JOURNAL OF SOCIAL STUDIES AND HISTORY EDUCATION (JSSHE)

A Peer-Reviewed Online Journal Sponsored by the Texas Council for the Social Studies and the University of Houston - Downtown

2022 SPECIAL ISSUE:
SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION AND CIVICS TEACHING
Edited by: Bernardo Pohl, Sarah M. Straub, and Kevin Magill

Recommended Citation: Lambert, J. M. (2022). Defining citizenship and democracy: A Delphi study. *Journal of Social Studies and History Education, 6(1)*, 1-23.

Defining Citizenship and Democracy: A Delphi Study

Jarod M. Lambert

Keywords: citizenship, democracy, transnational citizenship, education

How people view, understand, and experience citizenship and democracy impacts their ability to interact with others in their communities. Moreover, Osler (2011) indicated that citizenship might be conceived of as more than national citizenship; it can also be thought of in the sense of a broader worldly citizenship (e.g., cosmopolitanism). Even within the context of national citizenship, more than one definition of citizenship exists. For example, Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) identified three understandings of citizenship: (a) "the personally responsible citizen," (b) "the participatory citizen," and (c) "the justice-oriented citizen" (p. 239). Building on the work of Westheimer and Kahne (2004b), Wood et al. (2018) identified minimal as opposed to *maximal* approaches to citizenship.

Democracy, too, can be defined in multiple ways such as thin versus strong and local versus global. Barber (1984/2003) developed the notion of thin versus strong democracy. Thin democracy is typified by a belief that humans are unable to live peaceably in close quarters with one another (Barber, 1984/2003). As a result, thin democracy is structural in that it is used to control the ways people relate to one another. The practitioners of thin democracy are focused on controlling the interactions between people. An emphasis on personal, independent action is also seen in thin democracy. That is to say, proponents of thin democracy are focused on the actions undertaken by individuals rather than the concentrated actions of groups of citizens.

Whereas thin democracy is typified by the actions of individuals for the sake of individuals, "strong democracy urges that we take ourselves seriously as citizens. Not merely as voters, certainly not solely as clients or wards of government"

Jarod M. Lambert teaches in the Educational Leadership Department at Sam Houston State University. The author may be contacted at jml013@SHSU.edu.

(Barber, 1984/2003, p. xxix). Earlier, Dewey (1916/2005) contemplated democracy as a means of associated living. Barber (1984/2003, 1992) included this idea in his thinking about strong democracy. Having acknowledged the civic society in which democracies function, Barber (1984/2003) asserted that "the very idea of democratic governance as the right of peoples to oversee collectively their common goods has been under siege" (xiii).

Statement of the Problem

The United States has been the center of a national story that focuses on the nation's role as a beacon of democracy for the world (Barber, 1992). While Lynch (2019) argues that humans are storytelling creatures, Nussbaum (2018) insists that the vision toward which we strive for the future of our country must be "more than a poetic vision" (p. 235). As a national story is defined, education plays a role in forming citizens (Barber, 1984/2003; Geboers, Geijsel, Admiraal, & ten Dam, 2013; Zyngier, 2012).

Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) argue K-12 education has been dominated by a discourse of citizenship that leads to the promotion of a "pallid, overly cleansed, and narrow view of political life in Western democracies" (p. 654). At the same time, Merry (2020) questions the role of public schools in citizenship education. To understand what Barber's (1992) beacon is illuminating or what vision is pursued (Nussbaum, 2018), it is necessary to explore the character of democracy and citizenship within the curriculum documents used to guide public school instruction in social studies. Therefore, a means of analyzing social studies standards in terms of citizenship and democracy is essential to guiding our understanding of those standards.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to identify experts' definitions of citizenship and democracy. Once defined, those definitions can be used to guide analysis of curriculum documents, especially social studies curriculum documents, in terms citizenship and democracy. Experts' definitions were identified through a Delphi study (e.g., Day & Bobeva, 2005; Delbecq et al., 1975; Hsu & Sandford, 2007; Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Skulmoski et al., 2007).

Significance of the Study

State standards are often the legally mandated curriculum in public schools. Conceptualizations of citizenship and democracy in those standards, then, is a matter of public policy. Developing a standard by which to evaluate these terms allows for an understanding of the ideas of citizenship and democracy advanced through public education. Moreover, types and definitions of citizenship abound (Bellamy, 2008). Isin and Ruppert (2020) conceive of politics as a contest to determine who and what counts. In identifying who, that contest is defining citizenship. Democracy, too, is defined in multiple ways in the literature (e.g., Barber, 1984/2003; Zyngier, 2012).

In setting out to identify additional definitions of citizenship and democracy,

the intent was to bring together expert consensus on these terms as a means by which state social studies standards can be analyzed in terms of citizenship and democracy. In conducting this study, the intention was to provide a context within which education for citizenship in a democracy can be understood. Because standards are designed to drive practice in education, the findings of this study, ideally, might inform teacher education and public school practice.

The conception of citizenship and democracy endorsed by teaching the social studies curriculum matters with regard to the type of citizenship and democracy advanced in public education. Writing about Australian schools, Zyngier (2012) argued that the focus was on political structures as the basis of citizenship education. Focusing on schools in the north of England, Osler (2011) asserted that citizenship education focused on the nation state rather than a broader cosmopolitan view of citizenship. Westheimer (2008) claimed that citizenship education in Canada would be little different than a program of citizenship education offered by a totalitarian regime. Preservice teachers at a university in the southeastern United States tended to identify democracy with decision-making and voting (Sunal et al., 2009). Political efficacy has been linked to activities associated with justice-oriented citizenship (Kahne & Westheimer, 2006; Levy, 2013). Geboers et al. (2013) argued that teaching in schools might make a difference in learning citizenship. According to Westheimer and Kahne (2004b), "the choices we make have consequences for the kind of society we ultimately help to create" (p. 265).

