American Educational Research Journal
Summer 2004, Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 237–269

What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy

Joel Westheimer
University of Ottawa
Joseph Kahne
Mills College

*Educators and policymakers increasingly pursue programs that aim to strengthen democracy through civic education, service learning, and other pedagogies. Their underlying beliefs, however, differ. This article calls attention to the spectrum of ideas about what good citizenship is and what good citizens do that are embodied in democratic education programs. It offers analyses of a 2-year study of educational programs in the United States that aimed to promote democracy. Drawing on democratic theory and on findings from their study, the authors detail three conceptions of the "good" citizen—*personally responsible, participatory, *and* justice oriented*—that underscore political implications of education for democracy. The article demonstrates that the narrow and often ideologically conservative conception of citizenship embedded in many current efforts at teaching for democracy reflects not arbitrary choices but, rather, political choices with political consequences.*

KEYWORDS: character, citizenship, civic education, democracy, politics.

The notion of democracy occupies a privileged place in U.S. society. Everyone believes democracy is desirable. Indeed, educators, policymakers, politicians, and community activists alike pursue dozens of agendas for change under the banner of furthering democracy. The nature of their underlying beliefs, however, differs. We titled this article "What Kind of Citizen?" to call attention to the spectrum of ideas about what good citizenship *is* and what good citizens *do* that are embodied by democratic education programs nationwide. We added the subtitle "The Politics of Educating for Democracy" to underscore our belief that the narrow and often ideologically conservative conception of citizenship embedded in many current efforts at teaching for democracy reflects neither arbitrary choices nor pedagogical limitations but, rather, political choices that have political consequences.

In what follows, we examine the politics of educating for democracy. Specifically, we draw on our 2-year study of ten programs in the United States that aimed to advance the democratic purposes of education. We begin by

detailing three conceptions of citizenship (*personally responsible, participatory,* and *justice oriented*) that emerged from our analysis of democratic theory and program goals and practices. We then discuss some of the potentially significant political implications of these differing conceptions. The bulk of our empirical work describes two of the ten programs we studied. One program aimed to advance participatory citizens and the other justice-oriented citizens. Our data—both quantitative and qualitative—demonstrate that the decisions educators make when designing and researching these programs often influence politically important outcomes regarding the ways that students understand the strengths and weaknesses of our society and the ways that they should act as citizens in a democracy.

What Kind of Citizen?

Philosophers, historians, and political scientists have long debated which conceptions of citizenship would best advance democracy (see, for example, Kaestle, 2000; Smith, 1997; Schudson, 1998). Indeed, as Connolly (1983) has argued, conceptions of democracy and citizenship have been and will likely always be debated—no single formulation will triumph. The work of John Dewey, for example, which probably has done the most to shape dialogues on education and democracy, has not led to resolution. Rather, scholars and practitioners interpret his ideas in multiple ways, so no single conception emerges. In large part, discussion and debate regarding these different perspectives continue because the stakes are so high. Conceptions of "good citizenship" imply conceptions of the good society.

The various perspectives on citizenship also have significantly varying implications for curriculum. For example, Walter Parker (1996) describes three very different conceptions of citizen education for a democratic society: "traditional," "progressive," and "advanced." He explains that traditionalists emphasize an understanding of how government works (how a bill becomes

---

JOEL WESTHEIMER is a Professor of Education and University Research Chair at the University of Ottawa, where he founded and co-directs Democratic Dialogue *(www.democraticdialogue.com).* He can be reached at the Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, 145 Jean-Jacques Lussier, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5, Canada; e-mail *joelw@uottawa.ca.* A former New York City public schools teacher, he teaches and writes on democracy, social justice, service learning, and community in education.

JOSEPH KAHNE is a Professor of Education and the Kathryn P. Hannam Professor of American Studies at Mills College. He directs the doctoral program in educational leadership and co-directs the Institute for Civic Leadership *(www.mills.edu/ICL)* at Mills College. He can be reached at Mills College, 5000 MacArthur Blvd., Oakland, CA 94619; e-mail *jkahne@mills.edu.* A former New York City public schools teacher, his research, writing, and work with educators concerns the democratic purposes of schooling and urban school reform.

---

a law, for example) and traditional subject area content, as well as commitments to core democratic values—such as freedom of speech or liberty in general (see, for example, Butts, 1988). Progressives share a similar commitment to this knowledge, but they embrace visions such as "strong democracy" (Barber, 1984) and place a greater emphasis on civic participation in its numerous forms (see, for example, Newmann, 1975; Hanna, 1936). Finally, "advanced" citizenship, according to Parker, is one that builds on the progressive perspective but adds careful attention to inherent tensions between pluralism and assimilation or to what Charles Taylor labels the "politics of recognition" (1994, cited in Parker, p. 113).

Other writers, frequently those on the Left, place a greater emphasis on the need for social critique and structural change (Shor, 1992; Freire, 1990). Alternatively, those inclined to a conservative vision of citizenship education put forward a connection between citizenship and character (Bennett, 1995, 1998; Bennett, Cribb, & Finn, 1999). Rather than view problems that need attention as structural, they emphasize problems in society caused by personal deficits. Some educators reflect the liberal vision of citizenship embedded in John Rawls's (1971) writings, aiming, for example, to recognize the varied perspectives on "the good" that exist in a pluralistic society. What citizens require, in this view, is preparation for a society characterized by "durable pluralism" (see Strike, 1999). Still other visions emphasize preparing informed voters, preparing individuals for public deliberation, and preparing students to critically analyze social policies and priorities. Indeed, there exists a vast and valuable array of perspectives on the kinds of citizens that democracies require and the kinds of curricula that can help to achieve democratic aims (see, for example, Callan, 1997; Fine, 1995; Gutmann, 1986; Soder et al., 2001; Youniss & Yates, 1997).

The particular framework that we provide below was selected to highlight several important political dimensions of efforts to educate citizens for democracy. Our description of three "kinds of citizens" is not intended to be exhaustive. In addition, although we detail strategies related to these goals elsewhere (Kahne & Westheimer, 2003; Westheimer & Kahne, 2002), we focus in this article not so much on the various strategies that educators use to reach a particular democratic destination, but more on the varied conceptions of the destination itself. Thus our title question: What kind of citizen?

Three Kinds of Citizens

Our framework aims to order some of these perspectives by grouping three kinds of answers to a question that is of central importance for both practitioners and scholars: *What kind of citizen do we need to support an effective democratic society?* In mapping the terrain that surrounds answers to this question, we found that three visions of "citizenship" were particularly helpful in making sense of the variation: the *personally responsible citizen;* the *participatory citizen;* and the *justice-oriented citizen* (see Table 1).

Table 1
Kinds of Citizens

Personally responsible citizen	Participatory citizen	Justice-oriented citizen
Description		
Acts responsibly in his/her community Works and pays taxes Obeys laws Recycles, gives blood Volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis	Active member of community organizations and/or improvement efforts Organizes community efforts to care for those in need, promote economic development, or clean up environment Knows how government agencies work Knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks	Critically assesses social, political, and economic structures to see beyond surface causes Seeks out and addresses areas of injustice Knows about democratic social movements and how to effect systemic change
Sample action		
Contributes food to a food drive	Helps to organize a food drive	Explores why people are hungry and acts to solve root causes
Core assumptions		
To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must have good character; they must be honest, responsible, and law-abiding members of the community.	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must actively participate and take leadership positions within established systems and community structures.	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must question, debate, and change established systems and structures that reproduce patterns of injustice over time.

These three categories were chosen because they satisfied our three main criteria:

1. They aligned well with prominent theoretical perspectives described above;
2. They highlight important differences in the ways that educators conceive of democratic educational aims; that is, they frame distinctions that have significant implications for the politics of education for democracy; and
3. They articulate ideas and ideals that resonate with practitioners (teachers, administrators, and curriculum designers).

With these criteria in mind, we consulted both with the 10 teams of educators whose work we studied and with other leaders in the field in an effort to create categories and descriptions that aligned well with and communicated clearly their differing priorities.[1]

Each vision of citizenship, therefore, reflects a relatively distinct set of theoretical and curricular goals. These visions are not cumulative. Programs that promote justice-oriented citizens do not necessarily promote personal responsibility or participatory citizenship. In saying this, we do not mean to imply that a given program might not simultaneously further more than one of these agendas. For instance, although a curriculum designed principally to promote personally responsible citizens will generally look quite different from one that focuses primarily on developing capacities and commitments for participatory citizenship, it is possible for a given curriculum to further both goals. At the same time, we believe that drawing attention to the distinctions between these visions of citizenship is important. Doing so highlights the value of examining the underlying goals and assumptions that drive different educational programs.

