Peter Seixas of the University of British Columbia. Seixas operates The Historical Thinking Project which posits that to think historically, learners need to be able to:

1. Establish *historical significance*
2. Use *primary source evidence*
3. Identify *continuity and change*
4. Analyze *cause and consequence*
5. Take *historical perspectives*, and
6. Understand the *ethical dimension* of historical interpretations.

(Centre for Historical Consciousness, 2011, n.p.)

The Social Studies 11 course, thus, is primarily based on a historical framework and ways of historical thinking.

Manitoba Education (2012a) has also introduced some new elective courses such as Grade 12 Global Issues: Citizenship and Sustainability, Grade 12 Current Topics and First Nations, Métis and Inuit Studies. The Manitoba Education (2012d) Global Issues: Citizenship and Sustainability website indicates that “This course is based on the principles of active democratic citizenship, ecological literacy, critical media literacy, and ethical decision-making, and consolidates learning across the disciplines to empower students as agents of change for a sustainable and equitable future” (n.p.). The rationale for the global issues course states:

The 20th century has also seen the beginning of global efforts to improve human quality of life by working toward collective social goals. In 1948, the United Nations *Declaration of Universal Human Rights* marked a significant turning point in concern for the dignity of all human beings, while in the year 2000 the UN established the Millennium Development Goals to improve life for people across the globe.

Although some progress has been made, if we are to improve the human condition and sustain the Earth for future generations, more work must be done. We cannot continue along the path we are on – we need to change the way we live, reconnect to the natural world, develop an ethos based on ecological thinking and global concern, and teach our children to do the same. (Manitoba Education, 2012c, n.p.)

The course entices students to improve the human condition and the welfare of planet Earth. It advocates a strong environmental and human rights ethic, and it urges students to ethically and morally challenge the world and make a difference.

The *Global Issues 12: Citizenship and Sustainability* course description includes a number of headings of which one is “Active Democratic Citizenship” (Manitoba Education 2012d, n.p.). The program guide presents a description of the active democratic citizenship components of the course:

An ethos of active democratic citizenship involves developing a set of coherent ethical principles upon which to base decisions and practices. Citizenship is a fluid concept that is subject to continuing change over time: its meaning is often contested, and it is subject to interpretation and debate. In the course of history, citizenship has been used both as a means of strengthening human solidarity and a means of excluding or maltreating groups or individuals while conferring superior privilege and power to others. An ethos of active democratic citizenship in the contemporary world is often referred to as *global citizenship*, since it is based not on nationhood or ethno-cultural exclusivity, but on a fundamental acceptance of the inherent, equal, universal and inalienable rights of all human beings... This learning process may be seen as a process of moving from a sense of *me* to *we* – from passive to active, from detachment to engagement, from status quo to change, from indifference to concern, and, practically speaking, from consumer to citizen. Active democratic citizenship is an ethos motivated by concern for humanity, society, the planet and the future, and is activated by self-empowerment. Students will devote considerable time throughout this course to examining personal and social values and the factors that influence their decision-making. This reflection will take place in the context of recognizing our collective human responsibility for the well-being of future generations and our individual responsibility to contribute.

(Manitoba Education, 2012a, n.p.)

The program also encourages students to consider the impact that current lifestyles are going to have on future generations, and especially their own lifestyles. A quote by UNESCO (1997) that is referred to in the course description captures this:

Perhaps we are beginning to move towards a new global ethic which transcends all other systems of allegiance and belief, which is rooted in a consciousness of the interrelatedness and sanctity of life. Would such a common ethic have the power to motivate us to modify our current dangerous course? There is obviously no ready answer to this question, except to say that without a moral and ethical foundation, sustainability is unlikely to become a reality. (para.111-112)

In my research analysis I will explore this new discourse in reference to a myriad of active citizenship education research and in terms of a criticality that exhumes the reproductions of systemic oppressions.

Quebec

As I begin an exploration of citizenship education in Quebec I turn to a current announcement by Allison (2012) that indicates how ACE can become a controversial and contested space very quickly:

Minister Malavoy [Education], not a Canadian citizen at the time, resigned her seat in the National Assembly in 1994 after it was disclosed that she had voted illegally in various Quebec elections and referendums.

Violating laws related to citizenship does not exclude her from being in charge of “History and Citizenship Education,” the official name of the high school history course she wishes to change? Should we take her seriously? Neither William Weintraub nor Mordecai

Richler could have imagined such a ridiculous situation, even in their wildest satires about Quebec. (n.p.)

The existing “History and Citizenship Education” program that Allison referred to was developed by Malavoy, in 2004, and even then it was considered somewhat controversial. Kee (2004) writes:

In Quebec, history is a mandatory subject until Grade 11. Within the curriculum as a whole, the Québec Education Program (QEP) highlights "Geography, History and Citizenship Education" as one of five core "Subject Areas". As the title indicates, the creators of the QEP consider teaching about one's past to be central to an understanding of one's civic identity in the present. The connection is not unique to Québec – educators across the country agree that, while students can learn to become good citizens in a variety of contexts, history can play a special role in providing young people with a sense of place in the world. The consensus begins to break down, however, when educators start to define "citizenship"... By focusing on the history of the Western world, and then making reference to corresponding examples, the curriculum writers have attempted to create a historically informed citizenship that will meet the challenges facing contemporary Québec society: "to reconcile shared membership in a community with the diversity of identities."²...The underlying principle is one of mutual respect and understanding. But will a citizenship that is built around a "respect" for difference be enough for the challenges of 2010 and beyond? In cities such as Montreal, international migration is resulting in increasing diversification of the population, with a concomitant loss of a common historical identity.” (n.p.)

Is such a historically-based Eurocentric notion of citizenship adequate for Canada’s multicultural population? Many people are living in more than one country and/or have ties to homelands and

relatives living in other countries. Taylor (1998) indicates that globalization (e.g., faster travel and communication) is leading many citizens to have a “diasporic consciousness” and that “people now live in imagined spaces, spaces where they see themselves situated within a certain society and more and more of these spaces straddle borders and other boundaries” (p. 332). People are exploring opportunities to live in more than one country – our social imaginations are expanding.

The curriculum guide for a junior secondary course then explains how the topics of social studies and citizenship should be approached in the Quebec Education Program:

The purpose of teaching history at school is to interest students in present day social phenomena and help them develop the competencies and knowledge required to understand these phenomena in the light of the past and assume their responsibilities as citizens capable of critical judgment and measured analysis. In addition, learning history enables students to gradually acquire the intellectual approach, language and attitudes on which historical thinking is based. They learn how to examine social phenomena from a historical perspective, to base their understanding of these phenomena on documentary sources and to use the historian’s tools of reflection. In the Western world, history education became a standard feature of the curriculum in public schools in the context of the rise of the nation-state in the nineteenth century. Its introduction reflected a concern for citizenship education; historical narratives could be used to instill a national identity and a belief in the validity of the existing social and political order. Today, citizenship education still plays a key role in the teaching of history. (Québec Ministère de l’Éducation, 2004, p.

1)

Many citizenship education programs have used such a historical approach for the teaching and learning of citizenship.

Quebec's Social Studies 10 and 11 programs follow a similar historical approach to their junior citizenship education programs. The Social Studies 10 program includes the following sections on intellectual movements and international relations in the curriculum guide:

Intellectual movements:

Foundations of the major ideologies: conservatism, liberalism, social democracy, socialism:

- role of government: political
- ownership of the means of production: economic
- individual and collective rights: social

Nationalism:

- Québécois
- Canadian
- Native

Leaders:

- traditional elite: clergy, bourgeoisie, prominent citizens
- new elite: business community, intellectuals, unions, women's movement

International Relations:

- Canadian foreign policy:
- determining factors
- Québec's international relations:
- constitutional limit
- participation in la francophonie

(Ministère de l'Éducation, 1998, p. 4)

The way nationalism and international relations are itemized by the Ministry in Quebec is quite unique and deserving of some discussion. The concept of Quebec nationalism and its role as a state in the international community is explored in the curriculum and somewhat controversial given it is a province of a federal Canada. In all other regards the curriculum is similar to other provinces (e.g., pre-post-Confederation, WW1, and WW11, Canadian government and Canadian geography).

A current article about Quebec's 'History and Citizenship' student exam demonstrates how political citizenship education can become. Allison and Bradley (2011) state,

An essay question asks students to write about demographic changes that occurred in the 20th century in terms of immigration, migration within Quebec, and natural growth. In a telling omission, the consequences of Bill 101, which reduced Quebec's population and is recorded as the largest internal migration in Canadian history, are not to be considered by the students. While this is supposed to be an examination in English, some of the documents are in French and historical English names have been changed to comply with Bill 101. L'Estrie in 1880 was in reality the Eastern Townships; and Rue Saint-Jacques, Canada's financial centre in 1920, was in reality St. James Street. In addition, the examination uses words that are not English... The examination is supposedly about history and citizenship education, yet is grounded on the notion of the Québécois as a nation. Citizenship must deal with more than simply Quebec citizenship. Local, Canadian and international citizenship must also be covered. Citizenship at the beginning of the 21st century involves plural identities, but thanks to the skewed and narrow nationalist focus, the only citizenship identity pursued in this course is a specific Quebec one. This notion has seeped so deeply into educational thinking that in 2010 the English school boards

developed an entire exam based on the premise of "Quebec as a nation," entirely unaware that this has no basis in law or history. (Allison & Bradley, 2011, n.p.)

As can be seen citizenship education can be controversial. ACE discourse contained within curriculum, exams and academic scholarship can reveal important details not only about the construction of the discourse, but also about how the discourse can perpetuate systemic oppressions, hegemony and bias.

British Columbia

The rationale for secondary social studies programs in British Columbia is stated in the BC Social Studies 11 Integrated Resource Package:

The aim of social studies is to develop thoughtful, responsible, active citizens who are able to acquire the requisite information to consider multiple perspectives and to make reasoned judgments. The Social Studies 11 curriculum provides students with opportunities to reflect critically upon events and issues in order to examine the present, make connections with the past, and consider the future. Through their participation in social studies, students are encouraged to

- understand and prepare to exercise their roles, rights, and responsibilities within Canada and the world
- develop an appreciation of democracy and what it means to be Canadian
- demonstrate respect for human equality and cultural diversity
- think critically, evaluate information, and practise effective communication.

(British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2005, p. 11)

The British Columbia Ministry of Education (BCMOE) focuses on social studies program in their entirety to help develop active citizenship, but they all identify some specific prescribed learning outcomes and achievement indicators.

Social studies teachers are expected to support the diverse students they have and the diverse needs and sensitivities of students given that social studies curriculum cover a number of socio-cultural and political topics and students may come from a very diverse range of backgrounds:

British Columbia's schools include young people of varied backgrounds, interests, and abilities. The Kindergarten to Grade 12 school system is committed to meeting the needs of all students. When selecting specific topics, activities, and resources to support the implementation of Social Studies 11, teachers are encouraged to ensure that these choices support inclusion, equity, and accessibility for all students. In particular teachers should ensure that classroom instruction, assessment, and resources reflect sensitivity to diversity and incorporate positive role portrayals, relevant issues, and themes such as inclusion, respect, and acceptance. (p. 14)

This is not to say that learning outcomes can be skipped but rather that they can be addressed in respectful, compassionate and articulate ways (e.g., residential schools, Japanese internment camps, the Chinese comfort women),

Social studies eleven students are expected to “demonstrate skills and attitudes of active citizenship, including ethical behaviour, open-mindedness, respect for diversity, and collaboration” (BCMOE, 2005, p. 31). The program specifies how to identify such skills and attitudes in the curriculum so that teachers can evaluate student progress. Students are expected to be able to complete the following:

[I]dentify attributes associated with active citizenship, including

- ethical behaviour (e.g., honesty, fairness, reliability)
- open-mindedness
- respect for diversity
- empathy
- questioning and promoting discussion
- tolerance for ambiguity
- individual and collective responsibility
- remaining informed over time
- advocating responsibly for own and others' rights
- ongoing examination and reassessment of own beliefs
- willingness to participate

(BCMOE, 2005, p. 31)

Some of the suggested activities to achieve these learning outcomes include evaluating how to take action on public policy. Students are expected to not only learn historical, political and geographical facts but they are expected to critically evaluate these, in some cases form a thesis about an issue related to them, and to develop such skills as letter writing to a government official, debating and conducting a mock trial.

The prescribed learning outcomes for the course are categorized into five groupings and outline the main topics of study and skills to be learned. The first category looks at the skills students should acquire such as critical thinking, comparing, summarizing, and defending a position while the third category looks at human geography (BCMOE, 2005). The three other categories are more content area and related to citizenship skills:

[A] POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT

It is expected that students will:

- demonstrate understanding of the political spectrum
- explain how Canadians can effect change at the federal and provincial levels
- explain how federal and provincial governments are formed in Canada
- describe major provisions of the Canadian constitution, including the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, and assess its impact on Canadian society

[B] AUTONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT

It is expected that students will:

- describe Canada's evolution as a politically autonomous nation
- assess Canada's role in World War I and the war's impact on Canada
- assess Canada's role in World War II and the war's impact on Canada
- assess Canada's participation in world affairs...

[C] SOCIETY AND IDENTITY

It is expected that students will:

- assess the development and impact of Canadian social policies and programs related to immigration, the welfare state, and minority rights
- explain economic cycles with reference to the Great Depression and the labour movement in Canada
- describe the role of women in terms of social, political, and economic change in Canada
- assess the impact of the conscription crises, Quebec nationalism, bilingualism, and regionalism on Canadian unity

- demonstrate knowledge of the challenges faced by Aboriginal people in Canada during the 20th century and their response...

- represent what it means to be Canadian

(n.p.)

The grade eleven social studies course includes a provincial exam that is worth 20% of the student's final mark and it is a requirement for graduation. The final exam consists of multiple choice questions and two essay questions. Students can opt to take the First Nations 12 or Civics 11 course and exam instead. Interest in the Civics 11 course has been very poor and although few take the First Nations 12 course, it has been well received. The emphasis on the provincial exam impacts how teachers approach the course as the course content is quite extensive. Students have to be well prepared to perform well on the exam as their graduation is at stake and school district performance ratings are publically displayed (e.g., student names are anonymous).

The Social Studies 8-10 program is formatted in a similar way as the SS 11 course, other than the topics are different, the skills are not as sophisticated and students do not have to write a provincial exam. In the junior courses systems of governance are covered from a more historical perspective (e.g., the Magna Carta, the U.S. Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the Proclamations of 1763), whereas in grade 11 students learn about and to a very limited extent engage in public policy, civic affairs and election events. Preparing students to become effective citizens is emphasized in social studies programs, but citizenship education itself as a topic is not present. The Justice Education Society (2010) designed a robust teaching resource entitled "Being an Active Citizen: Law, Government and Community Engagement in BC" to augment existing IRPs. It should be noted at this time that the BCMOE only recommends certain textbooks and resource materials, rather than creating them. Instructional materials (e.g., discourse) are left to

teacher discretion; teachers are responsible to cover the prescribed learning outcomes – thus these are very important.

Students have the option of taking Social Justice 12 which includes a mandated action plan on a student-selected issue of choice (BCMOE, 2008). The emphasis and framework used in the Social Justice 12 course is to identify, analyze and confront social injustices using political mechanisms (e.g., campaigning, researching, letter writing, legal protesting, social mobilizing, petitioning, meeting with government officials, partaking in community events, fundraising for vulnerable groups and raising public awareness on issues (BCMOE, 2008). Students learn about issues of power, hegemony, oppression, human rights, feminism, poverty, genocide, restorative justice, First Nations reserve conditions, racism, anthropocentrism, discrimination, environmental injustices, universal instruments, environmental racism, sex trafficking, homophobia, civil rights movements, sustainability, climate change, animal rights, law, ethics and moral imperatives. This course is ministry designed. There are other courses that are locally designed by districts in the province (e.g., global studies, environmental studies and conservation).

Chapter 6: RESEARCH ANALYSIS

Like an astronomer using a telescope to study the Universe I used a CDA lens in my research to analyze the universe of citizenship education. An astronomer gazes through the lens of a telescope to identify already documented bodies in the Universe, and then proceeds to look for abnormalities and things never noticed or seen before. For example, the Kepler Mission just announced it has found “two exo-planets in the habitable ‘zone’” (Hern, 2012, n.p.). I begin my research analysis with a brief glimpse through my CDA lens to demonstrate how various discourses have shaped, and/or continue to shape, citizenship education. This will preface the next three sections of my research analysis (e.g., where we have been, where we are, and where ought we to be going) and provide a juxtaposition between historical and contemporary discourses. It will also reveal how many discourses have been excluded from much of the contemporary citizenship education policy, curriculum and pedagogy. As CDA analysts would say, they have been conveniently placed in the discourse background, or as astronomers would say, they exist as part of the dark energy and/or matter. In the fifth and last section of my research analysis I provide a culminating analysis. Throughout the chapter, I carry on my analogy that likens the study of citizenship education discourse to exploring space.

Astrophysicists build upon old and new discoveries to generate new discourses on where to go next with their research and practices, and so do I as the researcher of this study. Dejoie and Truelove (2012) state:

By looking at an object's electromagnetic spectrum, scientists can determine if an object is moving away from Earth or towards Earth. When distant objects, such as quasars, are viewed from Earth, their spectrum is shifted towards red. Whenever there is a shift in a

spectrum, it is called a [Doppler Shift](#). If the shift is toward red, the light given off by the object is in longer wavelengths. When an object moves away from Earth, the light that it is giving off is seen in longer wavelengths. When an object moves toward Earth, the light that it is giving off is seen in shorter wavelengths. This causes a shift in the object's spectrum towards violet. The amount of shift in an object's spectrum is determined by how fast the object is moving. All of the distant galaxies have tremendous red shifts. Based on these data, scientists believe the universe is still expanding outward. (n.p.)

As the Universe is continuously changing so is the discourse of active citizenship education. And, as astrophysicists build upon old and new discoveries to generate new discourse and pathways, so can researchers of active citizenship education.

As indicated in the introduction to my dissertation I designed five research questions to guide my research:

1. Where have we, as researchers, educators and policy-makers come from, in regards to citizenship education?
2. Where are we now and what factors have influenced this?
3. Where ought we to be going with citizenship education and why?
4. How might we get from where we have been in our research, education and policy-making to where we ought to be?
5. What might a new agenda for active citizenship education look like (e.g., in the Canadian context and British Columbia's provincial curriculum for example) and what considerations should be addressed when moving forward?

I address the first three research questions in my research analysis and the last two research questions in my conclusion.

Governments, as overseers of public education, determine the discourses they want to shape educational policy and citizenship education curriculum. The discourses they select establish what teachers are expected to cover, how they should cover it, and what the learning outcomes are. Such educational discourses can marginalize and/or completely disenfranchise populations without intending to do so, or they can become a vehicle for ideological propaganda. Critical discourse analysis reveals “how discourse figures in relation to other social elements in processes of social” and/or institutional change (Fairclough, 2009, p. 283), thus it will help me identify what’s motivating their decisions.

Governments seek to create model student citizens that will complement their plans and priorities. As Burak (2012) states,

The nation-building process is based on purpose of creating an “enlightened citizen”¹⁶. The creation of an “enlightened citizen” in Norbert Elias’ words [*sic*] can be seen as a project that not only aims to break the ties with the old traditional forces but also aims to make the individuals get responsibilities and duties under the rule of new forces¹⁷. In this sense, the individuals are supposed to adopt a set of specific attitudes, behaviors, and roles through internalizing some particular perceptions and standards of judgment. (p. 7)

It is expected that programs will create students who have the desire, moral conscience and competencies to participate in civic life.

Active citizenship education involves imagining what could be and determining how to achieve that. As Johansson (2007) states,

I claim that it is useful to study discourses, and thereby the constructive process, since language not only “mirrors the world but constructs social reality” as well.¹ Thus, it is a question of “representing reality” or creating a “social imaginary”.² Consequently there is

no 'reality' for us to find 'out there', social 'facts' are constructed through discourse.³ (p. 13)

Using critical discourse analysis, I will be able to carefully, thoughtfully and reflectively explore the complexities of active citizenship education and address my research questions.

Looking Through the CDA Lens to Analyze Text

In my exploration of the universe of citizenship education I included the obvious discourse that presents itself in contemporary educational discourse, but I also included much earlier texts on the subject as well as discourses from other disciplines. I compare my exploration of a much broader universe of discourse, to the astronomer's quest to explore not only the galaxies of the universe but also the dark spaces and energies which were at one time considered to be a space of 'nothingness'. According to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) (2013), when considering our Universe:

More is unknown than is known. We know how much dark energy there is because we know how it affects the Universe's expansion. Other than that, it is a complete mystery. But it is an important mystery. It turns out that roughly 70% of the Universe is dark energy. Dark matter makes up about 25%. The rest - everything on Earth, everything ever observed with all of our instruments, all normal matter - adds up to less than 5% of the Universe. Come to think of it, maybe it shouldn't be called "normal" matter at all, since it is such a small fraction of the Universe. One explanation for dark energy is that it is a property of space. Albert Einstein was the first person to realize that empty space is not nothing. (n.p.)

Contemporary citizenship education discourse in this scenario is like the Earth and other normal matter— it is significant in that it structures and propels policy and curriculum but it is also miniscule in reference to the socio-political, economic and cultural energies that complete the entirety of citizenship discourse – the forgotten, omitted and excluded tests. As Huckin, Andrus and Clary-Lemon (2012) state “CDA’s marriage of text and context, and its ability to consider history as part and parcel of analysis, provide an excellent methodological basis for archival work” (pp. 111-112). They also note that “power abuse is most often centered in institutions” and that “CDA routinely engages in institutional analysis—especially, powerful institutions such as government, education, the law, or the mainstream news media” (Clary-Lemon, 2012, p. 123).

Contemporary citizenship discourse is influenced by the political ideologies that it is immersed within. Consider the following statement as we look at three policy statements. Macdonald and Hursh (2006) state, “Training is preparation for a future we know. Education prepares for a future we don’t know” (n.p.). How does this policy relate to the following three policy statements? According to a report by the BC Ministry of Education (2010), intended to design the provinces 21st century education plan for K-12 education in British Columbia,

The fabric of a knowledge-based society is built around individuals with the ability to use information and continuously adapt to a rapidly changing globe...Traditional skills like literacy, numeracy, and critical thinking need to be applied in different ways and supplemented with new skills and attributes in order for students to become full participants in a knowledge-based society (p.1).

According to The Maastricht Treaty which is stated in Article 2 of the Treaty on the European Union,

The Community shall have as its task, by establishing a common market and an economic and monetary union and by implementing common policies or activities referred to in Articles 3 and 4, to promote throughout the Community a harmonious, balanced and sustainable development of economic activities, a high level of employment and of social protection, equality between men and women, sustainable and non-inflationary growth, a high degree of competitiveness and convergence of economic performance, a high level of protection and improvement of the quality of the environment, the raising of the standard of living and quality of life, and economic and social cohesion and solidarity among Member States. (The European Union, 1995, p. 2.)

In 2010, President Obama unveiled his blueprint for further revisions to the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act :

This blueprint builds on the significant reforms already made in response to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 around four areas: (1) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness to ensure that every classroom has a great teacher and every school has a great leader; (2) Providing information to families to help them evaluate and improve their children's schools, and to educators to help them improve their students' learning; (3) Implementing college- and career-ready standards and developing improved assessments aligned with those standards; and (4) Improving student learning and achievement in America's lowest-performing schools by providing intensive support and effective interventions. (p. 3)

Citizenship is not a priority in these blueprints for education. The node for much contemporary citizenship education is based on education providing the means (e.g., literacy, numeracy and information technology) to advance a knowledge-based economy so that nations may prosper. State

and educational objectives, as in the above examples, are designed to serve a knowledge-based society and a globally competitive market; little emphasis is placed on citizenship, the public good or sustaining democratic practices. As Fairclough (2005) states, narratives and discourses can “simplify,” “translate,” and “condense” “economic and political relations – the latter are so complex that any action oriented towards them requires ‘discursive simplification’, a selectivity of what is included, hence the constitution of discourses as ‘imaginaries’” (p. 55). In the three policy statements above, rhetoric is used (e.g., a “knowledge based society”) to justify and motivate a shift that would entail making citizenship about being competitive in the global market.

As well, in the three texts referred to above, the “state system is treated as an imagined political entity” that serves to have “a key role in the always tendential constitution and consolidation of the economic, political and other systems, shaping the forms of their institutional separation and subsequent articulation” (Fairclough, 2005, p. 56). In the policy texts, presented previously, the global knowledge based economy is presented as though ‘it’ is leading us into future realities. In regards to European Union policies, Rosamond (2002) states that “imagining” has become “a rhetorical strategy” and “part of a more complex process of constructing a regime of economic governance being constructed” (p. 56). In the three policy scenarios educational matters become part of the regime’s discourse constructions (e.g., genre). Harvey (1996) refers to this as a “dialectics of discourse” (p. 10). Fairclough (2005) explains that “a dialectical relationship” exists between “discourse and non-discursive elements of social life” (p. 57). In other words the two mediate one another – creating and compelling on one hand, while establishing structures of conformity and compliance to the system on the other.

It is important to recognize that language, such as that within citizenship education, doesn't just miraculously happen, but rather it is constructed. Language has power, exerts power and manifests power. According to Cui (2010),

The significance of language in the production, maintenance and change of social relations of power, particularly through the ideological workings of media discourse to construct stereotyped assumptions, manufacture consent, legitimate dominance and naturalize inequality have long been recognized and well theorized (Fairclough, 1989; Ferguson, 1998; Hall, 1997; Henry & Tator, 2002; Van Dijk, 1997). (p. 16)

This statement is significant to my research analysis and how I proceed with it. The following will provide an example of what I am referring to.

Alberta Education (2011) wrote a document entitled *Framework for Student Learning: Competencies for Engaged Thinkers and Ethical Citizens with an Entrepreneurial Spirit* (Alberta Education, 2011, p. 1). Citizenship is directly connected to having an entrepreneurial aspiration and imagination. According to the Alberta Education (2010) document, a stellar youth learner and citizen has “an entrepreneurial spirit,” “creates opportunities and achieves goals through hard work”, “strives for excellence and earns success,” “explores ideas and challenges the status quo,” is “competitive, adaptable and resilient,” and “has the confidence to take risks and make bold decisions in the face of adversity” (p. 6). What happened to democratic goals, the public good and cooperation – the activist state? It was Franklin Roosevelt's administration that “represented a conclusive triumph of the activist state over the philosophy of the limited state... But it is important to see clearly, what were the main components of this new activist state. The policies of the New Deal had three basic elements: economic stabilization, economic planning, and social reform” (Florig, 1992, p. 119), but this narrative changed in the postwar years. The doctrine that the

government should take on only a limited, if now expanded, set of roles rebounded ideologically” (Florig, 1992, p. 119).

Ideologies are often strongly linked to state policy initiatives and educational platforms. Said (1978) notes that a term, such as Orientalism, is not merely a simple identifier, and similarly, Cui (2010) notes, discourse “is not a mere a political matter, or a large and diffuse collection of texts” but rather, “it is a unifying set of values based on the ontological and epistemological distinctions” (p. 20). The term entrepreneur, as noted in Alberta Education’s statement noted above, is not merely a simple identifier in the policy document; it is connected to a unifying set of values and a carefully selected neoliberal genre (e.g., terms such as knowledge-based society, competitiveness, economic performance within educational discourse). Signifying the citizen as an ethical, thinking entrepreneur detracts greatly from constructs that present that citizen as someone collaboratively working with community towards the public good. Referring to youth citizenship education, in the context of the spirit of entrepreneurship, is reticent of limited government discourses during Roosevelt’s presidency, as it is of discourses that perpetuate such ideas through neoliberal policies. It is political and/or corporate propaganda intended to limit government reach and curb social programs.

How do such neoliberal discourses relate to CDA and citizenship education? According to Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak (2011),

CDA is not a discrete academic discipline with a relatively fixed set of research methods. Instead, we might best see CDA as a problem-oriented interdisciplinary research movement, subsuming a variety of approaches, each with different theoretical models, research methods and agenda. What unites them is a shared interest in the semiotic

dimensions of power, injustice, abuse, and political-economic or cultural change in society” (p. 357).

Power, or the lack thereof, as when someone is expected to be a subject as opposed to an agent in any given scenario, plays out in citizenship education discourse. The following example illustrates how power can play out in citizenship education discourse.

According to British Columbia curriculum, Social studies eleven students are expected to “demonstrate skills and attitudes of active citizenship, including ethical behaviour, open-mindedness, respect for diversity, and collaboration” (BCMOE, 2005, p. 31). Some of the attributes listed as identifiers of such skills and attitudes include the following: “ethical behaviour (e.g., honesty, fairness, reliability)”, “open-mindedness”, “respect for diversity”, “questioning and promoting discussion”, “tolerance for ambiguity”, “remaining informed over time”, “advocating responsibly for own and others’ rights”, “ongoing examination and reassessment of own beliefs” and a “willingness to participate” (BCMOE, 2005, p. 31). Such institutional discourse constructions place the student in a passive space and role, thus distinguishing the good citizen as one who is thinking, polite and responsible as opposed to questioning, challenging and assertive.

Constructed narratives, such as “tolerance for ambiguity” (BCMOE, 2005, p. 31), evade criticality and ‘others’ those who challenge such ambiguities. For example, Nielson (2009) states that “immigrants are rarely the audience implied by [an] articles’ framing of emotional and moral tones” about them. Too often immigrants are profiled (e.g., Asian gangs) or they are patronized by “journalistic pleas for hospitality toward them” (e.g., welcoming them to our city) (p. 23). Citizenship education policies that use terms that patronize certain groups in society (e.g., ‘tolerance for diversity’) do not represent the spirit of equality that iconic predecessors fought for.

In my research I used texts from multiple disciplines (e.g., social, political and economic) to enrich my understanding of citizenship education. Chiapello and Fairclough (2002) state that a transdisciplinary “dialogue between two disciplines or frameworks may lead to a development of both through a process of each internally appropriating the logic of the other as a resource for its own development” (p. 185). For example, Prime Minister Tony Blair, (as cited in Faircough, 2005) once stated, “The Government must promote competition, stimulating enterprise, flexibility and innovation by opening markets. But we must also invest in British capabilities when companies alone cannot: in education, in science and in the creation of a culture of enterprise” (p. 62). As much as CDA “can for instance give greater specificity” (Fairclough, 2005, p. 61) it can also bring together various texts to identify how discourses, for example citizenship education discourses, are textured by other disciplines, and influenced by genres (e.g., neoliberal discourses in various fields). As is the case with Blair’s speech above, we can see how “texturing a relation between the ‘global economy’ as fact, and policy prescriptions, between what ‘is’ and what consequently ‘must’ be done” (p. 62) are orchestrated. My citizenship education research is very trans-disciplinary and covers a great deal of important history. It reveals how the discourse has been textured over time by various stakeholders.

In the next three sections of this chapter I will analyze where we have been, where we are, and where we ought to be going. I want to note that much of the discourse found in this section is part of the proverbial dark energy and matter that exists in the non-hegemonic discourse of contemporary citizenship education universe. Many of these discourses have been marginalized, displaced and/or excluded from contemporary citizenship education discourse. As Ball (1993) states, “Power is multiplicitous, overlain, interactive and complex, policy texts enter rather than simply change power relations” (p. 13). In my analysis, I cautiously proceed knowing that the

discourses I am exploring is power-laden, complex and often marginalizes the same citizens it claims to be working for. As Muller (2010) states:

A discourse becomes hegemonic when it achieves to unify the social world around particular fixations of meaning, around the articulation of floating signifiers. Every hegemonic discourse is therefore political in the sense that it admits only one contingent fixation of meaning, excluding other possible meanings. This exclusion is what Laclau and Mouffe call ideology and what presents the critical edge of the politics apparatus in their theory of discourse.

By foregrounding background discourses (e.g., those positioned in the fringe), I juxtaposition the excluded and mainstream dialogues on citizenship education. I will provide an overview of my research analysis at the end of this chapter.

Where Have We Come From?

In this section I refer back to, and analyze, the historical discourse I collected on the citizen, citizenship and citizenship education. As you are aware, my document collection contained discourse from a number of time periods. I will indicate how discourses during these historical time periods, shaped concepts of the citizen, citizenship and active citizenship education and how such discourse served to empower/disempower; enfranchise/disenfranchise; marginalize/include; include/exclude; and/or emancipate/ enslave citizens. I will frequently refer back to quotations I noted in my documentary collection. As I analyze past discourses I need to take into consideration how youth are positioned in these dialogues and/or how youth positioned themselves in the prevailing circumstances. For example, during the American Civil Rights movement disenfranchised African American youth created informal spaces of resistance and participated in

projects of emancipation. Unfortunately, in the case of residential schools, Aboriginal children were removed from their families and became institutional victims of malformed, unethical and harmful citizenship education projects. I will step back into the past and move into the future as I analyze my research findings.

Socrates, Plato and Aristotle

When we look at a significant amount of mainstream citizenship education discourse (e.g., required social studies curriculum) the historical aspects of citizenship are taught exactly as such – in a historical context, as a historical subject and of historical significance. But, is this really the only reason students ought to study someone like Socrates or documents such as the Magna Carta? According to the 2001 NCLB blueprint, “All programs will focus on improving student academic achievement in core academic subjects, ranging from English language arts, mathematics, and science, to history, the arts and financial literacy” (US Department of Education, 2010, pp. 32-33). Why is citizenship placed outside this list of priorities? Where is the learning of Socratic thinking, dialoguing and building a sense of community? The purpose of education has shifted from away from one of questioning, dialogue and community as Socrates encouraged youth to do, to one that is designed to prepare students for “college-and career-ready standards” (United States Department of Education, 2010, p. 3). Citizenship in these new narratives is presented as part of knowledge-based “National Standards for Civics and Government” (Branson, 2002, para. “Formal Instruction”). Citizenship education and/or educational purpose in the contemporary context is nothing more than a means to a predetermined ideological end – the literate citizen, a signifier for work or college readiness.

Socrates encouraged youth to critically analyze how they were governed, unlike NCLB which mandates how principals, teachers and students are to be governed (e.g., administering tests and reporting back required information). Hodge and Kress (1988) state that “An ideological complex exists to sustain relationships of both power and solidarity, and it represents the social order as simultaneously serving the interests of both dominant and subordinate” (p. 3). For example, grade eight students may learn about Ancient Greece, Socrates and citizenship during contemporary times, but they may not learn from the valuable lessons he shared, because in the United States for example, the “politics of education have been nationalized to an unprecedented degree, and local control has all but disappeared as a principle framing education policymaking” (Howe & Meens, 2012, n.p.).

It could be said that the citizen discourse that emerged from Ancient Greece is timeless in nature as much as the discourse presented then, continues to not only circulate in the universe of citizenship discourse today, but it floats through current debates today. Arguments about what the future direction of ACE ought to be, should bring past debates into current deliberations. In the following section I analyze the citizen discourse of Ancient Greece to determine how such discourse marginalized or disenfranchised certain members, shaped the society, and most importantly how it continues to influence our ideas about ACE. It is important that my CDA analysis embraces the histories, complexities, and tensions that encompass the field of citizenship education and that I regularly refer back to the discourse I located to facilitate my discussion.