Citizenship and democracy are about more than just classroom instruction. Dewey (1916/2005) and Anderson (2004) conceive of democracy as a form of associated living. Palmer (2011) offered the following natural end of that conception:

> If American democracy fails, the ultimate cause will not be a foreign invasion or the power of big money or the greed and dishonesty of some elected officials or a military coup or the internal communist/socialist/fascist takeover that keeps some Americans awake at night. It will happen because we—you and I—became so fearful of each other, of our differences and of the future, that we unraveled the civic community on which democracy depends, losing our power to resist all that threatens it and call it back to its highest form. (p. 9)

Examination and understanding of the perspectives implicit in curriculum documents for social studies allows for a deeper understanding of the conceptions of citizenship and democracy being perpetuated in public schools. Developing consensus definitions of citizenship and democracy is a necessary first step toward understanding the use and meanings of those terms in social studies curriculum documents.

Research Questions

The study addressed the following research questions: (a) How do select experts in the field of civic education define the term citizenship?; and (b) How do select experts in the field of civic education define the term democracy?

Review of the Literature

Although Kahne and Middaugh (2012) argued that schools should not be seen as the only arenas for civic education, schools have traditionally been involved in the civic education of young people. Even while questioning the role of the liberal model of civic education, Merry (2020) acknowledges the necessity of schools "supplying children with some of the civic basics" (p. 133). Indeed, "partisans on both sides of the culture wars have acknowledged the political nature of teaching civics" (Williams & Maloyed, 2013, p. 26). Additionally, there is a long history of schools supporting democracy (Mirra & Morrell, 2011). Moreover, Kahne and Westheimer (2006) argued that young people need more chances "to recognize their potential contributions to civic and political life" (p. 294). As such, curriculum requirements with regard to civic education have the potential to impact the development of young people.

In their analysis of government and citizenship standards in four Texas high school social studies courses, Williams and Maloyed (2013) identified two broad approaches to teaching civic education: the conservative approach and the liberal approach. Transmission of knowledge and values that define American identity was central to the conservative approach (Williams & Maloyed, 2013): "By contrast, the liberal approach stresses the behaviors and values necessary for democratic engagement, which include avenues for active participation, deliberation, understanding issues of social justice, and globalism" (p. 30). As a result of their analysis, Williams and Maloyed (2013) concluded that the curriculum in Texas *s*upports a conservative approach to the teaching of civics.

For purposes of this study, I look at the civic education literature in two aspects: citizenship and democracy. In the exploration of citizenship, I examined the role of citizenship education and the variety of conceptualizations of citizenship. In terms of democracy, I undertook a description of the various understandings of democracy.

Citizenship

Citizenship education is of central importance to education (Tupper & Cappello, 2012). Indeed, most stakeholders agree in principle that developing characteristics of democratic citizenship in students is important (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a). Even so, it can be difficult to commit oneself to a particular definition of citizenship. Scholars disagree about the behaviors that comprise citizenship (Sherrod, Flanagan, & Youniss, 2002). Additionally, Lukšik (2019) asserts that wide variation exists in terms of teacher development of citizenship formation of students in Slovakia. Moreover, citizenship is a contested concept (Hughes et al., 2010). As such, citizenship is a complex subject about which deep thinking is required (Lucey, Lycke, Laney, & Connelly, 2013). Moreover, Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) identified seven discourses related to citizenship. Among these, civic republican citizenship and liberal citizenship were seen to have the greatest influence in citizenship education. These conceptions of citizenship are in addition to the three citizenship models (i.e., personally

responsible citizenship, participatory citizenship, and justice-oriented citizenship) proposed by Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, 2004b).

With regard to civic republican citizenship, Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) indicated that there is an emphasis on civic literacy. Moreover, "civic republicans wish to promote a civic identity among young people characterized by commitment to the political community, respect for its symbols, and active participation in its common good" (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 657). Indeed, civic republicanism emphasizes personal responsibility, and in this way is similar to the notion of the personally responsible citizen advanced by Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, 2004b). Even so, civic republican citizenship is national in character. Whereas Osler's (2011) notion of cosmopolitanism transcends national boundaries, civic republican citizenship is intimately tied to national identity. To further the contested nature of citizenship, Nussbaum (2019) argues against the appropriateness of cosmopolitanism as a conception of citizenship.

Whereas civic republican citizenship is a discourse of duties and responsibilities, liberal citizenship is a discourse of individual liberties (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006). Indeed, "the primacy of individual liberty" is at the heart of the liberal citizenship discourse (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 662). Citizenship discourse in the liberal citizenship vein often is about democratic rights.

In addition to civic republicanism and liberal citizenship discourses, Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) identified five critical citizenship discourses: (a) feminist, (b) reconstructionist, (c) cultural, (d) queer, and (e) transnational. These citizenship discourses were seen to be relatively silent in the curriculum and instruction of civic education (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006). Feminist discourses of citizenship raise questions about the gendered nature of citizenship. Reconstructionist discourses of citizenship address critical participation in democratic societies from progressive and neo-Marxist perspectives. Cultural citizenship discourses analyze the high cost of citizenship (e.g., assimilation) on ethnic and other cultural groups. Citizenship discourses in the queer tradition "use postmodern thinking to inquire into citizenship not simply as a status, membership, or stable identity, but as a performance of civic courage and risk" (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 667). Moreover, Isin and Ruppert (2020) emphasize the performative nature of citizenship in their conceptualization of digital citizenship. Transnational citizenship discourses relate to local, national, and international communities: "A citizen in this discourse is one who identifies not primarily or solely with her own nation but also with communities of people and nations beyond the nation-state boundaries" (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 675).

Similar to transnational citizenship, cosmopolitan citizenship is something more than national citizenship. Osler (2011), however, expressly rejects the notion that cosmopolitanism replaces local or even national citizenship. Rather,

cosmopolitanism links individuals through the notion of human rights (Osler, 2011). The practice of citizenship, however, occurs at various levels of political association. Moreover, the day-to-day practice of citizenship occurs primarily at the local level (Osler, 2011). Indeed, "demonstrating solidarity with others in the global community has limited value, if we are not ready and able to stand up for justice and defend the rights of others in our local community" (Osler, 2011, p. 2).

Within the context of her discussion of cosmopolitan citizenship, Osler (2011) identified a citizenship education binary. Through the binary, there is conflict between citizenship education emphasizing the building of the nation and citizenship education emphasizing global solidarity (Osler, 2011). Osler (2011) rejected the binary. Education for cosmopolitan citizenship requires a different approach to national citizenship, but it does not negate the idea—or the reality—of such citizenship (Osler, 2011).

Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, 2004b) offer a different conception of citizenship from those explored by Knight Abowtiz and Harnish (2006) and proposed by Osler (2011). Even so, their approach to citizenship education should be understood within the construct of national citizenship. That is to say, each of the three conceptions by Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, 2004b) is a version of national citizenship; they did not address cosmopolitanism of other versions of transnational citizenship.

As discussed earlier, Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, 2004b) offered three conceptions of citizenship education: personally responsible, participatory, and justice oriented. These three conceptions of citizenship education formed a framework through which diverse perspectives on democratic citizenship could be ordered (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a). In categorizing the three ideas about citizenship education found within the framework, Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, 2004b) use the concept of a food drive to delineate the differences between personally responsible, participatory, and justice-oriented citizenship: "If participatory citizens are organizing the food drive and personally responsible citizens are donating food, justice-oriented citizens are asking why people are hungry and acting on what they discover" (p. 243).

Each conception of citizenship "reflects a relatively distinct set of theoretical and curricular goals" (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004b, p. 241). Moreover, the conceptions are not cumulative (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004b). That is to say, one need not be a personally responsible citizen before one can become a participatory citizen.

Among the three conceptions of citizenship offered by Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, 2004b), personally responsible citizenship receives the most attention (Westheimer, 2008; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004b). Indeed, Westheimer (2008) asserted that in numerous studies curricula meant to foster democratic citizenship usually included goals and practices that dealt more with being good and obeying than they did with democracy. In his critique, then, Westheimer (2008)

associated democracy more closely with justice-oriented citizenship than with personally responsible citizenship. Moreover, Kahne and Westheimer (2006) argued that developing democratic citizens required that students develop efficacy in the sense that they can make a difference in society. More to the point, students must, according to Kahne and Westheimer (2006), also be able to "identify, analyze and challenge social and institutional practices as they work to create a more just society" (p. 295).

Merry (2020) challenges the conception of citizenship education that asks students to challenge social and institutional practices. In short, Merry (2020) asserts that citizenship education based on dissent it "empirically naïve for what they suppose about schools, where dissent is most often interpreted as misbehavior, and whose institutional design resists any outcome other than the status quo" (p. 125). Moreover, to believe a curriculum designed around dissent can be effective is to have an ahistorical view of public education (Merry, 2020).

Different approaches to citizenship education rely on different political foundations (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004b). Levy (2013) indicated that adolescents' political efficacy leads to political involvement. This involvement, however, is consistent with participatory citizenship. Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) indicated that justice-oriented citizenship was the least commonly pursued form of citizenship in civic education. At the same time, Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) identified personally responsible citizenship as the most common form of citizenship education. Moreover, the form of citizenship supported in classroom instruction is linked to specific political positionalities.

Democracy

Beliefs about civic education are influenced by perceptions of democracy. In fact, "questions about what constitutes good citizenship and proper civic education have also been fueled by a widely perceived crisis in democratic life and citizenship in America" (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 654). Crick (2008) argued that democracy is a sacred term, but one that is seen in different ways by those viewing it. Indeed, Haste (2004) argued that democracy is not a universal or unitary concept. It is, rather, a concept filtered through the cultural realities of the particular community undertaking the practice of democracy (Haste, 2004). Arguing from a critical pedagogical perspective, Mirra and Morrell (2011) challenged the current neoliberal association of democracy with global capitalism.

Mirra and Morrell (2011) contrasted neoliberal democracy with critical democracy. Whereas neoliberal democracy was seen to rest on individualism, critical democracy relied on collectivism. Consumerism was a hallmark of neoliberal democracy, while production was a key component of critical democracy. Finally, neoliberal democracy was characterized by passivity as opposed to the engagement seen in critical democracy. Through the individualism of neoliberal democracy,

we can see citizens as "a collection of atomized individuals striving for personal gain" (Mirra & Morell, 2011, p. 410). Moreover, action by government is often seen as infringement on the personal autonomy of the individual. The collectivism of critical democracy is a foil to the individualism of neoliberal democracy. With the theoretical understanding of critical democracy, individual action is not enough. Rather, individuals need to band together and act in collective ways (Mirra & Morell, 2011).

With regard to the consumerism of neoliberal democracy, Mirra and Morrell (2011) argued that it leads to an educational system in which "teachers are considered conduits of content knowledge rather than professionals who shape learning experiences for students" (p. 410). Such an understanding is in opposition to the emphasis on production found in critical democracy. Reflecting on Dewey's (1916/2005) assertion that democracy is a means of associated living, Mirra and Morrell (2011) argued that production is found in shared inquiry and discovery in the pursuit of knowledge.

Mirra and Morell (2011) further discussed the dichotomy between neoliberal and critical democracy through passivity and engagement. The passive understanding of citizenship inherent in neoliberal democracy leads to "a test-driven atmosphere [that] eliminates opportunities for any explicit instruction about democracy" (Mirra & Morrell, 2011, p. 411). Within the critical participatory understanding of democracy, however, it is understood "that schools must provide students with the skills and opportunities o work with other citizens in authentic situations to solve problems and create change" (Mirra & Morrell, 2011, p. 412).

While Mirra and Morrell (2011) discussed democracy in terms of neoliberal and critical versions, Crick (2008) argued that there have been four broad historical usages of the term democracy. First, there was the understanding of democracy as rule by the many or the mob. This understanding of the term is associated with Plato. Indeed, Plato (trans. 1968) asserted that democracy is the result of the poor winning against the wealthy, killing some and casting out others. Moreover, ruling offices in the city were given out by lot. Earlier, Plato (trans. 1968) discussed four races: gold, silver, bronze, and iron. In the discussion, Plato (trans. 1968) traced the development of the timocratical city—a city somewhere between aristocracy and oligarchy. In what Plato (trans. 1968) described as the denigration of regimes toward tyranny, the bronze and iron races pull the regime toward money making. Plato (trans. 1968) also argued that the bronze and iron races will move the regime away from philosophy toward other, lesser, means of decision making within the city.