The Personally Responsible Citizen

The *personally responsible citizen* acts responsibly in his or her community by, for example, picking up litter, giving blood, recycling, obeying laws, and staying out of debt. The personally responsible citizen contributes to food or clothing drives when asked and volunteers to help those less fortunate, whether in a soup kitchen or a senior center. Programs that seek to develop personally responsible citizens attempt to build character and personal responsibility by emphasizing honesty, integrity, self-discipline, and hard work (Horace Mann, 1838; also see current proponents such as Lickona, 1993; Wynne, 1986).

People who are involved in the character education movement frequently advance such perspectives. The Character Counts! Coalition, for example, advocates teaching students to "treat others with respect, . . . deal peacefully with anger, . . . be considerate of the feelings of others, . . . follow the Golden Rule, . . . use good manners," and so on (Character Counts! Coalition, 2004). Other programs that seek to develop personally responsible citizens hope to nurture compassion by engaging students in volunteer activities. As illustrated in the mission statement of the Points of Light Foundation, these programs hope to "help solve serious social problems" by "engag[ing] more people more effectively in volunteer service" (*www.pointsoflight.org*, retrieved in April 2000).

The Participatory Citizen

Other educators see good citizens as those who actively participate in the civic affairs and the social life of the community at the local, state, or national level. We call this kind of citizen the *participatory citizen*. Proponents of this vision emphasize preparing students to engage in collective, community-based efforts. Educational programs designed to support the development of participatory

citizens focus on teaching students how government and community-based organizations work and training them to plan and participate in organized efforts to care for people in need or, for example, to guide school policies. Skills associated with such collective endeavors—such as how to run a meeting—are also viewed as important (Newmann, 1975; also see Verba et al., 1995, for an empirical analysis of the importance of such skills and activities). Whereas the personally responsible citizen would contribute cans of food for the homeless, the participatory citizen might organize the food drive.

In the tradition of de Tocqueville, proponents of participatory citizenship argue that civic participation transcends particular community problems or opportunities. It also develops relationships, common understandings, trust, and collective commitments. Dewey (1916) put forward a vision of "Democracy as a Way of Life" and emphasized participation in collective endeavors. This perspective, like Benjamin Barber's notion of "strong democracy," adopts a broad notion of the political sphere—one in which citizens "with competing but overlapping interests can contrive to live together communally" (1984, p. 118).

The Justice-Oriented Citizen

Our third image of a good citizen is, perhaps, the perspective that is least commonly pursued. Justice-oriented educators argue that effective democratic citizens need opportunities to analyze and understand the interplay of social, economic, and political forces. We use the term justice-oriented citizen because advocates of these priorities use rhetoric and analysis that calls explicit attention to matters of injustice and to the importance of pursuing social justice.[2] The vision of the justice-oriented citizen shares with the vision of the participatory citizen an emphasis on collective work related to the life and issues of the community. Its focus on responding to social problems and to structural critique make it somewhat different, however. Building on perspectives like those of Freire and Shor noted earlier, educational programs that emphasize social change seek to prepare students to improve society by critically analyzing and addressing social issues and injustices. These programs are less likely to emphasize the need for charity and volunteerism as ends in themselves and more likely to teach about social movements and how to effect systemic change (see, for example, Ayers et al., 1998; Bigelow & Diamond, 1988; Isaac, 1992).[3] That today's citizens are "bowling alone" (Putnam, 2000) would worry those who are focused on civic participation. Those who emphasize social justice, however, would worry more that when citizens do get together, they often fail to focus on root causes of problems. In other words, 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.

Although educators aiming to promote justice-oriented citizens may well employ curriculum that makes political issues more explicit than those who emphasize personal responsibility or participatory citizenship, the focus on

social change and social justice does not imply an emphasis on particular political perspectives, conclusions, or priorities. (The range of structural approaches for alleviating poverty that exist, for example, spans the political spectrum.) Indeed, those working to prepare justice-oriented citizens for a democracy do not aim to impart a fixed set of truths or critiques regarding the structure of the society.[4] Rather, they work to engage students in informed analysis and discussion regarding social, political, and economic structures. They want students to consider collective strategies for change that challenge injustice and, when possible, address root causes of problems. The nature of this discussion is of critical importance. As many theorists of democracy make clear, it is fundamentally important that the process respect the varied voices and priorities of citizens while considering the evidence of experts, the analysis of government leaders, or the particular preferences of a given group or of an individual leader. Similarly, students must learn to weigh the varied opinions and arguments of fellow students and teachers. Because conceptions of the greater good will differ, justice-oriented students must develop the ability to communicate with and learn from those who hold different perspectives. This is not to say that consensus is always the appropriate outcome. Educating justice-oriented citizens also requires that they be prepared to effectively promote their goals as individuals and groups in sometimes-contentious political arenas.

The Limits of Personal Responsibility

Among competing conceptions of democratic values and citizenship, personal responsibility receives the most attention. This is especially true of the character education and community service movements, both of which are well-funded efforts to bring about these particular kinds of reforms. We find this emphasis an inadequate response to the challenges of educating a democratic citizenry. The limits of character education and of volunteerism and the conservative political orientation reflected in many of these efforts have been addressed elsewhere in some detail, so we simply summarize them here. Critics note that the emphasis placed on individual character and behavior obscures the need for collective and public sector initiatives; that this emphasis distracts attention from analysis of the causes of social problems and from systemic solutions; that volunteerism and kindness are put forward as ways of avoiding politics and policy (Barber, 1992; Boyte, 1991; Westheimer & Kahne, 2000; Kahne & Westheimer, 1996).

The central tenets of the Character Counts! Coalition illustrate what we see as the limitations of personally responsible citizenship as it is commonly practiced in school-based programs. Certainly honesty, integrity, and responsibility for one's actions are valuable character traits for good neighbors and citizens. We are not arguing that personal responsibility or related virtuous behavior is unimportant. Similarly, in most circumstances, obeying laws that flow from democratic structures such as legislatures is essential. Such traits have the potential to strengthen a democracy by fostering social trust and willingness

to commit to collective efforts, for example.[5] There are a host of reasons beyond our focus on democratic citizenship that could be used to justify efforts by educators to foster personal responsibility—to produce trustworthy, helpful, hard-working, and pleasant students. No one wants young people to lie, cheat, or steal.

At the same time, the visions of obedience and patriotism that are often and increasingly associated with this agenda can be at odds with democratic goals. And even the widely accepted goals—fostering honesty, good-neighborliness, and so on—are not *inherently* about democracy. Indeed, government leaders in a totalitarian regime would be as delighted as leaders in a democracy if their young citizens learned the lessons put forward by many of the proponents of personally responsible citizenship: Don't do drugs; show up at school; show up at work; give blood; help others during a flood; recycle; pick up litter; clean up a park; treat old people with respect. These are desirable traits for people living in a community. But they are not about democratic citizenship. To the extent that emphasis on these character traits detracts from other important democratic priorities, it may actually hinder rather than make possible democratic participation and change. For example, a focus on loyalty or obedience (common components of character education as well) works against the kind of critical reflection and action that many assume are essential in a democratic society.

Data regarding the way young people often think about their civic responsibilities reinforce our concern regarding an exclusive focus on personally responsible citizenship. A study commissioned by the National Association of Secretaries of State (1999) found that fewer than 32% of eligible voters between the ages of 18 and 24 voted in the 1996 presidential election (in 1972, the comparable number was 50%), but that a whopping 94% of those aged 15–24 believed that "the most important thing I can do as a citizen is to help others" (also see Sax et al., 1999). In a very real sense, youth seem to be "learning" that citizenship does not require democratic governments, politics, or even collective endeavors.

Research and evaluation of educational programs also frequently reflect this conservative and individualistic conception of personally responsible citizenship.[6] Studies commonly ask participants, for example, whether they feel it is their responsibility to take care of those in need and whether problems of pollution and toxic waste are "everyone's responsibility" or "not my responsibility." They rarely ask questions about corporate responsibility—in what ways industries should be regulated, for example—or about ways that government policies can advance or hinder solutions to social problems. Survey questions typically emphasize individual and charitable acts. They ignore important influences such as social movements and government policy on efforts to improve society. Educators who seek to teach personally responsible citizenship and researchers who study their programs focus on individual acts of compassion and kindness, not on collective social action and the pursuit of social justice (Kahne, Westheimer, & Rogers, 2000).

Pursuit of Participatory and Justice-Oriented Citizens

Often, democratic theorists blend commitments to participation with commitments to justice. For example, Benjamin Barber's "strong democracy" focuses on forms of civic engagement that are "persuasively progressive and democratic . . . useful especially to those who are partisans of democratic struggle and social justice" (1998, p. 10). Similarly, Boyte and Kari (1996) invoke the populist tradition and emphasize the need to recognize the talent, intelligence, and capacities of ordinary people by engaging them in collective civic projects. They stress the importance of forms of civic participation that have historically been used to pursue social justice, showcasing, for example, the work of civil rights activists who used nonviolent actions of civil disobedience.

