Educating the "Good" Citizen: Political Choices and Pedagogical Goals

by
Joel Westheimer,
University of Ottawa
Joseph Kahne,
Mills College

At the level of rhetoric, most educators, policymakers, and citizens agree that developing students' capacities and commitments for effective and democratic citizenship is important. When we get specific about what democracy requires and about what kind of school curricula will best promote it, however, much of that consensus falls away. For some, a commitment to democracy is a promise to protect liberal notions of freedom, while for others democracy is primarily about equality or equality of opportunity. For some, civil society is the key, while for others, free markets are the great hope for a democratic society. For some, good citizens in a democracy volunteer, while for others they take active parts in political processes by voting, protesting, and working on political campaigns.

It is not surprising, then, that the growing number of educational programs that seek to further democracy by nurturing "good" citizens embody a similarly broad variety of goals and practices. We title this article "Educating the 'Good' 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 add the subtitle "Political Choices and Pedagogical Goals" to reflect 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 with political consequences.

Consider, for example, the following perspectives. In 1985, Bill Bennett, then secretary of education under Ronald Reagan, wrote: "A democracy depends on schools that help to foster a kind of character which respects the law and . . . respects the value of the individual" (1985).

That same year, in his book *The Politics of Education: Culture, Power and Liberation*, Paulo Freire stated that, "Democracy requires oppressed groups to develop political determination, that is, to organize and mobilize in order to achieve their own objectives. Education can make possible such a democracy" (1985). The next year, Albert Shanker, then president of the American Federation of Teachers, had this to say in a speech entitled "Education and Democratic Citizenship": "How can we fail to build a world in which the rights due to every human being from birth are respected? In order to build this world . . . we must [have schools] teach democracy (1986). Finally, President George W. Bush recently established the National Veterans Awareness week and launched a new school program aimed at rekindling our democratic spirit. He called the program "Lessons of Liberty" in which, in the words of the president: "Veterans will visit elementary and high school classrooms to teach the ideals of democracy and freedom that American servicemen have defended for over two centuries" (2001).

Each of these quotations takes seriously the idea that schools are essential for democracy. Yet Bennett, Freire, Shanker, and Bush each provide their own sense of what democracy requires and how schools can help us strengthen their respective—and often competing—visions of a democratic society. When educators, policymakers, politicians, and community activists pursue democracy, they do so in many different ways and towards many different ends.

Students are no more in agreement on what good citizenship means than are teachers, policy makers, or politicians. We asked students in focus groups what it means to be a good citizen. One in an urban California school said: "Someone who's active and stands up for what they believe in. If they know that something's going on that is wrong, they go out and change it." But a student from a different urban California school told us that to be a good citizen, you need to "follow the rules, I guess, as hard as you can, even though you want to break them sometimes. Like cattle" (Kahne et al. 2003).

For many educators, making the case for democracy and the important role schools have in pursuing it is not difficult. Political scientists and civic educators alike are familiar with statistics documenting a precipitous decline in voting rates, with the biggest declines among young people. Political participation, such as working for a political party, for example, is at a 40-year low (Saguaro Seminar 2000). And targeting what people do not know about civics remains a favorite pastime of not only Jay Leno, but also of educators and politicians: one study, by the National Constitution

Center, found that only 38% of respondents could name all three branches of government while a separate poll conducted two years earlier found that 59% of all Americans could name the three stooges (Dudley and Gitelson 2002). Recent debates about domestic security, individual liberties, and foreign policy have further spurred educators to reexamine the role of schools in educating students to be thoughtful and engaged citizens.

One of the biggest areas of growth has been in the area of service learning and community service. Such practices have been marketed in large part through claims that they can respond to the civic mission of schools. Cities such as Chicago, Washington, D.C., and Atlanta, as well as the entire state of Maryland, have created service and service learning requirements to advance such goals. Indeed, a recent survey by the National Center for Education Statistics revealed that 83% of high schools currently offer community-service opportunities, compared with 27% in 1984. The visions of citizenship reflected in these and related civic education policies and programs warrant careful attention.