The second historical usage of the term democracy is seen, according to Crick (2008) in the Roman Republic and the early American republic, among others. In this second understanding of democracy, mixed government operating within the bounds of constitutional law is normative. The French Revolution and the writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau illustrate Crick's (2008) third historical understanding of democracy. In this third understanding,

decisions were to be made according to the general will of everyone in the society—though that general will was not necessarily expressed through popular election or polling of all members of the society. Rather, the general will often, as in the instance of the French Revolution, was expressed by a smaller group attempting to speak for the entirety of the society. The fourth historical usage of the term democracy is seen in the American constitution as well as in the constitutions created in West Germany and Japan after World War II (Crick, 2008). Moreover, this fourth usage is widely normative today. As such many understand democracy to allow all to be active citizens within the framework of equal and protected rights (Crick, 2008).

While Crick (2008) identified four broad historical understandings of the term democracy, Barber (1984/2003) argued in support of strong democracy. Participatory in nature, strong democracy is modern (Barber, 1984/2003). Moreover, strong democracy "rests on the idea of a self-governing community of citizens who are united less by homogeneous interests than by civic education" (Barber, 1984/2003, p. 117). In fact, strong democracy relies on a politics of conflict (Barber, 1984/2003). Individual interests are not assumed to be commonly held, and individuals work for competing interests. Strong democracy is not representative and does not rely on the influence of elites (Barber, 1984/2003). Rather, strong democracy exists as a participatory form of democracy that Barber (1984/2003) argued "is not intrinsically inimical to either the size or technology of modern society" (p. 117). Even with competing interests, Barber (1984/2003) argued that citizens in a strong democracy are striving toward "the advantage of their mutuality" (p. 118). That is, in the struggle for strong democracy, citizens are constantly working to live together communally (Barber, 1984/2003). In sum, Barber (1984/2003) argued that in strong democracy—where democracy is an end as well as a means—there is a sense of journey. That is, in strong democracy "the going is as important as the getting there" and "the relations among travelers are as vital as the destinations they may think they are seeking" (Barber, 1984/2003, p. 120). In short, through strong democracy citizens are invited to live out democracy. Citizens are encouraged to make decisions with a focus on living together while continuing to struggle with their own particular interests.

While Crick (2008) identified historical perspectives on democracy and Barber (1984/2003) argued for strong democracy, others have entered the conversation as to the meaning of democracy as well. Among those who have entered the conversation have been Dewey (1916/2005), Haste (2004), Parker (1996), and Zyngier (2012). Whereas Dewey (1916/2005) understood democracy as a form of associated living, Parker (1996) argued that there have been many attempts to define democracy for purposes of the curriculum. Moreover, Haste (2004) argued that the past decade had seen "the proliferation of versions of democracy" (p. 414). In his look at conceptions of democracy in Australian education, Zyngier (2012), too, saw multiple forms of teaching democracy. Zyngier (2012) asserted that

> through the notion of **thin** versus **thick** democracy, we conceptualize the visible tension between the superficial features associated with teaching about democracy and the fundamental scaffolding which permits people to appropriate the deeper meaning of the term teach for democracy. (p. 4, emphasis in the original)

In Zyngier's (2012) terms, then, there was a distinction not just in the definition of democracy but in the purpose for which democracy was taught.

Zyngier (2012) views thin democracy as the teaching about democracy. It is within this thin conception of democracy that can be seen an emphasis on teaching about institutions and a focus on simple participatory acts such as voting. According to Zyngier (2012), thick democracy is more robust and critical as compared to thin democracy. Moreover, Zyngier (2012) saw thick democracy as democracy that "must be constantly cultivated, conceptualized and re-worked, with less dependence on the formal political process and cycle of elections, and more on critical engagement in developing the conditions for emancipation, enhanced power relations, and epistemological discovery" (p. 3). In this way, thick democracy can be seen to be associated with liberal (Williams & Maloyed, 2013) or justice oriented (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a, 2004b) conceptions of citizenship.

Whether it is seen through the lens of one of Crick's (2008) historical perspectives on democracy, Barber's (1984/2003) strong democracy, or Zyngier's (2012) thin versus thick democracy, "democracy is not self-winding" (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a, p. 246). Moreover, students need to be taught about democracy and how to participate in it (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a; Zyngier, 2012). When deciding what and how to teach about democracy, Westheimer and Kahne (2004a) cautioned that, "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" (p. 246).

Methodology

This mixed methods Delphi study consisted of both qualitative and quantitative elements. The mixed methods research design employed in this study was the fully mixed sequential equal status design (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). Both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed. Qualitative questions were asked initially, and quantitative items followed in successive Delphi rounds using a series of web-based questionnaires.

Despite common usage of the terms citizenship and democracy, interpretations of the meanings of these concepts are not consistently presented and applied. In fact, Bellamy (2008) discussed multiple meanings for the term citizenship. Moreover, Parker (1996) indicated there have been multiple attempts to define democracy for purposes of the curriculum. Scheele (1975) argued that "realities can be described as presumed agreements" (p. 37). One means of identifying these agreements is to conduct research by applying the Delphi method to determine

consensus of meaning among a group of experts. Linstone and Turoff (1975) defined the Delphi method as "a method for structuring a group communication process so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with a complex problem" (p. 3). In this study, the complex problem addressed was defining the terms citizenship and democracy. Establishing these definitions was undertaken by engaging select civic education experts using the Delphi method.

Participants

Participants were identified through multilevel sampling (Collins, Onwuegbuzie, & Jiao, 2006). Select civic education experts identified through criterion sampling (Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007). Criteria for selection included: (a) holding a terminal degree in the social sciences, (b) living in Western democracies, and (c) publishing within the non-fiction civic education, citizenship, or democracy literature. Initially, experts were solicited for participation based on identification through a review of the literature. Criteria were applied to the list of authors identified through the literature review for this study, and 24 potential participants were identified for inclusion in the panel of select experts. Of those, 11 were female and 13 were male. Secondarily, snowball sampling was employed to identify additional potential experts based on the recommendations of initially solicited experts. Snowball sampling yielded eight additional possible participants. Of these, five were female and three were male. From these potential participants, nine agreed to participate (six female, three male), and eight (five female, three male) ultimately took part in the Delphi study. The reader is directed to Table 1 for additional Delphi participant information.