From the standpoint of supporting the development of democratic communities, combining these commitments is rational. Developing commitments for civic participation and social justice as well as fostering the capacities to fulfill those commitments will support the development of a more democratic society. We should be wary of assuming that commitments to participatory citizenship and to justice necessarily align, however. These two orientations have potentially differing implications for educators. Although pursuit of both goals may well support development of a more democratic society, it is not clear whether making advances along one dimension will necessarily further progress on the other. Do programs that support civic participation necessarily promote students' capacities for critical analysis and social change? Conversely, does focusing on social justice provide the foundation for effective and committed civic actors? Or might such programs support the development of armchair activists who have articulate conversations over coffee, without ever acting? We now turn to these questions.

Our empirical investigation of this topic focuses on the subtle and not-so-subtle differences between programs that emphasize participation and those that emphasize justice. We focus this part of our discussion on goals of participatory and justice-oriented citizenship for two reasons. First, because of shortcomings of the personally responsible model as a means of developing citizens, none of the programs funded by the foundation that supported our study emphasized this approach. Moreover, as noted earlier, a significant body of work already addresses the conflicts and limitations of equating personal responsibility with democratic citizenship.

Below, we describe two of the programs we studied, to draw attention to the differences in their civic and democratic priorities and to the tensions that those differences raise for educators. Both programs worked with classes of high school students, and both were designed to support the development of democratic and civic understandings and commitments. But their goals and strategies differed. The first, which we call "Madison County Youth in Public Service," aims to develop participatory citizens; the second, which we call "Bayside Students for Justice," aims to develop justice-oriented citizens.

Method

Sample

This article focuses on data from two of the ten programs, all in the United States, that we studied as part of the Surdna Foundation's Democratic Values Initiative.[7] The first, Madison County Youth in Public Service, was located in a suburban/rural East Coast community outside a city of roughly 23,000 people. Two teachers were involved in this project, one from each of the county's high schools. Although we were not able to collect reports on students' ethnicity, teachers characterized the student population as almost entirely European American (with a few recent immigrants). An estimated 3% of the schools' students were persons of color. Each year, the teachers worked with one of their government classes, so over period of 2 years, four classes participated. Students needed to request to participate in this version of the 12th-grade government class, and teachers characterized participants as slightly better than average in terms of academic background. Students who enrolled in the advanced placement government course could not participate. More girls (59%) than boys (41%) participated.

The second program, Bayside Students for Justice, was a curriculum developed as part of a 12th-grade social studies course for low-achieving students in a comprehensive urban high school on the West Coast. The student population was typical of West Coast city schools: a total of 25 students took part in the program, and 21 of them completed both pretest and posttest surveys; of those taking the survey, 13 were female (62%) and 8 male (38%), 8 were African American (38%), 1 was Caucasian (5%), 8 were Asian or Pacific Islander (38%), 1 was Latino (5%), and 3 identified themselves as "Other" (10%). The group tested roughly at national norms and was relatively low-income, with 40% living in public housing (data provided by the instructor).

Procedures

Our study employs a mixed-methods approach—it combines qualitative data from observations and interviews with quantitative analysis of pre/post survey data. Our rationale for adopting a mixed-methods approach reflects what Lois-ellin Datta (1997) has labeled "the pragmatic basis" for mixed-method designs. That is, we employed the combination of methods that we felt were best suited to our inquiry—the methods that would best enable us to gain insight and to communicate what we learned to relevant audiences (also see Patton, 1988).

At all 10 sites in our study, we collected four forms of data: observations, interviews, surveys, and documents prepared by program staff. Each year, our observations took place over a 2-to-3-day period in classrooms and at service sites. Over the 2 years of the study, we interviewed 61 students from the "Madison" program (close to all participating students, in groups of 3 or 4). We interviewed 23 students from "Bayside" (either individually or in groups

of 2 to 3. We aimed for a cross-section of students in terms of academic ability, enthusiasm for the program, and gender. We also interviewed at least three staff members for each program toward the end of each year. Interviews lasted between 20 and 45 minutes, and all interviews were both taped and transcribed. Finally, we conducted pre and post surveys of all participating students in September and June. In the case of Madison, we studied the same program for 2 years.[8] The Bayside program changed significantly after the 1st year of operation, and so it did not make sense to merge the data from Years 1 and 2. In this article, we report data only from the 2nd year.[9] To receive feedback and as a check on our interpretations, we shared our analysis of quantitative and qualitative findings with those who ran the programs.

Measures and Analysis

Survey items were selected in an effort to assess capacities and orientations related to aspects of the three kinds of citizenship we identified. We also included several measures associated with students' civic orientation and capacities: civic efficacy, vision, leadership efficacy, desire to volunteer in the future, knowledge/social capital for community development, following news stories, views on government responsibility for those in need, and employer responsibility for employees.[10] Together, these measures helped us to see differences across programs in democratic orientation and the capacities that they promoted.

The interviews and observations were designed to help us clarify students' beliefs regarding what it means to be a good citizen and the ways that features of the curriculum may have affected those perspectives. We asked participants to identify and discuss particular social issues that were important to them and to community members. We encouraged them to describe their perspective on the nature of these problems, the causes, and possible ways of responding. Did the students emphasize needs for individual morality, civic participation, or challenges to structures or social inequities? Next we asked participants to describe any ways that their participation in the given program might have altered their attitudes, knowledge, or skills in relation to those issues.

We asked similar questions of teachers. We wanted to understand their priorities, their conception of responsible and effective citizenship, their perspective on civic education, their strategies, and how these approaches did and did not appear to be working. During these interviews we encouraged students and instructors to talk about specific "critical incidents" so that we could better understand the curricular components that promoted varied forms of development. Our methods here were informed by critical incident interviewing techniques (see Flanagan, 1954).

The analysis of interview and observation data occurred throughout data collection as well as after data collection was complete and followed the process described by Strauss (1990) as the "constant comparative method."

This iterative process occurred through reflective and analytical memorandums between the researchers as well as through the ongoing coding of field notes. In particular, we analyzed the interviews for recurring themes and patterns regarding student and teacher perceptions of how participation had affected students' beliefs regarding citizenship and democratic values. We also asked teachers to reflect on our observations, not only to test the accuracy of statements but also to reexamine perceptions and conclusions, drawing on their insider knowledge.[11]

Authors' Predispositions

Given the ideological nature of the content of our inquiry, it makes sense for us to be explicit about our own perspectives with regard to personally responsible citizenship, participatory citizenship, and justice-oriented citizenship. We think that each vision has merit. However, although we value character traits such as honesty, diligence, and compassion, for reasons already discussed, we find the exclusive emphasis on personally responsible citizenship apart from analysis of social, political, and economic contexts (as it frequently is, in practice) inadequate for advancing democracy. There is nothing inherently *democratic* about personally responsible citizenship, and specifically *undemocratic* practices are sometimes associated with programs that rely exclusively on notions of personal responsibility.

From our perspective, traits associated with participatory and justice-oriented citizenship are essential. Not every program needs to address all goals simultaneously to be of value. But educators must attend to these priorities if schools are to prepare citizens for democracy.

Developing Participatory Citizens: Madison County Youth in Public Service

Madison County Youth in Public Service was run by two social studies teachers in a rural East Coast community. The idea for Youth in Public Service came to one of the teachers after she had attended a speech by Benjamin Barber about the importance of engaging students in public life. These teachers (one a 20-year veteran and the other a 2nd-year teacher) taught a condensed and intensified version of a standard government course during the first semester of the academic year. For the second semester, they developed a service learning curriculum. Students focused on particular topics related to their government curriculum as they worked in small teams on public service projects in their county's administrative offices. Their goal, as one teacher explained, was "to produce kids that are active citizens in our community . . . kids that won't be afraid to go out and take part in their community . . . kids that understand that you have to have factual evidence to back up anything you say, anything you do."

One group of students investigated whether citizens in their community wanted curbside trash pickup for recycling that was organized by the county. They conducted phone interviews, undertook a cost analysis, and examined charts of projected housing growth to estimate growth in trash and its cost and environmental implications. Another group identified jobs that prisoners incarcerated for fewer than 90 days could perform and analyzed the cost of similar programs in other localities. Other students helped to develop a 5-year plan for the fire and rescue department. For each project, students had to collect and analyze data, interact with government agencies, write a report, and present their findings in a formal hearing before the county's board of supervisors.

The teachers of the program believed that placing students in internships where they worked on meaningful projects under the supervision of committed role models would

- Teach students how government works;
- Help students to recognize the importance of being actively involved in community issues; and
- Provide students with the skills required for effective and informed civic involvement.

As we discuss below, Madison County Youth in Public Service was quite successful in achieving many of these goals.