Three Kinds of Citizens

What Kind of Citizen Do We Need to Support an Effective Democratic Society?

We examined 10 programs engaged in the Surdna Foundation's Democratic Values Initiative, as part of a multi-year study of school-based programs that aim to teach democratic citizenship. From the study of both democratic

theory and program goals and practices, we constructed a framework to order some of the diverse perspectives. We found three visions of "citizenship" particularly helpful: the *personally responsible citizen*; the *participatory citizen*; and the *justice-oriented citizen* (see Table 1).[1]

The Personally Responsible Citizen

The *personally responsible citizen* acts responsibly in his/her community by, for example, picking up litter, giving blood, recycling, volunteering, and staying out of debt. The personally responsible citizen works and pays taxes, obeys laws, and helps those in need during crises such as snowstorms or floods. 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. S/he might contribute time, money, or both to charitable causes.

Both those in the character education movement and many of those who advocate community service would emphasize this individualistic vision of good citizenship. Programs that seek to develop personally responsible citizens hope to build character and personal responsibility by emphasizing honesty, integrity, self-discipline, and hard work (Mann 1838; and currently proponents such as Lickona 1993; Wynne 1986). 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. They want students not to "threaten, hit, or hurt anyone [or use] bad language" (Character Counts! 1996). Other

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 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 and change established systems and structures when they reproduce patterns of injustice over time

programs that seek to develop personally responsible citizens hope to nurture compassion by engaging students in volunteer activities. As illustrated in the mission 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" (Points of Light 2003).

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 local, state, and national levels. We call this kind of citizen the *participatory citizen*. Educational programs designed to support the development of participatory citizens focus on teaching students about how government and other institutions (e.g., community based organizations, churches) work and about the importance of planning and participating in organized efforts to care for those in need, for example, or in efforts to guide school policies. While the personally responsible citizen would contribute cans of food for the homeless, the participatory citizen might organize the food drive.

In the tradition of 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. 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, 118).

The Justice-Oriented Citizen

A third image of a good citizen is, perhaps, the perspective that is least commonly pursued. We refer to this view as the justice-oriented citizen, one that calls explicit attention to matters of injustice and to the importance of pursuing social justice goals. Justice-oriented citizens critically assess social, political, and economic structures and consider collective strategies for change that challenge injustice and, when possible, address root causes of problems. 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. However, these programs emphasize preparing 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 affect systemic change (See, for example, Isaac 1992; Bigelow and Diamond 1988).

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. That today's citizens are "bowling alone" (Putnam 2000) would worry those 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 or to critically analyze the social, economic, and political structures that generate problems. This is not to say that justice-oriented citizens necessarily promote a left-of-center perspective. One can adopt a structural approach to "stemming the erosion of

support for 'traditional' families" or to "building greater support for 'non-traditional' families," for example.

The strongest proponents of the justice-oriented perspective were likely the Social Reconstructionists who gained their greatest hearing between the two world wars. Educators like Harold Rugg (1921) 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. Similarly, George Counts 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" (1932, 262). These educators emphasized 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.[2]

Conflicting Priorities

Is it possible to pursue all three of these visions? Perhaps. Might there be conflicts? Yes. Certainly participatory citizens or those committed to justice can simultaneously be dependable or honest. However, there may also be conflicts. The emphasis placed on individual character and behavior, for example, can obscure the need for collective and often public sector initiatives.

Citizenship without Politics: Service and Character, But Not Democracy

A vast majority of school-based service learning and community service programs embrace a vision of citizenship devoid of politics; they often promote service but not democracy. They share an orientation toward volunteerism and charity and away from teaching about social movements, social transformation, and systemic change. These programs privilege individual acts of compassion and kindness over social action and the pursuit of social justice.