Concepts of the citizen, citizenship and active citizenship education existed in ancient times as is evident in the discourse contained within texts from Ancient Greece. As like most citizenship even today, citizenship eligibility was based upon a number of determining factors; some of these determinants marginalized, disenfranchised or excluded certain groups, which were in the geo-

political terrain. In Ancient Greece the “polis” consisted of the capital city, towns and a specified territorial space (Pomeroy et al., 1999, p. 84). As noted in the research documents, foreign residents, who were referred to as “Metics”, and slaves who were referred to as “doubloi”, did not qualify for citizenship status and/or membership (Kreis, 2009b) within the polis. Their children assumed an identical “non-citizen” status, thus perpetuating their parents’ secondary-rate status, lack of socio-political status rights and access to institutional help and/or programs (e.g., justice, education and forums) (Palaiologou, 2011). The discourse terms (e.g., Metic and doubloi) not only affected citizenship identity, but also affected structural aspects of governance (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2011).

Although the Metic and dubloi received some degree of acceptance, the discourse of exclusion established the structure and the structure reinforced the discourse. Unfortunately, we see remnants of these forms of exclusion today, but it is even worse. “First Nations schools receive “\$2000 to \$3000 less per student, per year for elementary and secondary education” in Canada (The Office of the Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth, 2011, p. 74), yet we continue to see curriculum that has students “evaluate the impact of interactions between Aboriginal peoples and European explorers and settlers in Canada from 1815 to 1914 [Social Studies 10]” (BCMOE, 2006, p. 16), but not explore contemporary challenges that reveal perpetuated systemic oppressions. The presupposition presented in such curriculum discourse is that aboriginal issues, of merit to explore, happened in the past. As Sheenhan (2012) states, “The primary learning goal of Socratic Method is to explore the contours of often difficult issues and to learn critical thinking skills” (n.p.). Socrates wanted citizens to seek answers not find the right answer, to bring all into the discussion not make some the subject of discussion, and to know one another not know about the ‘Other’.

A sense of belonging and the creation of an extended and/or imagined sense of belonging were significant to the Ancient Greeks (i.e., citizens in adjacent territories were given the impression they belonged) (Kreis, 2009b). As indicated by Aristotle in his book *Politics III*, it was considered “necessary for the citizens to be of such a number that they knew each other’s personal qualities and thus can elect their officials and judge their fellows in a court of law sensibly” (Miller, 2012, n.p.). A sense of belonging, community, and public discourse were considered to be integral to the structuring of direct democracy and citizenship, in the early phases of ancient Greek governance. The system of governance intended to include rural participation in the larger state system’s governance, thus for example, Plato fixed the number of citizens in “an ideal state at 5040 adult males” (Kreis, 2009a, n.p.). The ancient Greeks tried not to differentiate public and private life (Kreis, 2009a), thus hoping to maintain open identification of its citizen members; transparency of their home and political life; and open accountability in regards to all aspects of their social and political life. This is not stating that this was necessarily accomplished, but that it was an aspiration and/or quazi-observation of philosophers such as Aristotle.

Citizens of the polis were defined as much by their membership as they were by their exclusions. In his book *Politics III*, Aristotle wrote about his “political theory of constitutions”, whereby the city state is by nature a collective entity composed of a multitude of citizens and which is defined as much by the resident alien slaves it excludes as it is by the citizens who have “the right (exousia) to participate in the deliberative and judicial office” (Miller, 2012, n.p.). Enrolment was a strong part of early Greek citizenship and a requirement. The Greek citizenship enrolment structure was established for adult males, but wives and children of those enrolled enjoyed a second-stage level of citizenship, thus making citizenship itself hierarchical in nature. As Palaiologou (2011) states in his/her document, “While female citizens had important roles in the religious worship of

the community, they were completely barred from participation in political, judicial and military affairs” (p. 269). According to Streeter (1998), “paradigmatic relations” exist where “signs get meaning from their association with other signs” (n.p.). In BC’s Social Studies 8 students are to “focus on the relationship between the individual and the power structure in the different societies [ancient societies]” (BCMOE, 2007, p.16). Thus, if students learn that women were barred from government positions in some ancient societies and not that there are still countries today where this occurs, then they associate such an atrocity with the ancient past not with contemporary times. The same would hold true for the practice of stoning. Citizenship education needs to use more than a historical framework and paradigm to facilitate a better understanding of the current world they are to make decisions in.

Female citizens (not slaves, foreign residents, or those with other bloodlines) were distinguished as *politai*. They had legal protection (e.g., from slavery) and the right to recourse in the court, but they “could not represent themselves and had to have men speak for their interests” (Martin, 2000, p. 61). “Women became citizens of the city-states in the crucial sense that they had an identity, status”, protection, and legal representation (Martin, 2000, p. 61). Such a statement is patriarchal, patronizing and paltry as women ultimately had only the title of citizen, but not its rights (e.g., membership into councils, right to defend herself in the court as a victim, and first-hand access to services as in the case of a legal case). In fact, as found in my documentary research, female citizens were required to have “an official male guardian (*kyrios*) to protect them physically and legally” (Palaiologou, 2011, p. 269). Women did not have the right to participate in crucial “deliberative or judicial office (Miller, 2012, n.p.). When considering where we ought to go with ACE, it is important that we identify those groups that are marginalized by citizenship structures, and to work towards making policy changes that will address such inequities and discrimination.

According to research documents by Palaiologou (2011) there were three groups of inhabitants in the polis: 1) the highest in the social hierarchy who were citizens with political rights, 2) citizens without political rights which seems an oxymoron, and 3) non- citizens. So, in fact, even among male citizens, citizenship rights were unequal and/or inequitable (Palaiologou, 2011). In the time of Plato, the number of citizens was fixed at “5040 adult males” but the criteria for citizenship was that all men knew each other (Kreiss, 2009a) which was unrealistic in concrete terms given the size of the Greek polis (e.g., a sense of knowing one another or belonging was enough). According to Palaiologou (2011), only rich males and their adult male descendants were granted the right “to vote and speak in the assembly, hold office, serve as judges [and] fight in the army” (p. 269). Such sexist and classist distinctions were not uncommon in early Greece. Even in early Greece, citizenship requirements were under constant scrutiny and being questioned, thus as we look at citizenship education and where we ought to go, we need to ensure that students explore whether contemporary citizenship criteria may be unjustly disenfranchising certain groups.

The philosopher, Socrates, introduced a form of critical dialectical thinking to his students and people on the street (Kries, 2009a). A Socratic dialogue takes the form of question-answer, question-answer, question-answer (Gundara, 2011). Socrates would argue both sides of an argument to arrive at a conclusion. Then that conclusion was argued against another assumption and so-on and so-on (Kries, 2009a). As an educator, Socrates encouraged his male students to always-question-everything-about-their state, those in power and oppositional political forces (Kries, 2009a). He was a strong advocate of public conversations and he was “committed to the rigorous examination of the faith and morals of the time, giving pride of place to those convictions which are widely shared and rarely questioned” (Elins, 2008, n.p.). As Kaufman (1995) stated in *The Future of the Humanities*, Socrates expected individuals to explore “compelling alternatives to

current fashions” (p. 29), “swim against the stream” and evaluate any assumptions that may reside outside typically mainstream streams of thought. Paul (1993) states:

Generally, to develop intellectual virtues, we must create a collection of analyzed experiences that represent to us intuitive models, not only of the pitfalls of our own previous thinking and experiencing but also processes for reasoning our way out of or around them. These model experiences must be charged with meaning for us ... What does this imply for teaching? It implies a somewhat different content or material focus. Our own minds and experiences must become the subject of our study and learning. Indeed, only to the extent that the content of our own experiences becomes an essential part of study will the usual subject matter truly be learned. By the same token, the experiences of others must become part of what we study. But experiences of any kind should always be critically analyzed. (n.p.)

How we teach citizenship and/or social studies and the elements of moral, ethical and critical thinking may need to be contextualized quite differently. Instead of students thinking of the topics they have to learn about, perhaps they should think along the lines of what do I need to learn about myself as I encounter new information, experience others ways of thinking and explore other worlds of knowing, thinking and being. Perhaps, we are underestimating youth’s capacity to address the complexities of critical citizenship. Socrates didn’t.

Socratic teachings encourage citizens to confront and re-vision everyday life and the discourse that supports it. This is extremely important to note as it indicates that early citizenship education as conducted by Socrates, required critical critique, self evaluation of one’s own assumptions, re-visioning the philosophy we enact in the discourse of everyday life, taking action

on an issue, providing alternative solutions to issues and challenging orthodoxies that may even have been established via consensus (Elkins, 2008). Socrates lived in the context of an oral culture and strongly promoted conversation among divergent bodies. Socrates, as a street-side educator and philosopher, challenged the notions of democracy, freedom, and citizenship, and encouraged his students to do the same (Linder, 2002). Socratic teachings, methodologies and critique are not obvious in active citizenship education policy, curriculum and teacher training. Political literacy and critical thinking emerge in modern ACE discourse, but the history, philosophies and methods of Socratic questioning have been lost and/or left out in the mainstream policy, curriculum and pedagogy that I have encountered (e.g., as per curriculum document elements provided)

Socrates was given the choice between “exile and death and he chose death” (Gundara, 2011, p. 232) when accused of committing a political crime, corrupting youth and/or committing impiety. One can draw an inference that the active citizenship and active citizenship education he engaged in, met with great resistance, and possibly his own death. Socrates stood up for what he believed in: critical self reflection, critical inquiry of everyday life; identifying unjust institutional practices; visioning alternatives to existing socio-political structures and challenging flawed notions of freedom, democracy and citizenship. According to Gundara (2011) the trial of Socrates (399 B.C.) was an “indication of the fallibility of democracy, which is not equal to the task of achieving legal justice or legal correctness” (p. 232). Linder (2002) asks, “Why, in a society enjoying more freedom and democracy than any the world had seen, would a seventy-year-old philosopher be put to death for what he was teaching?” (n.p). Perhaps, it wasn’t what he was teaching, but the questions he was evoking, that led to his demise. Such questions, raised questions not only about the authority of prevailing rulers and government structures, but also the discourses that perpetuated the inequities, injustices, and institutionalized power that facilitated them to continue.

In his writing of *The Republic*, Plato, a student of Socrates, offered a “blueprint for a future society of perfection” (Kreis, 2009b, n.p.). Plato posits a number of significant philosophical questions about self, reality and knowledge to guide his thinking on the topic. “Plato asks what is knowledge? what is illusion? what is reality? how do we know? what makes a thing, a thing? These are epistemological questions – that is, they are questions about knowledge itself” (Linder, 2002, n.p.). They are also questions about the use of discourse and its significance. Much ACE does little to examine the nature of discourse. Social studies courses present information on how to identify bias, propaganda and/or inaccuracy, but do secondary citizenship students examine deeper philosophical questions that are perhaps far too often left to graduate school students. Secondary students ought to learn how to ask basic epistemological questions.

The Athenian philosophers encouraged students to explore government processes rather than blindly fit in. Clark and Case (1999) claim that currently there is a schism that divides people’s views on the purpose of citizenship education:

The purposes of citizenship education are debatable. Should it enable students to fit into society or prepare them to change it? ... Approaches to citizenship education that adopt social *initiation* as their purpose believe citizenship education should pass on ‘the understandings, abilities, and values that students require if they are to fit into and be productive members of society’. These approaches imply that society is functioning well and is worthy of reproduction. Citizenship for social reformation, on the other hand, assumes that society is in need of improvement and aims to empower students’ with the understandings, abilities, and values necessary to critique and ultimately improve their society’ (p. 18)

Researchers believe such two opposing notions of the purpose of citizenship education give rise to dualist models of citizenship (Winston, 2007). Smith (2003) indicates (e.g., interview transcript) that Socrates first and foremost seeks a self-reflective internal change based on rational, philosophical and a questioning citizen:

That is to say that Socrates proposes, right, a new conception of what it is to be a citizen, he opposes, we have seen, the traditional, you might say Homeric conception, of the citizen, certain notions of citizen loyalty and patriotism, created, shaped by the poetic tradition going back to Homer. He wants to replace that with a new kind of, I want to call it rational citizenship, philosophical citizenship... Socrates says, in an interesting passage, that he has spent his entire life pursuing private matters rather than public ones and has deliberately avoided public issues, issues of politics and that raises a question. How can a citizen, how can this new kind of citizenship that he is proposing, how can any kind of citizenship be devoted just to private matters and not public? ...[H]e means simply that by pursuing a private life that again he's going to rely almost exclusively on his own individual powers of reason and judgment, not to defer or rely on such public goods as custom, as authority, as tradition, things of this sort. But I think Socrates means more than that, more than simply he wishes to rely on the powers of private individual judgment.

(n.p.)

Socrates not only seeks civic enlightenment by way of reason and logic, but as Plato indicates in *The Apology*, Socrates believed that “the unexamined life is not worth living for a human being” (Nails, 2010, n.p).

Socrates wanted citizens to examine their socio-political selves, rather than merely accept them, thus lending to an active citizenship education whose purpose is to contribute to critical,

reasoned-based change. Are nation-states, supra-states and sub-states confident enough to comfortably embrace challenging active citizenship education students, who may through peaceful protest, dialogue and/or petition seek more reform than approval? What space do governments and Ministries of Education provide in their ACE programs for learning about counter arguments, movements and skills (e.g., petitions, campaigns and demonstrations)? If we look at Manitoba's History 11 course the five themes are the following: "First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Peoples," "French-English Duality," "Identity, Diversity, and Citizenship," "Governance and Economics," and "Canada and the World" (Manitoba Education, 2012e, n.p.). Critical thinking, self-awareness and moral/ethical reasoning are not themes – Socratic thinking, meta-cognition and relevancy to everyday life are absent from the list. Students are expected to "establish historical significance," "use primary source evidence", "identify continuity and change," "analyze cause and consequence," "take historical perspectives," and "understand the ethical dimensions of historical interpretations" (Centre for Historical Consciousness, 2011, n.p.). Socrates wanted his students to understand more than history (e.g., which is important). He wanted them to examine and challenge the life they were living, the lives society had come to accept and to imagine other manifestations of these things and of being a citizen – perhaps we ought to consider doing the same in social studies, history and citizenship classes. As Socrates stated, "Wonder is the beginning of thinking" (Goodreads, n.d., n.p.).

Rousseau, Locke and the Magna Carta

Rousseau noted the intersections between education and politics but he probably never expected it to go so far as to be bigger than the spice trade. According to the Advisory Panel on Canada's International Education Strategy, 2012, "The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) estimates that the global demand for international higher education is set

to grow from nearly 3.7 million students (in 2009) to 6.4 million in 2025. On top of this is a huge market potential in high school students” (p.ii). International education has taken on a hegemonic economic narrative. Rousseau (1911), in *Emile* wrote, “There is no subjection so perfect as that which keeps the appearance of freedom” (n.p.) and in *The Social Contract* s/he warns us of those who may be thinking, “I make with you a convention wholly at your expense and wholly to my advantage; I shall keep it as long as I like, and you will keep it as long as I like” (Rousseau, 1882, “Book One: Section 6”).

Liberal economics strongly influence political, economic and educational spheres, as can be seen above with international education. It is difficult to believe that the terms ‘huge market potential’ and ‘high school students’ (e.g., as quoted in the above paragraph” would be spun together by a panel representing international education for Canada. What is in the best interest of the foreign student, for example, is sent to the discourse background. According to Chun (2009),

Neoliberalism envisions the world as a “vast supermarket” in which “the ideal citizen is the purchaser” (Apple, p. 204). Underlying this vision is an ideology that is presented as “a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedom and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade.

(p.111)

If nations seek to improve to improve citizenship education and the participation of their youth in civic affairs, they may want to reconsider how they position their youth in a free market, free trade and entrepreneurial world. When Rousseau (1882) stated, “Men are born free and everywhere are in chains” (“Book One: Section One”), he was not only referring to “the legal chains of tyrannical

government but a wide variety of social chains all caused by a wide variety of inequalities” (Moody, 2010., para. 11).

When exploring citizenship-related matters from the time period ranging from the development of the Magna Carta to some of the great Enlightenment thinkers (e.g., 1215 to 1700s) I discovered how a collective group of oppressed barons sought justice by crafting, through discourse, a document that would legitimize their rights to lawful justice and institutionalized civil liberties. In the discourse universe of citizenship, the Magna Carta became a guardian star for travellers in the galaxy. Philosophers like Rousseau, urged citizenship education and noted the inevitable intersections between education, politics and the arts, and the infinite opportunities these intersections provided for scripting new possibilities (Channick, 2009). Locke proclaimed the right of all, to collectively seek the institutionalization of their rights (Neuhouser, 2008). Like a convoy of confederate star-troopers, individuals of this time period, proclaimed the right to have a say in how the galaxy would be governed.

According to the Magna Carta (1215), “No freeman shall be taken, imprisoned, disseised, outlawed, banished, or in any way destroyed, nor will We proceed against or prosecute him, except by lawful judgement of his peers and the law of the land ... To no one will We sell, to no one will We deny or delay, right or justice” (n.p.). The Great Charter is “widely viewed as one of the most important legal documents in the history of democracy” (U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, n.d., n.p.). The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution (e.g., as ratified December 15, 1791) states that, “no person shall ... be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law” (Fifth Amendment of the US Constitution, as cited by Legal Information Institute, n.d., n.p.) derives from the Magna Carta (Wilkes, 2006). The institutionalization of civil liberties benefitted citizens and contributed substantially to a paradigm shift in the discourse of

citizenship – civil rights were now embedded into textual discourse and such discourse became law, had power and was circulated widely. The citizen, thus also gained power, as they now had a document that clearly articulated their rights and the nature of the relationship, they had a right to have with their government. In terms of citizenship education, the power of discourse, the discourse of power, and the institutionalization of discourse and power, emerge inferentially as three important aspects of active citizenship development (e.g., educational policy) and structures (e.g., curriculum).

A number of influential speakers advocated for active citizenship education during this time period. In his book *Emile*, or also called the *Treatise on Education*, Rousseau advocates for an education which “provides a self-conscious meeting ground for the educational, the political and the artistic. The interplay of formal conventions reconciles the goal of critiquing society while simultaneously presenting how society ought to be” (Channick, 2009, p. 399). According to Colbern (2010), philosopher John Locke advocated for a liberal citizenship whereby citizens have the right to engage in political life and to have those rights institutionalized. In the liberal tradition citizens have the right to engage in parliamentary affairs, and as education is an institution, alongside governance, it too should provide space to explore the intricacies of active citizenship learning as per the liberal tradition. Rousseau’s desired end result for young Emile is not that of being a man instead of a citizen “but a man-citizen whose education has proceeded in two stages: the first is governed exclusively by the “manly” ideal of self-sufficiency, while the second provides the product of the first stage with what he needs in order also to be a citizen (and husband)”, thereby unifying the two educations [man and citizen] and ... ‘removing the contradictions’ between them” (Neuhouser, 2008, p. 14.).

The barons that composed the Magna Carta aimed to have their rights and freedoms institutionalized. Rousseau thought that the citizen ought to be a contributing member of society and an independent thinker and Locke believed education ought to play a strong role in ensuring the citizen was informed and competent to exercise such rights. Contemporary rhetoric on targeting youth to make immense profits by selling international education (e.g., as quoted above) flips the original concept and intentions of institutional freedoms upside down. The institution claims the freedom to capitalize on the subject – target youth. In “the same ‘critical spirit’ that is held in common among the divergent perspectives of Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, and Foucault,” I have sought to “serve a demystifying function . . . by demonstrating the silent and often non-deliberate ways in which rhetoric conceals as much as it reveals through its relationship with power/knowledge” (Huckin, 2002, p. 2).

The French, Haitian and American Revolutions

Contemporary citizenship education discourse, as evident in much of the contemporary text I located, can present itself as a lexicon of liberation (social, cultural and economic freedom), but this narrative contrasts greatly from earlier discourses of emancipation (e.g., French and Haitian Revolutions, American civil war, suffragette movement). Citizenship education discourse often draws from the lexicology of social, economic and political initiative. For example, early citizenship and citizenship education spoke of free persons not free markets, of cooperation not competition, and of public not private enterprises. In my analysis it was important for me to look back into the rear-view mirror of my metaphorical space ship to explore citizenship related discourse from the past and to look outside my side windows to explore the citizen discourse as it appears in different galaxies (e.g., disciplines) today. I identified some sharp contrasts in how

concepts such as freedom, liberty and rights were presented during revolutionary times and how they have been construed in citizenship education discourse today.

In the universe of citizenship-related discourse the French, Haitian and American Revolutions revealed how far collective societies are willing to go to define their identities and assert their liberties. An exploration of what active citizenship education ought to be, would be remiss, if it didn't include aspects of citizenship development that emerged during the American, Haitian and American Revolutions. It is one thing to ensure that curriculum include these historical moments in their curriculum, but it is another thing, to ensure that the discourse of these movements be used to shape active citizenship education policy, curriculum and pedagogy. In the universe of citizenship discourse certain discourse is timeless – it is set in the past, influences the present, and can help shape how to proceed in the future. Revolutionaries put it upon themselves to shape history: to ensure they would not be treated as second-class colonial citizens, slaves and/or subjects (e.g., as opposed to citizens); and to define the nature of their national identity.

For many colonists, the American Revolution was about freeing them self from a life of oppressive subjugation and establishing a new sense of belonging, identity and status. They imagined a new citizenship for themselves that was separate from British rule. Countryman (2003) states that,

From the Treaty of Paris of 1763 until the Treaty of Paris 1783, Britain maintained that everybody in eastern North America “belonged” to it. *Belonging* can imply membership, participation among fellows for the sake of a common goal; the idea of citizenship expresses that sense perfectly. But *belonging* also can mean being possessed, in the way that an object belongs to its owner. For a human being, belonging in this way implies some

combination of accepting one's subordination while also claiming the protection of somebody more powerful in a dangerous world. Theoretically, that is the sense in which subjects belonged to a king, wives and children belonged to husbands and fathers, and slaves belonged to masters. For adult white males who chose the American side, the [American] Revolution brought a shift from subjection to citizenship. (p. xviii)

Even though citizenship assumes geographical borders and is grounded in legal status, it is also a project that draws upon creating and/or reinforcing a sense of belonging. Citizen members can opt to embrace, reject or transform the sense of identity and belonging that the state seeks to promote. American colonists rejected the chattel-like-ownership that Britain claimed of its settlers overseas. The forefathers of the American Declaration of Independence carved a sense of identity and belonging, they not necessarily had, but aspired for.

I want to return to the concept of the 'citizen' as one who has been 'freed' from being a subject or one who is 'no longer subjected to' oppression and/or an oppressor. As was noted, prior to the American Revolution, British colonists felt they were subjects of the motherland but not entitled to the rights of homeland citizens. The term 'subject' ascribed a meaning and circumstances the colonialists were unwilling to accept in their present or future circumstances. The colonists became aware of a discourse that disadvantaged them and subjugated them. If they accepted these conditions, their future would be subject to the state's future plans for them. They rejected this plan. I suggest that even in today's world, that a lot of mainstream contemporary citizenship education policy and curriculum, is subjecting students to an imagined in-the-making role (e.g., subjects of a neoliberal ideal), which students are disastified with, skeptical of and distrusting of (Dalton, 2008; Henn & Foard, 2011; Tonge & Mycock, 2009). This will take a bit of

in-depth discussion, to explain, but I will do so without too much disruption from the flow in this section.

What plans do states have for their students who are, let's say, 'becoming' citizens? Let's take a look at British Columbia's plan for 21st century education. According to a report by the Premier's Technology Council (PTC) (2010):

The PTC believes that a vision for an education system that prepares students to function in a knowledge-based society must first identify what a student needs to learn in order to function in such a society. There are skills and attributes that were important in the past that remain important today. These include literacy, numeracy, and critical thinking. However, the combination of technology and access to information that underpins a knowledge-based society means that these skills need to be applied in different ways and supplemented with new skills in order for students to become full participants in a knowledge-based society. (p. 9)

The construction of this youth citizen is quite different from that of Noah Webster, who lived from 1758-1853, and sought, through education, to promote the "ideals of democracy" (Gelrich, 1999, n.p.). Graham (2005) states:

Once constituted as an object of a particular sort, individuals can be dispersed into disciplinary spaces within that "grid of social regularity" (Scheurich, 1997: 98) and from there, can become subject to particular discourses and practices that result in what Butler (1997b: 358-359) describes as, "the 'on-going' subjugation that is the very operation of interpellation, that (continually repeated) action of discourse by which subjects are formed

in subjugation.” In other words through the process of objectification, individuals not only come to occupy *spaces* in the social hierarchy but, through their continual subjugation, come to know and accept their *place*. (p. 10)

Part of critical discourse analysis is to identify how subjects (e.g., students) become subjectified through a process of subjectification. As Chouliaraki (2009) states, “discourse analysis describes in detail the operations of mediated meanings...so as to show how these meanings engage human beings with specific technologies of rule and place them in concrete relationships of power to one another” (p. 23). According to the BCMOE [Premier’s Technology Council] (2010) students need to “function” as “full participants in a knowledge-based society,” and, as a rule of thumb, become subjects of this carefully constructed 21st century agenda. This sounds familiar to what the British colonists, living in present day United States, were expected to do in the 17th century, which takes us back to learn more from that time period.

The American Revolution demonstrated that citizenship is not only an abstract concept or ideal but also an attainable construct. If citizenship education is taught as only a concrete structure that on occasion is altered, then much is lost, as the discourse of citizenship can create: chains or liberty; fences or emancipation; and ceilings or opportunities. According to Gelrich (1999), Noah Webster, who lived from 1758-1853, developed student textbooks that were “promoting a curriculum that advocated the ideals of democracy” (n.p.). At this time it is ethically important for me to mention that Webster also advocated “independence from England” (Gelrich, 1999, n.p.) in his textbooks (e.g., some propaganda was included). It is important that citizenship education also be ethical, in that when it presents controversial issues, it has an obligation to provide materials for students to explore the complexities of the issue. Meanwhile, I rhetorically ask: What are schools

doing today to promote the ideals of democracy, which includes not only established indicators, but also newly aspired ideals as well?

Educating students and the common public about democratic ideals became very significant to the American colonists. Thomas Jefferson (1820), one of the signatories to the American Declaration of Independence, once stated, “I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education” (as cited in Cornwell, 2012, n.p.). Jefferson could not have made a much more profound declaration for active citizenship education than this. Thomas Jefferson, (as cited in Cornwell, 2012) stated in 1787 that “education of the common people” (n.p.) was the most effective means of preserving the democratic ideal. Jefferson consistently advocated for free public schools because he believed that educational institutions should be bastions for democratic imperatives, ideals and idealism. This is in contrast to some postmodern philosophies that prioritize economic imperatives, individualism and competition.

A rights-based public narrative and education emerged during the French Revolution and as a result of the struggles that the nation’s citizens endured. According to Wallerstein (2002), the French Revolution left a “legacy to the whole world-system: Sovereignty now belonged to the people, the nation; and political debate and political change were their normal consequence” (n.p.). Initially inequalities were most obvious between noble and commoner, but as “more equality was proclaimed as a moral principle, the more obstacles –juridical, political, economic and cultural – were instituted to prevent its realization” (Wallerstein, 2002, n.p.). As a result of the French Revolution citizenship education in France was designed to liberate, emancipate and equalize the lives of citizens, but this didn’t necessarily happen automatically. For example, Napoleon

institutionalized new lycees (e.g., schools) aimed at advantaging children of the bourgeoisie. Citizenship education in France varied. Programs were intended to advantage some groups while disadvantaging others (e.g., the lycees); suppress the use of multiple dialects in order to make French the national language of its citizens; and to promote the principles of liberty, freedom and equality that were engrained in their Constitution. Brubaker (1992) asserts that the French Revolution contributed to “the institutionalization of political rights” and created the “link between citizenship and nationhood” (p. 35). Ultimately, the concept of emancipation - “the idea that the rights of citizens were applicable to all people within a nation” (Dubois, 2000, p. 22), spread not only through France but also to Europe and the Americas. The concept also entered citizenship education discourse, but the idea of emancipation for all had not been fully realized or understood (e.g., slavery was still practiced and the bourgeoisie were still disenfranchised in many ways).

The concept of emancipation spread to the French colonies in Haiti where slavery was widely spread. As stated by Dubois (2000):

Between 1789 and 1794, the social order of the most prosperous colonial possessions of the Americas was completely reversed...Even those who advocated slave emancipation were unprepared for the radical implications of the slave revolt of 1791, and tended to argue that political rights could only be granted to ex-slaves...Ultimately, emancipation was decreed locally in St Domingue [Haiti], and this decision was ratified by the National Convention in Paris in 1794, so that slavery was abolished through the French empire in the first national experiment in slave emancipation. (pp. 21-22)

But this was only after great struggle. When Napoleon took power he aimed to restore slavery on the French colonial islands and “appointed his brother-in-law General Leclerc, a vile racist in his own right, to command sixty-seven ships transporting 20,000 troops – the largest marine force in

French history” (Smith, 2009, n.p.), to overthrow the Blacks. The Haitian revolution forced the French to extend the freedom and equality, they proclaimed for their mainland citizens, to the colonies. Slavery, as a narrative and practice, was deconstructed, reconstructed and then deconstructed to prohibit the practice. The study of subjecthood as in Margaret Thatcher’s construction of the hegemonic “concerned patriot’, ‘responsible home-owner’ and ‘self-reliant citizen,’” “offers a way of understanding how subjectivities can be made and remade; in short, it has space to theorize change” (p. 439). As with the abolishment of slavery, and the need to overcome an oppressive Thatcherism, citizens need space to theorize change, deliberate current social conditions, and pursue various forms of emancipation.

Calls for equality, freedom and liberty permeated France and its colonies, leading to an emancipated notion of the citizen and a rights-based citizenship discourse, which also permeated government and educational institutions and spread to Western nations on either side of the Atlantic. The United States would later face a civil war which would emancipate slaves there as well. Jefferson once stated, as cited by Cornwell, 2012,

History by apprising them of the past will enable them to judge of the future; it will avail them of the experience of other times and other nations; it will qualify them as judges of the actions and designs of men; it will enable them to know ambition under every disguise it may assume; and knowing it, to defeat its views. (n.p.)

The teaching of history is one design to impart citizenship knowledge, skills and attitudes, but what other designs are being used in contemporary times to teach active citizenship? Are history and the exploration of governmental structures, the only two pedagogical vehicles available to advance active citizenship education? Is this really enough? Citizenship education programs ought to make students aware of contemporary struggles and assist them to explore ways to confront them.

According to the “ethics, civil responsibility, cross cultural awareness” section of BC’s 21st century education plan, “to have expert knowledge workers, every country needs an education system that produces them; therefore, education becomes the key to economic survival in the 21st century” (BCMOE, 2010, p. 12). This statement veers away from the citizenship ideals that emerged during the three revolutions – there is not a slight gap between them, but rather there is a discourse chasm and ideological chasm. Economic survival is portrayed as a driver in BC’s new plan – such a priority was not part of active citizenship planning in earlier discourses, nor ought it be (BCMOE 2010, 2013)..

Suffragettes, Decolonization and the Civil Rights Movement

These chapters (e.g., as per the above subheading) of history, reveal to the galaxy-cruisers of citizenship discourse, the pitfalls of marginalization, disenfranchisement and segregation and how the human spirit, as in the French, American and Haitian Revolutions, will long for, struggle for, intellectually articulate and physically embody, a seemingly innate need to gain dignity, freedom and liberty. As well, those who led such battles also sought to educate their youth, about the rights they fought for and how to ensure their longevity (e.g., Jefferson, Locke, and Martin Luther King Jr.). Citizenship education ought to emphasize that active citizenship is an ongoing struggle.

As we look back on the citizen, citizenship and citizenship education there are lessons that can be learned about what shouldn’t have happened in the teaching of so-called citizenship. In 1938, James wrote the book *The Black Jacobins* and spoke of the European conquest of the New World and the occupation of the island that is today referred to as Haiti. James (1938), as cited by Smith (2009) states:

The Spaniards, the most advanced Europeans of their day, annexed the island [Haiti], called it Hispaniola, and took the backward natives under their protection. They introduced forced labor in mines, murder, rape, bloodhounds, strange diseases, and artificial famine (by the destruction of cultivation to starve the rebellious). These and other requirements of the higher civilization reduced the native population from an estimated half-a-million, perhaps a million, to 60,000 in 15 years. (pp. 3-4)

Whether it was the Indigenous populations and/or native inhabitants of Haiti, Australia, Canada, the United States or New Zealand, assimilative policies denigrated, demoralized and debilitated Indigenous populations. In some countries, children were removed from their homes and forced to ‘become’ ‘suitable citizens’, as was the case in racist Canadian policy.

The residential schools of Canada were started in the 1840s and funded by the federal government. The intent of these schools, as indicated in policy, was to assimilate the Indigenous Peoples of Canada (Partridge, 2010). Children were removed from their families and not allowed to speak in their mother tongues and told their languages were primitive; many children never learned their parents’ language. “With the loss of language [sic] came the loss of the ability to communicate with their parents, extended family and Elders back home” (Partridge, 2010, p. 50). Students were taught that their parents were pagans, their storyteller’s teachings were false and that they would be taught Christian beliefs so they may rid themselves of the false and/or satanic spiritual beliefs their communities may have led them to believe (Partridge, 2012). Such teachings were very detrimental to the well-being of many students. As McKenzie and Morrisette (2003) state: “[T]he results for many, have included a lifestyle of uncertain identity and the adoption of self-abusive behaviors, often associated with alcohol and violence, reflect a pattern of coping sometimes referred to in First Nations as, ‘The Residential School Syndrome’ (p. 254). Students

were expected to succumb to a bastardized form of citizenship education which should never have happened. It is crucial that citizenship is monitored to ensure that it represents the ideals that have led to its design in the first place such as: democracy, emancipation and liberty.

In 1909, the general medical superintendent for the Department of Indian Affairs), Dr. Peter Bryce, reported to the Department of Indian Affairs that between 1894 and 1908, that the mortality rates of children at residential schools in Western Canada ranged from 30% to 60% and those deaths occurred within the first five years of their attendance at the schools (Bryce, 1922). These statistics were not revealed to the public until 1922, when Bryce, personally published *The Story of a National Crime: Being a Record of the Health Conditions of the Indians of Canada from 1904 to 1921*. The high mortality rates were attributed to unsafe exposure to those with tuberculosis (Bryce, 1922). In terms of a CDA of residential school policy, “aggressive assimilation” (CBC, 2008, n.p.), sums up the ideological plan to destroy the Aboriginal way of life and diabolical, detestable, and disgraceful only begins to describe what came to be – a devastating, deadly debacle.