Making Civic Education Meaningful

Our interviews, observations, and survey data all indicated that the experience of working in the local community had a significant impact on students, especially as compared with traditional classwork. Janine's reaction was typical:

> I learned more by doing this than I would just sitting in a classroom. . . . I mean, you really don't have hands-on activities in a classroom. But when you go out [to the public agencies] instead of getting to read about problems, we see the problems. Instead of, you know, writing down a solution, we make a solution.

Teresa, another student, said,

> I kind of felt like everything that we had been taught in class, how the whole government works. . . . We got to learn it and we got to go out and experience it. We saw things happening in front of us within the agency. I think it was more useful to put it together and see it happening instead of just reading from a book and learning from it.

Not only did the activities in the community help to enliven classroom learning, but many of the students' projects also tangibly affected the local

community. Indeed, students talked about the powerful impact of realizing that what they did would or could make a difference:

> I thought it was just going be another project. You know, we do some research, it gets written down and we leave and it gets put on the shelf somewhere. But in 5 years, this [curbside recycling] is going to be a real thing. . . . It's really going to happen.
>
> I didn't expect [our work] to have such an impact. . . . I mean, we've been in the newspaper, like, a lot.

By engaging students in projects in the community, Madison County Youth in Public Service had significant success in making learning relevant to students, conveying practical knowledge about how to engage in community affairs, and demonstrating to students the ways that classroom-based academic knowledge can be used for civic work in the community.

Making a Difference in the Lives of Others

The curriculum also developed students' desire to participate in civic affairs and gave them a sense that they could make a difference in the lives of others. When asked about how the program influenced their thinking, most students talked about how the experience deepened their belief in the importance of civic involvement. Emily, for example, spoke about the difference between talking about a problem and doing something active:

> Everyone needs to do their part if they want something to be done. . . . In politics, the people always say their opinions and get mad about this and that but then they never do anything about what they feel. . . . This [experience] makes me feel like you have to do your part.

Moreover, many students reported a strong sense that they could get things done if they tried:

> We're just kids to most people, and I kind of figured that those people wouldn't really give us the time of day, [but] they were always willing to help us.
>
> I realized there's a lot more to government than being a senator or a representative. There's so many different things you can do for the [community] that aren't as high up.

Students also reported excitement at the prospect of getting involved in ways they did not know were available to them before their experience with the Madison program:

> I didn't know that [the sheriff's office] had meetings all the time. . . . It makes me think that I'll go to them when I get older.

> I think if more people were aware of [how they could participate], we wouldn't have as many problems, because they would understand that . . . people do have an impact. But I think in our community . . . people just don't seem to think that they will, so they don't even try.

Our survey results help to further illustrate many of these effects. Student responses to questions asked on a five-point Likert scale indicated statistically significant ($p < .05$) changes from pretest to posttest raw scores on several measures related to civic participation. As detailed in Table 2, students expressed a greater belief that they had a personal responsibility to help others (+0.21), a greater belief that government should help those in need (+0.24), a stronger sense that they could be effective leaders (+0.31), and an increased sense of agency—a sense that they could make a difference in their communities (+0.24). Students also reported that they had a greater commitment to community involvement (this increase, +0.19, was marginally significant, $p = .06$).

The robust nature of these results became clearer during the 2nd year because a control group was also surveyed. This group had similar academic skills and was taught by the same two teachers. We used *t* tests to examine whether the gains noted above for the students who participated in the Madison program were different than those that occurred in the control classrooms. For six of the seven measures on which Madison students registered statistically significant gains, we found a statistically significant ($p < .05$) difference between the gains of the students in the Madison program and those in the control classrooms.[12] This finding, combined with the fact that the control group did not show statistically significant changes on any survey measures, adds to our confidence that the Madison curriculum supported student development in ways consistent with a vision of participatory citizenship.

A Vision of What to Do and the Knowledge and Skills Needed to Do It

Students consistently spoke of the needs in their community and of their ideas about how to address those needs. The group of students investigating curbside trash pickup for recycling, for example, conducted surveys of community residents, researched other communities' recycling programs, met with county officials about their plan, and wrote letters to the editors of local newspapers. "We researched the Code of [Madison] County to find out, you know, the legal requirements," one student explained. Another group of students discovered that child immunization rates were low in their community and worked with the health department to develop ways to encourage parents to have their children immunized:

> [We] worked on the computer a lot, putting records in, trying to find percentages [of children immunized] for the counties around us. . . . We talked about outreach programs and stuff like that. We're basically trying to let parents know.

Table 2
Madison County Youth in Public Service

Factors (Cronbach's alpha pretest, posttest)	Sample	Change	Pretest	Posttest	Significance level	Number of students
Personal responsibility to help others (.62, .74)	Intervention	.21*	4.00	4.21	.01	61
	Control	−.06	3.99	3.92	.63	37
Commitment to community involvement (.54, .71)	Intervention	.19	4.27	4.46	.06	61
	Control	−.10	3.89	3.99	.54	37
Interest in politics (.81, .81)	Intervention	.03	3.41	3.44	.55	61
	Control	−.05	2.76	2.71	.63	37
Structural/individual explanations for poverty (.59, .61)	Intervention	−.10	3.13	3.03	.56	32
	Control	.14	3.37	3.51	.35	37
Desire to work for justice (.65, .73)	Intervention	.07	3.07	3.14	.31	61
	Control	.03	2.84	2.88	.81	37
Civic efficacy (.66, .71)	Intervention	.34**	3.78	4.12	.00	61
	Control	.10	3.38	3.48	.34	37
Vision (.65, .71)	Intervention	.30*	2.65	2.95	.01	61
	Control	.12	2.63	2.75	.35	37
Knowledge/social capital for community development (.67, .72)	Intervention	.94**	3.95	4.89	.00	60
	Control	−.23	3.13	2.90	.25	37
Leadership efficacy (.78, .81)	Intervention	.31**	3.60	3.91	.00	61
	Control	.03	3.57	3.60	.72	37
I will volunteer (.80, .86)	Intervention	.10	3.59	3.70	.14	61
	Control	−.09	3.28	3.18	.43	37
Follow the news (.43, .41)	Intervention	.24**	3.35	3.59	.00	60
	Control	−.12	3.22	3.10	.27	37
Government responsibility for those in need (.68, .61)	Intervention	.24*	3.10	3.34	.05	32
	Control	.00	3.28	3.28	1.00	37
Employer responsibility for employees (.83, .87)	Intervention	.09	3.81	3.9	.35	32
	Control	−.02	4.14	4.12	.83	37

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Other groups learned how to analyze the tax code, telephoning the Commissioner of Revenue's office when they needed information or explanations, or wrote grants to raise money for student resources, or traveled to the state attorney's office to get information on crime rates in schools before surveying faculty and students.

The quantitative findings (see Table 2) demonstrated the gains in students' vision and sense of capacity for community engagement as well. Responses on Likert scales indicated increases in students' vision of how to help others (+0.30) and in their belief that they had knowledge and the "social capital" needed to support community development (+ 0.94, the greatest gain). The control groups showed no significant change in these measures.

The Politics of Participatory Citizenship

The Madison program aimed to promote civic participation consistent with a vision of participatory citizenship, to link service to academic content, and to provide a meaningful research experience. We found the program to be notable for its success in these areas. But the program did not aim to foster the justice-oriented citizen's understanding of structural or root causes of problems. Although students did study controversial topics—prisoners' being required to work for small earnings or without pay, for example, or problems in a detention center for juveniles—they did not consider structural issues or questions of systemic injustice. They did not examine data regarding the relationship between race, social class, and prison sentencing or question whether increased incarceration has lowered crime rates. They did not examine whether incarcerating juveniles (as opposed to other possible policies) affects the likelihood of future criminal activity or investigate which groups lobby for tougher or less strict sentencing laws. Nor did they identify or discuss the diverse ideologies that inform political stances on such issues. We found a similarly limited focus when a group of students examined their county's tax structure to identify possible ways to finance needed school construction and conducted a survey to determine residents' preferences. They found that 108 of 121 residents said no to the idea of a local income tax. The students did not discuss the reasons that so many residents opposed a local income tax or examine issues of equity when considering alternative options for taxation.

Students said that they had learned a great deal about micro-politics, such as how various government offices compete for funding, why collaboration between county offices is sometimes difficult, and how to make things happen. However, teachers avoided broader, ideologically based political issues. One group of students, for example, conducted research for the county voter registrar. Their plan was to survey customers of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to find out how the voter registration process could be improved. They struggled for more than a month to get permission from the DMV to conduct the survey but were unable to make any progress until they contacted their state representative. Their request was then approved. As a

student explained, "I basically learned about how our government works and who has pull." Although valuable, their exploration did not consider the ways that interest group and party politics have influenced voter registration policies. Students were not asked why some groups opposed practices that would ease the voter registration process.

In general, we did not find evidence in student interviews, in our observations, or in our analysis of survey data that the students examined ideological or political issues related to interest groups or the political process, the causes of poverty, various groups' access to health care, or the fairness of various systems of taxation (even though two projects focused on issues related to health care and taxation). Students focused on particular programs and policies and aimed for technocratic, value-neutral analysis.