We find the emphasis placed on personal responsibility and character an inadequate response to the challenges of educating a democratic citizenry. Clearly, personal responsibility traits commonly associated with character (telling the truth, helping others, being polite) may strengthen a democracy by fostering social trust and willingness to commit to collective efforts, for example. We are not arguing against these goals (with the exception of certain visions of obedience that are sometimes associated with this agenda). Our point is rather that granting primacy to this goal can impede other fundamentally important goals for civic educators. First, the emphasis placed on individual character and behavior can obscure the need for collective and often public sector initiatives; second, this emphasis can distract attention from analysis of the causes of social problems; and third, volunteerism and kindness are put forward as ways of avoiding politics and policy.

As a way of illustrating what we see as the limitations of personally responsible citizenship, recall the central tenets of the Character Counts! Coalition. Certainly honesty, integrity, and responsibility for one's actions are valuable character traits for good neighbors and citizens. (One might even argue that citizens' sense that other citizens are dishonest, irresponsible, and lack common decency will undermine their desire to participate in democratic processes.) Still, on their own,

these traits are not inherently about democracy. To the extent that these traits detract from other important democratic priorities, they hinder rather than make possible democratic participation and change. For example, a focus on loyalty or obedience (common components of character education as well) work against the kind of critical reflection and action many assume are essential in a democratic society.

Consider Cesar Chavez Day in California. The state appropriated funds for students from across the state to participate in a wide range of community service experiences honoring Chavez. But the request for proposal to receive these monies included the following statement:

> Although marches, religious services, and political advocacy were important aspects of Chavez's work, such activities do not constitute allowable activities under this grant . . . Prohibited activities include: lobbying, marches, petitions, participating in events or activities that include advocacy legislation or party platforms.

Such statements are common—indeed, all Americorps members are prohibited from doing anything that engages the political system.

Personal responsibility, voluntarism, and character education must be considered in a broader social context or they risk advancing civility or docility instead of 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 to school; show up to work; give blood; help others during a flood; recycle; pick up litter; clean up a park; treat old people with respect. The leaders of both China and Syria, as well as leaders of democracies, would argue that these are desirable traits for people living in a community. But they are not about democratic citizenship.

Federally funded post 9/11 efforts at renewing citizenship have echoed similar themes while also emphasizing narrow visions of patriotism. The Bush administration, for instance, wants a new role for civic education programs supported by the Corporation for National and Community Service and the new USA Freedom Corps—one tied to patriotism and homeland defense.

Nebraska offers a more far-reaching example. In November of 2001, two months after the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center, Nebraska's State Board of Education specified that high school social studies curriculum should, "include instruction in . . . the benefits and advantages of our government, the dangers of communism and similar ideologies, the duties of citizenship, and appropriate patriotic exercises, that middle-grade instruction should instill a love of country," and that the social studies curriculum should include "exploits and deeds of American heroes, singing patriotic songs, memorizing the Star Spangled Banner and America, and reverence for the flag" (Nebraska State Board of Education 2001). Indeed, 17 states enacted new pledge laws or amended policies in the 2002–2003 legislative session (Piscatelli 2003).

Recent studies of youth reflect this apolitical conception of citizenship as well. A study commissioned by the National Association of Secretaries of State (1999) found that less 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 government, politics, or even collective endeavors (see Andolina, Jenkins, Keeter, and Zukin 2002).

It's not that youth do not care to express their opinions. We need only look at this season's popular television show *American Idol*. Number of votes cast by young people for the next American idol? More than 24 million.[3] Young people can be motivated to act, but too many school-based programs stifle rather than stimulate collective and democratic attitudes and skills.

Strikingly, research and evaluation of educational programs also reflect this conservative and individualistic conception of personally responsible citizenship. Major studies of civic education programs, for example, ask participants 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." They rarely ask questions about corporate responsibility—in what ways industries should be regulated, for example—or about ways government policies can advance or hinder solutions to social problems. Survey questions typically emphasize individual and charitable acts. They ignore important influences like social movements and government policy on efforts to improve society (Kahne, Westheimer, and Rogers 2000).

The vision promoted by most school-based initiatives and the evaluations that judge their success is one of citizenship without politics—a commitment to service, but not to democracy.