The residential school disaster raises serious questions about the underpinning motives of citizenship education programs and serious concerns regarding the intent of such programs, especially in respect to excluded and/or marginalized populations. It also raises questions about how history is represented in school curriculum and whose narrative takes prominence. In some provinces such as British Columbia, textbooks are used only to support curriculum; teachers often depend on many other resources for their teaching. Thus, I never focused on textbook representations of Aboriginal materials but rather upon the social context of Aboriginal matters (e.g., assimilation as a citizenship strategy). Citizenship education ought to include historical, contemporary and future depictions of Aboriginal matters, and such representations ought to be constructed in collaboration with Aboriginal populations. University programs ought to ensure that

education students are taught the skills to collect relevant resources to enhance their teaching (e.g., contemporary and emerging issues related to Indigenous peoples and provide guidelines for such selections). I will now move on to another historic issue pertinent to citizenship education.

Women's suffragette movements took place in a number of countries and most notably took place in Britain, the United States and Canada where women won the right to vote. Suffragists (e.g., both male and female) used moderate and/or radical means to advance their cause. It was the island of New Zealand that in 1893, first granted women over the age of twenty one, the right to vote (Harper, 1922, p. 752). Several American suffragettes were put in jail, and like their British counterparts some engaged in hunger strikes while there. As incarcerated militants, the women were expected to adjust to deplorable living conditions and work while in the jail to support the war effort (Graham, 1984). One American suffragette, Alice Paul, declared that she would engage in a to-death hunger strike and shortly after was transferred to a psychiatric wing where she was held down for forcible feeding (Paul, 1909).

Sympathy for the imprisoned women grew over time and even the treasurer of the Woodrow Wilson Independent League protested, "It is absolutely essential that the American people be united at this time. But unity is not to be obtained by dragging women to filthy jails for the crime of bearing banners upon which are inscribed the words from the President's lips" (e.g., referring to Paul's banner for example) (Graham, 1984, p. 676). Alice Paul was released from jail in November, 1918. A Joint Resolution of the Sixty-sixth Congress of the United States of America that is referred to as the 19th Amendment was declared. It states, "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex" (Congress of the United States, 1919, n.p.). The American suffragette movement iconically colour branded their movement. They "used white, gold and purple for buttons, pins, sashes, flags,

clothing, horses — you name it. White symbolized purity; gold, hope; and purple, dignity” (Bloch, 2013, n.p.). The struggles of the suffragettes to achieve equality, emancipation and representation should not be taught just as a matter of historical fact, but as means to teach how citizenship is entrenched in power-laden discourse, values, and iconic messaging. How many citizenship education policies are coded with the values of earlier times: emancipation, equality, representation, hope and dignity?

As I explore active citizenship I ponder whether active citizenship education adequately explores the intimate nature of civil rights – that it isn’t just about marginalized and oppressed ‘others,’ but also about innate needs (e.g., burning fire for equality), reflective action (e.g., moving beyond indifference) and the rights of youth to claim their future, not to just fit into it (e.g., Martin Luther King’s speeches). I also wonder if the role that youth have played in the civil rights movement and other projects of emancipation have been minimized and underrepresented. Martin Luther King (1963) while in jail claimed:

Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The yearning for freedom eventually manifests itself, and that is what has happened to the American Negro. Something within has reminded him of his birthright of freedom, and something without has reminded him that it can be gained. Consciously or unconsciously, he has been caught up by the Zeitgeist, and with his black brothers of Africa and his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America and the Caribbean, the United States Negro is moving with a sense of great urgency toward the promised land of racial justice. (n.p.)

How many countries, other than the United States, cover the American civil rights movement in their citizenship education programs, or other iconic political movements? As we become transnational in our economic, political, social, environmental, digital and cultural exchanges how

are nations building awareness of significant events that occur elsewhere? Given the mass migrations occurring and our growing global interdependence, an increased awareness of other histories, cultures and socio-political realities is becoming vitally important. Citizenship education ought to be expanding in its breadth, rather than succumbing to economic and performance narratives that are taking precedence.

In the past, I've been hired to examine textbooks for bias, diversity, and hegemonic dialogue, but I don't recall being asked to use criteria that included peer and intergenerational representation. If histories are significant to the teaching and learning of active citizenship education then how important are the histories of youth. For example:

On 2 May [1963], more than a thousand African American students skipped their classes and gathered at Sixth Street Baptist Church to march to downtown Birmingham. As they approached police lines, hundreds were arrested and carried off to jail in paddy wagons and school buses. When hundreds more young people gathered the following day for another march, commissioner Bull Connor directed the local police and fire departments to use force to halt the demonstration. Images of children being blasted by high-pressure fire hoses, clubbed by police officers, and attacked by police dogs appeared on television and in newspapers and triggered outrage throughout the world. On the evening of 3 May, King offered encouragement to parents of the young protesters in a speech delivered at the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church. He said, "Don't worry about your children; they are going to be alright. Don't hold them back if they want to go to jail, for they are not only doing a job for themselves, but for all of America and for all of mankind" (King, 1963, n.p.).

The past tells us that youth subjects ought to be showcased in active citizenship education narratives. It also tells us that there are many more important histories that need to be given a

legitimate space in citizenship education (e.g., those from other cultures and times). Youth citizens ought to be showcased in active citizenship education as should intergenerational and global discourse (e.g., youth dialogue on global issues, intergenerational discourse, and emerging concerns such as sustainability) – such discourse has been sent to the background at the expense of a global narrative that promotes global capitalism.

Closing Remarks

In terms of the citizen, citizenship and active citizenship education history I have figuratively boomeranged to the other side of the universe and come back. I've explored how oppressed populations struggled to articulate and configure the citizen, active citizenship and active citizenship education – emancipation was at the heart, soul and intellectual design of active citizenship. Governments quite often had different notions of citizenship than those they ruled over. Even after the French established the discourse of equality and freedom (e.g., from slavery) Napoleon sought to perpetuate slavery in the French colonies. Similarly, other governments were reluctant to relinquish power: the British government sought to subjugate their colonial subjects, the Canadian government sought to assimilate the Aboriginals, American president Roosevelt rejected women's suffrage, and the United States government sought to perpetuate slavery and segregation. In the past, legendary leaders and groups critiqued, challenged, and created new constructs of the citizen, citizenship and active citizenship education. These groups fostered civil liberty, projects of emancipation and an ongoing legacy of not only the democratic ideal but also the democratic imagination – the soul of the citizen, citizenship and citizenship education was the innate right to have dignity, freedom and liberty. Such nuances have been lost in contemporary citizenship education because students are being pigeon-holed into a new socio-imaginary that worships the

Wall Streets of the world. I will begin my transition into the next section of my research analysis – looking at contemporary times.

In contemporary citizenship education students are expected to plug into a “knowledge-based society” (p. 13), while democratic ideals such as emancipation that I have referred to, are often cast aside. In reference to his study of youth, global neoliberalism and global youth resistance, Oyeleye (2012) states:

I contended that the current outbreaks of youth protests and uprisings across the world against a long-running oppressive and hegemonic global system and interrelated processes signals an instance of the breaking of silence of youth as a social group long rendered mute and nondescript by society, and an announcement of youth agency in the determination of their own future in a way that relocates the social category youth from ‘lost’ to ‘found’ both in broad global consciousness and in performativity. (n.p.)

Yet when we look at something such as *A Blueprint for Great Schools: Transition Advisory Team Report*, a project led by Torlakson (2011), State Superintendent of Public Instruction California Department of Education, the state aims to produce “productive citizens” (p. 4); “well educated citizens, who will bring creativity, invention, innovation, entrepreneurship, industriousness, and high levels of productivity to the state’s future” (p. 15); caring and good citizenship” (p. 20). These narratives contrast substantially from the discourse of earlier times.

CDA takes into consideration agency and passivity when analyzing discourse. A statement that aims to have “productive citizens” for the “state’s future” (Torlakson, 2011, p. 4; 15) is not giving its citizens much agency to determine the future the people want. Again, this discourse contrasts substantially from citizenship discourses which were motivated by liberty, equality and fraternity. It is unrealistic to expect that youth will commit to an infinite path of unexamined

agency, designed by and for global capitalists and imparted by state policies. As Whitehead [1861-1947], philosopher and mathematician [1861-1947] once stated, "The art of progress is to preserve order amid change, and to preserve change amid order" (Hillwatch, n.d., n.p.). It's time to now analyze the contemporary discourses that often contrast to the more historical ones (e.g., Socrates, Rousseau, and Martin Luther King Jr.).

Where Are We Now?

As evidenced in my researching findings, there were a number of researchers that claimed youth had deficits in citizenship skills and engagement; many attributed this to deficits in active citizenship education (Armario, 2011; Crick & Lockyer, 2010; Huckle, 1996). Others indicated that many existing social, educational and political structures marginalized and/or disenfranchised certain populations and this contributed to the manufacturing and/or reproduction of oppressive, inequitable and disenfranchising structures and processes (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2008; Steinberg & Kincheloe, 2010). Others have noted that certain factors such as globalization, neoliberalism and shifting geo-governance have reshaped our way of being, as well as our way of being citizens, and that active citizenship education has failed to adequately address these changes in their active citizenship education programs and/or policy (Demaine, 2002; GHK 2007; Giroux, 2008; Nabavi, 2006; Sears, 1996). ACE is a highly contested space where competing stakeholders wrestle to influence programs and narratives are power-laden. I refer to the following statement by Chouliaraki (2008):

Discourse Analysis, to begin with a claim of broad consensus, poses the question of how to analyse culture not as a question of behavioural variables or objective social structures,

but as a question of understanding culture ‘from within’ and it provides the cultural analyst with a concrete object of investigation- the text. (p. 1)

In this section of my research findings, I need to analyze not only the discourse of this period but also the social situations of our times, which are both critical to CDA, in order to determine where we are at with citizenship education and how government/education policies and programs may be systematically oppressing marginalized groups, youth or even citizenship education itself.

Youth Disengagement, the Deficit Model and Distrust

Research on youth disengagement in political life suggests that many youth are not voting or engaging in political life, thus active citizenship education is failing to produce an engaged citizen (Nabavi, 2010; Sears, 1996; Tonge & Mycock, 2009; Torney-Purta, Schwille & Amadeo, 1999). Research discourse indicates that such claims are not quite accurate. Menard (2010) reports:

Today, however, young people seem to exhibit disengagement from the civic sphere and a general loss of interest in public affairs. This phenomenon has been reported in numerous countries, including the United Kingdom¹, the United States² and Canada.³ However, we should not be too hasty to declare this disengagement absolute or irreversible. A number of factors are working against this trend, the education process chief among them. While the international context may have changed since the 1960s – the Cold War, for example, is no longer a source of tension – various other major issues, such as environmental protection, have come to the fore. Nor should anyone underestimate the fact that the Internet and social media have changed the way in which young people communicate among themselves and, very likely, the ways in which they can and want to engage in civic life.⁴

(p.1)

Menard (2010) also notes that youth living in poverty and/or coming from non-mainstream socio-cultural backgrounds often feel alienated, unsafe, and disenfranchised from socio-political life, and even more so than mainstream youth, they feel their participation in civic affairs will not influence political leaders or make much difference.

Inglehart (1997) claims that the allegations of youth apathy in political affairs are misleading and that “mass publics are deserting the old-line oligarchic political organization that mobilized them in the modernization era,” and instead are becoming more active via “elite challenging forms” (p. 307). Just as important, though, it is important to note that the “[t]he term ‘politics’ elicits negative reactions from many young people, who tend to associate the term with national government and leading politicians” (Tonge & Mycock, 2009, p. 182). Tonge and Mycock (2009) allege that “a myth of political apathy had developed, which wrongly conflated disenchantment with certain politicians and aspects of the political system,” while Dalton (2008) suggests that “America is witnessing a change in the nature of citizenship and political participation leading to a renaissance of democratic participation – rather than a decline in participation” (p. 85). Rudyard Griffiths, Dominion Institute co-founder and advocate for civic education “warns that Canada is becoming a nation of civic slackers whose focus is on consumption opposed to responsibility” (Campbell, 2007, p. 10). Such claims do not constitute fully objective data, but they do offer insights into the perceptions of youth that exist which are significant to a CDA analysis. Making such a generalized and demeaning claim reveals Griffiths assumptions and frustrations, and circulates ill-conceived perceptions of youth.

Lewis (2009) notes that past revisions to British Columbia’s curriculum neglected to make the curriculum relevant in terms of ongoing socio-cultural and political struggles and that the new Civics 11 course failed to pique the interest of students and teachers: “Out of the roughly 50,000

Grade 11 course students in British Columbia, only 645 students were enrolled in the course in 2005-2006” (Lewis, 2009, p. 25-26). The report does not reveal that the course is optional, has to compete with other elective courses and that a new Social Justice 12 course which explores civic issues using a social injustice framework rivaled for and won popularity instead. There are other new citizenship-related courses being introduced into course selections and receiving a positive response.

There are indicators that voter turnout among youth are down, but claiming that youth’s poor voter turnout and participation in formal political affairs is evidence that ACE programs are failing to produce engaged citizens are misleading. A construction of youth in these ways marginalizes the contributions of youth, and undermines what positive active citizenship learning is taking place. Not only do we need to better understand the political thinking and actions of youth, but we need to critically explore how we determine what constitutes political thinking and action, especially given that youth are leaning towards a digital world that connects them to issues on multiple fronts and allows them to politically participate in complex, diverse and unorthodox ways.

Isin (2009) suggests that the term “active citizens” has come to mean in educational discourse “follow[ing] scripts and participating in scenes that are created,” while “activist citizens engage in writing scripts and creating the scene” (p. 381). Schultz and Guimaraes (2012) suggest that “deliberative processes are important because they emphasize the public sphere rather than institutions of the state and encourage engagement of discourses across the different sites in society,” thus I posit that ACE programs (via policy and curriculum) not only introduce significant histories, government structures and socio-cultural practices in their programs, but also open up their classrooms as forums for deliberation (e.g., current affairs).

The Quebec Education Plan as per the Québec Ministère de l'Éducation (2004) 'History and Citizenship Education' program states the following:

The purpose of teaching history at school is to interest students in present day social phenomena and help them develop the competencies and knowledge required to understand these phenomena in the light of the past and assume their responsibilities as citizens capable of critical judgment and measured analysis. In addition, learning history enables students to gradually acquire the intellectual approach, language and attitudes on which historical thinking is based. They learn how to examine social phenomena from a historical perspective, to base their understanding of these phenomena on documentary sources and to use the historian's tools of reflection. In the Western world, history education became a standard feature of the curriculum in public schools in the context of the rise of the nation-state in the nineteenth century. Its introduction reflected a concern for citizenship education; historical narratives could be used to instill a national identity and a belief in the validity of the existing social and political order.

(p. 1)

Historical studies play a strong and very important role, in social studies programs and citizenship education, but they address only part of an active citizenship education. This is not to question the value and importance of historical studies and teachings, but if part of the curriculum is intended to develop deliberating engaged citizens, then time must be allocated for it. It must be recognized that uncomfortable issues (e.g., poverty, racism, and classism) need to part of those discussions as that is the lived reality for many students and those are issues many of them can relate to. As Dewey (1916) stated, "A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated

living of conjoint communicated experience” (p. 87).

Manitoba introduced a new grade twelve course entitled, *Global Issues: Citizenship and Sustainability*. The description of the course states the following:

An ethos of active democratic citizenship involves developing a set of coherent ethical principles upon which to base decisions and practices. Citizenship is a fluid concept that is subject to continuing change over time: its meaning is often contested, and it is subject to interpretation and debate. In the course of history, citizenship has been used both as a means of strengthening human solidarity and a means of excluding or maltreating groups or individuals while conferring superior privilege and power to others. An ethos of active democratic citizenship in the contemporary world is often referred to as *global citizenship*, since it is based not on nationhood or ethno-cultural exclusivity, but on a fundamental acceptance of the inherent, equal, universal and inalienable rights of all human beings. However, the concept of *global citizenship* is a fairly recent phenomenon, and it too is subject to interpretation and debate. While some thinkers embrace global citizenship as a vision for a sustainable future for all, others argue that citizenship can only truly exist within the bounds of a nation state; hence the idea of global citizenship is either pure idealism or an imposition of Western liberal democratic ideology. Regardless, our students live in a world where national boundaries and identities may not have the same meaning as they did for previous generations, and students today more easily see themselves as citizens of an interconnected global community. (Manitoba Education, 2012b, n. p.)

If I am to answer the following three interconnecting questions: ‘Where are we with ACE, where ought we to go, and how do we get there?’ I would say part of answer can be found in the above quotation. The complexities and discourse of active citizenship education ought not to be left only

for the academics to tackle. Students ought to also be informed of these complexities and taught how to deliberate and act upon them.

Unfortunately, the discourse in the *Global Issues: Citizenship and Sustainability* course description segregates global citizenship as though it is inexplicably separate from normative citizenship, and is this something we wish to do? The course description also states that active democratic citizenship “involves a recognition and acceptance of a collective responsibility for the continued economic and social well-being of humans while preserving the environmental integrity of the planet” (Manitoba Education, 2012d, n.p.). Sustainability is quintessential to an ethos and ethic of ACE but is “recognition and acceptance” (n.p.) of this factor adequate enough to contend with the problems it encompasses. Are students not expected to critique, challenge and craft new alternatives? If not, is such a program not slipping back into the dualist schism whereby citizenship education is designed to either fit into an existing or change an existing schema (e.g., Case, 1999). Students need to be able to identify sustainability issues, stakeholder positions, and dialogue in ways that allow them to confront power (Gonsalvez, 2012).

Before I shift my discussion from one about youth’s alleged civic apathy and citizenship deficits (e.g., knowledge and skills) to one about youth’s skepticism of contemporary hegemonic systems of government, I want to introduce a socio-cultural perspective (e.g., discourse) on the issue of institutional power. According to Brennan (2012)

So then, we find that throughout human history those with power seek to control all aspects of the human societies within their sphere of influence, while these human societies wish to be left alone to their own lives with the minimal molestation from the state and from the powers that be. This is an eternal conflict, or, as Foucault so amply put it, the ‘*ancient, permanent, war*’ between the vertical power structures and the citizenry.

Over generations tools or weapons have been developed, and are continually being developed, by those that hold power in order to subjugate the masses to their will, especially when it is against the will of these same masses. This is the heart of what I call the *Foucauldian War on the Citizen* – a continual struggle for political, religious and temporal dominance by the powered elites against the citizenry. (n.p.)

As I discuss youth's engagement or disengagement from civic affairs, it may or may not become apparent that citizenship education projects aimed at 'repairing' youth, might actually be constituted in a larger issue – that youth, school programs and citizenship enhancement initiatives may only be reproducing and circulating a narrative that shifts the focus away from a bigger issue (e.g., dominance by the powered elites) onto a more tangible group of subjects – youth. Such a suggestion may seem far-fetched, if it didn't resonate so strongly with Karl Marx who stated, "The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it" (Marx, as cited by Gasper, 2004, n.p.).

Research from various states indicates that youth increasingly are skeptical and/or distrustful of formal politics, political figures and/or political systems. (Dalton, 2008; Henn & Foard, 2011; Tonge & Mycock, 2009). Shultz (2007) states:

[I]n national focus groups conducted for Communication Canada in 2001, the common lament from young Canadians was the lack of political leadership to inspire and help youth to believe there is something and someone worth voting for. Recent government scandals surrounding improper contracting and misuse of money have only helped fuel this perception. The lack of interest is also generated by a perception that government does not understand young people's needs and interests. This was confirmed by Communication

Canada's *Listening to Canadians: Focus on Young Adults* report (2002), which indicated that 70 percent of young adults do not believe that the federal government understands what is desirable to them. (p. 241)

At the same time, the research indicates these problems may not only fall upon youth who hold a sense of distrust of, disenfranchisement from, or discontent with their governments.

Dalton (2008) notes that “Rising levels of education, changing generational experiences and other social forces are decreasing respect for authority and traditional forms of allegiance as represented in duty-based citizenship,” and that “Simultaneously, these same forces are increasing self-expressive values as well as the ability and desire to participate more directly in the decisions affecting one’s life” (pp. 81-82). In contrast, Mascherini, Manca and Hoskins (2009) determined that,

Countries with lower number of years of education belong to southern Europe, as Portugal, Greece, Spain and Italy, while countries with the highest number of years of education are Denmark, Norway and Germany. The relation between the years of education and the level of active citizenship...shows that low years of education are associated to low level of active citizenship; there is an exception for Great Britain which has on average high numbers of years of education but lower levels of active citizenship. (Mascherini, Manca & Hoskins, 2009, p. 67)

More research needs to be done to identify how to establish better relationships between youth and government; youth and elected officials; and youth and democratic practices. But, there are other emergent factors involved in youth’s diminishing regards and trust for their governments.

Stats Canada, 2012, (as cited by Canadian Press, 2012), determined that “13 per cent of the 6.8 million Canadians in the age bracket of 15-29 years of age were not in education, employment

or training” (n.p.) and unemployment among a growing population of Aboriginal youth is even much higher. Soaring student debts are becoming problematic as are the lack of good paying jobs for university graduates. European countries, especially Spain, Portugal, Greece and Italy, have high rates of youth unemployment:

The youth unemployment rate in the EU-27 was more than double the overall unemployment rate in 2011. At 21.4 %, more than one out of every five young persons in the labour force was not employed, but looking and available for a job. In the euro area, the youth unemployment rate was marginally lower at 20.8 %. The unemployment rate among young persons was higher than the rate among those aged between 25 and 74 in all of the Member States. In Spain (46.4 %), Greece (44.4 %), Slovakia (33.2 %), Lithuania (32.9 %), and Portugal (30.1 %) youth unemployment rates were particularly high. The Netherlands (7.6 %), Austria (8.3 %), and Germany (8.6 %) were the only Member States with a youth unemployment rate below 10 %. (European Commission, 2013, n.p.)

In regards to the high unemployment rates in some of the European states Durden (2012) comments that, “the last thing Europe needs is a discontented, disenfranchised, and devoid of hope youth roving the streets with nothing to do, easily susceptible to extremist and xenophobic tendencies” (n.p). It is important that nations have youth who are presented with the ways, means and attitudes necessary to shape deliberative democracy.

Institutions often feel students lack, or have deficits in the field of active citizenship. Knowledge tests are often administered to confirm or deny these suspicions. According to Armario (2011),

Just 13 percent of high school seniors who took the 2010 National Assessment of Educational Progress — called the Nation's Report Card [United States] — showed solid

academic performance in American history ... Education experts say a heavy focus on reading and math under the federal No Child Left Behind law in the last decade has led to lagging performance in other subjects such as history and science... [and that] history is critical to students learning how to become better citizens and understanding how the country's political and cultural systems work. (n.p.)

Huckle (1997) claims that students are unable to “explain how the economy, politics, society and culture work; how everyday events reflect and shape underlying structures and processes operating at all scales from the local to the global; and what changes to these structures and processes might lead to more just, democratic and sustainable futures” (p. 30). It is important to society that students understand socio-political histories, processes and structures.

I want to interject in my conversation to position youth in the context of all aspects of the state, as opposed to just within the government sphere. Giroux (2012) states,

Neoliberalism is once again imposing its values, social relations and forms of social death upon all aspects of civic life.⁽⁴⁾ One consequence is that the United States has come to resemble a "suicidal state," where governments work to destroy their own defenses against anti-democratic forces;⁽⁵⁾ or as Jacques Derrida has put it, such states offer no immunity against authoritarianism and in fact emulate "that strange behavior where a living being, in quasi-suicidal fashion 'itself' works to destroy its own protection, to immunize itself against its 'own' immunity..." (n.p.).

What would lead Giroux and other leading public intellectuals to stake this claim? Giroux (2012) states,

As a result of the triumph of corporate power over democratic values - made visible recently in the Citizens United Supreme Court case that eliminated all controls on

corporate spending on political campaigns - the authority of the state does more than defend the market and powerful financial interests, it also is expanding its disciplinary control over the rest of society. There is more at work here than, as David Harvey points out, a political project designed "to re-establish the conditions for capital accumulation and to restore the power of economic elites"⁽¹¹⁾ (n.p.)

What impact might such a neoliberal project have on today's 'vulnerable' youth (e.g., I am intentionally avoiding the apathetic and deficient narrative)?

Today's young people inhabit an age of unprecedented symbolic, material and institutional violence - an age of grotesque irresponsibility, unrestrained greed and unchecked individualism. Youth now constitute a present absence in any talk about democracy. Their absence or disappearance is symptomatic of a society that has turned against itself, punishes its children and does so at the risk of killing the entire body politic. The "suicidal state" produces an autoimmune crisis in which a society attacks the very elements of a society that allow it to reproduce itself, while at the same time killing off of any sense of history, memory and ethical responsibility." (Giroux, 2012, n.p.)

In previously mentioned policy documents there were a number of references made to students taking responsibility for themselves and being productive, in the new global, competitive, and knowledge-based society. As much as Giroux's description can be dismissed as a dystopian myth, "a combination of paradigms and syntagms that make up an oft-told story with elaborate cultural associations, e.g., the cowboy myth, the romance myth," so can the mystical knowledge-based utopian myth that is being perpetuated.

As I continue my analysis of citizenship education policies, curriculum and pedagogies it is important to note, how the newly imagined citizen and citizenship can be 'spun'. As we look at

citizenship education we need to carefully evaluate the narratives that are being spun (e.g., new global world). Some linguistic signifiers, signs or codes being used to support the new technocratic knowledge-based global world are: accountability, standards, productivity, self-reliance, knowledge-based society, ethical, and individual choice. Over time, many alternative paradigms have been sent to the proverbial background (e.g., critical democratic deliberation) to foreground other educational priorities, as is the case in the following scenario.

Unfortunately, high-stakes testing in the fields of math and reading are dominating teaching priorities in many American schools. As Burke (1997) states,

The core problems of the future are political problems. We do not lack the natural resources, technology or capital to deliver a sustainable high quality of life for a population of ten billion, but we are woefully bad at putting them together properly. At the heart of so many contemporary crises is the crisis of legitimate authority: how do we construct political mechanisms, including global ones that have the power to resolve real differences and yet retain enough legitimacy for those resolutions to hold? (p. 47)

We need informed, skilled and competent youth citizens who can morally, ethically and critically address critical issues that occur locally, regionally, nationally, supra-nationally, internationally trans-nationally and/or globally. Policy and curriculum ought to recognize this.

Students may have some civic knowledge deficits that have to be addressed, but active citizenship education needs to achieve a higher profile, significance and place in education if we are going to be able to preserve, maintain and continuously reinvent a vibrant and functional democracy. According to The Common Core State Standards board that establish the American standards in English, history, social studies, science and technology, for K- 12 students, critical literacy is the key element necessary to develop responsible citizens who are ready to exit to college

and/or careers (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010). As well, they claim that students who engage in “high-quality literary and informational texts” will “reflexively demonstrate the cogent reasoning and use of evidence that is essential to both private deliberation and responsible citizenship in a democratic republic” (p. 3). Perhaps, it is a false assumption to believe that streamlining of policy, curriculum and pedagogy, along the lines of critical literacy, will produce responsible citizens. And, perhaps it is faulty to assume that, “Students can only gain this foundation [critical literacy] when the curriculum is intentionally and coherently structured to develop rich content knowledge” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, p. 10). Perhaps students ought to have time to explore their own assumptions, political positions and/or worldviews and socio-political imaginations. Where do they see themselves now, after learning more about citizenship and contemporary issues, and in their future?

The Colorado Academic Standards include “Prepared Graduate Competencies” in the Civics Standards whereby students are expected to 1) “Analyze and practice rights, roles, and responsibilities of citizens,” and 2) “Analyze the origins, structures, and functions of governments and their impacts on societies and citizens” (Colorado Department of Education, 2009, p. 15). In Georgia the “standards are organized around strands of history, geography, civics and economics” and in grades 9 – 12 course-specific standards are set to “address such topics as constitutional government, roles, separation and powers of the three branches of government, civil rights and liberties, participation in civic life and the United States Congress” (2010, p. 6). Such a sterile, regimented and memorization-driven approach can marginalize students who are academically, socially, and linguistically challenged.

Students need an outlet to process the struggles and the inequities they are experiencing. As the Law Foundation of BC (2010) states:

As members of societies and communities, we are connected and interdependent with each other and with the systems that govern our lives. We thus have a responsibility to be aware of our actions and the impact they have on others. We also have the power to change our social and political environment for the better by being active members of the society we live in. Active citizenship means utilizing one's rights, responsibilities and agency through civic engagement (p.1).

We need to include critical literacy in ACE, but if we want to facilitate the development of politically engaged youth citizens, the political will must exist to make active citizenship education, about 'being' a competent engaged citizen, who can help shape the world they live in. All students, at various levels of the academic spectrum ought to receive instruction that will facilitate this. ACE policy and curriculum writers ought to recognize that certain demographic groups feel that they are already marginalized as citizens, and establish policy and curriculum that recognizes their disenfranchisement (e.g., homeless, living in poverty, language barriers) and facilitates ways for them to engage and be heard.

Youth may not be as disengaged as they appear to be and they may not be abdicating civic responsibilities, but rather choosing alternative pathways of engagement. This is not to say there are problems, but rather that the complexities of the problem need to be brought to the table for further examination. According to Ryan (2010),

Civic participation of young people around the world is routinely described in deficit terms, as they are labelled apathetic, devoid of political knowledge, disengaged from the community and self-absorbed (Andolina, 2002; Weller, 2006)...Today's youth negotiate unstable social, economic and environmental conditions, new technologies and new forms of community. Loyalty, citizenship and notions of belonging take on new meanings in

these changing global conditions (Youniss, 2002) as young people make choices about levels of participation and performances of civic identity that are tied to space and time (Thomas, 2005). (p. 2)

Huckin (2002) states that “[i]f the same heuristics and the same reading positions are repeatedly invoked” [e.g., youth are civically disengaged], “it leads to a naturalization of the ideas presented; that is, they come to seem ‘natural’ or commonsensical [e.g., youth are apathetic] (p.11). This is especially so if the ideas conform to widely-accepted cultural models and myths such as the American Dream or the US as exporter of democracy” (Huckin, 2002, p. 11), or in this case our “apathetic youth” (Dugan, 2010, n.p.) as found in numerous articles.

Neoliberalism, Globalization and Shifting Geo –governance

Springer (2012) states that, “A discourse approach moves theorizations forward by recognizing neoliberalism is neither a ‘top-down’ nor ‘bottom-up’ phenomena, but rather a circuitous process of socio-spatial transformation” (p. 133). Thus, in my research analysis here, and as will follow in my next sections, I am exploring many texts so I can more fully understand the circuitous development of citizenship education. For example, a citizenship education booklet produced by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012) indicates that active citizenship is about:

- Obeying the law
- Taking responsibility for oneself and one’s family...
- Serving on a jury...
- Voting in elections...
- Helping others in the community...
- Protecting and enjoying our heritage and environment...

(Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2012, p. 9)

Citizenship is presented as a set of duties to immigrants in this case, and the booklet characterizes the role of new citizens as one of compliance and gratitude. The booklet provides little, if any space, to encourage newcomers to be questioning and to understand how citizens may collectively challenge the status quo. The role of the newcomer takes on a rather passive, limiting and subjective tone in the booklet. The dialogue in the book encourages newcomers to fit into the existing society rather than to critique, challenge or change it, or to feel that they bring something uniquely distinct to their new home. This ultimately marginalizes the immigrant imaginary and experience. I bring this up in this section of my research analysis, so as I analyze some of the more forgotten, marginalized, and excluded citizenship discourses in the next sections, it will be more obvious why I needed to lasso the discourses that other researchers have not brought into an inquiry of citizenship education.

Some of the forerunners in globalization research such as Appadurai (1996), Held (1987, 1996) and Harvey (1990) explored some of the early phenomenon taking place as time seemingly quickened, global distances seemingly shortened and global interdependencies increased. Harvey (1990) claimed that a “time-space compression” was occurring and it was speeding up “our way of being” (n.p.). Appadurai (1996) claimed that the current global economy (e.g., global capitalism and deregulation) were creating disjunctures between the economy, politics and culture and that new terrains that he referred to as “ethnoscapes”, “mediascapes”, “technoscapes”, “financescapes” and “ideoscapes” were emerging (p. 33). As well, people, money, ideas, technology and the media were globally on the move via transit, computers and newly created spaces. Constructs of citizenship were changing as the number of migrations escalated; people were either fleeing

disaster (e.g., socio-political, environmental, or cultural), wanting to improve their standard of living or seeking the dreamland of their imaginations).

As we look at active citizenship in terms of where we are and where are we going, it is important to note that global shifts are taking place that have, do, and most likely will continue to, reshape our notions of citizenship; we ought to be prepared to address what is before us. For example, Peters (2008) states,

Most traditional accounts of citizenship begin with the assertion of basic civil, political and social rights of individuals and note the way in which the modern concept as inherently egalitarian, took on a universal appeal with the development of the liberal tradition which is often understood as synonymous with modernity. Yet the concept has appealed to both conservatives and radical democrats: the former emphasise individual freedom at the expense of equality and see state intervention as an intolerable and unwarranted violation of the freedom of the individual while the latter stress the democratic potential of citizenship. Increasingly, on the left the concept has been seen as a means to control the injustices of capitalism. (n.p.)

If we are to prepare students for active citizenship we ought to prepare them to understand the political dynamics they may encounter.

Tribalism is something that concerns societies at large – for some it may be considered a positive force. For example, the First Nations Idle No More is in some regards a tribal insurgency – they are banding together to reclaim many aspects of their identity. For others modern day tribalism poses concerns. For example,

Back in the 1960s, Obama's father [e.g., his father was from the Luo tribe Kenya while his mother was from the Kikuyu tribe], shaped by his American experience, warned that

“tribalism was going to ruin the country”... [President] Kenyatta, a Kikuyu, punished the “old man” for his frankness... Oginga Odinga, the first vice-president to Kenyatta [e.g., and also a Luo], was arrested in 1969 after ethnic violence in the Luo-dominated western city of Kisumu, near the Obama homestead. Today, burnt buildings and shattered stores line Kisumu once again. But we’re beyond tribalism, right? Wrong. The main forces in the world today are the modernizing, barrier-breaking sweep of globalization and the tribal reaction to it, which lies in the assertion of religious, national, linguistic, racial or ethnic identity against the unifying technological tide. Connection and fragmentation vie. The Internet opens worlds and minds, but also offers opinions to reinforce every prejudice. You’re never alone out there; some idiot will always back you. The online world doesn’t dissolve tribes. It gives them global reach. (Cohen, 2008, n.p.)

ACE programs need to move forward because globalization has thrust us into a new way of ‘global being’ where various stakeholders [e.g., cultural, economic and social tribes] sometimes feel a need to compete for self-interest. Students need to be aware of socio-political, economic and environmental shifts that are occurring. They need to be able to identify what is happening in the world, why and what they can do about it. Are we preparing students to understand the dynamic of such things as modern-day tribalism? As I discuss concepts such as ‘tribalism’, ‘ethnoscapes’, ‘disjunctures’, ‘cultural models and myths’, ‘the suicidal state’, ‘capital accumulation’ and ‘economic elites’, I am referring to the many contemporary discourses that circulate and often put into question the hegemonic discourses that are circulated in government and economic circles (e.g., deregulation).