Accordingly, our survey data (see Table 2) did not indicate significant increases in measures related to justice-oriented citizenship. The program did not alter students' stated interest in politics or political activity (e.g., by voting or writing letters) or their stated commitment to work for justice. Nor did it alter their perspective on the degree to which structural rather than individual factors might contribute to poverty.

These findings are consistent with the stated goals of the people who ran the program. When asked to list characteristics of a "good citizen," program leaders responded with expressions such as "honesty," "civic participation," "takes responsibility for others," "becomes involved in solving public problems," "active participant rather than passive," "educated about democracy, makes decisions based on facts," and "loyalty to God/country." To summarize, then, neither the goals of the teachers who developed and taught the curriculum nor the outcomes we measured included changes in students' interest in politics, their perspective on structural roots of social problems, or their commitment to social justice.

Developing Justice-Oriented Citizens: Bayside Students for Justice

In a comprehensive urban high school on the West Coast, a group of teachers developed the Bayside Students for Justice curriculum as part of a multi-school program tying school-based academic work to educational experiences in the community. Inspired by the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights, these teachers implemented the Bayside curriculum with students diverse in ethnicity, language, and socioeconomic status, 40% of whom were living in public housing (see "Methods" section for complete demographics).

The Bayside program aimed to develop community activists. As one of the teachers for this program put it, "My goal is to turn students into activists [who are] empowered to focus on things that they care about in their own lives and to . . . show them avenues that they can use to achieve real social change, profound social change." The program advanced a justice-oriented vision of citizenship seeking to teach students how to address structural issues of inequity and injustice and bring about social change. A program developer explained:

> A good citizen actively organizes with other people [to address] causes of injustice and suffering. . . . A good citizen understands the complexities of social issues, political issues, and economic issues, and how they are tied together, and is not always willing to accept the definition of a problem as presented to them by politicians.

Some Bayside students studied whether SAT exams were biased, and they created a pamphlet pointing out the weaknesses of the test in adequately predicting future student success in college. They distributed the pamphlet to the school and surrounding community. Another group examined child labor practices worldwide and the social, political, and economic issues those practices raise. These students held schoolwide forums on their findings in an effort to inform students—many of whom wore the designer clothes and shoes manufactured by the corporations that the group investigated. They also called on school officials to be aware of the labor practices employed by manufacturers from which the school purchased T-shirts and athletic uniforms. Jason's observation—typical of students interviewed about their experience—reflects the program's emphasis on justice: "It's amazing how all this exploitation is all around us and stuff. I mean, we are even wearing clothes and we don't have [any] idea who makes them, how much they're paid, or where they work." A third group investigated what they found to be a dearth of adequate education programs in juvenile detention centers, eventually making a video to publicize their findings. In a presentation to the school, this group reported, "Instead of buying books, they used money to put bars on windows [that] don't even open." One of the students said, "We wanted to show that not all the kids in there are that bad," adding, "If our youth is the future of our country, then we'd better take care of [them] even if they're in trouble."

The teachers of the Bayside program believed that having students seek out and address areas of injustice in society would

- Sensitize students to the diverse needs and perspectives of fellow citizens;
- Teach students to recognize injustice and critically assess root causes of social problems; and
- Provide students with an understanding of how to change established systems and structures.

Bayside, like Madison, was successful in meeting many of the curriculum planners' stated goals. Bayside students, for example, also noted the importance of making their classroom learning meaningful. One Bayside class member reported, "I don't like to learn just by reading because it goes in one ear and out the other; but in this class we can really make a difference." Others made comments such as these: "This class was more exciting because it was more real"; "We were out there instead of just with our heads in the books"; and, "I liked feeling like we could do something positive." Ayisha spoke about the connection this way: "Before this experience, I thought

school was just about passing this test or that test. . . . Now I finally see [that] you can use your knowledge of history to make a better world." Also, like their Madison counterparts, Bayside students indicated an increased sense of civic efficacy (+0.47), likely attributable to their experiences in the community, and an increased belief that government has a responsibility to help those in need (+0.29).

But although the Bayside and Madison curricular experiences shared a number of features, other aspects of their curriculums, goals, and effects on students differed significantly. For example, survey results from Bayside reflected the program's emphasis on critical social analysis and on understanding political forces that affect social policy (see Table 3). Students reported significant increases on items measuring their ability to consider structural explanations for poverty (+0.28) and their interest in politics and political issues (+0.33)—scales on which Madison students showed no change. Conversely, Bayside students did not demonstrate gains in their knowledge about particular community groups or about the technical challenges and possibilities associated with particular policies and initiatives, whereas the

Table 3
Bayside Students for Justice

Factors (Cronbach's alpha pretest, posttest)	Change	Pretest	Posttest	Significance level	Number of students
Personal responsibility to help others (.62, .74)	.09	3.84	3.94	.60	21
Commitment to community involvement (.54, .71)	.07	3.58	3.45	.77	21
Interest in politics (.81, .81)	.33*	2.68	3.01	.02	21
Structural/individual explanations for poverty (.59, .61)	.28*	3.88	4.16	.04	21
Desire to work for justice (.65, .73)	−.09	3.19	3.10	.54	21
Civic efficacy (.66, .71)	.47*	3.03	3.50	.04	21
Vision (.65, .71)	.36	2.43	2.79	.15	21
Knowledge/social capital for community development (.67, .72)	.17	2.76	2.93	.43	21
Leadership efficacy (.78, .81)	.12	3.13	3.26	.36	21
I will volunteer (.80, .86)	.18	3.10	3.28	.22	21
Follow the news (.43, .41)	.27*	3.13	3.40	.02	21
Government responsibility for those in need (.68, .61)	.29*	3.19	3.48	.05	21
Employer responsibility for employees (.83, .87)	−.05	4.37	4.32	.73	21

*$p < .05$.

Madison students showed evidence of progress in these areas. Madison students reported statistically significant ($p < .05$) gains on survey items linked to leadership skills, vision, and knowledge related to civic participation (as well as on items linked to their sense of personal responsibility to help others); Bayside students did not.

Our case study of Bayside helps us understand the reasons for these different outcomes. Specifically, at the center of Bayside's approach were commitments to critical and structural social analysis, to making the personal political, and to collective responsibility for action.

Critical and Structural Social Analysis

The class that best illustrates the Bayside program's focus on critical analysis and social critique was the one led by Nadia Franconi, a veteran social studies teacher and one of the program's founders. Franconi saw an understanding of social justice as an essential component of informed citizenship. Adorning her classroom walls were several posters with quotations from well-known educators, religious leaders, and social critics, for example, Bishop Dom Helder Camara: "When I give food to the poor, they call me a saint. When I ask why the poor have no food, they call me a communist"; Paulo Freire: "Washing one's hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless means to side with the powerful, not to be neutral."

Franconi had her students study a variety of manifestations of violence in their community, including domestic violence, child abuse, and gang violence. They arrived at this choice through a process in which the teacher had them "map" their communities (to gain a sense of what issues affected the students' own lives and the lives of others) and write about an issue that deeply angered or affected them. Using a weighted vote, students came up with violence as an issue they found both common across their lives and deplorable in its social consequences. Their work on that topic was combined with a domestic violence curriculum that the teacher decided to use and a 3-day retreat on violence prevention organized by the violence-prevention group Manalive/Womanalive.

In class, the students focused on the causes and consequences of violence in their lives and in their community. They began by sharing stories of their own experiences with violence (at home, in their neighborhood, at school). One student, for example, talked about a shooting incident that she had witnessed several blocks from her house. Another wrote about his experience with domestic violence in his family. What made this teacher's approach unusual, however, was not the focus on violence (many teachers discuss violence with students in urban classrooms).[13] It was the way that she engaged students in a discussion of social, political, and economic forces that contribute to violence.

In one classroom activity, students compared demographic data on per capita income broken down by neighborhood with data on the prevalence of violent crime, also broken down by neighborhood. Students also explored

various beliefs about violence expressed by politicians, writers, the media, and community groups and organizations. At virtually every stage of the curriculum, their own stories and the incidents of violence reported in the media were examined in relation to broader social, political, and economic forces. Students used their own and their classmates' experiences as a means of exploring ways to prevent violence and promote human rights and social justice. In another class session, for example, Franconi asked, "What does violence reveal about what else is going on, and how can we fix it?" The class then created a reverse flow chart, starting at the bottom where an incident of domestic violence had occurred and connecting it to events and forces that might have provoked the violence. One student, Tameka, posited, "There must have been a lot of tension in the house." The following exchange ensued:

Teacher: And what might have led to that much tension?
Keri: Maybe Dad lost his job
Hector: And then he started drinking.
Keri: Maybe there's no money.
Teacher: We can't really know, right, but there could be a lot of pressure on these people right now.