Table 1
Delphi Participant Information

Participant	Gender	Country of Residence	Year of Doctorate	Civic Ed Publications	Civic Ed Presentations
1	M	Canada	1996	≥20	*
2	F	Canada	2009	28	51
3	M	Australia	2007	25	*
4	F	United Kingdom	*	16	13
5	F	Canada	2004	25	45
6	F	United States	1996	22	20
7	M	United States	2006	33	34
8	F	United States	2005	19	34

Instrumentation

The Delphi method is used to develop consensus among expert opinion. With numerous definitions of both citizenship and democracy present in the literature, it was necessary to develop a working definition of these terms. The survey for the initial round of the Delphi included two open ended questions: (a) How do you define citizenship? and (b) How do you define democracy? Likert-type items were crafted from responses to each of these questions. In subsequent rounds of the Delphi, participants were asked to rate their agreement with various definitions using a four-point scale. In addition, participants were given the opportunity to provide open ended comments in each round. Instruments in each subsequent round were developed based on responses from the previous round (Delbecq et al.,

1975).

Procedures

After receiving Institutional Review Board approval and once participants were recruited, the Delphi process began. Delbecq et al. (1975) indicated that a minimum of 45 days were needed to complete a three-round Delphi. Delphi studies often go through three rounds (Davidson, 2013; Skulmoski et al., 2007; & van der Schaaf & Stokking, 2011). In the current study, four rounds of were completed in 26 days.

In their taxonomy of Delphi inquiry designs, Day and Bobeva (2005) identified seven criteria used to categorize Delphi studies: (a) purpose of the study, (b) number of rounds, (c) participants, (d) mode of operation, (e) anonymity of panel, (f) communication media, and (g) concurrency of rounds. With regard to purpose of a Delphi study, choices are building, exploring, testing, and evaluation. For the number of rounds, the taxonomy allows for between two and 10. Participants can either be homogeneous or heterogeneous. When identifying the mode of operation, choices include face-to-face or remote access. Anonymity of the panel may be either full or partial. There are three options for communication media: (a) paper-and-pen, (b) telephone or fax facilitated, and (c) computerized. Finally, concurrency of rounds may be either sequential or real-time online conferencing. With regard to this study, each of Day and Bobeva's (2005) taxonomy criteria will be addressed. The purpose of the study was exploration in that I explored select experts' definitions of citizenship and democracy. As to the number of rounds, this Delphi extended to four rounds. Participants in the Delphi study were homogeneous in that they all had published works in the fields of democracy, citizenship, or civic education. Remote access was the mode of operation as Delphi participants communicated through electronic means. The panel of Delphi participants in this study remained fully anonymous to each other. Communication media was computerized; specifically, communication was through email and electronic forms. Finally, the concurrency of rounds was sequential in that one round was concluded before a further round began. Data analysis occurred between Delphi rounds.

In round one of the Delphi, participants were asked: (a) How do you define citizenship?, and (b) How do you define democracy? Participants received a link to an electronic form containing the preceding questions. The link was sent to participants via email. Questions were submitted to participants via email, and the deadline for completion of the form was five days from the date the link was sent. Moreover, a dunning letter—in email form—was sent to those who had not responded to the round one questions within three days of the initial correspondence. Delbecq et al. (1975) recommended the use of a dunning letter to encourage a high response rate in each round of a Delphi study. Responses to round one questions were open-ended and resulting data were qualitative in nature.

At the completion of the five-day window, definitional responses from round one were condensed into Likert-type items

wherein respondents were asked to what extent they believe in a particular item using a four-point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). The electronic form containing these items was sent (again, via email) to participants, and they had five days to rate the items. As with round one, a dunning letter was sent via email three days into the response period. At the end of the response period, responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics (Hsu & Sandford, 2007) to determine level of consensus. Green (as cited in Hsu & Sandford, 2007) suggested that "at least 70 percent of Delphi subjects need to rate three or higher on a four-point Likert-type scale and the median has to be at 3.25 or higher" for consensus to be reached (p. 4). Delbecq et al. (1975) suggested an analysis time of half a day, but their recommendation was made with the understanding that the analysis would be undertaken as full-time staff work. Analysis of responses in the Delphi portion of the study were completed within one day, and a summary of responses was sent to Delphi participants. Further Likert-type items were developed as necessary, and round three of the Delphi was undertaken.

In the third round, Likert-type items were developed as described for round two. The electronic form containing the Likert-type items was emailed to respondents in the same manner as in round two. A dunning email was sent to non-responding participants three days into the response period. At the end of the round three response period, responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the level of consensus. As in previous rounds, analysis of responses in round three was completed within one day of the end of the response period. Consensus on Likert-type items was reached at the end of round three. A fourth, and final, round of the Delphi was undertaken to allow participants the opportunity to comment on the definitions of citizenship and democracy developed through the three rounds of this Delphi. Participants were given five days to respond, and a dunning letter was sent via email three days into the response period.

Findings

Findings reported in this section are divided according to the research questions addressed in the study: (a) How do select experts in the field of civic education define the term citizenship?, and (b) How do select experts in the field of civic education define the term democracy?

How do select experts in the field of civic education define the term citizenship?

Hughes et al. (2010) argued that citizenship is a contested concept. Moreover, Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) asserted that different approaches to citizenship education are based on different political foundations. With these understandings in mind, I worked through the Delphi process to create a definition of citizenship that can be used to guide analysis of social studies curriculum documents. As I approached the Delphi process and the review of responses regarding citizenship, I set out to bracket my own conception of the term. In so doing, I identified my beliefs about citizenship as national in character. Prior to conducting the Delphi study, I understood citizenship as a mark of the

nation-state. That is, I understood the idea of citizenship as an individual's status with regard to their relationship with the State.

Initial participant definitions of citizenship expanded beyond my beginning understanding of the term. In round one, with regard to citizenship, participants were asked: "How do you define citizenship?" Seven participants provided responses to that question. Four of those seven responses included some version of my understanding of the character of citizenship, but in each case such understanding was only part of the definition provided. Indeed, one participant asserted that "most basically citizenship is a legal status based on the rights and responsibilities of a person within a specific location." That is, the status of citizenship with which I was most associated going in was seen by this participant as only the most basic of understandings. Indeed, that same participant included a notion of citizenship as participatory saying that "a citizen works alongside others to ensure collective well-being."

The notion of *collective well-being* or common good arose in multiple definitions of citizenship offered by Delphi participants. For example, one participant defined citizenship as: "Democratic citizenship is all about making informed and reasoned decisions for the common good in a multicultural society situated within an interdependent world." Another participant took time to differentiate between legal and substantive citizenship. To that end, the participant pointed out that a person can be a substantive citizen (though without the legal status of citizen) by "contributing to the common good of a particular polity."