Neoliberalism and globalization go hand and hand, so much so that some consider them to be almost, if not, the same. According to Condon and Phillips (2005), “Neoliberal agendas are

increasingly based on deregulation, privatization and non-welfare state (e.g., social protections) agendas”; “economic citizenship”: and “the discourse of economic citizenship” (p. 107). According to Kennelly and Llewellyn (2011) liberalism, is based on the following principles: “that every individual is free and equal under the law; that freedom is based on the human capacity to reason; and that an inviolable right to property and the sale of one’s labour within the free market flow from these tenets” and that “the ‘neo’ in neoliberalism – or what is ‘new’ about it – is its extensive emphases on self-regulation” (pp. 898-899). The masses are led to believe success relies strictly upon individual efforts thus negating how unequal playing fields significantly disadvantage vulnerable groups.

Kennelly and Llewellyn (2011) state: “Neoliberal ideologies carry specific implications for conceptualizations of citizenship within the state” (p. 899). In this structure, active citizens are responsible to themselves for the choices they make and not to the larger public sphere, or for the crumbling fragments on the periphery. According to Mitchell (2003), “[E]ducating a child to be a good citizen is no longer synonymous with constituting a well-rounded, nationally oriented, multicultural self, but rather about the attainment of the ‘complex skills’ necessary for individual success in a global economy” (p. 399). The BC Ministry of Education, Education for Tomorrow booklet (2010) states that,

Citizen engagement is a grass roots movement gaining in popularity around the world. It acknowledges that many complex problems cannot be solved by governments alone.

Citizen participation is necessary to identify the best solutions, and to introduce them so that they take hold. At the Ministry of Education, we are poised to steer B.C.’s education system towards a new model, and we know that we cannot succeed without the partnership

of all those involved in education, from students, parents and teachers, to academics, business people and leaders in the science and technology sectors. (p. 30)

If citizenship engagement is “a grass roots movement” that is “gaining in popularity” what place do the historical, philosophical and democratic elements of citizenship hold? In the BCMOE discourse citizens are presented as but ‘add-ons’ to busy governments that can’t handle absolutely everything. This is the most current position on education in the province of British Columbia, and although there are many good intentions in the policy – it isn’t where citizenship ought to be going unless we want citizenship to be undermined and reduced to a pop culture phenomenon that will assist busy government officials. As well, the concept that a government and its youth and/or citizens, are in a “partnership” with businesses disrupts the entire concept of a government of its people for its people. As Haque (2008) states, “the character of the emerging neoliberal state in the developing world is also reflected in its deeper alliance or partnership with private capital, including both the local business enterprises and transnational firms or investors” (p. 16).

Globalization and neoliberalism have not only affected cultures, economies and human rights; they have had a considerable impact on the dynamics of governance and its powers. According to Paquet (2003),

The shift from a geo-government based on the old trinity of state-nation-territory to a new and more fluid, mobile, slippery, shifty, evasive geo-governance has created new challenges. In this new game where geographical space plays a lesser and different role, where the state has lost its full grip on governing, and the nation and various other territories of the mind have woven a multiplicity of powerful reciprocal extraterritorialities of determining consequence, the game is without a master, and collaboration is the new imperative. This is eminently subversive since it amounts to nothing less than an

expropriation of the power base of most of the traditional and well-established potentates. Whatever might be the pretenses of state (national or territorial) leaders, they are faced with a turbulent environment marred by much disconcertion and conflictive equilibria where each group recognizes that it cannot ride the systems of either its partners or opponents but has to live and compromise with them to survive. (p. 2)

Countries have entered transnational spheres by signing trade agreements that are transnational in scope, and thus they have indirectly taken their citizens to this new dimension. For example, Chapter 11, of the North American Free Trade Agreement, “gives corporations the right to sue the Canadian government, often for tens of millions of dollars, if any public policy or government action denies them investment or profit” (Council of Canadians, 2009, n.p.). The rights of citizens in this relatively new transnational realm have been diminished and democracy compromised – citizens have been rocketed into the transnational sphere.

Citizens’ rights to protect their social, economic and environmental interests have been diminished substantially. According to Maguth (2012), “Many scholars claim an inadequacy in current education practice to teach students the ways in which individuals and states are connected to a sophisticated global system,” but s/he is encouraged that schools are beginning to “take an active role in developing students that are effective players in an increasing pluralistic, interdependent, and changing world” (p. 76). Students need to be made aware that traditional state borders are more socially, politically and economically penetrable, as are their lives (e.g., via the Internet, for example) and that as citizens in an increasingly interconnected world, they can remain passively powerless to these changes or powerfully active to effect change. Schools should be offering them the tools and developing the skills necessary for them to become actors in their world, not victims of it. When educational policy refers to the new “global citizenship” (e.g.,

Johnston et. al., 2004, p. 99), as it commonly does, it is important to discern what the connotation implies. As Neubauer (2011) states,

Global market access mandated by international regulatory bodies and legal frameworks further wither the citizenry's control over labour laws, regulations, and trade policy. The integration into unregulated global financial markets not only enhances capital's ability to discipline labour, but also enables the disciplining of entire governments, vastly reducing the spectrum of possible policy options... In this way, global neoliberal flexible accumulation undermines the capacity of local populations to control their own economic, social, and political destinies. If there is some other global political-economy more toxic to the meaningful application of democratic citizenship, it does not spring readily to mind. (p. 207).

What type of 21st century global world are youth being introduced to? This is not to say that there are not positive global interdependencies developing, but one has to be sure that citizenship education is not falling prey to corporatocracy (e.g., socio-political systems run by corporations).

Inclusion, Rights of the Child and the Critical Dimensions of Citizenship

An important aspect of active citizenship is to recognize, that a youth audience is not homogeneous, and that some groups feel disenfranchised by or are excluded from mainstream educational experiences. As actors of life, those who feel marginalized or who are excluded from the mainstream, seldom remain the subjective identities they are ascribed – they create alternative forms of status, belonging and empowerment. This holds true in South Africa where citizens living in poverty and isolated townships choose counter-identities to the norm. Swartz, Harding and De Lannoy (2012) documented their findings:

To explain why they drank or smoked dagga (marijuana), had multiple sexual partners or committed crimes, youth would often explain ‘This is the way it is in ikasi’ or ‘That’s ikasi style’ (Swartz 2010, 40, 65). Here, the concept of ikasi is not just a physical location as it bounds people’s origins and movement (people inhabit not just the township but specific areas of it); it is also a descriptor of townships as poor, unsafe, racialised spaces. However, as previously described ikasi was also a style which youth explained as defining the township and also the broader society. When explaining their interaction with the moral landscape of the townships, youth positioned themselves as agents and performers of ikasi style which, in its own right becomes both a reconciliation of dreams and the predetermined impossibility of achieving those dreams. Ikasi uses the language of belonging by referring to the markers of social inclusion, such as wealth and possessions, and by framing alternative means of access, such as crime or multiple sexual partners. Ikasi style is therefore as much a discourse of inclusion as it is a style that creates subjects who are already excluded from the ‘New South African’ narrative. (p. 34)

Such a narrative indicates the importance of recognizing counter-normative adaptations of citizens who can find little sense of belonging and/or identity in the larger collectives of citizenship identity. Those living in poverty or who are socially massaged to the outskirts of society, often from generation to generation, develop their own counter-inclusionary sense of belonging and inclusion.

Exclusion and inclusion are often subject to not only ‘counter’ manifestations but one’s gazing spot. Approaches to active citizenship education, ought not to assume homogeneity of their learners and their experiences. Nabavi (2010) indicates that “varied experiences of immigrant youth in formal and informal contexts become increasingly important for gaining a better understanding of their changing societal and material conditions and how that informs their experiences with

citizenship learning,” and urges research to be conducted on “immigrant youth experiences of identity, belonging, social, and political learning” (p. 1). Given the cosmopolitan nature of many large cities it is important that citizenship education facilitate the development of a “citizenry respectful of multiple identities, sharing a common sense of belonging and having full parity of rights and obligations and duties and responsibilities” (Nabavi, 2010, p. 517). Does respect go far enough and is such an approach not perpetuating a status quo of disenfranchisement, perhaps we ought to be increasing understandings and dialogue with others in citizenship education.

There is great concern that the neoliberal narrative has penetrated the media and advertising so much so that purchasers feel an obligation to be faithful to certain companies and see critical consumer decision-making as part of being an analytical citizen (Klein, 2002). Citizenship has been weaved into the discourse of purchasing. As Aldenmyr, Wigg and Olson (2012) state,

What stands out as central in the active citizen’s choice-making is a logic of choice that is linked to principles of consumerism rather than to a logic of rights and democracy. It does so by stressing the need for the young student to ‘become someone’ by taking up a consumer’s attitude through education; a becoming that is related to her ‘building-up of competences’ and that are presumed as necessary for individual self-fulfilment. Put differently, the individual’s choice making is envisaged as a goal in itself rather than as a means to attain increased opportunities to take control over her own life. The agency promoted in this kind of citizen ‘activeness’ stands out as a question of self-making through constantly on-going navigation in a bazaar marked out by competition and transactional assessment. (p. 258)

Youth are vulnerable in the realm of the “mediascape” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 33) and they are persuaded by marketing schemes that are intended to preoccupy them with consumption more than

citizenship. As well, students are bombarded with so much embedded news, as opposed to un-embedded journalism that is corporate sponsored, that a number of schools are teaching media literacy to help students discern the political information, or misinformation, they are absorbing. These distractions complicate the task of being an informed and engaged citizen.

Arnot and Swartz (2002) states that “[t]he use of citizenship education as a political strategy to unite populations characterised by social inequality and division, or to promote particular gendered power relations, is rarely addressed” and that the “link between social class, ethnicity and gender, and citizenship knowledge and the shaping of citizenship identities has been seriously neglected” (p. 2). Tonge and Mycock (2009) claim that many youth become marginalized not only by circumstances beyond their control (e.g., poverty, need to work, or health) and therefore do not attend school regularly; therefore their access to political/civic education is reduced to positioning them “outside the ‘citizen space’... Rather than being the focus of research, the existence of a large pool of such undereducated and underemployed ‘lumpen’ youth is represented as potentially apathetic or disengaged and as weakening the foundations of stable democratic societies” (p. 182). ACE research and policy ought to include the needs of vulnerable youth who may or may not be accessing citizenship education via traditional schooling.

Globalization has brought socio-cultural changes, one of which is the migrations, of many diverse peoples’ into a newly evolving geo-political space – the socially engineered cosmopolitan city. Banks (2004b) states:

Racial, ethnic, cultural, and language diversity is increasing in nation-states throughout the world because of worldwide immigration. The deepening ethnic diversity within nation-states and the quest by different groups for cultural recognition and rights are challenging assimilationist notions of citizenship and forcing nation-states to construct new

conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education. A delicate balance of unity and diversity should be an essential goal of citizenship education in multicultural nation-states. Citizenship education should help students to develop thoughtful and clarified identifications with their cultural communities, nation-states, and the global community. It also should enable them to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to act to make the nation and the world more democratic and just. (p. 289)

Developing cultural awareness, belonging, and interactions is critical to advancing citizenship.

Researchers have expressed concern that aspects of assimilation, colonization, and/or monoculturalism (Banks, 2011; Jakubowicz, 2009; Paltridge, 2010) still reside in socio-cultural, educational and political policies and practices. The research community ought to be vigilante in ensuring that policies are not perpetuating such social oppressions. Policies of assimilation have clearly taken place in countries such as Australia and Canada. Residential schools and training programs in Canada targeted Aboriginal children and men for assimilation (McKenzie & Morrisette, 2003). Australia's postwar emigration policies aimed to create homogeneity and as Jakubowicz (2009) notes the state system was "assimilationist, rationalist and nationalist" (p. 2). As the cosmopolitan agenda continues, Indigenous peoples' in many countries continue to be marginalized, disenfranchised and frighteningly dispossessed as they take actions to be recognized as citizens (e.g., Idle No More movement).

Some educational boards are making inroads to better include Aboriginal content and understandings in their curriculum. The BCMOE has created alternative routes for completing compulsory Social Studies and English courses. Students can choose to take First Nations 12 instead of Social Studies 11 to obtain the required social studies graduation credits (BCMOE, 2006). Manitoba Education has also introduced a new grade 12 course entitled, Current Topics and

First Nations, Métis and Inuit Studies. At the same time, this is only the beginning of what ought to be a larger project. Why? It is crucial that Canadian schools cautiously, carefully and critically decide how to appropriately represent Aboriginals and other oppressed persons, in their policies and curriculum, and we ought not to forget that:

It was in the name of citizenship, for example, that in Manitoba First Nations children were sent to residential schools; that French-speaking Roman Catholics lost their right to publicly-supported schooling; that Mennonite schools were closed; that the Polish, French, Ukrainian, and Mennonite Normal Schools were shut down; that French was prohibited as a language of instruction and, in defiance of Canadian history, treated as a “foreign” language; that girls and women were confined to restrictive social and political roles.

(Osbourne, 2005, p. 1)

As a nation, Canada must seriously consider how it continues to marginalize First Nations children attending schools on reserve (Paquette and Fallon, 2010).

Funding for First Nations children living on reserves is approximately \$2000 (e.g., averaging each province) less per student each year (Paquette and Fallon, 2010). First Nation students like Shannen Koostachin, and her allies, have sought equitable funding for their education. These inequities have continued for hundreds of years, and this problem only represents a fraction of the issues these children encounter (e.g., poverty, lack of clean drinking water, and dilapidated housing) (Chisholm and Gonsalvez, 2012). Citizenship education ought to raise awareness of such inequities and governments ought to address the unique and fundamental needs of the Indigenous Peoples residing in their country. Ministries of education ought to also address the unique citizen status of off-reserve students in their districts, ensuring that they are justly recognized and

represented in citizen curriculum and their distinct needs addressed. As well, citizenship education programs ought to prepare all students to understand the histories, contemporary struggles and the rights of Indigenous peoples as per the United Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, state constitutions and treaty agreements.

When we look at citizenship we must consider United Nations conventions, covenants and resolutions. It is most likely that in the fore mentioned situation with First Nations children that international conventions, covenants and resolutions are being violated when children and/or Indigenous populations do not have adequate educational funding, safe drinking water, housing facilities, sanitation, and health services. This violates a number of international agreements including the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Despite the ratification of the UN Rights of the Indigenous Peoples in 2010 citizenship education programs have not updated their programs to officially reflect this. Why is this discourse not in the foreground at present?

Article 12 (1) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) states, “States parties will assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child,” while Article 3 states, “In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration” (n.p.). Signatories to the CRC are expected to domesticate these international laws in their state legal systems and structures. Students ought to have a voice in how their active citizenship education is constructed in policy, curriculum and pedagogy as they do have the right to express their views freely. Such matters affect students and it is in the best interest of youth that “due

weight in accordance with [their] age and maturity” (CRC, 1989, n.p) is given.

Students should have a voice in how they are being governed. In 1991, the United Kingdom, for example, established seats for “four Children’s Commissioners” to “safeguard and promote the rights and interests of children and young people” (Lockyer, 2010, p. 15). In many countries youth are advocating for the voting age to be dropped to sixteen years of age, which they believe, should be part of the rule of law – given the expectations of the CRC. Lockyer (2010) identifies a flaw in how ACE is implemented in many schools:

Thus, if the transformative aspiration of citizenship education depended upon the opportunity for democratic participation within schools, the aspiration must appear to be a distant ideal. Let us look again at what learning to be an active citizen requires. It remains the case that children are expected to acquire the knowledge, skills and attributes required by all the elements of citizenship, including political literacy, before they possess full legal autonomy, or the right to vote. How problematic is that?

If we assume that children are citizens, not just becoming citizens, we might restructure the role that children play in their active citizenship. Some schools are more liberal in terms of having student councils that have actual powers, but wouldn’t it be magnificent if we opened this up throughout the chain of education: classroom, school, school district, region/province, state, supra-state if there is one and internationally. Given the contents of the CRC we ought to be moving in this direction. As well, governments need to seriously look at lowering the voting age, so youth truly do have a voice in public life

Generally speaking, most citizenship education programs want students to be able to critically think, but what they mean varies substantially. If we are to explore the dimensions of critical citizenship education then a good starting point is to consider what it isn’t. Citizenship

education often promotes patriotism, compliance, conformity and as Sigauke indicates a “molding process” (Sigauke, 2011, p. 82), which if taken to the extreme, smells of propaganda and indoctrination. In other cases, fear creeps in and critical exploration is afforded little space in the curriculum as it might expose hidden agendas such as corporate and/or lobbyist plans. Grelle and Metzger (1996) warn that there may be an unhealthy socialization component in citizenship education which, “contribute[s] to the transmission of an overly narrow, uncritical, and chauvinistic conception of citizenship that tends to equate being a good citizen with the acceptance and defense of the status quo” (p. 150). We want youth citizens to be responsible, critical, and engaged. Nikolakaki (2008) claims that,

Education in both content and delivery has been promoting a passive and exclusive habitus. According to Freire (1970-1990), in societies that are characterized by injustice and oppression, the owners of power define the methods, the programs, the content of education, so that the dominant culture is internalized by the masses and their oppression is continued. Thus, education in both content and delivery becomes a weapon whereby the subjected learn to adapt to the oppressor. (p. 227)

If we are to move forward with ACE and a functionally working democracy we should not be accepting a status quo that continues to reproduce and perpetuate systemic oppressions (e.g., poverty, racism and classism). Freire (1970) supports critical citizenship education that provides a space for students to reflect and act upon issues (e.g., praxis) and claims that “Deliberative critical citizenship education is about learning how to connect with one’s fellow citizens to confront power and authority” (p. 299).

There has been a backlash on critical thinking and/or critical citizenship education in schools. Some say they reject what they refer to as postmodernist positions on issues; they want students to

learn facts rather than explore the complexities of truth (Westheimer, 2008). The following excerpt describes this situation:

In the past five years, hundreds of schools, districts, states, and even the federal government [US] have enacted policies that seek to restrict critical analysis of historical and contemporary events in the school curriculum. In June 2006, the Florida Education Omnibus Bill included language specifying that, “The history of the United States shall be taught as genuine history ... American history shall be viewed as factual, not as constructed, shall be viewed as knowable, teachable, and testable.” Other provisions in the bill mandate “flag education, including proper display” and “flag salute” and require educators to stress the importance of free enterprise in the U.S. economy. (Westheimer, 2008, p. 4)

Given the nature of globalism (e.g., uniting people globally), to create new ways of socio-political being (e.g., Appadurai’s ideoscapes, technoscapes and financescapes), and the rights of the child to shape their world, active citizenship education ought to help youth develop the capacity to shape their future, thus critical reflexive elements are imperative. As Giroux (2008) states,

I would like to conceptualize education as a form of provocation and challenge, a practice rooted in an ethical-political vision that attempts to take people beyond the world they already know in a way that does not insist of an fixed set of altered meanings, but instead provokes an expansion of the range of human possibilities and provides the conditions for the development of an informed, critical citizenry capable of actively participating in a Democratic society.

Such a conceptualization of critical citizenship opens the citizenship sphere to include space for creativity, hope and transformation, but there are counterbalances that must also be in place, such as social justice, equity and a responsibility to respectfully and constructively contribute to the system

that affords such opportunities. Foucault (1984) would say we need “an attitude, an ethos, a philosophic life in which the critique of what is at one and the same time the historical analysis of the limits that are imposed on us and an experiment with the possibility of going beyond these” (p. 43). We need to acknowledge that youth are disenfranchised with politics in many ways, that there are populations of youth that are in some regards dispossessed from political life, and that we need to look at options to not patronize youth in general, or subsets of our youth, but rather look at ways, to not only engage them, but to recognize where they stand.

Policies, Curriculum and Pedagogy

As I analyze some of the policies, curriculum and pedagogy specific to citizenship education (e.g., please note there is a list of these documents in the appendix following my conclusion) it is important that I keep in mind that policies are not mere rules to be reinforced or guidelines to follow, but more often they are texts that are deeply rooted in power and designed with intentionality. It often isn't by chance that certain words, or combinations of words, will surface in multiple texts (e.g., ‘knowledge-based society’, ‘good citizens’, ‘tolerant’, ‘competitive’, ‘global’, ‘accountable’, ‘standards’, and ‘21st century education’), but rather they are indicative a larger agenda – in many cases a neoliberal agenda. Ball (1993) states:

Thus we need to appreciate the way in which policy ensembles, collections of related policies, exercise power through a *production* of 'truth' and 'knowledge', as discourses. Discourses are "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak ... Discourses are not about objects; they do not identify objects, they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention" (Foucault, 1977, p. 49)... Words are ordered and combined in particular ways and other combinations are displaced or

excluded. "Discourse may seem of little account" Foucault says "but the prohibitions to which it is subject reveal soon enough its links with desire and power (1971, pp.11-12)".

(p. 13)

A commonality amongst many documents is that they are riddled with neoliberal codes and innuendos. As in the passage by Westheimer (2008), terms such as "genuine history," "testable," "factual," "testable," and "knowable" (p. 4), are far from being neutral, but rather they are indicative of a government seeking to maintain a narrow narrative in educational matters.

I selected a variety of policy, curriculum and pedagogy-related discourse from various institutions in my research findings. My collection includes samplings from UNESCO, the European Union, Latin America, United States, Canada, Quebec, Manitoba and British Columbia. The documents in my research findings represent global, supranational, national and provincial perspectives on ACE. The UNESCO, European Union and Latin American documents tend to represent a narrative that recognizes the interdependency of nations and acknowledges the socio-political aspects of globalization. Overall, the policy and curriculum documents I gathered reveal narratives that promote a variety of topics: performance standards, accountability, competition, meritocracy, global interdependency, individual accountability, Indigenous rights, and universal norms. The gamut and spectrum of initiatives varies substantially.

UNESCO (2007) seeks to "advanc(e), through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind, for which the United Nations Organisation was established and which its charter proclaims" (n.p.). UNESCO's (2010) mandate to member nations is the following:

Member States should promote, at every stage of education, an active civic training which will enable every person to gain a knowledge of the method of operation and the work of public institutions, whether local, national or international; and to participate in the cultural life of the community and in public affairs. Wherever possible, this participation should increasingly link education and action to solve problems at the local, national and international levels. (n.p.)

UNESCO promotes universal rights and practices and encourages civic action at all levels (e.g., from local to global levels). UNESCO did not emerge from a pragmatic need on the part of governments to coordinate their relations in a specific domain (such as the common management of the seas, or the coordination of post and of telecommunication). UNESCO (2007) was “founded on a broader idealist philosophy that ‘since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed’” (n.p.). Member states are expected to voluntarily participate in educational initiatives, many which are citizenship related, to promote the goals of the organization.

UNESCO’s citizenship education materials, which are regularly updated, utilize a human rights framework as per many United Nations documents. UNESCO (2010) states:

Men, women and children all come into the world as individual human beings. Thanks to the immense historical conquest of human rights, we are equal, in rights and dignity, to all other human beings. When citizenship education has the purpose of ‘educating future citizens’ it must necessarily address children, young people and adults, who are living beings, having the status of human beings endowed with conscience and reason. It cannot, therefore, exclude consideration of individuals as subjects, each with individual characteristics. Moreover, human rights include civil and political rights, the latter

obviously relating to the rights and obligations of citizens. Thus a comprehensive human rights education takes account of citizenship, and considers that good citizenship. (n.p.)

UNESCO (1995) is “committed to peace, human rights, democracy and sustainable development, open to other cultures, able to appreciate the value of freedom, respectful of human dignity and differences, and able to prevent conflicts or resolve them by non-violent means” (n.p.) Human rights, peace and security (Burgess, 2009), and sustainability narratives ought to be incorporated into active citizenship programs. Active citizenship education therefore, in this context, can help prepare students to prevent and resolve conflict; support and maintain democratic structures; and promote and uphold sustainable practices – locally, nationally and globally. UNESCO provides a number of free, updated, online active citizenship education materials.

In 2007, the Lisbon Treaty was signed by twenty seven European member states, and in 2009 this international agreement took effect. The Council of Europe (2010) defines what they mean by education for human rights and democratic citizenship as the following:

- a. “Education for democratic citizenship” means education, training, awareness raising, information, practices and activities which aim, by equipping learners with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviour, to empower them to exercise and defend their democratic rights and responsibilities in society, to value diversity and to play an active part in democratic life, with a view to the promotion and protection of democracy and the rule of law.
- b. “Human rights education” means education, training, awareness raising, information, practices and activities which aim, by equipping learners with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviour, to empower learners to contribute to the building and defence of a universal culture of human rights in society,

with a view to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

(Council of Europe, 2010, p.7)

Although the EU identifies the significance of both elements, this division may be problematic as active citizenship sometimes involves having to reconcile one's own rights with the human rights of others, for example. Given that 27 countries had to come together to sign this EU agreement I could see how separating the two simplified negotiations, but ultimately citizens must also be prepared to address the tensions that exist in the areas where human rights and citizenship collide.

On the other hand, the EU is to be commended for all the research on citizenship (e.g., the International Civic and Citizenship Study) it did in order to identify a number key indicators to compare member state levels of active citizenship, and identify gaps between EU goals and classroom practice. It made a number of insightful recommendations to foster student participation in representative democracy including some of the following:

- Establish mechanisms for national dialogue
- Promote the participation of youth in representative democracy
- Make use of information technologies to broaden and deepen participation
- Realize the value of youth centers
- Support the development of intercultural awareness and competencies
- Support educational activities for students to learn more about their rights
- Address housing, homelessness and poverty
- Promote supporting young families
- Promote global exchanges and training
- Encourage green projects and volunteering

- Promote easier access to services for youth (e.g., health, social services and transport
(Council of the European Union, 2009)

The EU provides tangible, informed suggestions for member states, on how to facilitate student engagement in civic affairs. EU active citizenship research indicated that active citizenship learning needs to be supported and facilitated in the classroom, schools and in collaboration with communities (UNESCO, 2010). The need for teacher professional development in the area of active citizenship engagement is suggested in EU reports (European Commission, 2012). Such recommendations ought to be considered when seeking to upgrade ACE and to prevent hegemonic constructions of policy and curriculum.

In the United States steps have been taken to prioritize literacy, math and testing (e.g., NCLB). The NCLB Act, in 2001, reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to make standardization the priority in educational reform. Under the Act states were required to establish rigorous assessments in basic skills, administer standardized tests, and report the results back to the federal government. Schools were responsible to send in their reports in order to maintain federal school funding. In 2010 President Obama reformed the Elementary and Secondary School Act placing an emphasis on literacy, science, technology, engineering and math; citizenship education and critical socio-political examination (e.g., democracy) were not given much priority in the plans. Obama's blueprint states,

All programs will focus on improving student academic achievement in core academic subjects, ranging from English language arts, mathematics, and science, to history, the arts, and financial literacy, as part of a well-rounded education, and providing enrichment activities, which may include activities that improve mental and physical health, opportunities for experiential learning, and greater opportunities for families to actively

and meaningfully engage in their children's education. (US Department of Education, 2010, p.3)

Little was stated about active citizenship education yet, "For more than 200 years - from the country's founding to the early twenty-first century—Americans have believed that the primary purpose of U.S. schools is to educate young people for responsible citizenship"... and they "believed that schools must foster the qualities of mind and heart required for successful government within a constitutional democracy" (State University Education Encyclopedia, 2013, n.p.). According to the State University Education Encyclopedia (2012) "The formal [US] curriculum has three major tasks: providing students with civic knowledge, developing their civic skills, and fostering those dispositions or traits of private and public character essential for citizens in a constitutional democracy" (n.p.). Educational policy in the United States currently does not provide a strong framework on which to build active citizenship education for youth, contemporary society or for future times.

In the Canadian context a few ideas emerged in regards to active citizenship education. One detail that stood out in the research is that provincial bodies would benefit from the gathering of the Ministers of Education together to create a national direction for ACE in secondary schools. This would not have to be at the detriment of provincial autonomy which is where educational powers formally lie in the country. Forums and funding would be necessary to accomplish this. Osbourne (2005) suggests that active citizenship for Canadian students should be developed by developing:

- A sense of Canadian identity that has been established by debate (e.g., shared struggles)
- A distinct Canadian identity within the international community (e.g., League of Nations)
- Awareness of one's rights and the rights of others (e.g., Charter of Rights and Freedoms)
- Commitment to be dutiful and service-oriented citizenship (e.g., voting and volunteering)

- Commitment to international and/or universal values (e.g., tolerance)
- Political literacy (e.g., skills, discernment and engagement)
- Civic knowledge, skills and attitudes (e.g., taking political action)
- Reflective capacities (e.g., critically think through situations)
- Respect for and stewardship of the environment (emerging) (e.g., environmental ethic)

Although the list was presented in 2005 it is not outdated when comparing it to current discourse on active citizenship education. It focuses on political literacy, sustainability, critical reflection, political engagement, political identity that is shaped through dialogue, universal values, constitutional arrangements, and having an international identity. It could expand upon this by going beyond having an international identity, to fostering a global ethic, imperative and voice in the international community, but better implementation strategies ought to be explored. After exploring the citizenship education via social studies curriculum for Manitoba, British Columbia and Quebec, it was the newer elective courses (e.g., Social Justice 12) that are addressing the layers, tensions and more critical aspects of citizenship education that Osbourne has mentioned, leading me to believe that if typical Social Studies programs at the secondary level are going to solidly remain focused on history, geography and government structures then perhaps a stand-alone citizenship course ought to become part of the required curriculum. Otherwise, the lens with which standard courses are taught ought to be altered, or some components of the existing secondary social studies curriculum should make way for considerably more active citizenship education to take place.

At the school, district and ministerial levels, policy ought to shift to institutionalize more democratic ways of being for students (e.g., making citizenship engagement a part of the school experience). As well, the unique needs of diverse students (e.g., new immigrants, refugees, First

Nations) ought to be considered when establishing citizenship education, as one can ascribe an identity and criteria of belonging (Swartz, Harding and De Lannoy, 2012), but that doesn't mean that the individual feels they have that identity or sense of belonging, especially if they are coming from a marginalized demographic group. Initiatives to explore the composition of school bodies ought to take place to inform teachers, schools and school districts about the demographics of students, so that they can adapt citizenship education programs to address the unique needs of students; especially those arriving from other countries.

According to Kee (2004) Quebec's curriculum is built upon mutual respect and understanding, but s/he ponders whether this is enough:

But will a citizenship that is built around a "respect" for difference be enough for the challenges of 2010 and beyond? In cities such as Montreal, international migration is resulting in increasing diversification of the population, with a concomitant loss of a common historical identity. As McGill philosopher Charles Taylor has pointed out, adding to the dissolution of a common identity is increasing differentiation within the population. With the rise of feminism, to cite just one example, unity on political issues has faded, replaced by an increased diversity of opinion. We are witnessing the rise of what Taylor calls a "diasporic consciousness." As a result, "people now live in imagined spaces, spaces where they see themselves situated within a certain society and more and more of these spaces straddle borders and other boundaries."⁴ (n.p.)

Active citizenship education needs to allow students to explore their citizenship identities as well as comprehend the key citizenship markers of the state. As much as citizenship education programs

want to foster a collective Canadian identity, they too need to embrace diversity as a norm, a space and a hybrid identity (e.g., way of being).

Quebec's Social Studies 10 program incorporates a unique approach to studying nationalism. The three sub-themes are Quebecois, Canadian and Native. It also has an interesting way of looking at international relations. It includes looking at Canada's international relations and Quebec's international relations. I don't claim to know enough about the Quebec's citizenship program to comment on these features, or its other features, other than to say they are quite unique. I respectfully understand the distinct rights and needs of Quebec, and I believe that there are pockets of tribalism throughout Canada, probably even within Quebec, and in other places of the world as well. I think a Canadian dialogue on active citizenship education may promote the dialogue we need to have to understand each other. Citizenship education can promote shared differences as well as shared commonalities. A Canadian active citizenship education dialogue (e.g., between provinces, with Indigenous groups, and with marginalized groups) could foster greater appreciation of differences, awareness of those on the margins, and shared understandings about active citizenship education. Such a dialogue could also bring attention to the broader discourses about active citizenship education (e.g., the histories of active citizenship, emerging concerns about active citizenship education and the global dimensions of active citizenship today). Sponsoring such a dialogue ought to be considered by the federal government as it could facilitate understanding and reduce the marginalization of vulnerable groups.

The British Columbia Ministry of Education made three very favourable improvements to the active citizenship components of its secondary social studies programs. It introduced First Nations 12 and First Nations Languages 12 as alternative courses that students can take to replace

their compulsory English 12 and Social Studies 11 courses (BCMOE, 2006). Manitoba also introduced a First Nations course as an elective. The BCMOE (2008) also introduced a very popular Social Justice 12 course that focuses on active citizenship education using a social justice and human rights framework. Manitoba introduced an elective global studies course that is similar. In the Social Justice 12 course students are required to identify, analyze and confront socio-political issues that are occurring at local-to-global levels (BCMOE, 2008). British Columbia introduced a Civics 11 course which focused on government structures but few students elected to take it (Lewis, 2009), unlike the popular Social Justice 12 course. Social Studies 11, which is a required course for graduation, became a provincially examinable course and the standardized test tends to drive the course, leaving little opportunity to explore how to make the course more politically engaging (e.g., as per active citizenship education).

The BC secondary social studies curricula seeks to promote critical thinking, engagement, self-reflexive thinking, open-mindedness, respect for diversity, and awareness of the cultural differences (BCMOE, 2005). Students can explore current affairs and how they can affect change by writing letters, campaigning, protesting and lobbying. It is in the Social Justice 12 course that students are taught to explore the more systemic aspects of social injustices (e.g., environmental racism, homophobia, classism, sexism, and poverty) (BCMOE, 2008). They are required to explore an emergent issue and how they would go about addressing this issue via such ways as petitions, letter writing to government officials and petitions. The course encourages students to identify institutionalized oppressions, deconstruct hegemonic narratives and engage in activities that address social injustices. The new citizenship-related courses offered in British Columbia and Manitoba (e.g., global studies, sustainability, First Nations) ought to be explored as a means to more fully incorporate active citizenship education in school curriculum. They provide students with the

discourse (e.g., systemic oppressions, hegemony, narrative frames), the means (e.g., critical reflection) and the opportunity (e.g., petitions, letter writing, and forums) to engage on issues – this is a start.

Three contemporary models of active citizenship are the active citizen continuum, the active citizenship model (AC model) and the civic pulse model. The active citizenship model depicts the growth of citizens or students from being a member, volunteer, aware and then engaged citizen. The AC model established citizens according to where they are positioned in terms of three scales (e.g., passive/active engagement; individual/community focus; poor/strong civic literacy) and then labels them according to the three dimensional quadrant, or cube, they fit into. Osler and Starkey's Civic Pulse Model (CPM) provides a snapshot of where an individual is according to republic-liberal perspectives. Osler and Starkey (1999) established a checklist to assess citizenship engagement and the three categories they evaluate are "cooperative practice," "independent reasoning and critical awareness," and "intercultural communication" (p. 213). As the purpose of much active citizenship education research is to motivate change that will increase student participation these scales are more useful for monitoring adult demographics. They do offer some insights into how we can present the concept of 'levels of engagement' to students and perhaps begin to establish assessment tools for students, schools and educational ministries to ascertain what types and levels of engagement are they offering or engaging in. More research in this area could be very beneficial, but for the moment an emphasis on recognizing, bolstering and facilitating active citizenship education is where the current need tends to be.