Participatory and Justice-Oriented Goals

Perhaps we are overstating the point. It may be true that the vast bulk of energy going into education for democracy and citizenship does so in a way that avoids political engagement. Alternatively, it may be that the programs that promote personal responsibility or participatory citizenship enhance commitments to the kind of civic engagement that will ultimately strengthen our democracy. Proponents make this argument, but how well does it hold up? We studied exactly this question. A brief description of our findings from two programs will illustrate our point.[4]

Both programs worked with classes of high school students and both initiatives were designed to support the development of democratic and civic understandings and commitments. But their goals and strategies differed. The first aims to develop participatory citizens, the second justice-oriented ones.

Participatory Citizens: The Madison County Service League

The Madison County Youth Service League (a pseudonym) is located in a suburban, largely white, east coast community outside of a city of roughly 23,000 people. One Madison County group of students investigated whether citizens in their community would prefer curbside trash pickup that was organized by the county. Another group explored the development of a five-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 in front of the county's Board of Supervisors.

We saw evidence that the Madison County students learned a great deal about micro-politics, such as how different government offices compete for funding. And students talked about the powerful impact of realizing that what they did

would or could make a difference. One student told us that before he started the program he thought it was "just going to be another project [where] we do some research, we leave and it gets put on the shelf somewhere." But he was pleasantly surprised at the extent of the impact their projects had on the community. "We've been in the newspaper," another student noted, "a lot!" The program was admirably successful in these respects.

But we found little evidence that the Madison County students learned about broader ideological and political issues related to interest groups and the political process, the causes of poverty, different groups' need for health care, or the fairness of different 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. Perhaps not surprisingly, our analysis of student interviews indicated that the curriculum did not appear to change students' interest in politics or their perspectives on structural issues related to, for example, possible causes of poverty.

Quantitative results reinforced our findings from observations and interviews. Statistically significant gains were recorded in several important areas, such as in the knowledge and social capital needed for community development and students' sense of civic efficacy—that they could make a difference in their community. Madison County students also increased their scores on our measures of personal responsibility and leadership efficacy. However, the program did not alter students' interest in political engagement.

Justice-Oriented Citizens: Bayside Students For Justice

In the second program, politics took center stage. Bayside Students For Justice is a curriculum developed as part of a social studies course in a large, urban, west coast high school with a highly diverse student body. This program had goals oriented around improving society through structural changes. As one of the teachers for this program put it, "My goal is to empower [students] 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.

Some students investigated the lack of access to a local health care center for women. Others sought ways to challenge a Senate bill that would put students and their parents in jail for truancy and would try juveniles as adults for certain crimes. Others studied the social, political, and economic causes and consequences of violence in their community.

Like their Madison County peers, the Bayside students expressed a passion for the real-world connections to their academic studies. But these students appeared to take away different lessons. Our survey results show that Bayside students, to a much greater degree than those from Madison County, learned forms of civic involvement that addressed macro-level critique of society. And, in interviews, students expressed a strong sense of the need to address these problems collectively rather than as individuals. One student observed that in most classrooms, "it seems like everyone works as an individual to better themselves, but in this class, we're working as a group to better everything around us."

In comparison to Madison County Youth Service League, the Bayside Students For Justice curriculum appeared to emphasize social critique significantly more and technocratic skills associated with participation somewhat less. To the extent that Bayside students learned about participatory skills, they focused on extra-governmental social activism that challenged rather than reinforced existing norms (such as community organizing or protesting). 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 too few jobs that pay wages high enough to support a family rather than being a result of individuals being lazy and not wanting to work). Survey results also showed that while students who participated in Madison County Youth Service League reported an increased sense of personal responsibility to help others and sizable increases on measures related to active participation, knowledge/social capital for community development, and leadership efficacy, those in Bayside Students for Justice reported increased interest in politics and political issues, and 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."