Coding of open-ended responses in round one of the Delphi led to six Likert-type items relating to the definition of citizenship. Of these, four met the pre-defined level for consensus (70% agree or strongly agree with a weighted average of 3.25 or higher). Round two citizenship items are recorded, with participant responses, in Table 2.

Table 2
Round Two Citizenship Likert-type Items

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Weighted Average
Citizenship is a legal status.	0	0	3	4	3.57
Citizenship denotes nationality.	1	2	2	1	2.50
Citizenship requires participation and engagement.	0	0	3	4	3.57
Citizenship represents membership in a society.	0	1	4	2	3.14
Citizenship requires decision making for the common good.	0	1	0	6	3.71
Citizenship requires being a full active member of society through activities including voting.	0	1	0	6	3.71

While round two included six Likert-type items with regard to citizenship, it also included five additional open-ended items. These items were used to clarify definitions of citizenship offered by participants and to create additional Likert-type citizenship items for round three of the Delphi. These open-ended items were:

- Some of you stated that citizenship should be fluid. What might fluid

mean when we refer to citizenship?

- Some of you stated that citizenship is plural. What might make citizenship plural?
- Some of you stated that citizenship comes with responsibilities. What might constitute some of those responsibilities?
- Some of you commented that citizenship is comprised of intersecting elements. What might comprise those elements?
- Is there anything else you would like to share with regard to citizenship?

Using responses to these items to generate additional Likert-type items, I ended up with nine additional items related to citizenship. Each of these nine items reached the pre-determined level of consensus. The reader is directed to Table 3 for round three items.

Table 3

Round Three Citizenship Likert-type Items

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Weighted Average
Citizenship is fluid in that dual citizenship is a possibility.	0	1	2	4	3.43
Citizenship must be understood as evolving and contextual.	0	0	2	5	3.71
Citizenship is fluid because identities, responsibilities, and rights can change.	0	0	2	5	3.71
Citizenship is plural through the notion of dual citizenship.	0	1	2	4	3.43
Citizenship is plural as a result of varying levels of citizenship (i.e., community, city, state/province, and nation).	0	0	2	5	3.71
Citizenship includes the responsibility of active participation.	0	1	2	4	3.43
Citizenship is comprised of intersecting elements like race, gender, and class.	0	0	3	4	3.57
Citizenship is about more than partisan action.	0	0	1	6	3.86
Citizenship has a critical disposition as an essential element.	0	0	1	6	3.86

Working from the consensus items identified in rounds two and three of the Delphi, I developed the following definition of citizenship:

While it should be understood as evolving and contextual, citizenship is a legal status that is about more than partisan action. Requiring decision making for the common good and with a critical disposition as an essential element, citizenship requires active participation and engagement. Citizenship is comprised of intersecting elements like race, gender, and class. Moreover, citizenship can be thought of as plural as a result of varying levels of citizenship and the notion of dual citizenship. In addition, the fluid nature of citizenship results from the changeability of identities, responsibilities, and rights.

In the fourth and final round of the Delphi, participants were asked to comment on the definition.

Five of eight participants commented on the definition. None of these participants rejected the definition outright. Some offered suggestions for editing the definition, and others offered ideas to keep

(continued)

n mind when understanding the definition. One participant acknowledged the comprehensiveness of the definition while also pointed out that "the rights associated with the legal status of citizenship are not always applied in equitable ways." Another participant expanded upon the fluid nature of citizenship: "The fluid nature of citizenship is also due to contested ideas about the meaning of key elements of citizenship."

With these responses taken into account, I decided to keep the definition as written for a tool in the analysis of social studies curriculum documents. In answering the first research question, then, we see that select experts in the field of civic education define the term citizenship broadly. As I originally conceived of the term, citizenship was defined by the participants as a legal status. Delphi participants, however, significantly broadened that definition by including the notion of active participation and the idea of citizenship comprised of intersecting elements like race, gender, and class. And for all of the experts, the changing nature of identities, responsibilities, and rights leads to a fluid understanding of citizenship.

How do select experts in the field of civic education define the term democracy?

Like citizenship, democracy is a term with multiple definitions. Indeed, Crick (2008) asserted that those viewing democracy see it in different ways. In round one of the Delphi, I asked participants to define democracy. Seven participants offered a definition. Prior to exploring the definitions offered by select experts in the field of civic education, I took the opportunity to bracket my beliefs about democracy. In setting out what I believed about democracy, I came to understand that my view of the term was broader than my initial understanding of citizenship. In my analytic memo written prior to coding round one data, I wrote, "When I think of democracy, my thinking is broader. I conceptualize democracy as people living together in community, making decisions through voting and consensus, but also living within a structure of protected rights."

One participant specifically mentioned Dewey's notion of democracy as associated living when defining democracy. Other than that, definitions tended to focus more on democracy as a form of government or political system. One participant asserted, "Democracy at a most basic level is a system of government reliant upon citizenship participation." Another participant said, "A democracy is any political system involving some degree of self-governance by citizens." Interestingly, however, the notions of democracy as a form of government and as a political system did not reach the level of consensus when addressed as Likert-type items.

In addition, the notion that democracy is a work in progress appeared in multiple responses. One participant referred to democracy as imperfect, while another mentioned that democracy was an aspiration. That participant said, "I would argue that democracy is an aspiration rather than an accomplishment in most so called 'democratic' countries as not all citizens benefit from the structures and

processes advanced as ‘democratic’.”

Coding of open-ended responses in round one of the Delphi led to 12 Likert-type items relating to the definition of democracy. Of these, eight met the pre-defined level for consensus (70% agree or strongly agree with a weighted average of 3.25 or higher). The reader is directed to Table 4 for round two Likert-type items for democracy.