Before Moving On

In the next section I am going to focus on how we ought to move forward with active citizenship education. Before doing so I want to remind us of the unique nature of active citizenship education:

Active citizens usually learn their citizenship skills through trying to solve a problem or to fulfil a mission, rather than by setting out to “learn to be good citizens”. Learning, and citizenship emerge as a consequence of this primary motivation. Learning therefore has to be embedded in those processes...Therefore, learning citizenship is unlike many more formal kinds of learning. It is interactive and deeply embedded in specific contexts. (The European Commission, 2007, p. 2)

As we consider where we ought to go with active citizenship we must always remember a pedagogy of engagement is critical to the teaching of active citizenship, as active citizenship is a site of: struggle, competing interests and visions.

Where We Ought To Be Going?

Based on the information I gathered about where we have been with ACE, where we are at with ACE, and the factors contributing to these circumstances I was able to capture insights into where we ought to be going with active citizenship. A growing gap emerged in citizenship education over time, as stakeholders who were more interested in advancing their own agendas, steered education away from its strongholds (e.g., democratic ideals). Many of the fundamental histories that led to the institutionalization of active citizenship education (e.g., Socrates, Revolutions and Civil Rights Movements) have been swept aside, and we have been propelled into a transnational world that demands, more than ever before, that we critically alter the course many

programs are on. I have organized my summations of ‘Where we Ought to be Go with Active Citizenship Education into the following categories:

- Challenging the Discourses
- Championing Critical Civic Deliberation
- Championing the Civil Liberties
- Second-class Citizenship Rights, Be Gone!
- Championing Emancipation, Equality and Equity
- Domesticating the Rights of the Child and other United Nations Agreements
- Transforming Active Citizenship Education

After researching, analyzing, and synthesizing past and present components of active citizenship education, I now discuss the key themes that emerged from my study. In my research conclusion, I provide recommendations on how to move forward to get to where we ought to be with active citizenship education as well as my overall conclusions.

Challenging the Narratives

Rather than just noting that citizenship education discourse has been hijacked and that we need to confront the masterminding behind the plot, I propose educational researchers, practitioners and policymakers collaboratively, critically and carefully sit down together and construct the story of citizenship education that ought to be. Of course, previous research would serve to inform discussions as would moral, educational and ethical imperatives. Forums can be set up with other groups to inform decisions (e.g., social, cultural and economic stakeholders). Once they establish the desired narrative, then as policymakers often do, they can work backwards to establish the

intricacies of the process. Although from a public policy perspective, Bailey (n.d), offers a framework for such an idea:

Public narrative is the “why” of organising—the art of translating values into action through stories. From stories we learn how to manage ourselves, how to face difficult choices, unfamiliar situations, and uncertain outcomes, because each of us is the protagonist in our own life story, facing everyday challenges, authoring our own choices, and learning from the outcomes. But stories not only teach us how to act – they inspire us *to* act. Stories communicate our values through the language of the heart, our emotions. And it is what we *feel* – our hopes, our cares, our obligations – not simply what we *know* that can inspire us with the courage to act. (n.p.)

As much as we need to critically discern what is necessary, it is important that we note that every endeavour is value-laden to some degree, thus this proverbial elephant in the room must be addressed. As well, the assumptions that are brought into the room must be presented and examined. Do we characterize youth as apathetic, disengaged and future workers or do we recognize that maybe their knowledge and citizenship skills are weak, but that does not necessarily indicate they are ignorant and don't care.

Championing Critical Civic Deliberation

There was a diverse range of documents that I chose to explore active citizenship education and they spanned many disciplines, time frames, geographical locations, political persuasions, historical events, social movements and biographical sketches of significant leaders. When I look at where we have come from with citizenship education I can say without hesitation that we have come from a long line of inspiring, passionate and transformative champions of active citizens who

strived to promote socially just, inspiring and critically engaging citizenship and/or citizenship education. Socrates inspired his students to commit to “the rigorous examination of the faith and morals of the time, giving pride of place to those convictions which are widely shared and rarely questioned ... to swim against the stream” (Kaufman, 1995, p. 22), to explore “compelling alternatives to current fashions” (Elkins, 2008, n.p.), and to “confront and re-vision the philosophy we enact in the discourse of everyday life, a discourse revealed in the way we speak and regard others in conversation” (Elkins, 2008, n.p.). Students ought to be taught in the ways of the Socratic thinking, the history of this great thinker, how to claim their rights as equal citizens, and how to confront power through oral dialogue and textual discourse. Such is the bedrock of active citizenship education.

Critical civic deliberation is essential to active citizenship education but there is an emerging trend in the United States, for example, to retreat back to an emphasis on reading, writing and math, so that the state’s students can facilitate a competitive economic edge for the nation (Brown, 2005). According to Veugelers (2012) the Republican Party of Texas stated in their political platform that they are “politically opposed to critical thinking in public schools throughout the state...Law and order is what counts, and critical education, of course, seeks to subject all laws and claims to order to the lens of critical scrutiny, something the powerful disdain” (n.p.). In 2006, the Florida Education Omnibus Bill stated that, “The history of the United States shall be taught as genuine history...American history shall be viewed as factual, not as constructed, shall be viewed as knowable, teachable and testable” (Westheimer, 2008, p. 4). This is not representative of all the American states, nor is it representative of the US Supreme Court which fervently upholds students rights to free speech as in the *Guiles v. Marineau* case (e.g., US Court of Appeals) (*Guiles v.*

Marineau, 2006), but it presents concern as the bill did pass (American Historical Association, 2007, n.p.).

If we are to take active citizenship education as it was intended during the ancient times of Greece's polis and bring it forward into where we need to go in the future, we need to settle an age old problem that has existed for many years. Is the primary purpose of ACE to "enable students to fit into society" and "reproduce society" or is it to socially transform society as it will always be in "need of improvement" (Clark and Case, 1999, p. 18). I rest my case on the latter – that active citizenship education, like democracy, always requires critical reflection and critique of self and community. As Simpson (2006) states "Socrates' ability to invite and foster conversation, deepen logical clarity, purge one of false belief and arouse curiosity may be worth cultivating in citizens of democracy. Indeed, Socrates's critical reflection is necessary to prevent thoughtless acceptance of beliefs, practices and traditions which could prove detrimental to the flourishing of democracy" (n.p.).

Championing the Civil Liberties

The Magna Carta established many of the civil liberties we have come to accept as a common norm. The most famous verse of the Charter is, "That no freeman ought to be taken, or imprisoned, or disseized of his freehold, liberties, or privileges, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any manner destroyed, or deprived of his life, liberty, or property, but by the judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land" (The Magna Carta, 1215, n. p.). Most social studies courses cover the Magna Carta sometime in their curriculum and as such it remains merely a historical document established by a group of disgruntled barons to confront their king. Some may even have been made aware that it is considered by some to be "the greatest constitutional document of all times"

(Danzinger and Gillingham, 2004, p. 278) or that it influenced what are referred to as the Enlightenment thinkers, and the crafting of both the Declaration of Independence and the Declaration of the Rights of Man. When we consider where we have come from in active citizenship education we must consider that one of the greatest acts of citizenship was to confront power, articulate a social contract and to shape the destiny of the common man. When considering where we ought to go with ACE we must not only teach about the historical significance of some very magnanimous documents (e.g., Magna Carta), but we need to help students to comprehend the lesson that is to be learned from the underdogs who created such documents. As Giroux (2008) states,

What separates an authoritarian from an emancipator notion of education is whether or not education encourages and enables students to deepen their commitments to social justice, equality and individual and social autonomy...Education is always political because it is connected to the acquisition of agency. As a political project, education should illuminate the relationship among knowledge, authority and power. It should also draw attention to questions concerning who has control over the production of knowledge, values and skills, and it should identify how knowledge, identities and authority are constructed with particular sets of relations. (n.p.)

If we want to create effective ACE policy and curriculum for the future, we ought to ensure that students are aware that, like the barons of England who created the Magna Carta, they have the rights to shape their future, to confront power and to carve social contracts that hold their governments accountable and in the process of doing so, ensure that their rights are not trampled upon, nor their actions obstructed.

Second-class Citizenship Rights, Be Gone!

The American Revolution was influenced by the contents of the Magna Carta and the writer John Locke (1632-1740 A.D.), a liberal and influential Enlightenment philosopher, who believed that an individual has the natural right to engage in a political life and that such rights should be institutionalized b) that all citizens should have access to certain privileges and protections such as life, liberty and property, and c) that “meanwhile the citizen is obligated to follow laws, pay taxes, or serve in the military if called on by their state” (Colbern, 2010, n.p.). When British citizens transferred to the colonies they felt their status as full citizens was diminished: “Were they freeman in England and did they become slaves after a six-weeks’ voyage to American” (Breen, 1997, p. 32). The motherland started imposing various taxes: “[T]he Stamp Act seemed an especially poignant reminder for the Americans of their new second-class status ... a calculated insult, clear declaration of exclusion, a denial of English Rights to Americans” (Breen, 1997, p. 32-33). As a result, the colonists sought to establish a new status, identity and sense of belonging – similar in nature to others who in history have established a counter-culture to accept their being dispossessed (Swartz, Harding & Delannoy, 2012).

The American Revolution became a landmark event that revealed how important having full citizenship status and membership rights are to the citizen. It also revealed how the construct of citizenship can be altered very quickly – it shifted from being a rights-based entitlement, to a Revolution, and then it became a new ideal and hoped for reality. As Jefferson said,

I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome

discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education. (Jefferson, 1820, as cited in Cornwell, 2012)

In contemporary times, neoliberal ideologies have impacted conceptualizations of citizenship within the state. Mitchell (2003) states, [E]ducating a child to be a good citizen is no longer synonymous with constituting a well-rounded, nationally oriented, multicultural self, but rather about the attainment of the ‘complex skills’ necessary for individual success in a global economy” (p. 399). If we are to consider where we ought to go with ACE, we need to alter course, so that students recognize they are not second-rate citizens next to corporate personhood, and given the tools to “exercise their control with a whole discretion” (Jefferson, as cited in Cornwell, 2012). As it was claimed in the French Revolution, sovereignty belongs to the people (Wallerstein, 2002).

Championing Emancipation, Equality and Equity

Historically, citizenship curriculums are written assuming that students will transfer what they have learned into their upcoming adult citizenship – this is a far-reaching assumption. Students need more than this as they ought to be able to relate historical events to contemporary issues, to explore how these issues relate to themselves or society at large, and then develop the skills to confront such issues. Hytten (2010) suggests that critical hope is necessary to address inequalities and to emancipate the oppressed from their chains:

Critical hope is grounded in the recognition that “we live in systems of inequality,” the responsibility to “be fully alive in the process of constant change and becoming,” and the realization that we must act even amid “ambiguity and uncertainty” (Boler 2004, 128–129). It is hope that requires participation in social change efforts. It is fueled by the belief that the world is, indeed, unfinished; that our collective actions do change our realities and

create different futures. It is hope that is robust and bold. It includes “a critique of current arrangements, a vision for the future, and political and organizational strategies to move to a preferred future” (McInerney, 2007, 270). It entails recognizing fallibility, accepting incompleteness, and beginning a journey toward change whose ends are uncertain, but whose goals are, nonetheless, worthy. (p. 161)

It is important that students understand the emotive aspects of struggle, oppression and social movements and relate historical struggles to contemporary ones.

Please follow along with me as I recap some historical events while leading to my next conclusion in this section. The French Revolution sparked a demand for citizenship rights in the French colony of Haiti. The French revolutionaries “proclaimed liberty as their highest ideal” (Censer & Hunt, 2001, p.1), thus the Black slaves living in the French colony of Haiti, replicated the call for the same freedoms. An uprising in the French colony of Haiti led to the abolishment of slavery and subsequent changes in citizenship rights and citizenship education in France. Their victory was short lived. When Napoleon took power he aimed to restore slavery on the French colonial islands and “appointed his brother-in-law General Leclerc, a vile racist in his own right, to command sixty-seven ships transporting 20,000 troops – the largest marine force in French history” (Smith,2009, n.p.), to overthrow the Blacks. In the end the slaves not only won, but the new state of Haiti was formed and the abolition movement spread to the United States where slavery was later to also be overthrown. The slave insurgents “ultimately expanded – and ‘universalized’ – the notions of rights, a new colonial order emerged, one in which the principles of universalism were put into effect” and emancipation, “the idea that the rights of citizens were applicable to all people within a nation” (Dubois, 2000, p. 22) emerged as a new norm.

Yet, are students expected to consider that there were populations of Indigenous peoples in Haiti, who lived there long before the French arrived on the island and instituted slavery. Are they asked to explore the concept of doctrine of discovery? In 1938, James wrote the book *The Black Jacobins* and spoke of the European conquest of the New World and the Spanish occupation of Haiti, calling it Hispaniola. James (1938) notes how the Spanish “introduced forced labor in mines, murder, rape, bloodhounds, strange diseases, and artificial famine (by the destruction of cultivation to starve the rebellious)” (Smith, 2009, n.p.). A doctrine of discovery served to legitimize such an abuse as a doctrine of racial superiority served to justify slavery. Hegemonic oppression dominated time periods of discovery, colonization and slavery and as it always does – it crept forward.

After African Americans overcame slavery (e.g., economic emancipation) Martin Luther King Jr. sought to overcome institutionalized segregation and make emancipation a reality in everyday life, public forums and government institutions. He had the moral courage to watch the African American children of Birmingham create their future:

On 2 May [1963] more than a thousand African American students skipped their classes and gathered at Sixth Street Baptist Church to march down to Birmingham. As they approached police lines, hundreds were arrested and carried off to jail in paddy wagons and school buses. When hundreds more young people gathered the following day for another march, commissioner Bull Conner directed the local police and fire departments to use force to halt the demonstration. Images of children being blasted by high-pressure fire hoses, clubbed by police officers, and attacked by police dogs appeared on television and in newspapers and triggered outrage throughout the world. On the evening of 3 May, King offered encouragement to parent of the young protestors in a speech delivered at the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church. He said, “Don’t worry about your children, they are going

to be alright. Don't hold them back if they want to go to jail, for they are not only doing a job for themselves, but for all of America and for all mankind.

African American children marched to gain their freedoms – but the saga of humankind's emancipation from institutionalized oppressions doesn't end there – it continues on throughout time, across the planet, and by young and old.

Shannen Koostachin, A First Nations youth from Attawapiskat, Canada, at the age of 13, sought funding from the Canadian government to have a safe school for her and other children on the reserve where she lived. She lobbied the federal government to fund her dream and encouraged others to join in the plight. In a simple message Koostachin wrote, as cited by Angus (2010): "I would tell the children not to be afraid, to follow their dreams. I would tell them to never give up hope. Get up, pick up your books, and go to school (just not in portables)" (n.p.). Shannen died, at age 16, in a car crash, after leaving her community to attend an off-reserve school (Angus, 2010, n.p.). Her legacy continues on as others seek equitable educational funding for children living on reserves. Shannen, like those from the French, Haitian and American Revolutions; the American Civil Rights Movement; and the Idle No More movement in Canada, was confronting institutionalized oppression.

We are attempting to educate students about the histories, institutions, and the rights and obligations they have to contribute to existing government institutions, but we are not doing enough to encourage them to question, challenge and shape those institutions. We ought to support them in their quests, according to their visions, to shape their communities, nation-states and the planet. As citizens they not only have the right to access the mechanisms of government, but to also change the policies and structures of that system. Active citizenship education, ought to prioritize the

development of youth's creative civic visions for the societies they live in and the world, and encourage them to continue the ongoing saga of addressing institutionally-based oppressions. It is very rare in required social studies curriculum (e.g., social studies) that curriculum includes learning outcomes whereby student address issues of power, hegemony and highly institutionalized oppression. This ought to change.

Citizenship in a Globalized, Digital and Interdependent World

There are three intersecting conclusions I want to present in this section. They all relate to globalization. The first conclusion is related to transnational corporations. According to Gans (2005),

Two aspects of globalization have implications for citizenship. First, the movement of people across national boundaries to live and work calls into question issues of national identity and belonging, of membership in a polity, and of the rights that accrue to that membership. Second, a hallmark of globalization is the existence of transnational and multinational organizations that are overlays on national sovereignty. These exist in parallel with the nation state and both complicate and diffuse the rights and privileges that accrue to citizenship. (p. 2)

Global capitalism, deregulation and new trade agreements were all part of the globalization process. Such deregulation, constituted by some as part of the neoliberal project, increased the powers of transnational corporations. As Westaway (2011) states,

It is clear that the rise in the power and influence of transnational corporations both domestically and internationally, can be attributed to the processes of economic globalization. National economies have over recent years been reducing the political and

financial barriers which have limited their ability to engage in trade activities and attract foreign investment.... Whilst it cannot be denied that the power and influence of transnational corporations provide employment, income and, and in some instances, country wealth, this increase in power and influence has what has been described as a ‘darker side’² – economic devastation, and the ability to operate outside the human rights obligations assumed by each state pursuant to their status as a signatory of various human rights conventions, hence being able to avoid the accountability implications when violations are alleged to have occurred. (n.p.)

In other words, multinational corporations have gained transnational powers that can supersede state and international laws. Citizens have been brought into the transnational sphere, by way of trade agreements and thus, the space of geo-governance that the citizen now lives in has enlarged greatly, while the locus of their power has been diminished enough to compromise it in the global arena.

Students need to be made more aware that as citizens, they have been thrust into a transnational sphere, where individual, democratic and state rights are at risk. Standard curriculum (e.g., as opposed to newly designed elective courses) such as those in the United States, Europe, and the Canadian provinces are not addressing this in any significant way. Other than in the newly designed elective courses such as Social Justice 12 (e.g., BCMOE) or Global Studies 12 (Manitoba Education) very little time is devoted to studying how globalization has propelled citizens into a new ball game – the transnational sphere, and its far-reaching consequences upon state citizens. In order to understand these changes, critical deliberation ought to take place (e.g., in curriculum and

classroom dialogue). Students ought to be more informed, about globalization, and their discretionary skills enhanced to address such issues.

Thirdly, studies indicate that a significant number of youth are not voting and have little regard for and/or distrust their political figures and political systems (Dalton, 2008; Henn & Foard, 2011; Tonge & Mycock, 2009). Tonge and Mycock (2009) allege that “a myth of political apathy had developed, which wrongly conflated disenchantment with certain politicians and aspects of the political system,” while Dalton (2008) suggests that “America is witnessing a change in the nature of citizenship and political participation leading to a renaissance of democratic participation – rather than a decline in participation (p. 85). Menard (2010) states:

The role of the media as a socializing agent conducive to the development of civic engagement should not be overlooked. Today, self-image and the image of others are no longer developed solely through interpersonal relations: they are also shaped by the media. It can be assumed that the exponential spread of the Internet and the ever-growing popularity of social media are having an impact on youth civic engagement.¹¹ Through the Internet, it is now possible to access, almost instantaneously, information from foreign countries that previously took days, weeks or months to arrive. Issues of public interest no longer know borders, and people can now debate them almost instantly with anyone anywhere on the planet...Civic engagement has positive effects for individuals, including your people, and for the community.

(p. 3)

Although new policy and curriculum are encouraging more use of the Internet when studying social studies and/or active citizenship education, these same documents are not referring to any research on how the digital world is affecting citizenship, their students and governance. The Internet is full

of websites where students can involve themselves in local, regional, state, supra-state and global affairs. More research needs to be done to determine how youth are engaging in citizen-related activities on the Internet. As well, research indicates that youth engagement in civic affairs bolsters self esteem, spurs them to take on challenges and fosters a sense of social capacity (Menard, 2010).

Generally speaking, we ought to investigate how the digital world, mass migrations and socio-economic shifts, associated with globalization, are affecting active citizenship and ACE. Conversely, students ought to learn how to identify, analyze and address civic affairs related to globalization. We need to identify the role that the Internet plays, or could play, in active citizenship engagement, and determine how that can be measured. Students ought to be empowered to address those aspects of globalization that affect their autonomy, human rights and civic powers. As Suarez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard (2004) state,

While globalization has created a great deal of debate in economic, policy, and grassroots circles, many implications and applications of the phenomenon remain virtual terra incognita. Education is at the center of this uncharted continent. We have barely to consider how these accelerating transnational dynamics are affecting education, particularly precollegiate education. (p.1)

Not only do researchers need to continue with research in this area, but students ought to be made more aware of the global dynamics affecting their own citizenship.

Domesticating the Rights of the Child and other United Nations Agreements

There are a number of international human rights instruments that most developed countries are signatory to, such as the following:

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
- Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)
- Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
- Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNRIP)

Member nations deliberate on the intent of the documents and ratify these legal documents. It is expected that countries domesticate the intent of the conventions, covenants and resolutions into their state laws – the extent to which states do this varies.

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) pertains to children, their rights as active citizens and their learning of active citizenship education. Article 12 (1) of the CRC states: “States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child” (1989, n.p.). Article 3 of the UNCRC (1989) states: “In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration” (n.p.). According to the Children’s Rights Alliance for England (CRAE) (2012)

The right to participate in elections by universal and equal suffrage without distinction of any kind is protected by international law. Any restriction on the right to vote should meet international legal requirements based upon objective and reasonable criteria and constitute a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim. We believe that the exclusion of 16 and 17 year-olds from voting in the UK does not meet these requirements. At 16, young people can pay taxes, leave home, consent to medical treatment, get married or enter a civil partnership, join the armed forces and make lots of other major decisions. However, they are denied the basic rights of citizenship - they have no say in how the country is run, how their taxes are spent and whether the country goes to war. Lowering the voting age would send a clear and positive message to young people that their views count. It would provide a seamless transition from compulsory citizenship education to the opportunity to vote, avoiding what can be for some a seven year gap between their formal education about voting and their first national election. (n.p.)

Suffrage for sixteen and seventeen year olds is gaining momentum in the global sphere and many arguments are being based on the UNCRC.

According to UNICEF in 2008, (as cited by the Rights of the Child UK, 2012) as many as forty countries have implemented UNCRC into their state laws. The practice is quite feasible if the political will and/or pressure to do so are strong enough. The Rights of the Child UK indicates that not only would domesticating the UNCRC (e.g., international law) into state law facilitate youth engagement in civic affairs and affirm their citizenship rights (e.g., lowering the vote to 16), but that it would also spur the government to address the socio-political inequities that marginalized youth (e.g., those living in poverty and dropping out of school early to work) endure.

In *Why Incorporate? Making Rights a Reality for Every Child* the Rights of the Child UK (2012) stated that it “calls on the UK Government to demonstrate commitment to children’s rights by giving force and full effect to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in UK law” (p. 3). The situation is such that there are member states lowering or considering lowering their voting age, as it is the expressed desire of a number of youth and their allies to do so. As Switzer (2013) states:

Members of Marois’ party [Parti Quebecois, Canada] have indicated their support for lowering the age to 16 in the past, and countries like Austria, Argentina, Ecuador and Brazil have made similar decisions over the years to combat flagging voter turnout.

Considering young people are the biggest drag on Canada’s overall decline in turnout, it’s something we should consider nationally too. (n.p.)

It would be advantageous if researchers continued to explore the potentialities and significance that lowering the voting age has or could have. Also, given the contents of the CRC, it would be advisable for educators, policy makers and youth workers to consider their position on lowering the voting age. Perhaps youth need allies in advocating for the lowering of the voter age. States ought to seriously consider dropping the voting age to 16, given the CRC, and their desires to increase student involvement in political life.

The Need to Transform Active Citizenship Education

When I started my dissertation I entered with an open-mind, knowing that I sought to explore active citizenship education in the broadest context as possible. I aimed to answer some basic questions regarding where we have been, where we are and where ought we to be going and why. I was content not to constrict my understanding of ACE and other associated terms to one definition, so that again I could explore the pluralities that are in the discourse. I sought to peruse

multiple forms of discourse to glean insights on the wide ecology of ACE and I sought to critically analyze the wide range of discourse I found on related topics. My documents included academic texts, curriculum, policy, reports and other related materials. I saw myself tweaking policy and curriculum and making both grand-sweeping recommendations and more specific recommendations for British Columbia secondary social studies programs. It was in the broader context of ACE that I found answers to my questions, but they were not at all what I expected. I established seven categories upon which I was to situate the answers to my research questions.

The educational structures, policies and curriculum that we have set up to actively engage our youth in civic affairs are impressive in many ways (e.g., history, covering current events, and making attempts to engage them in political affairs), but we are failing to a) recognize the alternative routes of participation they are engaging in b) explore youth's disregard for, distrust of and deliberate choice of alternative paths of political engagement and most importantly c) to help them identify, analyze and confront systemic and/or institutionalized oppressions like many others in history have had to (the barons and the Magna Carta; the colonists and the American revolution; the slaves and the Haitian Revolution and American Civil war; Martin Luther King, the Children's Marches and segregation; and Shannen Koostachin and educational apartheid).

We ought not to fear that we will create a group of revolutionaries by teaching them how to constructively and peacefully confront power and that may mean existing government power. We ought to consider giving youth more power by lowering the voting age, directly involving them in parliamentary affairs as commissioners (e.g., as they do in Scotland), and including them in educational governance (e.g. at the ministry, district, school and classroom levels). It isn't just that students want to have a voice and equity in governance but they have a right to share their visions. When I look at British Columbia's curriculum we are not much different from Manitoba. In general

we are not much different than Quebec except in regards to how it presents nationalism and international affairs. It is the fundamental structuring of active citizenship education which ought to be reconsidered. To move forward, we too have to go back to the drawing board, and truly make youth empowerment, critical civic deliberation and youth engagement in all its pluralities, a reality. I have clarified this position below.

The educational structures, policies and curriculum that we have set up for actively engage our youth in civic affairs are impressive in many ways but we are failing to recognize the alternative routes of participation they are engaging in; their disregard for, distrust of and deliberate choice of alternative paths of political engagement, and their need to learn how to identify, analyze and confront contemporary oppressions and emergent situations. The citizenship foundations that many others in history have had to struggle for (e.g., the barons and the Magna Carta; the colonists the slaves and the Haitian Revolution and American Civil war; and Martin Luther King Jr. and integration) have frequently been about confronting institutionalized power that disenfranchises, marginalizes and ignores natural rights. ACE programs ought to prepare students to confront power.

Culminating Analysis

The discourses that originally constructed notions of the citizen, citizenship and the rights of the citizen (e.g., Socrates, Michavelli, Rousseau, Jefferson, Roosevelt, Martin Luther King, Jr., etc.) varied, contradicted one another, and differed but they often shared themes of self-reflection, critique, and emancipation, but over time some of these fundamental pillars fell increasingly by the wayside. As globalization spun its web (e.g., mass migration, the Internet, access to faster systems of travel, free trade, etc.) and neoliberal discourse transformed local, state and global systems,

citizenship education like other aspects of society also changed. The new “global” (Johnson & Morris, 2010, p. 77), “unregulated” (Neubauer, 2011, p. 207) “knowledge society” (Androulla Vassiliou, as cited by the European Commission, 2012, p. 3), claimed necessity alongside “efficiency” (European Commission, 2009, p. 1), “choice” (BCMOE, 2008, p. 3), “free trade” (European Commission, 2009, p. 1) and a new vision of citizenship. At the same time the spirit of globalism (e.g., global community) expanded and universal discourses such as sustainability, cooperation, and human rights were promoted, but also used at times to disguise development (e.g., fracking for natural gas presented as a green energy project). Many of these discourses became imbedded within the corporate world and spread into public institutions – education was not immune to this.

At the turn of the 21st century, the once “invisible hand of the market,” (Smith, 1776, n.p.) self-propelled in theory, was insisting that it required ‘cheaper labourers’, more ‘consumers’, and ‘productive citizens’ (e.g., students) who would fit into a newly inspired ‘knowledge society’ (Androulla Vassiliou, as cited by the European Commission, 2012, p. 3). Governments were expected to produce globally “competitive” (Alberta Education, 2010, p. 6), “improved workers” (European Commission, 2009, p.1), and “productive citizens” (Torlakson, 2011, p. 4) who had an “entrepreneurial spirit” (Alberta Education, 2001, p.1). In the quest to stay globally competitive, state policymakers insisted upon “standardized tests” (NCLB, 2010, p. 3), “accountability” (Gunzenhauser and Hyde, 2007, p. 489) and new priorities: “literacy” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, p. 3) and “numeracy” (BCMOE, 2010, p. 1). The purpose of education was altered, and so to was citizenship education. By connecting various discourses I have tried to demonstrate how an ideological genre, resulted in a new story of citizenship education – a disastrous one at that.

Those creating citizenship education policy and curriculum need to be confident, rather than fearful, of critical engaged youth who are able to constructively and peacefully confront power, even if this may mean they may give challenge to existing government power. Governments ought to consider lowering the voting age, involving students in parliamentary affairs as commissioners (e.g., Scotland), and including citizenship in all areas of educational governance. As we research and develop citizenship education programs we need to embrace the complexities of citizenship, identity, and belonging and aim to foster emancipation, democratic ideals and equality, so that our programs become more inclusive and authentic.

Youth often want to use less conventional paths to participate as citizens (e.g., Internet, NGOs and lobbying) and these ought to be recognized. This holds true in many jurisdictions, including British Columbia, and other countries. To move forward, we too have to go back to the drawing board, and truly make youth empowerment, critical civic deliberation and youth engagement in all their pluralities, more of a reality. As Foucault (1997) would say, "Critique would essentially insure the desubjugation of the subject in the context of what we would call, in a word, the politics of truth" (p.132).

Chapter 7: CONCLUSION

The citizen has come from a long and passionate history of struggle, critical deliberation and emancipation. Constructs of citizenship were articulated by societies who struggled to establish how they would be governed, defined and their rights secured. Whether it was Socrates, Thomas Jefferson, Alison Paul, Martin Luther King Jr., or Shannen Koostachin, individuals have over time entered public, political and problem-ridden spaces to claim their rights, shape citizenship, and ensure active citizenship education is taught. As leaders, they epitomized the active citizen, and as I proceed with my conclusion I know that I ought to draw from their moral, ethical and physical courage to seek liberty, equality and the right to establish how one will be democratically governed.

As I explored the contemporary discourses from a range of topics that directly or inferentially related to active citizenship education I realized that a discussion of ACE can flourish when socio-economic, political and environmental issues are brought into the discussion space. Bringing in the dynamics of such factors as globalization, neoliberalism, international law, sustainability, and youth unemployment helped to reveal the many issues that infringe on citizen's rights and/or unjustly impede the rights of certain populations. Citizenship is amidst an expanding always-changing universe, thus, citizens must constantly revisit their privilege, reassess the status of their citizenship in the polis, and reform governance as necessary. We as researchers also must recognize that we are standing on the shoulders of others who have made it possible to explore what active citizenship education was, what it currently is today, and through scholarly research determine what it ought to be in the future and how to get there.

Significant to my research study was the use of CDA to critique citizenship education. I first noted the "denotative" (Korobov, 2001, n.p.) labeling of non-citizens (e.g., dublois and metics) which disqualified them from equal participation, status and rights, and deemed them inferior.

Similarly, Greek women were expected to engage in familial life and accept a reduced citizenship status. Men had to accompany them in their travels and be a conduit for any political concerns they wanted to forward. Tupper (2002) notes that “formal citizenship was lived in exclusive, homogenized spaces by white bourgeois men, and relationships between public and private were mediated by class, race and gender...Rationality, associated with men, was valued over emotion and passion, associated with women” (p. 3). Ironically, and a bit out of sequence in my conclusion, it was men who frantically lost control, and in a juvenile manner, cursed women suffragettes who marched in the streets and threw things at them. “Wearing white [became] a way to demonstrate their [suffragettes] purity in reaction to men hurling insults like ‘Any women *in* the streets must be women *of* the streets’ to discredit their work” (Bloch, 2013, n.p.). Ironically, as well, the women “dressed in robes at public events, personifying America, Democracy, Liberty and Justice, thus linking existing symbols of civic and social virtues to voting rights for women” (Bloch, 2013, n.p.); the women were petitioning for liberty at a time when Roosevelt was promoting, “Order without liberty and liberty without order are equally destructive” (Roosevelt, 1890, n.p.). Early citizenship was masculinized and patriarchal and the remnants of these constructions still continue today.

During the Enlightenment Locke asserted a rationality (e.g. although paternalistic and masculinized in its nature as it disenfranchised women), which asserted that “people were within their rights to remove or alter a government which betrayed their trust. Revolution, then, became the ultimate recourse (and a legitimate one) of a people whom tyranny had deprived of their rights” (Cody, 1988, n.p.). ‘Rights’, ‘reason’, and ‘rebellion’ became codes for ‘revolution’. “Liberté, égalité, fraternité” (Docherty and Khayat, 2006, n.p.); translated as liberty, equality, fraternity; became the national motto of France and the tricolour flag its symbol; but black slavery remained in place until Haitians slaves fought the republic. Emancipation and liberty were branded by use of

symbols, colours and phrases (e.g., signifiers and signs). Discourse played a strong role in the American Revolution, Civil war, and civil rights movement. Words such as liberty, freedom, right, democracy, courage, abolition, morality, equality, opposition, resistance, determination, vision, and reality were used to promote an emancipator ideology and a democratic republic. A discourse shaped a nation, and a nation shaped the discourse of citizenship. Leaders like Noah Webster ensured that citizenship education would be placed in the foreground in educational policy texts, taking a priori role in shaping the nation's youth.

A policy of aggressive assimilation orchestrated by the Canadian government resulted in one of the most grotesque misuses of citizenship education ever witnessed in history. Aboriginal children were subject to humiliation, abuse, sexual abuse, uncleanly surroundings, disease, cultural denigration, language erosion and family alienation. The residential schools are discussed from a historical framework in many social studies classes, but little exists in the curriculum in regards to contemporary conditions. According to an Amnesty International (2012) report,

By every measure, be it respect for treaty and land rights, levels of poverty, average life spans, violence against women and girls, dramatically disproportionate levels of arrest and incarceration or access to government services such as housing, health care, education, water and child protection, Indigenous peoples across Canada continue to face a grave human rights crisis.