Table 2
Pre/Post Changes

Measures	Madison County Youth Service League (N=61) CHANGE (pre/post)[†]	Bayside Students For Justice (N=21) CHANGE (pre/post)[†]
Personal Responsibility To Help Others	.09 (3.84/3.93)	.21* (4.00/4.21)
Knowledge/Social Capital For Community Development	.94** (3.95/4.89)	.17 (2.76/2.93)
Leadership Efficacy	.12 (3.13/3.25)	.31** (3.60/3.91)
Interest in Politics	.03 (3.41/3.44)	.33* (2.68/3.01)
Structural/Individual Explanations For Poverty	-.10 (3.13/3.03)	.28* (3.88/4.16)
Civic Efficacy	.34** (3.78/4.12)	.47* (3.03/3.50)
Gov't Responsibility For Those In Need	.24* (3.10/3.34)	.29* (3.19/3.48)
Vision To Help	.30* (2.65/2.95)	.36 (2.43/2.79)

*p < .05; **p < .01; [†]Pre and Post surveys were administered to all program participants (for a detailed discussion of these measures and findings, see Westheimer and Kahne 2004).

The Politics of Pursuing Dual Goals

As noted earlier, those committed to educating social activists who practice justice-oriented citizenship would ideally want to couple critical analysis of root causes of injustice with opportunities to develop capacities for participation. They want students to be able to both analyze and understand structural causes of deeply entrenched social problems and gain the skills and motivation to act by participating in local and national politics and community forums. But a focus on justice guarantees neither the motivation nor the capacity to participate in democratic change. Many—ourselves included—would applaud programs that manage to emphasize justice-oriented citizenship inextricably linked to a desire and capacity for participation. However, our findings indicate that engaging in critical analysis does not necessarily foster the ability or the commitment to participate. The reverse is also true: students can learn to participate without engaging in critical analysis that focuses on macro structural issues, the role of interest groups, power dynamics, and/or social justice. The ability to spot injustice is not organically linked to the inclination or the ability to take action[5].

The relative emphasis placed on these differing goals will likely depend on numerous factors. These include: the structure of the curriculum, the priorities of those designing and implementing the initiative, and the time available for such instruction. Moreover, the political constraints and value-based priorities of both administrators and community members are also likely to affect the structure of the curriculum.

Conclusion

So, what does this mean for teaching democracy? For those of us 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 values. What political and ideological interests are embedded in varied conceptions of citizenship?

First, school programs that hope to develop personally responsible citizens may not be effective at increasing participation in local and national civic affairs. In fact, efforts to pursue some conceptions of personal responsibility can undermine efforts to prepare participatory and justice-oriented citizens.

Second, the study of the Madison County Youth Service League and of Bayside Students for Justice demonstrates the importance of distinguishing between programs that emphasize participatory citizenship and those that emphasize the pursuit of justice. While each program was effective in achieving its goals, qualitative and quantitative data regarding these programs demonstrated important differences in each program's impact. Programs that champion participation do not necessarily develop students' abilities to analyze and critique root causes of social problems and vice versa. Although many committed to the democratic purposes of education may extol the value of linking priorities related to participation and justice, our study indicates that this outcome is not guaranteed. If both goals are priorities, those designing and implementing curriculum must give both explicit attention.

Finally, although most current programs are aimed only at personally responsible citizenship, educating for democratic citizenship *is* possible.[6] Those of us who design and teach these curricula and those studying its impact must be aware of different—and at times conflicting—visions of citizenship and their political implications. Democracy is not self-winding. Students need to be taught to participate in our democracy and different programs aim at different goals. We need to choose carefully. The choices we make have consequences for the kind of society we ultimately help to create.

Notes

1. These 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 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). To that end, we consulted with both 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. 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 emphasizing a distinction between "charity" and "change." We had used this distinction in earlier writing (Kahne and Westeimer 1996). Through the course of our work, however, it became clear that this distinction did not do enough to capture main currents in dialogues of practitioners and scholars regarding democratic educational goals and ways to achieve them (see also Westheimer and Kahne 2000). 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 the "social reconstructionist." As a result of dialogues with practitioners this was changed to the "social reformer" and finally to the "justice-oriented citizen." In making these distinctions, we do not mean to imply that a given program might not simultaneously further more than one of these agendas. These categories were not designed to be mutually exclusive. At the same time, we believe that drawing attention to the distinctions between these visions of citizenship is important. It highlights the importance of examining the underlying goals and assumptions that drive different educational programs in design and practice.