Through this and similar discussions, students focused their thinking on relationships between structural dynamics and the behavior of individuals.[14]

Making the Personal Political

At the same time that structural dynamics were examined in relation to individual behavior, personal responsibility also received substantial attention. For example, the retreat that the Bayside students attended on violence prevention taught students to work hard at controlling anger and stressed the need always to consider the consequences of their actions. Many character traits of a personally responsible citizen are important to Bayside's enactment of the justice-oriented citizen.

However, unlike many other programs that emphasize personal responsibility (like the character education programs we described earlier), Bayside's approach did not merely exhort students to adopt certain values or behaviors such as self-control, honesty, punctuality, and caring for others; it also included an implicit critique of societal structures and encouraged students to examine the relationship between those structures and how individuals behave. Approaches like those used by Nadia Franconi challenge a conservative focus on personal responsibility without rejecting the basic premise that it is important how children and adults behave. These approaches conclude that an individual's character does matter, but that character can best be understood—and changed—through social analysis and attention to root causes of social injustices. The program seeks to enhance students' understanding of society rather than simply giving students a list of values that they are to embrace and behaviors that they are magically to adopt.

Under the Manalive/Womanalive curriculum, Franconi's students discussed social, political, and economic factors that reinforce notions that men are superior to women and that they should enforce that superiority if it is challenged, with the result that some men turn violent and some women learn to tolerate men's violence. Thus, in addition to talking about how to take greater responsibility for improving their own behavior with respect to violence and anger, Franconi's students talked about their own experiences with violence to better understand and develop strategies to change institutions, structures, or conditions that cause or encourage violent behavior.

Contrasting this curricular approach with the Character Counts! Coalition's take on how to avoid violence, it becomes clear how the Bayside program incorporated important aspects of the personally responsible citizen into its emphasis on both understanding unjust social contexts and pursuing just ones. Recall that the Character Counts! Coalition advocates respect, good manners, dealing peacefully with anger, and so on. Franconi points out the limitations of this version of personal responsibility for teaching what she considers to be good citizenship by highlighting what she sees as the simplistic questions and answers that character education poses. She sees character educators making fallacious assumptions: "If I were individually responsible, the world would be a better place. There wouldn't be racism. There wouldn't be sexism." "I think [being a good person] is lovely, Franconi explains, "[but] you get trained in these roles" without ever being asked to consider other, larger problems that are "bigger than the self."

If there is a lesson to be learned about personal responsibility for Franconi, it is that the personal is political, that personal experiences and behavior both result from, and are indicators of, broader political forces. For Bayside Students for Justice, personal responsibility requires that one study and seek to change those forces. With this recognition, Franconi is able to structure a curriculum that promotes citizens who are both personally responsible and justice oriented.

Collective Responsibility for Action

Students in the Bayside program learn not only that individual behavior often results from societal factors, but also that social change is the product of collective effort. Even before the students started the research and service aspects of their projects, their teacher noted that, through the process of community mapping and choosing their topic, students had begun to think of themselves differently. They had begun to see themselves as part of a youth community with the potential to transform and improve society to make it more just. One student put it this way:

> [How] can I make a difference? One person with good intentions in a bad world cannot make a difference. This is what the structure of our society makes me believe. Yet I know that if I take the stand, others will follow.

Consistently, in interviews and written assignments, students demonstrated their understanding of a collective rather than individual vision for effecting change. After listening in class to the song "We Who Believe in Freedom," by Sweet Honey in the Rock, one young man wrote that "whether the struggle is big or small it should be everyone's responsibility together. . . . Movements are not about me, they're about us." Another student—a football player—observed that there was "a lot of camaraderie on the field, but in the classroom, it seems like everyone works as an individual to better themselves. In this class, we're working as a group to better everything around us."

Thus, in contrast to programs that seek to teach that "one person can make a difference," Bayside students emphasized the need to address social problems collectively.

The Political Significance of Different Conceptions of Citizenship: Some Comparisons

Both Madison County Youth in Public Service and Bayside Students for Justice were effective in achieving goals consistent with their respective underlying conceptions of citizenship. Yet our qualitative and quantitative data regarding these programs demonstrate important differences in impact. The Madison program appeared to have a powerful impact on students' capacities for, and commitments to, civic participation. Students could detail the skills they had used (conducting polls, interviewing officials, making presentations, reading legislation), as well as the knowledge they had gained about how government works. Survey measures of the students' sense of personal responsibility to help others, their vision of how to help, and their leadership efficacy show significant changes (see Table 4). Especially notable in both the survey and interview data was the change in students' confidence that they had the knowledge or "social capital" to make things happen in the community. Interviews, observa-

Table 4
Educating for Different Kinds of Citizenship

	Change from pretest to posttest	
Factors	Madison County Youth in Public Service	Bayside Students for Justice
Personal responsibility to help others	.21*	.09
Knowledge/social capital for community development	.94**	.17
Leadership efficacy	.31**	.12
Interest in politics	.03	.33*
Structural/individual explanations for poverty	−.10	.28*

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$

tions, and examples of student work all reinforced the survey finding of a dramatic (+.94) increase in students' sense that they had knowledge of what resources were available to help with community projects and how to contact and work effectively with community organizations to mobilize those resources. This confidence grew out of their involvement in substantive projects that required frequent interaction with multiple community actors and agencies.

In addition, Madison students spoke extensively during interviews about the micro-politics and technical challenges associated with their projects. "I thought there was cooperation amongst the departments," one Madison student told us, "but then, the more we got into it, the more I realized Person One is in charge of A, B, and C, and Person Two is in charge of X, Y, and Z." Students were frustrated with various departments that did not work well together and with what they identified as "turf issues." Many noted a poor working relationship between the county and the city.

We did not, however, see evidence that the Madison program sparked interest in or conveyed knowledge of broad social critiques and systemic reform. As noted in the discussion of the politics of participatory citizenship, Madison students tended to downplay or ignore explicitly political or ideologically contentious issues. They were not able to talk about how varied interests and power relationships or issues of race and social class might be related to the lack of consensus on priorities and the inability of varied groups to work effectively together. For example, Mark, a Madison student explained:

> A lot of people have preconceived notions that [community work] is so political . . . that . . . everything [is] divided between Republicans and Democrats, [but] people don't realize that . . . what your political agenda is doesn't really matter because when you're helping out in the community, you're not helping a party, you're helping a person.

Because structural and individual causes of poverty were not discussed as part of the curriculum, it is not surprising that students' perspectives on such issues did not change as a result of their participation. Nor did their interest in talking about or being involved in politics change.

To a much greater degree, the Bayside students talked about the need for forms of civic involvement that addressed issues of social justice and macro-level critique of society. When asked whether violence prevention programs such as the Manalive/Womanalive retreat could eliminate violence, Desiree eagerly praised the program but then added:

> There's some things that you see out there, the struggle [when] people are trying to do their best but still they're being brought down by society, and I think that's very troublesome.

Other students also emphasized the need to address root causes of problems such as poverty, governmental neglect, and racism. After telling the class

about his cousin who was arrested for carrying a weapon, Derrick wondered aloud to the class about how best to proceed:

> It would be great if nobody had weapons, but where does [the violence] begin? If the police are discriminating [and] if I can't get a job, . . . there's going to be a lot of anger. . . . The police aren't going to act better because [I'm] trying to make my neighborhood better.

And Tamika put it this way: "Lots of people want to be nice, [but] if you don't got food for your kids, how nice is that?"

Thus, in comparison with students from Madison, students who took part in the Bayside Students for Justice curriculum appeared to emphasize social critique significantly more and technocratic skills associated with participation somewhat less. For example, students were more likely at the end of the program than at the beginning to posit structural explanations for social problems (stating, for example, that the problem of poverty resulted from the shortage of jobs that pay wages high enough to support a family rather than from individuals' being lazy and not wanting to work). They were more likely than their Madison peers to be interested in, and want to discuss, politics and political issues, and they were more likely to seek redress of root causes of difficult social ills. As one student told us after several months in the Bayside program, "when the economy's bad and people start blaming immigrants or whoever else they can blame, they've got to realize that there are big social, economic, and political issues tied together, that it's not the immigrants, no, it's bigger than them."

To the extent that Bayside students learned about participatory skills, they focused on extragovernmental social activism (such as community organizing or protesting) that challenged existing norms rather than reinforcing them. Evidence from observations, interviews, student work, and surveys of Bayside students did not show an increase in students' knowledge about particular community resources. Unlike their Madison peers, Bayside students' sense of being effective community leaders (knowing how to run meetings, for example) remained unchanged. Nor was there any increase in students' sense of *personal* responsibility to help others (as opposed to their inclination for collective action for change that was frequently expressed during interviews).