Citizenship education ought to address systemic institutional injustices so that the resounding claims of present day equality for all citizens are debunked and the complexities of true realities addressed. Expecting students to “explain the concept of multiculturalism as it applies to race, ethnicity, diversity, and national identity in Canadian society” and “appreciation of culture” (The

Foundation for the Atlantic Canada Social Studies Foundation, 1999, p. 19:18), which are totally inadequate. Simplifying diversity does not address the complexities of inequalities:

Coming in the wake of arrivals in British Columbia of two ships carrying Sri Lanka refugee claimants in 2009 and 2010, the legislation allows groups of migrants, including refugee claimants, to be designated as “irregular arrivals.” The legislation also provides for the designation of groups of refugee claimants who are nationals of countries that are considered to be “safe countries of origin.” (Amnesty International, 2012, pp. 18-19)

Cozy placations that suggest that equality has been accomplished in Canada are deceiving and the lived realities of immigration and immigrants should not be overlooked. As Tupper (2009) states, “There is a propensity, when considering the meaning(s) of citizenship to think in terms of universality and equality rather than difference and inequity (Arnot, 2006; Hall, 2000)” (p. 77).

These binary positions ought to be explored by students. As Martin (2007) states, “We often don’t know what to do with fundamentally opposing models. Our first impulse is usually to determine which is ‘right’ and, by the process of elimination, which is ‘wrong,’ but integrative thinking allows us to “suspend” differing thoughts to capture even more insights (p. 66). Tupper (2009) clarifies this by indicating that one can support universalisms as an ideal but also critique them when they are falsely presenting them as already accomplished.

It was Martin Luther King Jr. (1967) who urged people to use their socio-imaginings to envision a dream of equality and to achieve such through non-violent resistance. His discourse motivated a nation of oppressed African Americans, and their allies, to claim the equality they deserved:

I've seen too much hate to want to hate, myself, and every time I see it, I say to myself, hate is too great a burden to bear. Somehow we must be able to stand up against our most bitter

opponents and say: We shall match your capacity to inflict suffering by our capacity to endure suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. Do to us what you will and we will still love you.... But be assured that we'll wear you down by our capacity to suffer, and one day we will win our freedom. We will not only win freedom for ourselves; we will appeal to your heart and conscience that we will win you in the process, and our victory will be a double victory. (King, as cited by The Quotations Page, 2013, n.p.)

Youth marched in the streets of Birmingham, radio stations delivered encoded messages to the protestors and integration became a reality.

A neoliberal discourse redefined citizenship education and continues to do so in many ways. In my research analysis, I noted how citizenship education discourse was dismantled greatly by a neoliberal agenda. The “invisible hand” (Smith, 1776, n.p.) of unfettered regulation has established a convincing discourse that promotes global “competition”, and a “knowledge society” (Androulla Vassiliou, as cited by the European Commission, 2012, p. 3), “productive citizen” (Torlakson, 2011, p. 4), and student citizens with an “entrepreneurial spirit” (Alberta Education, 2001, p. 1). Citizenship education language was disrupted, deconstructed, and reconstructed via neoliberal discourse.

Attempts are being made to disrupt “thin” (e.g., neoliberal) (Seddon, 2004, p. 173) representations of citizenship that have endorsed “hierarchy, elite agency and mass passivity” (Seddon, 2004, p. 173). Such approaches, as that of Australia’s Civics and Citizenship Education project (CCE) are challenging neoliberal trends (e.g., surveillance) by “filter[ing], reinterpret[ing], renegotiate[ing], and reconstructur[ing]” existing discourses, that merely promote “compliance and homogeneity” (Seddon, 2004, p. 173). In my critical discourse analysis I sought to not only expose how discourse has, is and continues to shape citizenship education, but also how omitting

background language, also contributed to its construction and in some regards its demise. As Tupper (2004) uses the phrase in a book review of Orlowski's, *Teaching About Hegemony: Race, Class, and Democracy in the 21st Century*, I hope my "efforts to deconstruct ubiquitous political terms" that permeate citizenship education, have been "particularly helpful" (p. 1).

Returning to my space (e.g., Universe) metaphor for exploring citizenship education, I suggest that the background space of active citizenship education - the dusty and subaltern dialogues (e.g., historical and marginalized discourses) – is similar to the magnetic turbulence in the cosmos which exists but is not seen or considered significant. Live Science (2011) states:

At first glance, it may seem astronomy and magnetic turbulence would be topics that would provide few societal benefits, however this view couldn't be further from the truth. Not only are there many different ways this research helps humanity, but these benefits touch our lives on many different levels... MHD [Magnetohydrodynamics] turbulence affects many other topics such as how stars and planets are formed, and how cosmic rays accelerate, which is relevant to a huge host of topics of interest to current researchers, from pressure support in the Milky Way galaxy to even global warming and human health. Astronomy in general has huge societal benefits. I really believe that the more people are aware of the scope of the grand universe of which they are a part, the more we will come together as a human race and abandon tribalistic tendencies. If everyone were to realize just how alone we are in space and how precious our planet is, we might be more kind to each other and to the Earth. (n.p.)

As I outline my research conclusions I keep in mind the significance of active citizenship education for youth and the enormous scope that it entails.

In the concrete sense it is important to know where we have been and where we are at with active citizenship education. Students ought to learn about significant historical movements, such as the French and/or American Revolutions, but they need to understand how these events relate to their own civic odyssey. They also need to be able to recognize, analyze and confront emerging issues as did, for example, those in the Haitian Revolution, the suffragette movement and the African American Civil Rights Movement. Claims that youth are politically disengaged require further research because youth are choosing alternative forms of engagement and they are disgruntled with what appear to them as failing government systems. In my analysis I have been able to synthesize where we have been, where we are at currently and where we ought to go with active citizenship – and how to move forward.

Moving Forward: How Do We Get to Where We Need to Be?

Moving Forward: An Overview

Although it is not always advantageous to simplify things, I believe in this case it may be very helpful. There are twelve key points to consider when considering how we ought to move forward with active citizenship. These points address the overarching concerns that I have identified as opposed to looking at specific site-based modifications. This is because it is at the level of the fundamental structures of ACE that the problems reside. The underlying principles of being a citizen, active citizenship surfaced in the ancient Greek polis; saw their way through the Enlightenment; presented themselves in the French, Haitian and American revolutions; motivated African American youth to challenge segregation; and they are still as much a part of citizenship today as they were then.. Globalization has delivered us into a universe where competing discourses, global capitalism and digital connections have impacted the very nature of our governance, sense of belonging, and political engagement. Competing discourses on what active

citizenship should entail emerged. Whether we like it or not, we are now immersed in a new global polis where economics, socio-political affairs, cultural being, socio-imaginings and environmental concerns are interconnected and we need more than ever to critically deliberate our place as citizens in this new world.

We ought to depend on the wisdom of those who dreamed of a new way of existing as citizens, believed that it could happen, and strived to make it happen. We have been catapulted into a new world (e.g., transnational economic trading arrangement and international conventions, covenants and treaties) that we have a right to have a voice in as do youth (e.g., CRC). I have culled my analysis to present a way forward.

Twelve Guiding Points for Active Citizenship Education

The following list summarizes where we ought to go with active citizenship education given where we have been, where we are now, and where we ought to be going. Active citizenship education ought to:

1. Educate students how to be critical, deliberative, and engaged citizens and when doing so teach students the methods that earlier thinkers and/or activists (e.g., Socrates, Rousseau, and Martin Luther King) used and how apply to them to contemporary circumstances.
2. Encourage governments to lower the voting age to sixteen and to establish positions for youth commissioners, or the like, in the architecture of state decision-making.
3. Establish educational policy and curriculum that links the emancipator-struggles against institutional power in the past, to how one would identify, analyze and confront contemporary issues of today.

4. Educate students about the major factors that are influencing their communities, states and the global sphere (e.g., globalization) and have them explore the impact these have on them, their status as citizens and to imagine how they wish to proceed as citizens given this knowledge would.

5. Educate students about the competing discourses on citizenship and active citizenship education, the history of these debates, and critically reflect upon what the concept of active citizenship opt to entail.

6. Ensure that issues such as equity, equality, oppression, marginalization, disenfranchisement, exclusion, inclusion, discrimination, sexism, and heterosexism are part of the active citizenship education discourse for students, educators, policy-makers, curriculum writers and those who select curriculum resources.

7. Ensure that students are actively engaged in citizenship-related activities that involve everything from the local to the transnational realm, the classroom to government offices, and reading about issues to doing something about issues.

8. Explore and recognize the many alternate ways youth are engaging in civic affairs and learn how to socio-politically capitalize on these new structures of engagement (e.g., Internet, volunteering and activism).

9. Have researchers explore the perceptions and lived realities of youth and all citizens (e.g., unemployment, political skepticism, and concern for the future) and the impact that these realities and/or perceptions have on their civic participation.

10. Ensure that citizenship education is not co-opted by neoliberal narratives that focus on citizens as workers, consumers and producers, and education as merely a means towards gaining a

competitive edge. Active citizenship education should be a foundation for education not a sideshow.

11. Ensure that active citizenship education uses inclusive dialogues, representations and activities as students may come from very diverse backgrounds, and still have strong ties to their birth-country and/or be part of, and have blended political identities.

12. Ensure that active citizenship education is given a high priority in the schema of educational purpose (both in formal and informal spheres).

This simplified list of key points was derived from my research. I discovered that the foundations of active citizenship (e.g., early narratives) as well as some of the more universal narratives (e.g., UNESCO) are lacking in many current narratives (e.g., neoliberal). I have provided an example of a hypothetical grade eleven curriculum for British Columbia which follows later in my dissertation.

Fundamental Principles to Guide Active Citizenship Education

In the illustration that follows I provide a navigational chart to guide the development and assessment of active citizenship education. At the center of the universe (e.g., diagram) is the active citizen. As the student, citizen education policy, curriculum, and/or instructional designer travels into the cosmos of citizenship they need to be aware of the ‘Fundamental Principles that Ought to Guide Active Citizenship Education:

- It is built upon a sense of belonging, community and identity
- It is based upon fundamental caring, compassion and civility
- It is built upon unceasing questioning, deliberation and critiquing
- It is based upon fundamental civil liberties: freedom, equality and liberty

- It is based upon struggle, solidarity and emancipation
- Youth citizens need to be informed, engaged and empowered
- ACE universe is contested, has competing stakeholders, transnational in nature, and shaped by contending forces
- ACE universe requires looking after environmental, cultural, human and economic rights

The following diagram graphically synthesizes these points. The elements in the diagram represent the vast universe of active citizenship education as well as the space where active citizenship education discourse, policy and curriculum is created, circulated, and composed




Figure 2. A Blueprint for Designing Active Citizenship Education

Designing a Positive Future for Active Citizenship Education

I have used concentric circles to represent some of the leading principles of active citizenship that I discovered in my research. Based on Socratic teachings the first and most important principle (e.g., having a sense of community, belonging and identity) is located closest to the centre of the circle. Each subsequent ring is relatively placed in order of their approximated significance. Please remember this is an informed recommendation on how we ought to move forward, not an ACE manifesto, that is based on my own ideological paradigm. There are four important ACE quadrants in the diagram: economic; environment and future generations; health, culture and well-being; and social. ACE ought to always take into consideration all four quadrants and seek to balance their representation in decision-making. Far too often active citizenship education programs focus on one quadrant (e.g., neoliberal narrative focus on the economic quadrant). Citizenship lines of engagement extend from local to global positions. This represents early citizenship constructs which were based on the early Greek ideal of community and dichotomizes it with contemporary global narratives that reflect our interdependencies on the planet. There are many factors influencing citizenship such as competing actors, transnational influences, contending stakeholders and contests for power. These are represented in the four corners of the diagram keeping in mind they can occupy any quadrant.

Moving Forward: Final Comments

If we are to navigate where we are to go in the universe of active citizenship education we ought to look at where we have been, where we are, and where we ought to go. Based on the wisdom, courage and visions of those who sought to determine what their citizenship would mean there ought to be a nexus for citizenship which is based on community. Given that there are

contemporary forces that have catapulted us into a globalized world citizens ought to learn how to navigate this new universe. We ought to teach students about the nature of community, belonging and identity (e.g., Socrates); the significance of youth in a democracy (e.g., Annan); the importance of questioning, deliberation and critiquing (e.g., Freire), the right to expect freedom, equality and liberty (e.g., Jefferson); the need to struggle, build solidarity and emancipate (e.g., Alice Paul and the suffragettes) and the importance of being informed, engaged and empowered (e.g., Martin Luther King Jr.). We ought to ensure that when advocating care, equality and belonging in our programs, that we also practice it. Active citizenship education is amidst a large universe after being catapulted into a globally interconnected, fast-paced, economically driven cosmos. It is a contested space, where many stakeholders compete to dominate the narrative and control this new geo-sphere.

Youth ought to be informed, engaged and empowered to shape the world they inhabit and future generations will inhabit. Active citizenship education ought to include the teaching of important histories, government structures and democratic principles, but it also needs to prepare students to enter the current universe of active citizenship and all that it entails – global capitalism, international human rights commitments and the need to secure their rights as citizens. They ought to know that they have the right to challenge institutionalized oppressions such as racism, sexism, poverty, economic disparity and the unhealthy destruction of the environment. They ought to be equipped to do so. As well, increasing youth involvement may require structural changes such as allowing them to vote at age 16, having youth representatives in parliament, and reshaping schools so they become more democratic. As youth are highly engaged in media/technology more highways of telecommunication ought to be developed to engage with youth; this is different than just wanting to engage youth in the ways we want them to. Active citizenship ought to become a space where students can engage with issues and create solutions – teachers will need to be given

professional development so they can teach controversial issues appropriately and effectively. ACE ought to develop a stronger profile in social studies program by being be a stand-alone course, co-joined with another course or embedded better into social studies programs. In the following section I demonstrate how constructing a program is possible and I have chosen British Columbia as a hypothetical site of implementation. I have previously constructed ministry approved curriculum for them before, so I have organized the curriculum guide in a fashion similar to their other formats.

Moving Forward: What a Course Would Look

(BC Active Citizenship 11 Course)

Implementation Strategy

The course outlined here can be implemented in a number ways a) as a means to address citizenship education components in grade 9-11 social studies programs, b) as a collaborative course which is combined with the existing Career and Personal Planning 10 course, c) or as a stand-alone Citizens Taking Action 12 course. For practical reasons only, I would recommend that the course be combined with the existing and compulsory Career and Personal Planning course; the course would be completed in grade 11. This course is not intended to replace Social Studies 11. On a practical level, “positioning” (Neill, 2001, n.p.) the course in this way, creates a paradigm shift from a ‘me to we’ (e.g., Kilberger brothers Me to We campaign) notion of responsibility for students. If this scenario is not possible the contents of the course should be divided and embedded into SS 9, 10 and 11, obviously thus requiring revisions to the existing curriculum. However citizenship education is implemented (e.g., integrated, combined or stand alone) it is important to note that the curriculum is intended to facilitate the growth of citizenship attitudes, understandings

and skills so that students develop the ability to fully engage in public life during and after graduating from school.

Course Rationale

Fostering a strong youth citizenship ethic ought to bring about the same in the adult years. Margaret Mead, an American cultural anthropologist once wrote, “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has”. (Mead, as cited by The Institute for Intercultural Studies, 2009, n.p.). John Diefenbaker, the thirteenth Prime Minister of Canada wrote,

I am a Canadian,
a free Canadian,
free to speak without fear,
free to worship in my own way,
free to stand for what I think right,
free to oppose what I believe wrong,
or free to choose those
who shall govern my country.
This heritage of freedom
I pledge to uphold
for myself and all mankind.

(Diefenbaker, 1960, as cited by Senator Nicole Eaton, 2012, n.p.)

Kielberger, the youngest person to receive the Ontario Medal for Good Citizenship; recipient of both the Meritorious Service Medal (Canada) and the Order of Canada states: "We often feel powerless to do anything about the many problems in the world around us. We are often left to

wonder whether one person can possibly make a difference. Mother Teresa said yes we can. Her life was resounding proof that it is possible” (Kielberger & Kielberger, 2008, p.5). This course seeks to inspire youth to become more active citizens during the school years and during their adult years.

Important Considerations

This course is designed to ensure that the way citizenship is presented in the course is moral, ethical and socially just. According to Manitoba Education (2012a)

An ethos of active democratic citizenship involves developing a set of coherent ethical principles upon which to base decisions and practices. Citizenship is a fluid concept that is subject to continuing change over time: its meaning is often contested, and it is subject to interpretation and debate. In the course of history, citizenship has been used both as a means of strengthening human solidarity and a means of excluding or maltreating groups or individuals while conferring superior privilege and power to others. An ethos of active democratic citizenship in the contemporary world is often referred to as *global citizenship*, since it is based not on nationhood or ethno-cultural exclusivity, but on a fundamental acceptance of the inherent, equal, universal and inalienable rights of all human beings. However, the concept of *global citizenship* is a fairly recent phenomenon, and it too is subject to interpretation and debate. While some thinkers embrace global citizenship as a vision for a sustainable future for all, others argue that citizenship can only truly exist within the bounds of a nation state; hence the idea of global citizenship is either pure idealism or an imposition of Western liberal democratic ideology. Regardless, our students live in a world where national boundaries and identities may not have the same meaning as

they did for previous generations, and students today more easily see themselves as citizens of an interconnected global community. (n. p.)

It is imperative that citizenship education is not presented as only a means to perpetuate the status quo, but rather, that it is presented in a way that is critical, deliberative and just. The above statement would require tinkering by a panel, but it serves as a starting block for such a construction.

Foundational Elements

Youth citizenship education ought to play a prominent role in British Columbia's 21st century educational plans. Youth rights as citizens ought to be re-considered at the school, local, provincial and federal levels using the Conventions of the Rights of the Child as a foundational guidepost. More dialogue is essential to foster greater appreciation, understanding and collaboration between the aboriginal groups living in Canada, residents of the various provinces and territories and with new immigrants to Canada. Canada has been a signatory to a number of new international agreements (e.g., United Nations Rights of the Indigenous Peoples) and these commitments ought to be domesticated and explained to Canadian citizens.

Curriculum Overview

The course is divided into four sections: constructions of citizenship; being a citizen, acting as a citizen; and a personal assessment of citizenship skills, attitudes and behaviours. The course is designed to include the cognitive, affective and psycho-motor (e.g., taking action) domains of learning. Students will be required to engage in critical thinking, self reflection and socio-political imagining. Students will explore citizenship at various levels: the school, the community, provincially, nationally, internationally and globally. They will explore their own citizenship, youth

citizenship and being a Canadian citizen. Environmental, social, economic, political, security and cultural issues will be explored from the vantage point of the capable, active and engaged citizen. Students will learn how to access routes of citizenship engagement, whether they are by way of government structures or informal pathways, to exercise their concerns and rights as citizens.

Curriculum Outline

I. Constructions of Citizenship (30% of time and assessment mark)

- a. History of Citizenship
 - i. Significance of critical deliberation
 - ii. Significance of emancipation
 - iii. Significance of civil rights movements
- b. Constructions of Citizenship
 - i. Local/global/state
 - ii. Youth citizens
 - iii. Defining citizenship
- c. Constructions of the Citizen
 - i. Who is the citizen?
 - ii. Exclusion, inclusions, and marginalization
 - iii. Self identification
- d. Spheres of Citizenship Rights and Responsibilities
 - i. Local, regional and state
 - ii. International, transnational and global
 - iii. Universal Agreements

- e. The Complexities of Citizenship and the Contestations
 - i. Membership, migration and stateless peoples
 - ii. Debates about citizenship
 - iii. Human right and citizenship
 - f. Accessing Government Offices
 - i. Municipal
 - ii. Provincial
 - iii. State and other
- II. Being A Citizen (30% of time and assessment mark)
- i. Democratic Structures, Processes and Operations
 - i. The citizen in a representative democracy
 - ii. Rights, responsibilities and imaginations
 - iii. Voting, volunteering and being connected
 - ii. Deliberation
 - i. Critical literacy, thinking and citizenship
 - ii. Deconstructing, analyzing and reflecting upon issues
 - iii. Assessing the best tools, access route and allies
 - iii. Networks of Citizenship Participation
 - i. Political parties, representatives and officials
 - ii. Allying with collective interest groups
 - iii. Creating networks for participation
- III. Acting as a Citizen (30% of time and assessment)

- i. Identifying Emergent Issues
 - i. School and community
 - ii. Local, regional or provincial
 - iii. State, Supranational and International
- ii. Confronting Emergent Issues
 - i. School and community
 - ii. Local, regional or provincial
 - iii. State, Supranational and International
- iii. Taking Action on a School, Local, or Regional Issue
 - i. Campaigning, volunteering and leading
 - ii. Joining a cause
 - iii. Initiating a project
- iv. Taking Action on a Provincial or Canadian Issue
 - i. Campaigning, volunteering and leading
 - ii. Joining a cause
 - iii. Initiating a project
- v. Taking Action on a Global, International or Transnational Issue
 - i. Campaigning, volunteering and leading
 - ii. Joining a cause
 - iii. Initiating a project

IV. Assessment of Citizenship Skills, Attitudes and Abilities (10% of time and mark)

- i. Self Reflection

- i. Understandings before the course
 - ii. Significant things I learned
 - iii. Where I am at now
- ii. Youth Rights, Responsibilities and Imaginations
 - i. Where are we with young participation?
 - ii. How can we motivate or improve youth's participation in civic affairs?
 - iii. How can we improve structures to facilitate more participation?

Prescribed Learning Outcomes

Following in a similar fashion as other BC social studies curriculum I have designed something similar to what would be called an Integrated Resource Package (e.g., Social Studies 11 IRP). The curriculum is defined by prescribed learning outcomes (chapters), accompanying achievement indicators, and suggested topics of instruction. Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and discuss how individuals and/or groups sought to articulate clear understandings of citizenship, emancipate the oppressed from the oppression and imagine democratic spaces of freedom. Students will take action on critical aspects of each chapter, on some level on (e.g., reflect upon, explain, critically analyze, debate, inform others, contact government or an organization, etc.), for the purpose of building their capacities to engage as citizens in public life. It is expected that students will interact with members of their own school, community, political organizations, government officials and/or public service agencies (e.g., hosting guest speakers, panel debates, public forums, school elections, volunteering, etc.). In section three of the prescribed learning students (e.g., “Taking Action on a School, Local, or Regional Issue”) students are expected to initiate a major project where they identify, research and

confront an important issue (e.g., poverty in their community, election issue, First Nations water conditions).

Section One: Constructions of Citizenship

Chapter 1: History of Citizenship

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate the significance of historical events where critical deliberation, emancipation and civil rights led to the improvement of citizenship structures, rights and processes.

- a. Significance of critical deliberation (e.g., Socrates, Plato, Socrates, Rousseau, Locke, Machiavelli)
- b. Significance of emancipation (e.g., Magna Carta, French Revolution, Haitian Revolution, Proclamation of 1763, American Declaration of Independence, Metis...)
- c. Significance of civil rights and liberation movements (e.g., American civil war, suffragettes, American civil rights movement, underground railway and the Rebellion Losses Bill)

Chapter 2: Constructions of Citizenship

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate what the various levels of citizenship are; the role that youth can contribute to citizenship and develop their own definition of citizenship based on classroom discussion and other research materials.

- a. Local/global/state as well as social/economic/environmental and (e.g., school, municipal, regional, provincial, state, global rights and responsibilities).

- b. Youth citizens (e.g., being and becoming, voting age, rights, responsibilities and mentors such as those from the Birmingham marches)
- c. Defining citizenship (e.g., students will create their own definition, share with the class and in small groups refine a definition)

Chapter 3: Constructions of the Citizen

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate what a citizen is, how they self-identify as a citizen, and how groups of citizens are marginalized by institutional structures.

- a. What is a citizen? (e.g., membership, rights, responsibilities, participation, and deliberation, domains of citizenship as related to the universe of citizenship education diagram outlined in my dissertation)
- b. Exclusion, inclusions, and marginalization (e.g., migrant workers, institutional limitations, racism, sexism, heterosexism and classism; also refer to the twelve fundamental principles to guide citizenship education in my dissertation)
- c. Self identification (e.g., diverse meanings and sense of citizenship)

Chapter 4: Spheres of Citizenship Rights and Responsibilities

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate what the various levels of citizenship are; the role that youth can take in these various spheres and how international agreements affect citizens.

- a. Local, regional and state (e.g., municipalities, regional districts, provincial and state)
- b. International, transnational and global (e.g., NAFTA, EU)

- c. Universal Agreements (e.g., UN Declaration, covenants, conventions, resolutions and treaties)

Chapter Five: The Complexities of Citizenship and the Contestations

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate some of the complexities of citizenship (e.g., migration and stateless people) and how human rights and citizenship intersect.

- a. Membership, migration and stateless peoples (e.g., status of citizenship)
- b. Debates about citizenship (e.g., refugees, migrant workers, etc.)
- c. Human rights and citizenship (e.g., medical and legal rights)

Chapter Six: Government

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate points of access to government systems for citizens.

- a. Municipal (e.g., mayor, councilors, law courts, city planner, etc.)
- b. Provincial and/or regional (e.g., MLA's, portfolios, auditor general, etc.)
- c. State or other (UN secretary general, governor general, Minister of Education, etc.)

Section Two: Being A Citizen (30% of time and assessment mark)

Chapter Seven: Democratic Structures, Processes and Operations

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate whether existing government systems of representation are fair, how they would imagine a different structure, and/or how they are can volunteer in some citizen-related capacity.

- a. The citizen in a representative democracy (e.g., fair representation)
- b. Rights, responsibilities and imaginations (e.g., changes student envisions)

- c. Voting, volunteering and being connected (e.g., Amnesty International)

Chapter 8: Deliberation

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate various socio-political, environmental or cultural issues and how they can voice their concerns to government on these issues.

- a. Critical literacy, thinking and citizenship (e.g., political/media literacy)
- b. Deconstructing, analyzing and reflecting upon issues (e.g., gun control)
- c. Assessing the best tools, access route and allies (e.g., social media)

Chapter Nine: Networks of Citizenship Participation

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate the platform positions of various political parties and non-government agencies, and determine how to locate or establish networks to advance a cause they are concerned about.

- a. Political parties, representatives and officials (e.g., lobbyists)
- b. Allying with collective interest groups (e.g., advocacy)
- c. Creating networks for participation (e.g., web mapping)

Section Three: Acting as a Citizen (30% of time and assessment)

Chapter Ten: Identifying Emergent Issues

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate how to identify and respond to emergent issues using both past and present scenarios.

- a. School and community (e.g., transportation for the elderly)
- b. Local, regional or provincial (e.g., poverty, minimum wage, healthcare)

- c. State, Supranational and International (e.g., national day care program)

Chapter Eleven: Confronting Emergent Issues

Students will be able to identify, research, analyze, deliberate and/or debate, as well as confront, emergent issues that currently present themselves.

- a. School and community (e.g., how have people addressed issues such as inadequate funding and what can people do about these issues today)
- b. Local, regional or provincial (e.g., how have people addressed issues such as the lack of social housing and what can people do about these issues today)
- c. State, Supranational and International (e.g., how have people addressed issues such as Haiti's cholera outbreak and what can people do about these issues today)

Chapter Twelve: Taking Action on a School, Local, or Regional Issue

Students will be able to identify, analyze and take action on an issue of concern. They will regularly consult with their teacher as they proceed with their project.

- a. Campaigning, volunteering, researching and/or leading (e.g., anti-bullying campaign at school)
- b. Joining a cause (e.g., environmental group)
- c. Initiating a project (e.g., water stewardship program for community)

Chapter Thirteen: Taking Action on a Provincial, State or International Issue

Students will be able to identify, analyze and take action on an issue of concern. They will regularly consult with their teacher as they proceed with their project.

- a. Campaigning, volunteering, researching and/or leading (e.g., helping with political campaign)
- b. Joining a cause (e.g., protecting a wildlife area)
- c. Initiating a project (e.g., looking into euthanasia)

Section Four: Assessment of Citizenship Skills, Attitudes and Abilities (10% of time and mark)

Chapter Fourteen: Self Reflection

Students will be able to carefully reflect upon what they have learned, whether it has motivated them to be more active citizens, and how they see themselves engaging in public life in the future.

- a. Understandings before the course (e.g., assumptions about citizenship)
- b. Significant things I learned (e.g., compose a journal and note any changes in your assumptions about citizenship)
- c. Where I am at now with my understanding of citizenship (e.g., assess how the course changed your view of citizenship)

Chapter Fifteen: Youth Rights, Responsibilities and Imaginations

Students will reflect upon youth citizenship, youth participation in civic affairs and how we can improve government structures and processes to increase youth's participation in civic life.

- a. Where are you in regards to your participation in civic affairs? (e.g., taking action, reflective thinking, voting, etc.)
- b. How can we motivate or improve youth's participation in civic affairs?
- c. How can we improve structures and processes to facilitate more participation?

Teachers are expected to follow protocol in terms of ensuring that all prescribed learning outcomes are covered and all achievement indicators are used to guide assessment.

Closing Statements

If we want to advance active citizenship education we must chart where we ought to go according to where we have been, and where we are now, just like an astronomer who has to update his/her charts of the universe (e.g., using results from the Kepler telescope) to plan future projects. Sutherland (2013) reports that,

The Earth isn't unique, nor the center of the universe," said astronomer Geoff Marcy, a UC Berkeley professor who has found more than 70 of the confirmed exoplanets. "The diversity of other worlds is greater than depicted in all the science fiction novels and movies. Aristotle would be proud of us for answering some of the most profound philosophical questions about our place in the universe. (n.p.)

We ought to carefully move forward with active citizenship education, using critical deliberation, ethical reasoning and moral judgment. It is important that we embrace the diverse universe of citizenship, discern the many narratives of citizenship discourse, and disrupt hegemonic narratives that may misguide citizenship education initiatives. We ought to also ensure that students are given opportunities to explore diverse perspectives on citizenship, their own citizenship identities and engage in citizenship activities. We ought to remember that it is the missing narratives, in discourse ecologies, that can manifest some of the greatest oppressions!

APPENDIX: LIST OF POLICY AND CURRICULUM DOCUMENTS
(Citizenship Education)

Organization	Title	Year
BC Ministry of Education	Social Studies 11 Integrated Resource Package	2005
BC Ministry of Education	Social Studies 10 Integrated Resource Package	2006
BC Ministry of Education	Executive Summary Social Studies Curriculum	2007
BC Ministry of Education	Social Justice 12 Integrated Resource Package	2008
BC Ministry of Education	A Vision for 21 st Century Education	2010
BC Ministry of Education	Education for Tomorrow: 2012/13 Transformation Technology Update	2013
Capelle, Crippen & Lundgren for CICE	World Citizenship Education and Teaching Training in a Global Context: CICE Guidelines	2011
Children’s Rights Alliance for England	Children’s Rights Part of Law	2012
Citizenship and Immigration Canada	Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship	2012
Colorado Department of Education	Colorado Academic Standards: Social Studies	2010
Common Core State Standards Initiative	Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies/Science and Technical	2010
Council of Europe	Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights	2010
Davin [Report]	Report on Industrial Schools for Indians and Half- Breeds	1879
EL Civics [US Department Education/Citizenship]	What is EL/Civics Online	2012
European Commission	Citizenship Education in Europe: Eurydice Report	2012

European Commission	Your guide to the Lisbon Treaty	2009
European Commission	Unemployment Statistics	2013
Georgia Board of Education [US]	Georgia performance standards: Social studies	2011
GHK	Active Citizenship Study Report	20007
Guiles v. Marineau US Court of Appeals	Guiles v. Marineau (Docket Nos. 05-0327-cv(L), 05-0517-ev(XAP))	2006
Hungarian Presidency Council of the EU	Youths [sic] Need Active Citizenship	2011
Justice Education Society	Being an Active Citizen: Law, Government and Community Engagement	2010
Manitoba Education	Grade 12 Global Issues: Citizenship and Sustainability (Rationale)	2012
Manitoba Education	History of Canada (Grade 11)	2011
Manitoba Education	Grade 12 Global Issues: Citizenship and Sustainability (Core Concepts)	2012
Manitoba Education	Grade 12 Global Issues: Citizenship and Sustainability (Course Description)	2012
Manitoba Education	Social Studies Welcome!	2012
Manitoba Education	Social Studies Curriculum Documents: Social Studies Grade 11 History of Canada	2012
Mascherini et al. for Joint Research Centre/ CRELL	The Characterization of Active Citizenship in Europe: JRC Technical Report: CRELL Research Report	2009
Menard (for) Ottawa: Library of Parliament	Youth Voter Turnout in Canada: 2 Reasons for the Decline and Efforts to Increase Participation (In Brief)	2010
Milner (for) Institute for Research on	Political Knowledge and Participation Among Canadians and Americans	2009

Public Policy		
National Centre for First Nations Governance	Reclaiming our identity band membership, citizenship and the inherent right	2011
No Child Left Behind Act: US Congress (107 th Meeting)	No Child Left Behind Act	2002
Obama (US President) [White House]	Remarks by the president in welcoming senior staff and cabinet secretaries to the White House	2009
Quebec Ministere de L'Education	Quebec Education Plan: Secondary School (Cycle One)	2004
Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act US Department of Education	The Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act	2010
Rights of the Child UK	Why Incorporate? Making Rights a Reality for Every Child	2012
Senate Standing Committee on Employment Education and Training (Australia)	Education for Active Citizenship	1989
State of Queensland Government [Australia]	Active Citizenship.	2004
The American Civil Liberties Union	Liberty is Always Unfinished Business	1957
The Atlantic Canada Social Studies Foundation	Foundation for the Atlantic Canada Social Studies Curriculum	1999
The European Commission	Engaging People in Active Citizenship: Briefing Paper #44	2007
The European Community	Provisions Amending the Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community...	1992
The Office of the Provincial Advocate for Children and	Our Dreams Matter Too: First Nations Children's	2011

Youth	Rights, Lives and Education	
Torney, Schwille & Amadeo for IEA	Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from IEA Civic Education Project	1999
UNESCO	Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action of Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy	1995
UNESCO	Educating for a Sustainable Future: A Transdisciplinary Vision for Concerted Action	1997
UNESCO	Focus on Participation	2007
UNESCO	Peace in Action	2007
UNESCO	Citizenship Education: Module 7	2010
United Nations General Assembly	United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child	1989

REFERENCES

- Aboagye, E. (2007). *Global citizenship and social justice education in the Canadian postsecondary system*. Retrieved from <http://www.centennialcollege.ca/citizenshipandequity/postsecondarysystem>
- Abbowitz, K. & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research*, 76 (4), 653-690. doi:10.3102/00346543076004653
- Active Citizenship Training. (2007). *ACT: Active Citizenship Training: Measuring the Impact of Informal Learning on Active Citizenship Training*: Retrieved from http://www.act-eu.org/uploads/media/AC-Cube_evolution_report.pdf
- Ahmed, J.U. (2010). Documentary research method: New dimensions. *Indus Journal of Management & Social Science*, 4(1), 1-14.
- Alberta Education (2011). *Framework for learning: Competencies for engaged thinkers and ethical citizens with an entrepreneurial spirit*. Edmonton: Government of Alberta. Retrieved from http://www.gov.bc.ca/premier/attachments/PTC_vision%20for_education.pdf
- Aldenmyr, S.I., Wigg, U.J., & Olsen, M. (2012). Worries and possibilities in active citizenship: Three Swedish educational contexts. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 7(3), 255-270. doi: 10.1177/1746197912456341
- Alibi. (1999). *Description: Magnificent Universe* by Ken Crosswell [Book review blog]. Ken Crosswell.com. Retrieved from <http://kencrosswell.com/magnificentuniverse.html>
- Allison, S. & Bradley, J. (2011, October 12). Quebec exam is bad history, written in bad English. *The Montreal Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://www.westquebecers.com/?action=show&lid=4EI4E-PAETZ-PKHL6&comaction=view&id=8EKD2-AQ61E-QY2G8>

- Allison, S. (2012, October 19). Malavoy and citizenship. *Montreal Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://www2.canada.com/montrealgazette/features/viewpoints/index.html>
- American Historical Association. (2007). American Historical Association statement on the 2006 Florida Education Bill. Retrieved from http://www.historians.org/governance/pd/2007_01_08_Florida.cfm
- Amnesty International. (2004). *Canada: Stolen Sisters. Discrimination and violence against Indigenous women in Canada (Report)*. Retrieved from <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/AMR20/001/2004/en/48f05a31-d589-11dd-bb24-1fb85fe8fa05/amr200012004en.pdf>
- Amnesty International. (2012). *Matching international commitments with national action: A human rights agenda for Canada (Report)*. Retrieved from <http://www.amnesty.ca/research/reports/matching-international-commitments-with-national-action>
- Anderson, S.J. (2010). Tobacco documents research methodology. [FDA Tobacco Products Scientific Advisory Committee Meeting, October 7-8]. Retrieved from <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/AdvisoryCommittees/CommitteesMeetingMaterials/TobaccoProductsScientificAdvisoryCommittee/UCM229124.pdf>
- Angus, C. (2010, July 28). Shannen Koostachin. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/facts-and-arguments/shannen-koostachin/article1387951/>
- Annan, K. (1998, Aug 8). *A society that cuts itself off from its youth severs its lifeline. UN Press Release*. Retrieved from UN website: <http://www.un.org/events/youth98/speeches/sgyouth2.htm>

- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjunctures and difference in the global cultural economy. In J.E. Braziel & A., Mannur. (Eds.). *Theorizing Diaspora* (pp. 25-48). Malden: MA. Blackwell Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.intcul.tohoku.ac.jp/~holden/MediatedSociety/Readings/2003_04/Appadurai.html
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Apple, M. W. (1996). *Cultural politics in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Armario, C. (2011, June 14). Report: Students don't know much about US history. *NBC News*. Retrieved from http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/43397386/ns/us_news-life/t/report-students-dont-know-much-about-us-history/
- Arts, K. (2010). *Coming of age in a world of diversity: An assessment of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Retrieved from <http://repub.eur.nl/res/pub/22645/Inaugural%20Arts%20web.pdf>
- Astronomy 162. (2013). *Colliding Galaxies* [Department of Physics and Astronomy University of Tennessee online]. Retrieved from <http://csep10.phys.utk.edu/astr162/lect/galaxies/colliding.html>
- Ball, S. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in Cultural Politics of Education*, 13(12),10-17. doi: 10.1080/0159630930130203
- Ball, S. J. (1998). Big policies, small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education*, 34(2), 119-130.
- Banks J. A. (Ed.). (2004a). *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Banks, J.A. (2004b). Teaching for social justice, diversity, and citizenship in a global world. *The Educational Forum*, 68, 289-298.
- Banks, J.A. (2011). Educating citizens in diverse societies. *Intercultural Education*, 22(4), 243-251.
- Barker, F. (2010). Learning to be a majority: Negotiating immigration, integration and national membership in Quebec. *Political Science*, 62(1), 11-36. doi:10.1177/0032318710370585
- Bartlett, B., Craig, R. and Sass, G. (1989). *Towards tomorrow: Canada in a changing world – government*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Basok, T. (2008). Constructing grassroots citizenship for non-citizens. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, 20, 265-272.
- BCMOE. (2005). *Social Studies 11 Integrated Resource Package*. Victoria, Canada: BC Ministry of Education, BC. Retrieved from http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp/pdfs/social_studies/2005ss_11.pdf
- BCMOE. (2006). *Social Studies 10 Integrated Resource Package*. Victoria, Canada: BC Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp/pdfs/social_studies/2006ss_10.pdf
- BCMOE. (2007). *Executive summary social studies curriculum (Grades 8 to 12) needs assessment*. Victoria: BC Ministry of Education. Retrieved from www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp/reports/ss8-12_exec_summary.pdf
- BCMOE. (2008). *Social Justice 12 Integrated Resource Package*. Victoria, Canada: BC Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp/pdfs/social_studies/2008socialjustice12.pdf
- BCMOE. (2010). *A vision for 21st century education [Premier's Technology Council]*. Victoria: BC Ministry of Education. Retrieved from British Columbia Ministry of Education (2010)

Retrieved from

http://www.gov.bc.ca/premier/attachments/PTC_vision%20for_education.pdf

BCMOE. (2013). *Education for Tomorrow: 2012/2013 Transformation Technology Update*.