Table 4

Round Two Democracy Likert-type Items

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Weighted Average
Democracy is a system of government.	0	1	3	2	3.17
Democracy is rule by the people.	0	0	5	2	3.29
Democracy requires active participation.	0	0	1	6	3.86
Democracy has both structural and cultural elements.	0	0	1	6	3.86
Democracy is guided by a constitution.	1	2	3	1	2.57
Democracy is based on consent of the governed.	0	2	1	4	3.29
Democracy protects the rights of citizens.	0	1	3	3	3.29
Democracy leads to a shared fate for its citizens.	0	5	1	1	2.43
Democracy is a political system.	0	1	4	2	3.14
Democracy is a mode of associated living.	0	0	4	3	3.43
Democracy can be plural in that there are different types of democracies.	0	0	2	5	3.71
Democracy has social justice as an essential element.	0	1	3	3	3.29

In addition to the Likert-type democracy items in round two of the Delphi, there was a single open-ended item with regard to democracy. This item was: “Is there anything else you would like to share with regard to democracy?” Three participants responded to this item, and one of those participants brought up the idea of rule of law within a democracy. To that end, the participant said,

> Democracy includes other elements including the rule of law – this might be included under rights, but I think deserves separate mention. A basic precept of the rule of law is that everyone is equal before the law, and this was basic in history in moves from autocratic to democratic systems.

From this response, an additional Likert-type item was created with regard to democracy for round three of the Delphi. The item met the pre-defined level of consensus for items in the Delphi portion of the study. This item, as well as participant responses, is included below in Table 5.

Table 5

Round Three Democracy Likert-Type Items

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Weighted Average
Democracy has the rule of law as an essential element.	0	0	1	6	3.86

Using the consensus items on democracy from rounds two and three of the Delphi, I drafted the following definition of democracy:

> With both structural and cultural elements, democracy is a mode of associated living based on rule by the

> people that requires active participation. With the rule of law as an essential element, it remains possible for there to be different types of democracies. Further, with social justice as an essential element, democracy protects the rights of citizens and is based on the consent of the governed.

Participants were given the opportunity, in round four, to comment on this definition.

Two comments on the definition of democracy stood out in particular. Those comments are listed below.

- "Democracies do not always protect the rights of citizens. This is a dangerous assumption. There are many historical and contemporary examples of this in democratic societies."
- "Social justice, while I value it, is certainly not essential to democracy and some people, especially those from neoliberal camps and some conservatives and libertarians would take offense at such a statement."

Each comment was from a different Delphi participant. Likert-type items related to each of the comments had one participant who disagreed, and all other participants either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Given that, I decided to acknowledge these comments but keep the definition in its original form.

In answering the second research question, using this group of experts in the field of civic education, I have ended up with a definition of democracy that might fall into what Williams and Maloyed (2013) categorized as a liberal approach to teaching civic education. As one Delphi participant pointed out, some conservatives might take issue with the inclusion of social justice as an essential element of democracy. Having said that, this select group of experts responded in such a way as to justify inclusion of social justice in the definition.

Findings

Definitions of citizenship and democracy were developed through a Delphi study with the assistance of select experts in the field of civic education. The developed definition of citizenship was most related to Westheimer and Kahne's (2004a, 2004b) notion of participatory citizenship, but there were aspects of justice-oriented citizenship present as well. The developed definition of citizenship is:

> While it should be understood as evolving and contextual, citizenship is a legal status that is about more than partisan action. Requiring decision making for the common good and with a critical disposition as an essential element, citizenship requires active participation and engagement. Citizenship is comprised of intersecting elements like race, gender, and class. Moreover, citizenship can be thought of as plural as a result of varying levels of citizenship and the notion of dual citizenship. In addition, the fluid nature of citizenship results from the changeability of identities, responsibilities, and rights.

It is primarily the notion of a critical disposition as an essential element of citizenship that leans the definition toward justice-oriented citizenship. The idea that identities, responsibilities, and rights can change further associates the developed

definition of citizenship with the justice-oriented citizenship proposed by Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, 2004b).

> With both structural and cultural elements, democracy is a mode of associated living based on rule by the people that requires active participation. With the rule of law as an essential element, it remains possible for there to be different types of democracies. Further, with social justice as an essential element, democracy protects the rights of citizens and is based on the consent of the governed.

The developed definition of democracy is consistent with both strong democracy (Barber, 1984/2003) and thick democracy (Zyngier, 2012).

Discussion

The present study was undertaken to define the terms citizenship and democracy through consensus among experts in the field of civic education. Definitions were sought such that they might serve as tools for analysis of curriculum documents, especially social studies standards, in terms of citizenship and democracy. Understanding the conceptualizations of citizenship and democracy perpetuated in curriculum documents will allow us to understand the narrative being taught in public schools. As mentioned above, Barber (1984/2003) referred to the narrative of the United States as a beacon of democracy. Also, Lynch (2019) conceptualized humans as natural story tellers. Understanding the narrative, the story, contained in curriculum documents is essential to understanding the kind of society we are working to create. Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) indicated the society we create is affected by the curricular choices we make.

Developed to serve as tools for analysis, the definitions of the terms citizenship and democracy presented in this study have immediate implications for curriculum writers and teacher educators. Curriculum writers can employ the definitions presented to purposefully understand the approaches to citizenship and democracy they embed in curriculum documents. Williams and Maloyed (2013) asserted that government and citizenship standards in four Texas high school social studies courses support a conservative approach to teaching civics. Transmission of knowledge and values was characteristic of the conservative approach (Williams & Maloyed, 2013). This is not to say that the conceptualization in curriculum documents is incorrect as much as it is to say that curriculum writers must know the implications of their work. By putting specific expectations in standards, curriculum writers are setting out a worldview that needs to be understood.

In developing curriculum, then, it is important for curriculum writers to consider different approaches to curriculum rest on different political foundations (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004b). Thought must be put into the kind of society we hope to create through the teaching of citizenship and democracy. Social studies curriculum writers have at the very least, a say in the way our students initially come to terms with what it means to be a citizen in a democracy.

Conclusion

The present exploratory study is a start. By design, it is the first step in analysis of curriculum documents, especially those in social studies, in terms of citizenship and democracy. As described above, there are multiple conceptions of both citizenship and democracy in the literature. Definitions presented in this study were developed by reaching consensus among experts in the field of civic education. As such, they are appropriate tools for the analysis of curriculum documents.

Recommendations for further research are suggested by the results of the present study. Purposely designed as a first step in the analysis of existing curriculum documents, further research is indicated in curriculum analysis. That is, the definitions of the terms citizenship and democracy developed could be used to understand the implications of conceptions of those terms in social studies curriculum documents. By understanding what is meant by citizenship and democracy in terms of civic education, it is also possible to begin to evaluate the arguments for and against citizenship education and democratic education in public schools.