Thus programs that successfully educate for democracy can promote very different outcomes. Some programs may foster the ability or the commitment to participate, while others may prompt critical analysis that focuses on macro structural issues, the role of interest groups, power dynamics, and/or social justice. And these differences often are politically significant. Indeed, answering the question "Which program better develops citizens?" necessarily engages the political views that surround varied conceptions of citizenship, because the question leaves open the definition of a good citizen. Educators who view civic participation as of primary importance would likely view the Madison County Youth in Public Service program as extraordinarily effective.

Alternatively, those who believe that students should learn how to examine social structures and deliberate about principles and practices of justice might prefer that participants in the Madison program couple their community action with talk about the need for structural change, about methods used historically to bring change about (those employed by various social movements, for example), or about social injustice.[15]

The social context and political norms of a given community can also shape curricular decisions and the impact of curriculum on students. The Bayside and Madison programs, for example, were located in very different communities. It may well be that Bayside's urban school environment exposed students to more forms of injustice and rhetoric related to injustice than the Madison students encountered in their largely homogeneous and middle-class community. The exposure of the Bayside students, in turn, may have made it more likely that they would gravitate toward justice-oriented themes.[16] The differing political climates certainly influenced the teachers' options. This was evident, for example, in the reaction of the Bayside director to the focus on social critique by Bayside students and other groups (who met three times during our study to discuss their programs with each other). She told us, "If my superintendent or board heard me saying what you all are saying, I'd be fired." When it comes to politically contentious topics, context matters. The ways that contexts shape both the constraints placed on teachers and the curriculum's impact on students clearly deserve extensive study.

Conclusion

Proponents of the democratic purposes of education, especially advocates of participatory and justice-oriented goals, frequently complain that they are fighting an uphill battle (Wood, 1993; Cuban & Shipps, 2000; Goodlad, 1979; Clark & Wasley, 1999). Traditional academic priorities and the current narrow emphasis on test scores crowd out other possibilities (Meier, 2000; Noddings, 1999; Ohanian, 2002). Given public schools' central role in helping to shape citizens, this conflict clearly is worthy of attention.

But what kind of citizens are the schools trying to shape? As educators interested in schooling's civic purposes, we maintain that it is not enough to argue that democratic values are as important as traditional academic priorities. We must also ask what kind of democratic values. What political and ideological interests are embedded in or easily attached to varied conceptions of citizenship? Varied priorities—personal responsibility, participatory citizenship and justice-oriented citizenship—embody significantly different beliefs regarding the capacities and commitments that citizens need for democracy to flourish; and they carry significantly different implications for pedagogy, curriculum, evaluation, and educational policy. Moreover, because the ways that educators advance these visions may privilege some political perspectives regarding the ways problems are framed and responded to, there is a politics involved in educating for democracy—a politics that deserves careful attention.

Our study of Madison County Youth in Public Service and Bayside Students for Justice demonstrates the importance of distinguishing between programs that emphasize participatory citizenship and those that emphasize the pursuit of justice. Although each program was effective in achieving its goals, qualitative and quantitative data regarding the programs demonstrated important differences in their impact. The study indicates that programs that champion participation do not necessarily develop students' abilities to analyze and critique root causes of social problems and vice versa (see Kahne, Chi, & Middaugh, 2003, for a study that comes to a similar conclusion). Although people who are committed to the democratic purposes of education may extol the value of linking priorities related to participation and justice, our study indicates that links between participation and justice not guaranteed. If both goals are priorities, the people who design and implement curriculum must give explicit attention to both. Similarly, as noted earlier, related research has found that initiatives that support the development of personally responsible citizens may not be effective in increasing participation in local or national affairs. In fact, efforts to pursue some conceptions of personal responsibility appear to further a politically conservative vision of the role of government and of the need for structural change. Indeed, there are some indications that curriculum and education policies designed to foster personal responsibility undermine efforts to prepare both participatory and justice-oriented citizens.

From the standpoint of research and evaluation, the implications for the development of democratic values and capacities are significant. Studies that fail to reflect the varied range of educational priorities in relation to democratic values and capacities will tell only part of the story. Moreover, because the desirability of many politically relevant outcomes is tightly tied to one's political preferences, consensus among scholars regarding "right" answers or sometimes even "better" answers to many relevant questions may be hard to achieve. Knowing, for example, whether a student now places greater emphasis on recycling or on environmental regulation does not enable us to say that a program was effective. However, it does help us understand the program's effects.

In acknowledging a lack of "right" answers, we do not mean to imply a sense of neutrality with respect to varied conceptions of democratic values. Instead, we mean to emphasize that politics and the interests of varied groups are often deeply embedded in the ways that we conceptualize and study efforts to educate for democracy. Politics and the interests associated with the varied conceptions therefore require close attention. We can focus on whether a given curriculum changes students' sense of personal responsibility, government responsibility, or employer responsibility, for example. If we ask only about personal responsibility (and if discussions of personal responsibility are disconnected from analysis of the social, economic, and political context), we may well be reinforcing a conservative and often individualistic notion of citizenship. Yet this is the focus of many programs and of their associated evaluations. If citizenship also requires collective participation and critical analysis of social structures, then other lenses are needed as well.

Clearly, highlighting the political significance of curricular choices must be done with care. Such dialogues may help to clarify what is at stake, but raising these issues can also lead to dysfunctional stalemates and may deepen differences rather than prompting more thoughtful inquiry. Yet not all discord is problematic—when the stakes are high, conflict is both likely and appropriate. Indeed, thoughtful analysis requires that those who design curriculum and those who study its impact be cognizant of and responsive to these important distinctions and their political implications. The choices we make have consequences for the kind of society we ultimately help to create.

Notes

This article received the Outstanding Paper of 2003 Award for Research in Social Studies Education from the American Educational Research Association and the Outstanding Paper of the Year Award from the Division on Teaching and Learning of the American Political Science Association. The research was generously supported by grants from the Surdna Foundation, with additional funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. The authors wish to thank Harry Boyte, Pamela Burdman, Bernadette Chi, Larry Cuban, Jeff Howard, Gordon Lafer, Barbara Leckie, Bethany Rogers, Robert Sherman, Dorothy Shipps, Jim Toole, and several anonymous reviewers. For help in structuring Table 1, we are indebted to James Toole and a focus group of Minnesota teachers. The authors are solely responsible for any and all conclusions.

[1]Our desire to respond to prominent educational theories related to democratic ideals and to develop a framework that practitioners would find both clear and meaningful led us to modify our categories in several ways. For example, we began this study by emphasizing a distinction between "charity" and "change." We had used this distinction in earlier writing (Kahne & Westheimer, 1996). Through the course of our work, however, it became clear that the distinction did not do enough to capture some major currents in the dialogues of practitioners and scholars regarding democratic educational goals and ways to achieve them. In addition, once our three categories were identified, we found that some of our rhetoric failed to clearly convey our intent. For example, we had initially titled our third category *social reconstructionist.* As a result of dialogues with practitioners, this was changed to *social reformer* and finally to *justice-oriented citizen.*

[2]We should note here that although adherents to the political philosophy of John Rawls also use a language of justice, their perspective is different from (though not necessarily in conflict with) what we describe as the justice-oriented citizen. For Rawlsians, the State's respect for different conceptions of the good and refusal to endorse particular conceptions of the good are matters of justice.

[3]The strongest proponents of this perspective were likely the Social Reconstructionists, who gained their greatest hearing between the two world wars. Educators such as Harold Rugg (1921/1996) argued that the teaching of history, in particular, and the school curriculum, more generally, should be developed in ways that connect with important and enduring social problems. George Counts (1932) wrote, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* He wanted educators to critically assess varied social and economic institutions while also "engag[ing] in the positive task of creating a new tradition in American life" (p. 262). The Social Reconstructionists believed that truly effective citizens needed opportunities to analyze and understand the interplay of social, economic, and political forces and to take part in projects through which they might develop skills and commitments for working collectively to improve society.

[4]For a discussion of the distinction between indoctrination and education for justice-oriented citizenship, see Westheimer and Kahne, 2002 and 2003.

[5]Moreover, those with libertarian leanings sometimes argue that the practice of civic virtue and responsible behavior can diminish the need for democratic governance and that such personal qualities will enable democratic governments to work effectively.

[6]Personal responsibility need not be framed in individualistic and conservative terms. Henry David Thoreau, for example, conceptualized personal responsibility in ways that

were not conservative. And one could also imagine visions of personal responsibility that embodied commitments to collective action. However, as put forward in most current public discussions related to citizenship, the focus is conservative and individualistic in that it emphasizes charity, personal morality, and the efforts of individuals rather than working to alter institutional structures through collective action.

[7]We highlight these two programs because, of the four high school programs in the sample, these two were the most clearly aligned with the two perspectives that we wished to investigate (participatory and justice-oriented). The other two high school programs, although compelling for several reasons, embraced a broader and less specific democratic vision.