Victoria: BC Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/pubs/tt-plan/2012_bced_tt_plan.pdf

Bennett, C. (2012, October 12). Conservatives' First Nations education numbers don't add up.

iPolitics. Retrieved from <http://www.ipolitics.ca/2012/10/12/carolyn-bennett-conservatives-first-nations-education-numbers-dont-add-up/>

Biesta, G. (2011). *Learning democracy in school and democracy*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Blackledge, A. (2009). *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam:

John Benjamins.

Blatter, J. (2011). Dual citizenship and theories of democracy. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(6-7), 769-

798. Retrieved from <http://www.unilu.ch/files/blatter-dual-citizens-and-theories-of-democracy-oct11.pdf>

Bloch, N. (2013, March 3). *100 years later, lessons from the sufferin' suffragettes*. Retrieved from

<http://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/100-years-later-lessons-from-the-sufferin-suffragettes/>

Blunkett, D. & Taylor, M. (2010). Active citizenship and labour. In, C. Crick & A. Lockyer (Eds.),

Active Citizenship (pp. 26-38). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Bohman, J. (2012). Critical theory. In E. Zalta (Ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*,

(Spring 2012 Edition). Retrieved from

<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2012/entries/critical-theory/>

- Bohnsack, R., Pfaff, N. & Weller, W. (Eds.). (2010). *Qualitative analysis and documentary method: In international educational research*. Barbara Budrich Publishers, Opladen & Farmington Hills, MI. doi: 10.3224/86649236.
- Boje, D.M. (2008). *Critical theory ethics for business and public administration*. Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.
- Bonnet, A. (2012). Toward an evidence base for CLIL: How to integrate qualitative and quantitative as well as process, product and participant perspectives in CLIL Research. *International CLIL Research Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.icrj.eu/14/article7.html>
- Boundless. (2013). Research models: Documents. Retrieved from <https://www.boundless.com/sociology/sociological-research/research-models/documents/>
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Bowen, G. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Bradburn, D. (2010). The problem of citizenship in the American Revolution. *History Compass*, 8 (9), 1093-1113. doi: 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2010.00728.x
- Branson, M.S. (2002). *Civics and citizenship education – A national education goal, formal instruction, the informal curriculum, concerns and issues, improving civic education*. Retrieved from <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1831/Civics-Citizenship-Education.html>
- Break Away. (n.d). *Active citizenship continuum*. Retrieved from <http://alternativebreaks.org/continuum.pdf>
- Breen, T.H. (1997). Ideology and nationalism on the eve of the American Revolution: Revisions once more in need of revising. *The Journal of American History*, 84(1), 13-39.

- Brennan, P. (2012). *The Foucauldian war on the citizen*. Retrieved from <http://cathouse.hivetimes.org.uk/2012/05/22/the-foucauldian-war-on-the-citizen/>
- Brown, W. (2005). *Edgework: critical essays on knowledge and politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bryant, T. (2004). How knowledge and political ideology affects rental housing policy in Ontario, Canada: Application of a knowledge paradigms framework of policy change. *Housing Studies*, 19(4), 635-651.
- Bryce, P. H. (1922). *The story of a national crime* [Ottawa: James Hope & Sons Limited website]. Retrieved from http://www.wherearethechildren.ca/en/documents/bryce_extract.pdf
- Burak, B. (2012, December). The image of the “undesired citizen” in Turkey: A comparative critical discourse analysis of Hurriyet and Zaman Newspapers. *The GWPost*, 1-24.
- Burbules, N., & Berk, R. (1999). Critical Thinking and Critical Pedagogy: Relations, Differences and Limits. In T. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Eds.), *Critical Theories in Education: Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics* (pp. 45-65). New York: Routledge.
- Burgess, J. (2009). Human security and liberal peace. *Public Reason*, 1(1), 91-104.
- Burke T. (1997, March 7). Green blinkers: [Review of the book *Slow Reckoning: The Ecology of a Divided Plane*, by T. Athanasiou], *New Statesman*, p. 47.
- Burn, M.H. (1776). *Letter from Mary Hay Burn to John Hay Burn*. *American Archives Series 5*, Volume 2, p. 1094. Retrieved from <http://lincoln.lib.niu.edu/cgi-bin/amarch/getdoc.pl?/var/lib/philologic/databases/amarch/.24691>

- Callahan, D., & Jennings, B. (1983). *Ethics, the social sciences, and policy analysis*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Campbell, M. (2007, June 29). Canadians' self-knowledge dismal, poll shows. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://dynamitearchives.blogspot.com/2007/06/canadians-self-knowledge-dismal-poll.html>
- Canadian Press. (2012, May 23). 13 percent of Cdns 15 to 29 out of work, school. *CTV News*. Retrieved from <http://www.ctvnews.ca/13-per-cent-of-cdns-aged-15-to-29-out-of-work-school-1.831066>
- Cappelle, G., Crippen, G., & Lundgren, U. (2011). *World citizenship education and teacher training in a global context: CICE guidelines on citizenship education in a global context*. London: CICE Erasmus Academic Network.
- Castles, S. & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. New York: Routledge.
- CBC. (2008, May 16). *Residential schools: A history of residential schools in Canada*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2008/05/16/f-faqs-residential-schools.html>
- Censer, J.R., & Hunt, L. (2001). *Liberty, equality, fraternity: Exploring the French Revolution: Slavery and the Haitian Revolution*. Retrieved from <http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/chap8a.html>
- Centre for Historical Consciousness (2011). *Historical thinking: Concepts. The Historical Thinking Project: Promoting critical historical literacy for the 21st century*. Retrieved from <http://historicalthinking.ca/concepts>
- Changes. (2011). *Active Citizenship: An introduction to active citizenship*. Retrieved from <http://changesuk.net/themes/active-citizenship/>

- Channick, D.E. (2009). *Romantic emulation and aesthetic citizenship* (Dissertation). Irvine: University of California [ProQuest Dissertations and Theses].
- Chiapello, E., & Fairclough, N. (2002). Understanding the new management ideology. A transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism. *Discourse and Society*, 13(2), 185-208.
- Chikwe, M. (2012). Civic education and global citizenship: A Deweyan perspective. *In Factis Pax*, 6(1), 1-25.
- Children's Rights Alliance for England (CRAE) (2012). *Children's rights part of UK Law*. Retrieved from <http://www.crae.org.uk/protecting/uk-law.html>
- Chindia Alert Blog. (2012). *The world turned upside down: How workers are moving from PIIGS to BRICS*. Retrieved from <http://chindia-alert.org/2012/05/19/the-world-turned-upside-down-how-workers-are-moving-from-piigs-to-brics/>
- Chisholm, A. & Gonsalvez, L. (2012). Does Canada advance the cultural sustainability of Aboriginal women? *The International Journal of Social Sustainability in Economic, Social and Cultural Context*. 8(1), 73-86.
- Chouliaraki, L. (2009). *Journalism and the visual politics of war and conflict*. In A. Stuart, (Ed.) *Routledge companion to news and journalism*. Retrieved from <http://www2.lse.ac.uk/media@lse/POLIS/Files/visualpolitics.pdf>
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2012). *Discover Canada: The rights and responsibilities of citizenship*. Retrieved from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/pub/discover.pdf>
- Clark, P., & Case, R. (1999). Four purposes of citizenship education. In P. Clark & R. Case (Eds.), *The Canadian Anthology of Social Studies* (pp. 17-27). Vancouver, BC: Simon Fraser University Press.

- Cleary, L. M., & Peacock, T. D. (1998). *Collected wisdom: American Indian education*. Toronto, Allyn and Bacon.
- Cody, D. (1988). *John Locke*. The Victorian Web (online). Retrieved from <http://www.victorianweb.org/philosophy/locke1.html>
- Cohen, R. (2008, March 10). Tribalism here, and there. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/10/opinion/10webcohen.html?_r=0
- Colbern, A. (2010). *Citizenship*. Riverside: University of California Immigration Research Group. Retrieved from <http://immigration.ucr.edu/know/know-citizen.html>
- Coles, R. (1997). *Doing documentary work*. NY: Oxford.
- Colorado Department of Education. (2009). *Colorado Academic Standards: Social studies*. Retrieved from http://www.cde.state.co.us/CoSocialStudies/Documents/Social_Studies_Adopted_12_10_09.pdf
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010). *Common core state standards for English language arts & literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Washington, DC: Governors Association Center for Best Practices.
- Condon, M. & Phillips, L. (2005). Transnational market governance and economic citizenship: New frontiers for feminist legal theory. *Thomas Jefferson Law Review*, 28, 105-150.
- Congress of the United States (1920). *19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Women's Right to Vote*. Sixty-sixth Congress of the United States of America: First Session. Retrieved from http://ourdocuments.gov/doc_large_image.php?doc=63

- Conley, M. W. (1989). Theories and attitudes towards political education. In K. A. McLeod (Ed.), *Canada and citizenship education* (pp. 137-156). Toronto: Canadian Education Association.
- Connecticut Department of Education. (2011). CT social studies curriculum framework PK-12 (draft). Retrieved from http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/curriculum/socialstudies/CT_Social_Studies_Curriculum_Framework_2011.pdf
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against women (CEDAW). (2008, November 7). *Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Canada* . Retrieved from <http://www.westcoastleaf.org/userfiles/file/CEDAW-C-CAN-CO-7.pdf>
- Copi, I.M., & Cohen, C. (1998). *Introduction to Logic (10th edition)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Cornwell, R. (2012). *Thomas Jefferson on educating the people* [Collection of quotations]. Retrieved from <http://tcfir.org/opinion/Thomas%20Jefferson%20on%20Educating%20the%20People.pdf>
- Corson, D., & Davie, B. (1997). *Encyclopedia of language and education: Oral discourse and education*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Council of Canadians. (2009). *NAFTA's Chapter 11: A threat to the environment and public policy*. Retrieved from <http://canadians.org/trade/documents/NAFTA-chapter11.pdf>
- Council of Europe. (2010). *Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights [Recommendation CM/Rec (2010)7 and explanatory memorandum]*.

Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing. Retrieved from

http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/Source/Charter/Charter_brochure_EN.pdf

Countryman, E. (2003). *The American Revolution (Revised Edition)*. New York: Edward

Cox, B., & Cohen, A. (2011). *Wonders of the Universe*. Harper Collins: New York.

Cox, C., Jaramillo, R., & Reimers, F. (2005). *Education for citizenship and democracy in the Americas: An agenda for Action*. New York: Inter-America Development Bank

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. London: Sage Publications.

Crick, B. & Lockyear, A. (2010). *Active citizenship: What could it achieve and how*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Crick, B. (1998). *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools [The Crick Report on Education for Teaching Citizenship and Democracy]*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

Crick, B. (1999). The presuppositions of citizenship education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 33(3), pp. 337–352.

Cui, D. (2010). Challenging the biased perceptions of “others”: A critical discourse analysis to global citizenship analysis. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 4(1). Retrieved from <http://criticalliteracy.freehostia.com/index.php?journal=criticalliteracy&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=48&path%5B%5D=37>

Curtis, B. (2002). Foucault on governmentality and population: The impossible discovery. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 4, 505-533.

Daily Mail Reporter. (2012, November 20). Spain offers residency to anyone buying a home worth more than 130,000 [British pounds] in bid to save its housing market. *MailOnline*:

Associated Newspapers. Retrieved from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2235318/Spain-offers-residency-buying-home-worth-130-000-bid-save-housing-market.html>

Dalton, R. J. (2008). Citizenship norms and the expansion of political participation. *Political Studies*, 56, 76-98. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00718.x

Danzinger, D. & Gillingham, J. (2003). 1215: *The year of Magna Carta*. New York: Touchstone.

Davies, L., & Issitt, J. (2005). Reflections on citizenship education in Australia, Canada and England. *Comparative Education*, 41(4), 389-410.

Davin, N. F. (1879). *Report on industrial schools for Indians and half-breeds*. Ottawa: S.N. Retrieved from http://www.archive.org/download/cihm_03651/cihm_03651.pdf

Dejoie, J. and Truelove, E. (2012). The Universe. The Universe. Retrieved from http://starchild.gsfc.nasa.gov/docs/StarChild/universe_level2/universe.html

DeLeon, A.P. (2006). The time for action is now! Anarchist theory, critical pedagogy, and radical possibilities. *Journal for Critical Educational Policy Studies*, 4(2).

Demaine, J. (2002). Globalisation and citizenship. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*. 12(2), 117-128. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09620210200200086>

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York: Free Press.

Dickenson, (1767, December 21). Letters from a farmer in Pennsylvania. *Boston Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://www.earlyamerica.com/earlyamerica/bookmarks/farmer/farmorig.html>

Docherty, C. & Khayat, I. (2006). *Liberté, égalité, fraternité*. Retrieved from <http://www.humanityinaction.org/knowledgebase/199-liberte-egalite-fraternite-realite>

- Dubois, L. (2000). La republic metisse: Citizenship, colonialism, and the borders of French history, *Cultural Studies*, 14(1), 15-34.
- Durden, T. (2012, January 30). This is Europe's scariest chart. *Zero Hedge* (online). Retrieved from <http://www.zerohedge.com/news/europes-scariest-chart>
- Eaton, N.C. (2010). Canadian bill of rights. Senate of Canada. Retrieved from <http://nicoleeaton.sencanada.ca/en/Canadian-Bill-of-Rights/>
- Edwards, D.B. (Jr.). (2012). Social movement oriented citizenship in Colombia: The effects of curriculum, pedagogy and extracurricular activities on student orientation. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 7(2), 117-128. doi: 10.1177/1746197911432597
- ELCivics. (2012). *What is 'EL/ Civics Online'?* U.S. Department of Education/Office of Vocational and Adult Education and the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services/Office of Citizenship. Retrieved from <http://www.elcivicsonline.org/what-is-elcol>
- El-Khairi, O. (2010). *Review*. [Review of the book *Active Citizenship: What could it achieve and how?*, by B. Crick (Ed.)]. Retrieved from <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/2010/12/26/book-review-active-citizenship/>
- Elkins, J. (2008). *Socrates and the Socratic method*. Retrieved from <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:http://myweb.wvnet.edu/~jelkins/pr-03/virtue/socrates.html>
- Encyclopædia Britannica. (2013). *Horace Mann Quotes [1848]*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/362466/Horace-Mann/362466suppinfo/Supplemental-Information>

- European Commission. (2009). *Your guide to the Lisbon Treaty*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from http://www.delbih.ec.europa.eu/documents/delegacijaEU_2011121405591575eng.pdf
- European Commission. (2012). Citizenship Education in Europe: *Eurydice Report*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency [EACEA P9 Eurydice and Policy Support]. doi:10.2797/83012
- European Commission. (2013). Unemployment statistics [Eurostat website]. Retrieved from http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Unemployment_statistics
- Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In T.A. Van Dijk, *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press and Blackwell.
- Fairclough, N. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in transdisciplinary research. In, Wodak, R., & Chilton, P. (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis*. (13 ed.) (pp. 53-70). (Discourse approaches to politics, society, and culture). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fairclough, N. (2009). Discourse studies in organizational change. In S. Clegg (Ed.), *Sage Directions in Organizational Study*. Washington, DC: Sage.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Van Dijk, *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction (Volume 2)* (p.258-284). London: Sage.
- Florig, D. (1992). The triumph of the activist state. In, D. Florig, *'The' Power of Presidential Ideologies*. Retrieved from <http://florigkor.com/chapter6r.html>
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H., Dreyfus & P. Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208 -226). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Foucault, M. (1984) What is Enlightenment ? (Qu'est-ce que les Lumières?). In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault Reader* (pp. 32-50). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel (2003). What is Critique? In M., Foucault, P. Rainbow, & N. Rose. *The Essential Foucault: Selections from the Essential Works of Foucault* (264-278). New York: The New Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gagnon, F., & Page, M. (1999). Conceptual framework and analysis. In F. Gagnon & M. Page *Conceptual framework for an analysis of citizenship in liberal democracies (Volume 1)*. [Electronic Version]. Retrieved from <http://canada.metropolis.net/research-policy/cern-pub/index.html>
- Galston, W. (1989). Civic education in the liberal state. In, N.L. Rosenblum (Ed), *Liberalism and the moral life* (pp. 71-88). Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Gans, J. (2005). *Citizenship in the context of globalization*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.
- Gardenfors, P., Woenski, J, & Kijania-Placek, K. (2003). *In the scope of logic, methodology and philosophy of science (Volume Two of the 11th International Congress of logic, methodology and philosophy proceedings)*. New York: Springer Publishing.
- Gasper, P. (2004). The classics of Marxism: The German ideology. *International Socialist Review* (online). Retrieved from <http://www.isreview.org/issues/33/germanideology.shtml>
- Gelbrich, J. (1999). *Education in the Revolutionary Era*. Retrieved from <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/ed416/ae2.html>
- Georgia Department of Education. (2011). Georgia performance standards: Social studies. Retrieved from

<https://www.georgiastandards.org/Standards/Pages/BrowseStandards/SocialStudiesStandards.aspx>

- GHK. (2007). Study on Active Citizenship Education. *Active Citizenship Education Study Report*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/pdf/doc248_en.pdf
- Giddens, A. & Dallmayr, F.R. (1982). *Profiles and critiques in social theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Giroux, H. (2012). The “suicidal state” and the war on youth. *Truthout*. Retrieved from <http://truthout.org/opinion/item/8421-the-suicidal-state-and-the-war-on-youth>
- Giroux, H.A. (1980). Critical theory and rationality in citizenship education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 10(4), 329-366.
- Giroux, H.A. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition (Critical perspectives in social theory)*. London: Heinemann Educational.
- Giroux, H.A. (2003). Critical theory and educational practice. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R.D. Torres, *The critical pedagogy reader* (27-56). New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Giroux, H.A. (2008, Dec 2). Rethinking the Promise of Critical Education Under an Obama Regime [Interview by B. Polychroniou]. *Truthout*. Retrieved from <http://www.truthout.org/article/henry-giroux-rethinking-promise-critical-education>
- Glassford, L. (2010). Citizenship literacy and national self-identity: The historical impact of curriculum and textbooks in shaping the character of Ontario [Active History website]. Retrieved from <http://activehistory.ca/papers/history-paper-5/>

- Gonsalvez, L. (2012). Teacher preparation programs: Integrating sustainability education components using a social justice framework. In W. Leal Filho (Ed.) *Sustainable Development at Universities: New Horizons*. Peter Lang Scientific Publishers, Frankfurt.
- Goodreads. (n.d.) *Socrates quotes*. Retrieved from <http://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/275648.Socrates>
- Gore, J. (2002). *The role of the school in citizenship education in an era of globalization*. Retrieved from <http://www.curriculumsupport.education.nsw.gov.au/secondary/hsie/assets/crosscurriculum/civics/occpapers/citglobal.pdf>
- Gornitzka, A. (2009). Research policy and the European Union- multi-layered policy change? In P. Clancy & D.D. Dill (Eds.), *In the research mission of the university: Policy reforms and institutional response*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Graham, S. (1984). Woodrow Wilson, Alice Paul and the woman suffrage movement. *Political Science Quarterly*, 98(4), 665-679. Retrieved from <http://72.22.72.207/History102/Articles/Alice%20Paul2.pdf>
- Grelle, B., & Metzger, D. (1996). Beyond socialization and multiculturalism: Rethinking the task of citizenship education in a pluralistic society. *Social Education*, 60(3), 147-151.
- Grover, S.C. (2011). *Young People's Human Rights and the Politics of Voting Age, Comparative Perspectives on Law and Justice Series*, New York: Springer Publishing.
- Gundara, J.S. (2004). *Migration, settlement and the state, speech at the human movements and immigration world congress* [Conference Proceedings: Learning to live together: Using educational skills]. Barcelona. Retrieved from

http://www.barcelona2004.org/www.barcelona2004.org/esp/banco_del_conocimiento/docs/PO_44_EN_GUNDARA.pdf

- Gundara, J.S. (2007). Diverse communities, inclusiveness and education for intercultural understanding. *Journal of Education for International Understanding*, 1, 177-197.
- Gundara, J.S. (2011). Ancient Athenian democratic knowledge and citizenship: Connectivity and intercultural implications. *Intercultural Education*, 22(4), 231-241.
- Gunzenhauser, M.G. & Hyde, A. (2007). What is the value of public school accountability? *Educational Theory*, 57(4), 489-507.
- Gusheh, M., & Powell, A. (2010). *Expanding citizenship: Expanding our understanding*. [Conference proceedings from 1st Global Conference: The Citizen in the 21st Century. Sydney, Australia. February 4th -6th, 2010]. Retrieved from <http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/probing-the-boundaries/persons/the-citizen-in-the-21st-century/conference-programme-papers-and-abstracts/session-10-youth-citizenship/>
- Habermas, J. (1970). On systematically distorted communication. *Inquiry: An interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*, 1(4), 205-218. doi:10.1080/00201747008601590
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action (Volume 1)*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action (Volume 2)*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1990), *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. (2003). *Truth and Justification*. (B. Fultner, Trans.). Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Haderer, M. (2005). *Form alien to citizen: On membership and boundaries* (Master's thesis).

Retrieved from Central European University website:

<http://web.ceu.hu/nation/theses/Haderer.pdf>

Hamrick, F.A. (1998). Democratic citizenship and student activism. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(5), 449-460.

Hancock, J. (1765, October 21). Letter to Bernard and Harrison: John Hancock, his book. [U.S. Archives]. Retrieved from

http://www02.us.archive.org/stream/johnhancock00browrich/johnhancock00browrich_djvu.txt

Hanisch, C. (1969). *The Personal is Political*. Retrieved from

<http://www.carolhanisch.org/CHwritings/PIP.html>

Hanson, T. (2012, April 18). Court victory for First Nations child welfare. *The Canadian Press*.

Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/story/2012/04/18/pol-first-nations-court-welfare.html>

Haque, M. S. (2008). Global rise of neoliberal state and its impact on citizenship: Experiences in developing nations. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 36, 11-3.

Harper, I.H. (1922). History of woman suffrage (Vol. 6). [National American Suffrage

Association]. Retrieved from <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/30051/30051-h/30051-h.htm>

Harris, L. (2011). *(Neo)Liberal Citizens of Europe: Politics, Scales, and Visibilities of*

Environmental Citizenship in Contemporary Turkey. [UBC Institute for Resources,

Environment, and Sustainability: Center for Women's and Gender Studies. Retrieved from

http://www.ires.ubc.ca/files/2010/10/Harris_Neoliberal_Citizens_of_Europe_Forthcoming_20111.pdf

- Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature, and the geography of difference*. Maiden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Heater, D. (2004). *Citizenship: The civic ideal in world history, politics and education*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Hebert, Y. & Sears, A. (2001). Citizenship education. *Canadian Education Association*. Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/37071603/Citizenship-Education>
- Hebert, Y. (2004). Citizenship learning at a time of intellectual turmoil: The pervasiveness of language perspectives (pp. 23-48). In L. Deringer, R. Schreyer & P. Wenzel, *Innovative Fremdsprachen-Didaktik: Kolloquium zu Ehren von Wolfgang Butzkamm (23-48)*. New York: Peter Lang. Retrieved from <http://dspace.ucalgary.ca/bitstream/1880/44222/1/citizenship.pdf>
- Hefferman, C. (n.d.). *Document analysis*. Retrieved from: <http://www.drcath.net/toolkit/document.html>
- Held, D. (1987). *Models of democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Held, D. (1996). Development of the modern state. In S. Hall, et al. (Eds.), *Modernity: An introduction to Modern Societies (pp. 55-89)*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics, and culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Henn, M. & Foard, N. (2011). *Young people, political participation and trust in Britain*. EPOP Annual Conference, University of Exeter, UK. Retrieved from

http://www.exeter.ac.uk/media/universityofexeter/research/microsites/epop/papers/Henn_and_Foard_-_Young_People,_Political_Participation_and_Trust_in_Britain.pdf

Higgins, C. (2009, February). End of an era. [Review of the book *Why Socrates died*, by R.

Waterfield]. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2009/feb/28/why-socrates-died-robin-waterfield>

Higonnet, P.L.R. (1980). The politics of linguistic terrorism and grammatical hegemony during the French Revolution. *Social History*, 5(1), 41-69.

Hillwatch. (2013). *Quotations on the character and nature of democracy*. Retrieved from

<http://www.hillwatch.com/pprc/quotes/democracy.aspx>

Hodge, R. & Kress, G. (1988). *Semiotics*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hodgetts, A.B. (1968). *What culture? What heritage? A study of civic education in Canada*.

Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Horkheimer (1982). *Critical Theory*. New York: Seabury Press.

Horkheimer, J. (1993). *Between philosophy and social science*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hoskins, B., Jesinghaus, J., Mascherini, M., Munda, G., Nardo, M., Saisana, Van Nijlen, D.,

Vidoni, D., & Villalba, E. (2006). *Draft framework on indicators for active citizenship*.

[Paper presented at the European Commission (Crell) Conference, Working towards

Indicators on Active Citizenship]. Ispra, Italy, September.

Howard, C., & Patten, S. (2006). Valuing civics: Political commitment and the new citizenship

education in Australia. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(2), 454-475.

Howe, K., & Meens, D. (2012). *Democracy left behind: How recent education reforms undermine*

local school governance and democratic education. Bolder, CO: National Education

Policy Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/democracy-left-behind>

- Huckin, T. (2002). Critical discourse analysis and the discourse of condescension (Chapter 7). In E. Barton & G. Stygall (Eds.). *Discourse Studies in Composition* (pp. 1-29). New York: Hampton Press.
- Huckin, T. (n.d.). Functional approach: Social approaches: Critical discourse analysis (Section 3-6). Retrieved from <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:1Zl0wYKujPQJ:web4.uwindsor.ca/users/w/winter/40-328.nsf/bab13a777f84009f85256ea600759a11/10ff8b04ff3a317885256d88005720f6/%24FILE/cda.howto.doc+Social+Approaches+6+Critical+Discourse+Analysis+Thomas+N.+Huckin&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca>
- Huckin, T., Andrus, J., & Clary-Lemon, J. (2012). Critical discourse analysis and rhetoric and composition. *National Council of Teachers of English*, 64 (1), 107-129.
- Huckle, J. (1996). Globalisation, Postmodernity and Citizenship. In Steiner, M. (Ed.) *Developing the Global Teacher* (pp. 29-36). Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Huckle, J. (1997). Towards a critical school geography. In D. Tilbury & M. Williams (Eds.). *Teaching and Learning Geography*. London: Routledge.
- Hungarian Presidency of Council of the European Union (HPCEU). (2011, March 29). *Youths need active citizenship*. Retrieved from <http://www.eu2011.hu/news/youths-need-active-citizenship-education>
- Hunter, J., & Jimenez, S. (1998, Nov 30). *Civics and Citizenship Education: What pedagogy? What possibilities?* Short paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in

Education Conference, Adelaide. Retrieved from

<http://www.aare.edu.au/98pap/jim98335.htm>

Hurrell, A., Woods, N. (Eds). (1999). *Inequality, globalization, and world politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hytten, K. (2010). Cultivating hope and building community: Reflections on social justice activism in educational studies (AESAs 2009 Presidential Address). *Educational Studies*, 46,151-167. doi: 10.1080/00131941003622146

Ignatieff, M. (2007). *The rights revolution*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press.

Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Isin, E. (2009). Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity*, 29, 367-388. doi:10.1057/sub.2009.25

Jakubowicz, A. (2009). *Cultural diversity, cosmopolitan citizenship & education: Issues, options and implications for Australia* [A discussion paper for the Australian Education Union]. Sydney, Australia: University of Technology Sydney.

James, C.L.R. (1989). *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingue revolution*. Toronto: Vintage Books.

James, J.H., & Iverson, S.V. (2009). Striving for critical citizenship in a teacher education program: Problems and Possibilities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Fall, 33-46.

Jenson, J. (2009). *Redesigning citizenship regimes after neoliberalism: Ideas about social investment*. [Canada Research Chair in Citizenship and Governance University of Montreal]. Retrieved from <http://www.cccg.umontreal.ca/pdf/Jenson%20RC19%2007.pdf>

- Jerome, L. (2011). Service learning and active citizenship education in England. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 7(1), 59-70. doi:10.1177/1746197911432594
- Jha, A. (2013, January 8). Kepler satellite: astronomers may have discovered 461 new planets. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2013/jan/08/kepler-satellite-461-new-planets>
- Johansson, J. (2007). Learning to be (come) a good European: A critical analysis of the official European Union discourse on European identity and higher education (Doctoral Thesis). [Linköping University]. Retrieved from www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:17138/FULLTEXT01
- Johnson, L. & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *Curriculum Journal*, 2(1), 77-96.
- Johnston, R. (2001). Canadian elections at the millennium. *Choices*, 6(6), 735-745.
- Johnston, S. et al. (2004). *Students for change action manual*. Retrieved from <http://stopogm.net/sites/stopogm.net/files/StudentsManual.pdf>
- JRank Science & Philosophy. (2013). Citizenship overview: Citizenship in the history of political philosophy. Retrieved from <http://science.jrank.org/pages/8629/Citizenship-Overview-Citizenship-in-History-Political-Philosophy.html>
- Justice Education Society. (2010). *Being an active citizen: Law, government and community engagement in BC*. Vancouver: Justice Education Society of BC.
- Kaufman, W.A. (1995). *The future of the humanities: Teaching art, religion, philosophy, literature, and history*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

- Kee, K. (2004). Towards a new world history and citizenship course in Quebec. *Canadian Social Studies*, 38(2). Retrieved from http://www.educ.ualberta.ca/css/Css_38_2/CLquebec_report_kevin_kee.htm
- Kellner, D. (1993). Critical theory today: Visiting the classics. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 10(2), 43-60. Retrieved from <http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/criticaltheorytoday.pdf>
- Kellner, D. (1995). *Media culture: cultural studies, identity and politics between the modern and postmodern*. London: Routledge.
- Kellner, D. (2000). Habermas, the public sphere, and democracy: A critical intervention. Retrieved from <http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/habermaspublicspheredemocracy.pdf>
- Kennelly, J. (2006). 'Acting out' in the public sphere: Community theatre and citizenship education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(2), 541-562.
- Kennelly, J., & Llewellyn, K.R. (2011). Educating for active compliance: Discursive constructions in citizenship education. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(6-7), 897-914.
- Kerr, D. (2000). Citizenship education: An international comparison (200-227). In D. Lawson, J. Cairns, R. Gardner. (Eds.). *Education for citizenship*. London: Continuum.
- Kielberger, C. & Kielberger, M. (2008). *Me to we: Finding meaning in a material world*. Toronto: Me to We.
- King, M. L. (Jr.) (1963, August 28). *I have a dream*. The King Center (Digital Archive). Retrieved from <http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/i-have-dream-1>
- King, M. L. (Jr.). (1963, April 16). Letter from a Birmingham Jail. In King, M.L. (Ed.), *Why we Can't Wait*. [African Studies Center University of Pennsylvania]. Retrieved from

http://afroamhistory.about.com/gi/o.htm?zi=1/XJ&zTi=1&sdn=afroamhistory&cdn=education&tm=4&gps=349_5_1003_581&f=20&tt=3&bt=1&bts=0&zu=http%3A/www.africa.upenn.edu/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html

- Kjellin, M.S. & Stier, J. (2008). Citizenship in the classroom: Transferring and transforming transcultural values. *Intercultural Education*, 19(1), 41-51.
- Klein, N. (2002). *No logo: 10th Anniversary edition*. Toronto: Random House.
- Kohn, A. (1997). How not to teach values: a critical look at character education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, February, 429-439.
- Kreis, S. (2009a). Greek thought: Socrates, Plato and Aristotle [Lecture 8]. *The History Guide [online]*. Retrieved from <http://www.historyguide.org/ancient/lecture8b.html>
- Kreis, S. (2009b). The Athenian origins of direct democracy [Lecture 6]. *The History Guide [online]*. Retrieved from <http://www.historyguide.org/ancient/lecture6b.html>
- Kress, T.M. (2011). *Critical praxis research: Breaking new life into research methods for teachers (Explorations of educational purpose)*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Kuepper, J. (2012). *What are the PIIGS?* Retrieved from <http://internationalinvest.about.com/od/glossary/a/What-Are-The-Piigs.htm>
- Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics*, 104, 352-381. Retrieved October 22, 2010, from <http://www.jstor.org/pss/2381582>
- Laswell, H.D. (1971). *A preview of the policy sciences*. New York: American Elsevier.
- Lee, J.W., & Hébert, Y. (2006). The meaning of being Canadian: A comparison between youth immigrant and non-immigrant origins. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(2), 497-520.