References

Anderson, J. L. (2004). In my view: What is democracy? Kappa Delta Pi Record, 41(1), 4-6. https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2004.10518801

Barber, B. R. (1992). An aristocracy of everyone: The politics of education and the future of America [Kindle edition]. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com

Barber, B. R. (2003). Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age, Twentieth anniversary edition. University of California Press. (Original work published 1984)

Bellamy, R. (2008). Citizenship: A very short introduction [Kindle edition]. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com

Collins, K. M. T., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Jiao, Q. G. (2006). Prevalence of mixed-methods sampling designs in social science research. Evaluation and Research in Education, 19, 83-101. https://doi.org/10.2167/eri421.0

Crick, B. (2008). Democracy. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of education for citizenship and democracy (pp. 13-19). SAGE.

Davidson, P. L. (2013). The Delphi Technique in doctoral research: Considerations and rationale. Review of Higher Education and Self-Learning, 6(22), 53-65.

Day, J., & Bobeva, M. (2005). A generic toolkit for the successful management of Delphi studies. The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methodology, 3, 103-116.

Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H., & Gustafson, D. H. (1975). Group techniques for program planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes. Dallas, Texas: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Dewey, J. (2005). Democracy and education. Barnes & Noble Books. (Original work published 1916)

Geboers, E., Geijsel, F., Admiraal, W., & ten Dam, G. (2013). Review of the effects of citizenship education. Educational Research Review, 9, 158-173. https://doi.org/10.1013/j.edurev.2012.02.001

Haste, H. (2004). Constructing the citizen. Political Psychology, 25, 413-439. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00378.x

Hsu, C., & Sandford, B. A. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 12, 1-7.

Hughes, A. S., Print, M., & Sears, A. (2010). Curriculum capacity and citizenship education: A comparative analysis of four democracies. Compare, 40, 293-309. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920903395528

Isin, E., & Ruppert, E. (2020). Being digital citizens, 2nd ed. Rowman & Littlefield International.

Kahne, J., & Middaugh, E. (2012). Digital media shapes youth participation in politics. Kappan, 94(3), 52-56. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171209400312

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (2006). The limits of political efficacy: Educating citizens for a democratic society. PS: Political Science & Politics, 39(2), 289-296. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506060471

Knight Abowitz, K., & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. Review of Educational Research, 76, 653-690. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076004653

Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2009). A typology of mixed methods research designs. Quality & Quantity, 43, 265-275. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-007-9105-3

Levy, B. L. M. (2013). An empirical exploration of factors related to adolescents' political efficacy. Educational Psychology, 33, 357-390. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2013.772774

Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.) (1975). The Delphi method: Techniques and applications. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Lucey, T. A., Lycke, K., Laney, J., & Connelly, C. (2013). Dimensions of citizenship through the lens of The Hunger Games: Fiction and the visual and performing arts as springboards for citizenship education. The Social Studies, 104, 190-199. https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2012.725110

Lukšik, I. (2019). The effect of primary education teachers on the formation of pupil citizenship. European Journal of Education, 54, 457-470. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12354

Lynch, M. P. (2019). Know-it-all society: Truth and arrogance in political culture. Liveright.

Merry, M. S. (2020). Can schools teach citizenship? Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education 41(1), 124-138. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2018.1488242

Mirra, N., & Morrell, E. (2011). Teachers as civic agents: Toward a critical democratic theory of urban teacher development. Journal of Teacher Education, 62, 408-420. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487111409417

Nussbaum, M. C. (2018). The monarchy of fear: A philosopher looks at our political crisis. Simon & Schuster.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2019). The cosmopolitan tradition: A noble but flawed ideal. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Collins, K. M. T. (2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social science research. The Qualitative Report, 12, 281-316.

Osler, A. (2011). Teacher interpretations of citizenship education: National identity, cosmopolitan ideals, and political realities. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 43(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2010.503245

Palmer, P. J. (2011). Healing the heart of democracy: The courage to create a politics worthy of the human spirit. Jossey-Bass.

Parker, W. C. (1996). “Advanced” ideas about democracy: Toward a pluralist conception of citizen education. Teachers College Record, 98, 104-125.

Plato. (1968). The Republic (2nd ed.) (A. Bloom, Trans.). BasicBooks.

Scheele, D. S. (1975). Reality construction as a product of Delphi interaction. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), The Delphi method: Techniques and applications (pp. 37-71). Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Sherrod, L. R., Flanagan, C., & Youniss, J. (2002). Dimensions of citizenship and opportunities for youth development: The what, why, when, where, and who of citizenship development. Applied Developmental Science, 6, 264-272. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532480XADS0604_14

Skulmoski, G. J., Hartman, F. T., & Krahn, J. (2007). The Delphi method for graduate research. Journal of Information Technology Education, 6, 1-21.

Sunal, C. S., Kelley, L. A., & Sunal, D. W. (2009). Citizenship education in the elementary classroom: Teacher candidates photograph and describe their perceptions. Journal of Social Studies Research, 33(1), 33-70.

Tupper, J. A., & Cappello, M. P. (2012). (Re)creating citizenship: Saskatchewan high school students' understandings of the 'good' citizen. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 44(1), 37-59. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2011.618951

van der Schaaf, M. F., & Stokking, K. M. (2011). Construct validation of content standards for teaching. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 55, 273-289. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.576878

Westheimer, J. (2008). What kind of citizen? Democratic dialogues in education. Education Canada, 48(3), 6-10.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004a). Educating the "good" citizen: Political choices and pedagogical goals. PS: Political Science & Politics, 37, 241-247. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504004160

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004b). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. American Educational Research Journal, 41, 237-269. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002237

Williams, J. K., & Maloyed, C. L. (2013). Much ado about Texas: Civics in the social studies curriculum. The History Teacher, 47(1), 25-40.

Wood, B. E., Taylor, R., Atkins, R., & Johnston, M. (2018). Pedagogies for active citizenship: Learning through affective and cognitive domains for deeper democratic engagement. Teaching and Teacher Education, 75, 259-267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.07.007

Zyngier, D. (2012). Rethinking the thinking on democracy and education: What are educators thinking (and doing) about democracy? Education, 2, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.3390/educa2010001