[8]During the 2nd year of our study, we also administered pre and post surveys to two control classrooms from the Madison program. These classrooms were also 12th-grade government classrooms, served students of similar academic ability, and were taught by the same two teachers. An appropriate control classroom was not available in the case of Bayside.

[9]For a discussion of the 1st-year experience and findings, see Kahne and Westheimer, in press.

[10]As an indicator of personal responsibility, we used a scale named "Personal responsibility to help others." It included items that measured students' individual commitments to recycle, for example. Our measure of participatory citizenship was called "Commitment to community involvement." We also had three scales related to social justice: One assessed students' interest in political affairs, another assessed students' understanding of "structural vs. individual explanations for poverty," and a third assessed students' desire to work toward justice by, for example, examining root causes of problems and legislation or social policies that perpetuate injustice.

Our measures of commitment to community involvement, personal responsibility, volunteering, and vision, were adapted from the National Learning Through Service Survey developed by the Search Institute. Some of those measures, in turn, were adapted from instruments developed by Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin (see *Instruments and Scoring Guide of the Experiential Education Evaluation Project,* 1981, Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, St. Paul). Items related to social capital and leadership efficacy draw on a leadership measure developed for the Community Service Leadership Workshop (contact Jim Seiber, Issaquah School District 411, Issaquah, WA 98027). For a list of all items associated with each scale, please contact the authors.

[11]The descriptions that follow were captured from field notes and audiotapes. The quotations are verbatim. The names of schools, students, and teachers are pseudonyms.

[12]In one case, for our measure of civic efficacy, we did not find a statistically significant difference ($p = .22$). Thus, although our data indicate statistically significant gains in civic efficacy for students who experienced the Madison curriculum, it is not clear that those changes were different from those experienced by students in the control classrooms.

[13]Students in the Bayside program also expressed skepticism of corporate-sponsored civic initiatives (Coca Cola's sponsoring of Earth Day activities, for example, or Phillip Morris initiatives to "build our communities"). In interviews, they reported that, in general, it was unwise to count on businesses to set the tone for improving communities or solving difficult problems that do not have "making money" or advertising as a goal. A number of classroom discussions also focused on the differences between political or legislative approaches to environmental regulations and those voluntarily promoted by private corporations.

[14]The distinctions that we draw between participatory and justice-oriented citizenship assume a predisposition to the basic mechanics of legislative democracy common to many school-based programs. For example, the Bayside Students for Justice curriculum takes seriously the notion that critical analysis can be fruitful only in a democratic culture. To teach the fundamentals of the democratic process, Franconi had her students engage in exercises such as planning a class party by the same means that Congress uses to pass a bill. Madison teachers conducted similar activities.

[15]From responses on our pretest surveys, we know that youth in the two communities started in different places on several relevant measures. As detailed in Tables 2 and 3, for example, Bayside students were far more likely to offer structural explanations for

poverty than Madison youth, and Madison youth were much more likely to express confidence in their knowledge related to community development. What is particularly interesting about our posttest survey results is that they demonstrate that, beyond these initial differences, Bayside's curriculum led students to support structural explanations even more strongly, and Madison's curriculum led to students to hold even greater confidence in their knowledge related to community development.

References

Ayers, W., Hunt, J. A., & Quinn, T. (Eds.). (1998). *Teaching for social justice.* New York: New Press and Teachers College Press

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

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

Barber, B. (1998). *A place for us: How to make society civil and democracy strong.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Bennett, W. J. (1995). (Ed.). *The moral compass: Stories for a life's journey* ("Citizenship and Leadership" section). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bennett, W. J. (1998). The place to harvest patriots. *School Administrator, 55*(5), 38–40.

Bennett, W. J., Cribb, J. T., and Finn, C. E. (1999). *The educated child* ("Character Education" section, pp. 523–539). New York: Free Press.

Bigelow, W., & Diamond, N. (1988). *The power in our hands: A curriculum on the history of work and workers in the United States.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Boyte, H. C. (1991). Community service and civic education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(10), 765–767.

Boyte, H. C., & Kari, N. N. (1996). *Building America: The democratic promise of public work.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Butts, R. F. (1988). The moral imperative for American schools: ". . . inflame the civic temper. . . ." *American Journal of Education, 96*(2), 162–194.

Callan, E. (1997). *Creating citizens: Political education and liberal democracy.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Character Counts! Coalition. (2004). *The Six Pillars of Character.* Retrieved on January 23, 2004, from *http://www.charactercounts.org/defsix.htm*

Clark, R. W., & Wasley, P. A. (1999). Renewing schools and smarter kids: Promises for democracy. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(8), 590–596.

Connolly, W. E. (1983). *The terms of political discourse* (2nd ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Counts, G. (1932). *Dare the school build a new social order?* New York: John Day.

Cuban, L., & Shipps, D. (Eds.). (2000). *Reconstructing the common good in education: Coping with intractable American dilemmas.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Datta, L. (1997). A pragmatic basis for mixed-method designs. *New Directions for Evaluation, 74,* 33–46.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education.* New York: Free Press.

Fine, M. (1995). *Habits of mind: Struggling over values in America's classrooms.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51*(4), 327–358.

Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Goodlad, J. I. (1979). *What schools are for.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation.

Gutmann, A. (1986). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hanna, P. R. (1936). *Youth serves the community*. New York: D. Appleton-Century.

Isaac, K. (1992). *Civics for democracy: The journey for teachers and students* (A project of the Center for Study of Responsive and Essential Information). Washington DC: Essential Books.

Kaestle, C. F. (2000) Toward a political economy of citizenship: Historical perspectives on the purposes of common schools. In L. McDonnell, P. M. Timpane, & R. Benjamin (Eds.), *Rediscovering the democratic purposes of education*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Kahne, J., Chi, B., & Middaugh, E. (2003). *Democratic education: The untapped potential of high school government courses*. Manuscript submitted for publication. For copies, please contact J. Kahne at *jkahne@mills.edu*.

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (1996). In the service of what? The politics of service learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77*(9), 593–599.

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (2003). Teaching democracy: What schools need to do. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(1), 34–40, 57–66.

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (in press). The limits of efficacy: Educating citizens for a democratic society. In J. Giarelli, & B. Rubin, *Civic education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kahne, J., Westheimer, J., & Rogers, B. (Fall, 2000). Service learning and citizenship: Directions for research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 42–51.

Lickona, T. (1993). The return of character education. *Educational Leadership, 51*(3), 6–11.

Mann, H. (1838). *First annual report*. Boston, MA: Dutton & Wentworth.

Meier, D. (2000). *Will standards save public education?* (New Democracy Forum Series). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

National Association of Secretaries of State. (1999). *New Millennium Project–Phase I: A nationwide study of 15–24 year old youth*. Alexandria, VA: Tarrance Group.

Newmann, F. (1975). *Education for citizen action: Challenge for secondary curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Noddings, N. (1999). Renewing democracy in schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(8), 579–583.

Ohanian, S. (2002). *What happened to recess and why are our children struggling in kindergarten?* New York: McGraw-Hill.

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

Patton, M. Q. (1988). Paradigms and pragmatism. In D. M. Fetterman (Ed.), *Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education: The silent scientific revolution*. New York: Praeger.

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

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rugg, H. O. (1996). Reconstructing the curriculum: An open letter to Professor Henry Johnson commenting on committee procedure as illustrated by the Report of the Joint Committee on History and Education for Citizenship. In W. C. Parker (Ed.), *Educating the democratic mind* (pp. 45–60). Albany: State University of New York Press. (Work originally published in 1921 in *Historical Outlook, 12*, 184–189)

Sax, L. J., Astin, A., Korn, W. S., & Mahoney, K. (1999). *The American freshman: National norms for Fall 1999*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Schudson, M. (1998). *The good citizen: A history of American civic life*. New York: Free Press.

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, R. M. (1997). *Civic ideals: Conflicting visions of citizenship in U.S. history*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Soder, R., Goodlad, J. I., & McMannon, T. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Developing democratic character in the young*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Strauss, A. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory, procedures, and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Strike, K. (1999). Perfectionism and neutrality: A response to Hostetler. *Philosophy of Education Society Yearbook 1999*. Retrieved February 9, 2004, at *http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/1999/strike.asp*

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic volunteerism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2000, January 26). Service learning required—But what exactly do students learn? *Education Week*, 42.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2002). Educating for democracy. In R. Hayduk & K. Mattson (Eds.), *Democracy's moment: Reforming the American political system for the 21st century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2003). *Teaching justice: Indoctrination, neutrality, and the need for alternatives*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago.

Wood, G. (1993). *Schools that work: America's most innovative public education programs*. New York: Plume.

Wynne, E. A. (1986). The great tradition in education: Transmitting moral values. *Educational Leadership, 43*(4), 4–9.

Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1997). *Community service and social responsibility in youth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Manuscript received June 10, 2003
Revision received December 24, 2003
Accepted March 1, 2004