- Legal Information Institute. (n.d.). *Fifth Amendment: An overview*. Retrieved from http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/fifth_amendment
- Levesque, S. (2003). Becoming citizens: High school students and citizenship in British Columbia and Quebec. *Encounters on Education, 4*, 107-126.
- Lewis, J. P. (2009). Is civic education the answer? The futile search for policy solutions to youth political apathy. In M. Print & H. Milner, H. (Eds.). *Civic Education and Youth Political Participation* (pp. 23-43). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Linder, D.O. (2002). *Famous trials: The trial of Socrates*. [University of Missouri School of Law Faculty project]. Retrieved from <http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/socrates/socrateschrono.html>
- Live Science. (2011). *Astrophysicist explores our turbulent universe*. Retrieved from Live Science website at <http://www.livescience.com/16871-burkhart-turbulent-universe-nsf-sl.html>
- Lockyer, A. (2010). Introduction. In B. Crick & A. Lockyer. *Active Citizenship* (pp.1-15). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Luke, A. (1997). Theory and practice in critical science discourse. In L.Saha (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the sociology of education*. Retrieved from <http://gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/ed270/Luke/SAHA6.html>
- Luke, A. (2008). Theory and practice in critical discourse analysis. *International Encyclopedia of the Sociology of Education*. Brisbane, Australia: Elsevier Science
- Lundholm, C. (2011). Society's response to environmental challenges: Citizenship and the role of knowledge. *In Factis Pax, 5*(1), 80-96.

Macdonald, G. & Hursh, D. (2006). *Twenty-first century schools: Knowledge, networks and new economies*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

MacKinnon, M.P., Pitre, S., & Watling, J. (2007, October). Lost in translation: (Mis)understanding youth engagement- synthesis report – charting the course for youth civic engagement and political participation. *Canadian Policy Research Networks*. Retrieved from http://www.cprn.org/documents/48800_EN.pdf

Maguth, B. (May, 2012). Examining Digital Natives' Use of Technology for Global Citizenship. Paper presented at the 8th Annual CitizED Conference, University of York, York, England.

Manitoba Education. (2011, March 25). *History of Canada (grade 11): How has Canada's history shaped the Canada of today*. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/socstud/history_gr11/gr11_history.pdf

Manitoba Education. (2012a). *Grade 12 Global issues: Citizenship and sustainability (Core Concepts)*. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/socstud/global_issues/core_concepts.pdf

Manitoba Education. (2012b). *Grade 12 Global Issues: Citizenship and sustainability*. (Course Description). Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/socstud/global_issues/index.html

Manitoba Education. (2012c). *Grade 12 Global issues: Citizenship and sustainability (rationale)*. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/socstud/global_issues/course_rationale.pdf

Manitoba Education. (2012d). *Social Studies Welcome!* Retrieved from <http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/socstud/index.html>

- Manitoba Education. (2012e). *Social studies curriculum documents: Social studies grade 11 history of Canada (30F)*. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/socstud/history_gr11/index.html
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing qualitative research (4th edition)*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications. Retrieved from http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/46924_CH_3.pdf
- Martin Luther King Jr. Research and Education Initiative. (2012). Children's crusade. *Stanford University Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from http://mlk-kpp01.stanford.edu/index.php/encyclopedia/encyclopedia/enc_childrens_crusade
- Martin, R. (2007). How successful leaders think. *Harvard Business Review*, June, 60-68.
- Martin, T.R. (2000). *Ancient Greece: From prehistoric to Hellenistic times*. New York, NY: Yale University Press.
- Mascherini M, Manca, A., & Hoskins B. (2009). The characterization of Active Citizenship in Europe. *JRC Scientific and Technical Report* [EUR 23995 EN]. Retrieved from http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/111111111/4854/1/reqno_jrc5406_5_the_characterization_of_active_citizenship_in_europe%5B1%5D.pdf
- Mascherini, M., & Hoskins, B. (2008). Building a composite indicator to measure active citizenship in Europe. 3MC Conference Proceedings: UN Comparative Issues (Session ID 49).
- Mascherini, M., Manca, A., & Hoskins, B. (2009) The Characterization of Active Citizenship. *CRELL Research Paper*. Retrieved from http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/111111111/4854/1/reqno_jrc5406_5_the_characterization_of_active_citizenship_in_europe%5B1%5D.pdf

- Mason, A. (2009). Environmental obligations and the limits of transnational citizenship. *Political Studies*, 57, 280-297, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.2008.00737.x
- Maw, J. (1993). The National Curriculum Council and the whole curriculum: Reconstruction of a discourse? *Curriculum Studies*, 1(1), 55-74.
- Mayhall, L.E.N. (2003.) *The militant suffrage movement: Citizenship and resistance in Britain. 1860-1930*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McCarthy, C., Giardina, M., Harewood, S., & Park J. (2004). Contesting culture: Identity and curriculum dilemmas in the age of globalization, postcolonialism, and multiplicity. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow. (Eds.), *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education* (pp. 449-465). New York: Routledge.
- McGregor, S. (2003). Critical science approach--a primer. *Kappa Omicron Nu Forum*, 15(1), Retrieved from http://www.kon.org/cfp/critical_science_primer.pdf
- McKenzie, B. & Morrissette, V. (2003). Social work practice with Canadians of Aboriginal background: Guidelines for respectful social work. In A. Al-Krenawi & J. Graham (Eds.) *Multicultural social work in Canada: Working with diverse ethno-racial communities* (pp.251-282). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- McKenzie, B., & Morrissette, V. (2002). Social work practice with Canadians of Aboriginal background: guidelines for respectful social work. In A. Al-Krenawi & J. R. Graham (Eds.), *Multicultural Social Work in Canada* (pp. 251-282). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- McKenzie, H. (1993). *Citizenship education in Canada*. Retrieved from <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection-R/LoPBdP/BP/bp326-e.htm>

- McLaren, P. (1999). A Pedagogy of Possibility: Reflecting upon Paulo Freire's Politics of Education: In Memory of Paulo Freire. *Educational Researcher*, 28(2), 49-54.
- McLaughlin, T.H. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), 235-250.
- McLean, S. and Dellot, B. (2011). *The civic measuring active citizenship in cold climate*. Retrieved from http://www.thersa.org/_data/assets/pdf_file/0018/408006/RSA-Civic-pulse_2011.pdf
- McPhee, P. (2002). *Daily life in French Revolution: French history and civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.h-france.net/rude/rude%20volume%20ii/McPhee%20Final%20Version.pdf>
- Mehlinger, D. H. (1977). The crisis in civic education: Education for responsible citizenship: *The Report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Menard, M. (2010, April 20). *Youth voter turnout in Canada: 2.Reasons for the decline and efforts to increase participation (In Brief)*. Ottawa: Library of Parliament. Retrieved from <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/2010-21-e.pdf>
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A quantitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, F, (2012). Aristotle's Political Theory. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (Ed.), Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2012/entries/aristotle-politics/>
- Miller, P., & Rose, N. (2008). *Governing the Present*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

- Mills, R. J. Jr., Eschenfelder, M., & Rudd, D.P. (2009, February). Curriculum analysis and development for advanced foods and catering operations: A study of facilities and resources in an undergraduate hospitality class. *Research in Higher Education*, 2, 1-12.
- Milner, H. (2007). Political knowledge and participation among Canadians and Americans: *Working Paper Series* [no. 2007-01]. Institute for Research on Public Policy. Retrieved from <http://www.irpp.org/wp/archive/wp2007-01.pdf>
- Mitchell, K. (2003). Educating the national citizen in neoliberal times: From the multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 28(4), 387–403.
- Mogalakwe, M. (2006). The use of documentary research methods in social research. *African Sociological Review*, 10(1), 221-230.
- Moody, T. (2010). *Rousseau: 20 questions/20 answers*. Retrieved from <http://philosophy.csusb.edu/~tmoody/Rousseau%20questions%20answers.html>
- Moore, G. (2012, December 19). Bank of America blocks employers from reading Zero Hedge blog (report). *Boston Business Journal (online)*. Retrieved from http://www.bizjournals.com/boston/blog/mass_roundup/2012/12/bank-of-america-blocks-zero-hedge.html
- Moores, E. (2009). *Citizenship for a modern democracy: Youth perspectives on the Canadian multicultural reality* (Digital Thesis: University of Waterloo). Retrieved from <http://is.uwaterloo.ca/erinThesis.pdf>
- Muller, M. (2010). *Doing discourse analysis in critical geopolitics*. Retrieved from <http://espacepolitique.revues.org/index1743.html>

- Nabavi, M. (2010). Constructing the 'citizen' in citizenship education. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, 3(1), 1-10.
- Nails, D. (2010). Socrates. In E. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring Edition online), Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2010/entries/socrates/>
- NASA. (2013). *Dark energy, dark matter*. Retrieved from <http://science.nasa.gov/astrophysics/focus-areas/what-is-dark-energy/>
- National Centre for First Nations Governance. (2011). *Reclaiming our identity band membership, citizenship and the inherent right*. Retrieved from http://fngovernance.org/resources_docs/ReclaimingOurIdentity_Paper.pdf
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2012). *Trust for representative democracy quotes: John F. Kennedy*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/legislatures-elections/trust/trust-for-representative-democracy-civic-educatio.aspx>
- Neill, K. (2001). Korobov: Reconciling Theory with Method: From Conversation Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis to Positioning Analysis. *FQS* .2(3) Retrieved from <http://www.utoronto.ca/~kmacd/IDSC10/Readings/text%20analysis/CDA.pdf>
- Neubauer, R. (2011). Neoliberalism in the information age, or vice versa? Global citizenship, technology and hegemonic ideology. *TripleC: Cognition, Communication and Cooperation*, 9(2), 195-230.
- Neuhouser, F. (2008). *Rousseau on the conflict between 'human' and 'civic' education*. Retrieved from <http://ptw.uchicago.edu/Neuhouser08.pdf>
- New York Times. (1917, September 25). *House moves for woman suffrage; adopts by 181 to 107 rule to create a committee to deal with the subject. Debate a heated one annoyance of President by pickets at White House denounced as 'Outlawry'* [Document ID:

102367693]. Retrieved from <http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=F00610F93B5E11738DDDAC0A94D1405B878DF1D3>

Nichol, R., & Boon-Yee Sim, J. (2007). Singaporean citizenship, national education and social studies: Control, constraints, contradictions and possibilities. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 17-31. Retrieved from

<http://www.citized.info/ejournal/Vol%203%20Number%201/Raymond%20Nichol.pdf>

Nielson, G. (2009). Framing dialogue on immigration in the New York Times. *Aether: The Journal of Media Geography*. Spring, 22-42.

Nikolakaki, M. (2008). Between deliberative and critical citizenship education: Reflections on theory and praxis. In A. Ross & P. Cunningham (Eds.). *Reflecting on Identities: Research, Practice and Innovation* (pp. 227 – 234). Retrieved from

www.learning.londonmet.ac.uk/cice/docs/2008_227.pdf

No Child Left Behind Act. (2002). Public Law 107-110-Jan 8, 2002. 107th Congress [U.S.].

Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Sullivan, M., & Pashby, K. (Eds.). (2008). *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Obama, B. (2009, January 21). *Remarks by the president in welcoming senior staff and cabinet secretaries to the White House*. [The White House Office of the Press Secretary].

Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-welcoming-senior-staff-and-cabinet-secretaries-white-house>

Orhan, O. (2008). The civic environmental approach. *The Good Society*, 17(2), 38-44.

- Osborne, K. (2005). *Schools, citizenship and democracy: Citizenship education for civic engagement and social justice* [Manitoba Association of School Superintendents speech]. Retrieved from <http://www.mass.mb.ca/documents/SchoolsCitizenshipforweb.pdf>
- Osler, S., & Starkey, H. (1999). Rights, identity and inclusion: European action programmes as political education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 1, 199-215.
- Oyeleye (2012, November 29). Lost and found? Youth, globalise neo-liberalism, and global youth resistance (Blogpost). Retrieved from <http://interactivecultures.org/2012/11/lost-and-found-youth-globalised-neo-liberalism-and-global-youth-resistance/>
- Pacquette, J., & Fallon, G. (2010). *First Nations Education Policy in Canada Progress or Gridlock*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Palaiologou, N. (2011). The modern intercultural persona and civitas: Tracing the path back to the ancient Greek Demoi. *Intercultural Education*, 22(4).
- Palmer, S. (2003). *Engaging disengaged youth in the 21st century: A guide for understanding the trends & meeting the challenges*. Retrieved from <http://www.serviceleader.org/instructors/studentpaper4>
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Paquet, G. (2003). *Governance as subversive bricolage in the 21st century*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Centre of Governance. Retrieved from <http://www.gouvernance.ca/publications/04-2.pdf>
- Partridge, C. (2010). Residential schools: The intergenerational generational impacts on Aboriginal peoples. *Native Social Work Journal*, 7, 33- 62.
- Paul, A. (1909). *Being fed by nostrils is described by Alice Paul, young American suffragette* [London, England archived newspaper article]. Retrieved from <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi->

[bin/ampage?collId=rbcmil&fileName=scripbk6/rbcmilscripbk6.db&recNum=142&itemLink=r?ammem/rbcmillerbib:@field\(NUMBER+@band\(rbcmil+scripbk6\)\)](http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/provinces-agree-to-press-for-national-inquiry-into-missing-aboriginal-women/article11364954/)

- Paul, A. (2013, April 17). Provinces agree to press for national inquiry into missing aboriginal women. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/provinces-agree-to-press-for-national-inquiry-into-missing-aboriginal-women/article11364954/>
- Peterat, L. (1989). Teaching of global concepts in home economics: A curriculum document analysis. *Canadian Home Economics Journal*, 39(1), 14-17.
- Peters, M. (2008). Citizenship in the age of globalization. *global-e: A Global Studies Journal*. Retrieved from <http://global-ejournal.org/2008/02/15/peters/>
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social constructivism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pickett, B.L. (2001). Communitarian citizenship and civil disobedience. *Politics and Policy*, 29(2), 265-289. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-1346.2001.tb00592.x
- Pike, G. (2008). Citizenship education in global context. *Citizenship Education*, 17, 38-49.
- Pinar, W. (2001). *The gender of racial politics and violence in America: lynching, prison rape, & the crisis of masculinity*. New York, NY: P. Lang.
- Pomeroy, S.B., Burstein, S.M., Donlan, W., Tolbert, J., & Tandy, D. (1999). *Ancient Greece: A political, social, and cultural history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Popkewitz, T.S. (1999). Critical traditions, modernisms, and the 'posts'. In T.S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler, *Critical Theories in Education: Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics* (pp. 1-16). New York: Routledge.

- Porfilio, B.J. & Gorlweski, J.A. (2012). Promoting active citizenship through the arts and youth: Canadian youth-led organizations as beacons of hope and transformation. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 8(3), 48-61.
- Québec Ministère de l'Éducation. (2004). *Quebec education plan: Secondary School (Cycle One)*. Quebec: Gouvernement du Québec. Retrieved from <http://www.mels.gouv.qc.ca/sections/programmeFormation/secondaire1/pdf/chapter1.pdf>
- Quotations Page. (2012). *MLK quote*. Retrieved from <http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/33603.html>
- QuotationsBook. (2012). *Sir Edmund Burke quote*. Retrieved from <http://quotationsbook.com/quote/46369/>
- Raborg, C. (2008). *The philosophical influence of John Locke on the Fundamental Ideas of the United States Constitution* [Third place essay winner (tie). Maryland Society, Sons of the American Revolution]. Retrieved from <http://www.marylandsar.org/SAR-Documents/Essay/Third-Tie-Essay-MDSSAR-0708.pdf>
- Ramirez, K.K. (2007). *Native hubs: Culture, community, and belonging in Silicon Valley and beyond*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ranciere, J. (1999). *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ranciere, J. (2004). Who is the subject of the Rights of Man? *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 103, 2/3, 297-310.
- Ranciere, J. (2007). *On the Shores of Politics*. London: Verso.

- Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (2010, March). Washington: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/blueprint.pdf>
- Reid, G. (2010). The fourth principle: Sharing power with the people of Scotland. In B. Crick & A. Lockyer, *Active Citizenship: What could it achieve and how?* (pp. 39-56). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ricento, Thomas (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Richet, E. (2007). *The education system in Canada from 1945- 2005 (thesis)*. Retrieved from <http://library.usask.ca/theses/available/etd-04302007-204958/unrestricted/THESIS.pdf>
- Rights of the Child UK. (2012). *Why incorporate? Making rights a reality for every child*. Rights of the Child UK. Retrieved from <http://www.crae.org.uk/protecting/uk-law.html>
- Rogers, J., Kahne, J., & Middaugh, E. (2007, April). Civic Education and the Multiple Pathways Approach. [A presentation at a meeting examining the possibilities of an enriched vision of vocational education. UCLA: Los Angeles, CA]. Retrieved from <http://www.civicsurvey.org/Multiple%20Pathways.pdf>
- Rogers, R. (2004). *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. London: LEA
- Rogers, Rebecca (Ed.) (2003). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Roosevelt, D.R. (1941). *Third inaugural address*. Retrieved from <http://www.historyplace.com/speeches/fdr-third-inaug.htm>
- Roosevelt, T. (1890). *Roosevelt: Miscellaneous writings, 1890*. Retrieved from <http://www.theodoreroosevelt.org/modern/trisland.htm>

- Rosamond, B. (2002). Imagining the European economy: Competitiveness and the social construction of Europe as an economic space. *New Political Economy*, 7(2), 157-177.
- Rose, N. (2011, January 18). Citizenship education is integral to 'big society'. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2011/jan/18/citizenship-education-integral-big-society>
- Rousseau, J. J. (1911). *Emile* (B. Foxley, Trans.). (Original work published 1762). Retrieved from <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/5427/pg5427.html>
- Rousseau, J., J. (1782). *The Social Contract (Section 1)*. (G.D.H. Cole, Trans). (Original work published 1762). Retrieved from http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/r/rousseau/jean_jacques/r864s/book1.html#section1
- Rousseau, J., J. (1782). *The Social Contract (Section 6)*. (G.D.H. Cole, Trans). (Original work published 1762). Retrieved from http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/r/rousseau/jean_jacques/r864s/book1.html#section6
- Rucinski, T. (2011, June 5). Few options for Europe's indignant youth. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <http://uk.reuters.com/article/2011/06/05/uk-europe-protests-idUKTRE7540KE20110605>
- Ryan, M. (2010). Productions of space: Civic participation of young people at university. Retrieved from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/37752/1/37752.pdf>
- Said, E. (1994). *Orientalism: 25th Anniversary Edition*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Saint, S. (2008). A critical discourse analysis of corporate environmental harm. *Internet Journal of Criminology*. Retrieved from <http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/Saint%20-%20A%20CRITICAL%20DISCOURSE%20ANALYSIS%20OF%20CORPORATE%20ENVIRONMENTAL%20HARM.pdf>

- Sarantakos, S. (2012). Chapter 13: The study of documents. In S.Sarantakos, *Social Research (4th edition) companion workbook*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from <http://www.palgrave.com/sociology/sarantakos4e/workbook/chapter13/index.html>
- Schemo, D.J. (2010, October 19). Preparation for active citizenship not on education agenda [*Remapping Debate* online]. Retrieved from <http://www.remappingdebate.org/article/preparation-active-citizenship-not-education-agenda?page=0,0>
- Schugurensky, D. (2005). *Citizenship and Citizenship Education: Canada in an International Context*. Text prepared as an input for class discussion. Retrieved from http://fcis.oise.utoronto.ca/~daniel_schugurensky/courses/4.citizenship&citized.doc
- Schugurensky, D., & Myers, J.P. (2003). Citizenship education: Theory, research and practice. *Encounters on Education, 4*, 1-10.
- Schultz, L. (2007). Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(3), 248-258.
- Schultz, L., & Guimaraes-Iosif, R. (2012). Citizenship education and the promise of democracy: A study of UNESCO associated schools in Brazil and Canada. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 7*, 241-254. doi: 10.1177/1746197912448712
- Scott, J. (1990) *A matter of record: Documentary sources in social research*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Scott-Bauman, A. (2003). Citizenship and postmodernity. *Intercultural Education, 14*(4), 355-366. doi: 10.1080/1467598032000139813
- Sears, A.M., & Hughes, A.S. (1996). Citizenship education and current educational reform. *Canadian Journal of Education, 21*(2), 123-142. doi:10.2307/1495085

- Seddon, T. (2004). Remaking civic formation: towards a learning citizen? *London Review of Education*, 2(3), 171-186.
- Senate Standing Committee on Employment Education and Training. (1989). *Education for Active Citizenship*, Canberra: AGPS.
- Shalvey, T. (1966). *Claude levi-strauss, social psychotherapy and the collective unconscious*. Hassocks: Harvester Press.
- Sheenhan, W. (2012). *Why question? – The basis of the Socratic method*. Retrieved from <http://www.luxperci.com/why-question-socratic-method/>
- Shephard, M.P., & Patrikios, S. (2012). Making democracy work early formal engagement? : A comparative exploration of youth parliaments in the EU. *Parliamentary Affairs*. May. doi: 10.1093/pa/gss017
- Shmoop Editorial Team. (2008). John F. Kennedy: Civil rights. *Shmoop.com*. Shmoop University. Retrieved from <http://www.shmoop.com/john-f-kennedy/civil-rights.html>
- Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53(3), 248-258.
- Shultz, L. (2009). Conflict, dialogue and justice: Exploring global citizenship education as a social justice project. *Journal of Contemporary Education*, 4(2), 3-15.
- Shulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Losito, B., & Kerr, D. (2008). *International civic and citizenship study: Assessment framework*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Siguake, A.T. (2012). Young people, citizenship and citizenship education in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32, 214-223.

- Siguake, A. T. (2011). Citizenship and citizenship education: A critical discourse analysis of the Zimbabwe Presidential Commission Report. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 6(11), 69-86.
- Simon, H. A. (1981). *The sciences of the artificial* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Simpson, T. (2006). Is Socrates the ideal democratic citizen? *Journal of Thought*. Retrieved from http://www.thefreelibrary.com/_/print/PrintArticle.aspx?id=173422710
- Smith, A. (1776). An inquiry into nature and the causes of the wealth of nations (Book 4: Chapter 2 online). Retrieved from http://spartan.ac.brocku.ca/~tmulligan/3p82inv_hand.html
- Smith, A. (2009). C.L.R. James: The Black Jacobins. *International Socialist Review*, 63. Retrieved from <http://www.isreview.org/issues/63/feat-blackjacobins.shtml>
- Smith, S. (2003, September 18). *Introduction to political philosophy- Socratic Citizenship: Plato, Crito* (Lecture 3: transcript). Retrieved from <http://www.srilankaguardian.org/2011/08/education-lecture-3-socratic.html>
- SolarSystemQuick. (2013). *Facts about the universe*. Retrieved from <http://www.solarsystemquick.com/universe/>
- Starkey, H. (2000). Citizenship education in France and Britain: Evolving theories and practices. *The Curriculum Journal*, 11(1), 39-54.
- State of Queensland Department of Education and Training. (2004). *Active citizenship*. Retrieved from <http://education.qld.gov.au/corporate/newbasics/html/pedagogies/differ/dif5a.html>
- State University Education Encyclopedia. (2013). *Civics and citizenship education – A national education goal, formal instruction, the informal curriculum, concerns and issues, improving civic education*. Retrieved from <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1831/Civics-Citizenship-Education.html>

- Steinberg, S.R., & Kincheloe, J. (2010). Power, emancipation, and complexity: Employing critical theory. *Power and Education*, 2(2), 140-151.
- Streeter, T. (1998). *Semiotic terminology*. Retrieved from http://www.uvm.edu/~tstreete/semiotics_and_ads/terminology.html
- Suarez-Orozco, M., & Qin-Hilliard, D.B. (Eds.) (2004). *Culture and education in the new millennium*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Sutherland, S. (2013). *NASA's Kepler telescope snaps evidence of 100 billion planets in our galaxy*. Retrieved from <http://ca.news.yahoo.com/blogs/geekquinox/nasa-kepler-telescope-snaps-evidence-100-billion-planets-210620867.html>
- Swartz, S., Harding, J.H., & De Lannoy, A. (2012). Ikasi style and the quiet violence of dreams: A critique of youth belonging in post-Apartheid South Africa. *Comparative Education*, 48(1), 27-40. doi:10.1080/03050068.2011.637761
- Switzer, J. (2013, February 21). Let's lower the voting age to 16: The Twitter generation is engaged and deserves a say. *On Campus (McLeans)*. Retrieved from <http://oncampus.macleans.ca/education/2013/02/21/lets-lower-the-voting-age-to-16/>
- Taylor, C. (1998). Globalization and the future of Canada, *Queen's Quarterly*, 105(3), 330-343.
- Taylor, S. (1997). Critical policy analysis: Exploring contexts, texts and consequences. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*, 18(1), 23-35.
- The American Civil Liberties Union. (1957). *Liberty is always unfinished business*. [36th Annual Report of the American Civil Liberties Union, July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956]. New York: ACLU.
- The American Heritage Science Dictionary. (n.d.). *Universe science definition*. Retrieved from <http://science.yourdictionary.com/universe>

- The Atlantic Canada Social Studies Foundation. (1999). Foundation for the Atlantic Canada social studies curriculum. Retrieved from <http://www.gnb.ca/0000/publications/curric/social.pdf>
- The European Commission. (2007). Engaging people in active citizenship: *Briefing Paper 44*. Retrieved from <http://www.pjb.co.uk/npl/BP%2044%20-%20Final%20ETGACE.pdf>
- The European Community. (1992, February 7). *Provisions amending the treaty establishing the European economic community with a view to establishing The European Community: Maastricht*. Retrieved from <http://www.eurotreaties.com/maastrichtec.pdf>
- The Institute for Intercultural Studies. (2009). *Margaret Mead (1901-1978): An anthropology of human freedom*. Retrieved from <http://www.interculturalstudies.org/Mead/biography.html>
- The Magna Carta. (1215).[U.S. National Archives & Records Administration]. Retrieved from http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured_documents/magna_carta/
- The Office of the Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth. (2011). *Our dreams matter too: First Nations children's rights, lives, and education*. Retrieved from <http://digital.provincialadvocate.on.ca/i/34389>
- Tibbits, F & Torney-Purta, J. (1999). Citizenship education in Latin America: Preparing for the future. Human Rights Education Associates. Retrieved from <http://www.hrea.org/pubs/IDB-monograph/civics.pdf>
- Tollefson, J. (2006). *Language policies in education: Critical Issues*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tonge, J. & Mycock, A. (2009). Citizenship and political engagement among young people: The workings and findings of the youth citizenship commission. *Parliamentary Affairs*. 63(1), 182-200.

- Toots, A., De Groof, S., & Kavadias, D. (2012). Editorial: New citizens for globalised societies? Citizenship education from a comparative perspective. *Journal of Social Science Education, 1*, 3-6.
- Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J., & Amadeo, J. (1999). *Civic education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from IEA civic education project*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Torlakson, T. (2011). *A blueprint for great schools*. Sacramento: California Department of Education
- Torres, C.A. (2002). Globalization, education, and citizenship: Solidarity versus markets. *American Educational Research Journal, 39*(2), 363-378.
- Tupper, J. (2002). The gendering of citizenship in social studies curriculum. *Canadian Social Studies, 36*(3),1-7. Retrieved from http://www.educ.ualberta.ca/css/Css_36_3/ARgendering_of_citizenship.html002
- Tupper, J. (2004). Book Review: Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social Studies Sears, A., & Wright, I. (Eds.). *Journal of International Social Studies, 1*(1), 44-47.
- Tupper, J. (2009). Unsafe waters, stolen sisters, and social studies: troubling democracy and the meta-narrative of universal citizenship. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 36*(1), 77-94.
- Tupper, J. (2012) A review of teaching about hegemony: Race, class, and democracy in the 21st century. *Democracy & Education, 20*(3), 1-2.
- Tupper, J. A. (2007). From care-less to care-full: Education for citizenship in schools and beyond. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(2), 259-272.
- UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action of Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy*. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/education/nfsunesco/pdf/REV_74_E.PDF

- UNESCO. (1997, November). *Educating for a Sustainable Future: A Transdisciplinary Vision for Concerted Action*. Retrieved from http://www4.gu.edu.au/ext/unesco/theme_a/mod01/uncom01t05s01.htm#culture
- UNESCO. (2007). *Focus on participation*. Retrieved from <http://www.giswatch.org/institutional-overview/civil-society-participation/united-nations-educational-scientific-and-cultural>
- UNESCO. (2007). *Peace in action: UNESCO*. Retrieved from <http://promotingpeace.org/2007/4/unesco.html>
- UNESCO. (2010). *Citizenship education* (module 7). Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/education/tlsf/docs/module_7.doc
- United Nations General Assembly. (1989). *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/cyberschoolbus/treaties/child.asp>
- US Court of Appeals. (2006, August 30). *Guiles v. Marineau* (Docket Nos. 05-0327-cv(L), 05-0517-cv(XAP)). Retrieved from http://www.acluvt.org/issues/guiles_2nd_circuit_decision.pdf
- U.S. National Archives & Records Administration. (2013). *The Magna Carta*. Retrieved from http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured_documents/magna_carta/print_friendly.html?page=index_content.html&title=Magna_Carta
- van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, 1, 17-27. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Aims%20of%20Critical%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf>
- van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283.

- van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352-372). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
doi: 10.1111/b.9780631205968.2003.x
- Veugelers, W. (2007). Creating critical-democratic citizenship: Empowering humanity and democracy in Dutch education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, 37(1), 105-119.
- Vincent, N. (2007). *Magna Carta translation*. Retrieved from http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured_documents/magna_carta/print_friendly.html?page=index_content.html&title=Magna_Carta
- Vox, L. (2012). *Major civil rights speeches and writings: King, Kennedy and Johnson on civil rights*. Retrieved from <http://afroamhistory.about.com/od/civilrightsstruggle1/tp/Major-Civil-Rights-Speeches-And-Writings.htm>
- Wallerstein, I. (2002, April 18). "Citizens all? Citizens some! The making of the citizen. (E.P. Thompson Memorial Lecture). University of Pittsburgh. Retrieved from http://www2.binghamton.edu/fbc/archive/iwepthomp.htm#N_1
- Weaver-Hightower, M. (2008). An ecology metaphor for educational policy analysis: A call to complexity, *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 153-167.
- Webber, J. (1994). *Re-imagining Canada: Language, culture, community and the Canadian constitution*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Westaway, J.A. (2011). *Globalization, transnational corporations and human rights – A new paradigm*. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1910465>
- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2003). Teaching democracy: What schools need to do. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(1), 2003, 34-40 & 57-66.

- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Education Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269. doi: 10.3102/00028312041002237
- Westheimer, J. (2005). Democratic dogma: There is no one-size-fits-all approach to schooling for democracy." *Our Schools Ourselves*, 15(1), 25-30.
- Westheimer, J. (2008). No child left thinking. *Democratic Dialogue Series*, 17, 1-10.
- White, S. (1986). Foucault's Challenge to Critical Theory. *American Political Science Review*. 80(2). 419-432.
- Wickham, G. & Kendall, G. (2007). Critical discourse analysis, description, explanation, causes: Foucault's inspiration versus Weber's perspiration. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/252/555#g3>
- Wilczenski, F.L. & Coomey, S. (Eds.). (2007). *A Practical Guide to Service Learning: Strategies for Positive Development in Schools*. New York: Springer.
- Wilkes, D.E. Jr. (2006, May 3). Human rights and due process of law. *Flagpole Magazine*, p.10. Retrieved from http://www.law.uga.edu/dwilkes_more/51human.html
- Winton, S. (2007, December 5). Does character education really support citizenship education? Examining the claims of an Ontario policy. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 66. Retrieved from <http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/winton.html>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Wright, I. (2003). The centrality of critical thinking in citizenship. *Canadian Social Studies*, 38(1), Retrieved from http://www.educ.ualberta.ca/css/Css_38_1/ARcentrality_critical_thinking.htm
- Xiuguo, X. & Zhange, X. (2005). *English rhetoric*. Beijing: Tsinghua University Press.

Yanow, D. (1993). The communication of policy meanings: Implementation as interpretation and text. *Policy Sciences*. 26(1), 41-61.

VITA AUCTORIS

NAME: Louise Gonsalvez

PLACE OF BIRTH: Calgary, Alberta

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1957

EDUCATION: James Fowler High School, Calgary, Alberta,
1974

University of Calgary, B.P.E., University of
Calgary, 1977

University of Calgary, B. Ed., University of
Calgary, 1978

University of Illinois, M.Ed., University of
Illinois, Champaign, Illinois, 2007

University of Windsor, currently a PhD candidate
in the Faculty of Education and planning to
graduate in the fall of 2013