2. For a description of a contemporary curriculum that reflects this emphasis, see Westheimer and Kahne 2002.

3. Martha Paskoff, "Idol Worship: What American Politics Can Learn From *American Idol*," *American Prospect Online*, May 23, 2003.

4. For a more detailed report of the study, see Westheimer and Kahne 2004 or contact the authors at joelw@uottawa.ca or jkahne@mills.edu.

5. For a related study see Kahne, Chi, and Middaugh 2003.

6. See Joseh Kahne and Joel Westheimer, "Teaching Democracy: What Schools Need to Do" (*Phi Delta Kappan*. September, 2003) for an exploration of the strategies effective programs use to teach for democratic citizenship.

References

Andolina, Molly, Krista Jenkins, Scott Keeter, and Cliff Zukin. 2002. "Searching for the Meaning of Youth Civic Engagement: Notes from the Field." *Applied Developmental Science* 6(4): 189–195.

Barber, Benjamin. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bennett, William J. 1985. *Education for Democracy*. Paper presented at the regular meeting of the *Consejo Interamericano para la Education, la Ciencia, y la Cultura*. Washington, D.C.

Bigelow, William, and Norman Diamond. 1988. *The Power in Our Hands: A Curriculum on the History of Work and Workers in the United States*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Bush, George W. 2001. "President Bush Launches Effort to Bring Students and Veterans Together in America's Classrooms: Education and Veterans Affairs Team Up to Promote 'Lessons of Liberty.'" U.S. Department of Education press release, Oct. 30. www.ed.gov/PressReleases/ 10-2001/ 10302001.html

Character Counts. 1996. *Character Counts*. Character Counts! Coalition.

Dudley, Robert L., and Alan R. Gitelson. 2002. "Political Literacy, Civic Education, and Civic Engagement: A Return to Political Socialization?" *Applied Developmental Science* 6(4): 175–182.

Freire, Paulo. 1985. *The Politics of Education: Culture, Power and Liberation*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Isaac, Katherine. 1992. *Civics for Democracy: The Journey for Teachers and Students*. Washington, D.C.: Essential Books.

Kahne, Joseph, and Joel Westheimer. 2003. "Teaching Democracy: What Schools Need to Do." *Phi Delta Kappan* 85(1): 34–40, 57–66.

Kahne, Joseph, and Joel Westheimer. 1996. "In the Service of What? The Politics of Service Learning." *Phi Delta Kappan* 77 (9): 593–599.

Kahne, Joseph, Joel Westheimer, and Bethany Rogers. 2000. "Service Learning and Citizenship in Higher Education." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (fall): 42–51.

Kahne, Joseph, Bernadette Chi, and Ellen Middaugh. 2003. *Democratic Education: The Untapped Potential of High School Government Courses*. (Under Review). Please contact jkahne@mills.edu for copies.

Lickona, Thomas. 1993. "The Return of Character Education." *Educational Leadership* 51 (3): 6–11.

Mann, Horace. 1838. *First Annual Report*. Boston: Dutton & Wentworth.

National Association of Secretaries of State. 1999. *New Millennium Project-Phase I: A Nationwide Study of 15–24 Year Old Youth*. Alexandria, VA: The Tarrance Group.

Nebraska State Board of Education. 2001. Board Minutes, 1-2 November. (Revised following 7 Dec. meeting).

Piscatelli, Jennifer. 2003. "Pledge of Allegiance." *State Notes: Character and Civic Education*. Education Commission of the States.

Points of Light Foundation web site. 2003. http://www.pointsoflight.org.

Putnam, Robert D. 2000 *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Rugg, Harold O. 1921. "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." *Historical Outlook* 12: 184–189. Reprinted in W. C. Parker, ed. 1996. *Educating the Democratic Mind*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Saguaro Seminar. 2000. *Report of the Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement*. Boston, MA: Saguaro Seminar.

Sax, Linda J., Alexander Astin, William S. Korn, and Kathryn M. Mahoney. 1999. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1999*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Shanker, Albert. 1986. "Education and Democratic Citizenship." Speech to meeting of the American Federation of Teachers, as quoted in Shanker, A. 1997. "Education and Democratic Citizenship: Where We Stand." *International Journal of Social Education* 12: 1–10.

Westheimer, Joel, and Joseph Kahne. 2004, Forthcoming. "What Kind of Citizen: The Politics of Educating for Democracy." *American Educational Research Journal*.

Westheimer, Joel, and Joseph Kahne. 2002. "Educating for Democracy." In *Democracy's Moment: Reforming the American Political System for the 21st Century*, eds. R. Hayduk and K. Mattson. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Westheimer, Joel, and Joseph Kahne. 2000. "Service Learning Required—But What Exactly do Students Learn?" *Education Week*, January 26. Back Page Commentary, 42.

Wynne, Ed A. 1986. "The Great Tradition in Education: Transmitting Moral Values." *Educational Leadership* 43(4): 4–9.

APSA Minority Identification Project: Core Schools

In 1989, APSA established the Minority Identification (MID) Project as part of its efforts to diversify the political science profession. A collaboration of undergraduate and graduate political science departments, the MID Project seeks to identify talented undergraduate minorities interested in being recruited to doctoral programs.

CORE GRADUATE SCHOOLS

Since its inception, the number of graduate programs participating in the MID Project has grown to include 48 Ph.D.-conferring institutions. These Core Schools are the only institutions with the ability to search the MID database to recruit students. For a flat annual fee of $150, these schools can access the database, take part in MID activities at the APSA Annual Meeting, and receive reports and mailing labels from APSA. Any institution with a Departmental Services Program (DSP) membership has the ability to submit students to the database.

BENEFITS

Several excellent benefits for participating as a Core School include:

- Advertising your program on the APSA website;

- Use of the MID database to recruit talented minority students from across the country to your program;

- Easy-to-use reports generated from the APSA membership database; and

- Participation at the Minority Identification Breakfast, a networking event held at the Annual Meeting where the chairs of each participating Core School discuss the MID Project and other issues related to diversifying the profession.

Participating Graduate Programs

- University of California,
    Berkeley
    Davis
    Irvine
    Los Angeles
    San Diego
    Santa Barbara
- University of Chicago
- Colorado State University
- University of Colorado,
    Boulder
- Columbia University
- Cornell University
- Duke University
- Emory University
- George Washington
    University
- Harvard University
- University of Illinois, Urbana/
    Champaign
- Indiana University
- University of Iowa
- Johns Hopkins University
- University of Maryland
- University of Massachusetts,
    Amherst
- MIT
- Miami University
- University of Michigan
- University of Minnesota
- University of Missouri,
    Columbia
- University of New Mexico
- University of New Orleans
- New School University
- New York University
- University of North Carolina,
    Chapel Hill
- Northwestern University
- Ohio State University
- University of Pennsylvania
- Pennsylvania State University
- Princeton University
- University of Rochester
- Rutgers University
- University of Southern
    California
- Syracuse University
- University of Texas, Austin
- Texas A&M University
- Vanderbilt University
- University of Virginia
- University of Washington,
    Seattle
- Washington State University
- University of Wisconsin,
    Madison
- Yale University

BECOMING A CORE SCHOOL

To participate as a Core School in the MID Project, APSA asks that you do the following:

- Pay a flat fee of $150 every fall. This fee will cover your access to the database, reports and mailing labels, and your department chair's attendance at the Annual Meeting breakfast.

- Participate as a virtual mentor on our MID list-serv. This entails responding periodically to questions students have about your program and, more generally, the graduate school application process.

- Use the reports and labels APSA provides to recruit minority students to your graduate program.

American Political Science Association

FOR MORE INFORMATION
www.apsanet.org/about/minority/