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Abstract

How can the arts be used to pursue a citizenship education? This thesis attempts to answer this question, focusing on the relationship between educational drama and a democratic citizenship curriculum. It is limited to a content analysis of a literature review, and concentrates on specific curriculum theories and selected theories of drama in education.

This thesis uses as its analytical focus the concept of the socially constructed nature of identity in an effort to clarify what the link between drama and democratic citizenship may be.

Approaches to curriculum that address issues concerned with democratic citizenship are identified and examined in order to understand how and why the concept of the socially constructed nature of identity is important to a democratic citizenship education.

A conceptual framework for a democratic citizenship curriculum is articulated and educational drama theory is explored for its implications to it. The focus is on both historical and contemporary contributions from the literature.

It is concluded that educational drama can be a powerful practice within a democratic citizenship curriculum. It can provide a form of analysis that can be used to integrate curriculum, to create possible visions of the future, and to develop an awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity. These three interrelated concepts are fundamental to a democratic citizenship curriculum and inherent in the practice of educational drama.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Within the summary of the Quebec Education Ministries new curriculum reforms, entitled, “The Quebec Education Program,” there is a bold section at the top of the page announcing the Program of Programs. Under this there are the Cross Curricular Competencies and Areas of Lifelong Learning. ¹ Beneath this are the Programs of Study including Subject Areas, Specific Subjects and Competencies, which, supposedly lead the student towards the Cross Curricular Competencies and the Areas of Lifelong Learning. Listed as an Area of Lifelong Learning is “Citizenship”. It is not clear by looking through the Programs of Study what exactly is involved in this area of lifelong learning or how it is to be pursued. In a conversation with a school principal, I asked how citizenship would be pursued. He admitted, that as it was a new addition to the curriculum, it wasn’t yet clear, but one teacher had suggested bringing in more televisions so the students could watch news. I nodded vaguely, supporting the assumption that there is a connection between televised news broadcasts and citizenship. That particular school offers strong programs in the arts, and we wondered if citizenship could be pursued through the arts. We enthusiastically agreed that it could be, but did not explain how. It seemed clear that there is a link between citizenship and the arts. The arts, after all, have been used both as a means of nationalist propaganda and as a subversive tool of revolution. What exactly is the link between citizenship and the arts? I realized that I, like this particular educational institution, had not an articulate answer. How can the arts be used to pursue a citizenship education? This thesis is an attempt to answer this question and the specific focus is on Democratic Citizenship Curriculum and its implications for Educational Drama. The thesis

is limited to a content analysis of a literature review, and concentrates on specific curriculum theories and selected theories of drama in education.

Recent educational drama theory addresses issues related to identity construction. (This will be examined in greater detail in chapter seven.) The concept of developing an awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity has been suggested as a goal of democratic citizenship education. (This will be discussed further in chapter two.) This thesis, therefore, uses as its analytical focus the concept of the socially constructed nature of identity in an attempt to understand what the link between drama and citizenship education may be.

Approaches to curriculum that address issues concerned with democratic citizenship are identified. These are examined in terms of their insights into how and why the concept of the socially constructed nature of identity is important to a citizenship education, and to articulate a democratic citizenship curriculum. Once this has been established educational drama theory will be examined for its implications to this. The chapters that follow will focus on historical and contemporary contributions from the literature.

Chapter Two (2) defines Democratic Citizenship in the North American context as that which opposes the current practice of liberal democracy and the social and economic inequalities that are implicit within it. Enlightenment concepts of universality are introduced for their role in liberal democracy and its institutions, primarily schooling, and criticized for their contribution to a 'positivist' culture and for their institutional appropriation by which they have provided the justification for the protection of private interests at the expense of subordinate groups. Traditional education is examined in terms of its relationship to cultural positivism and Enlightenment concepts. Democratic citizenship education is introduced as that which challenges traditional education and which seeks to develop educational practices in support of social transformation.

Thomas Bridges' citizenship ideology is introduced, and his suggestion that an awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity as critical to democratic civic culture
is examined. He calls this awareness ‘narrative imagination’ and argues that it should be the goal of democratic citizenship education to foster this form of narrative imagination. The next four chapters will examine various curriculum approaches where social change is a stated mandate, to illuminate this concept and further articulate a democratic citizenship curriculum.

Although several sources have contributed to the ideas in Chapter Two (2), the analyses provided by the curriculum theorists, Michael W. Apple, Henry A. Giroux, and Kenneth W. Osborne, and the philosopher, Thomas Bridges, have had significant influence.

The identified curriculum theories in this thesis that address social transformation have been categorized into three groups: Social Reconstruction, Post Critical Reconceptualist, and Critical Pedagogy. These groups are distinguished not only by their historical time periods but by their relationship to universalistic concepts, their commitment to social change, and their articulation of practices towards a citizenship education. They are analyzed in terms of their approaches to identity construction and their recommendations for curriculum design.

Chapter Three (3) examines the curriculum theory of the Social Reconstructionist period to discern how it contributed to an articulation of a citizenship education and furthered the exploration of identity within that context. The Reconstructionists wrote between the 1920s and 1940s and this analysis includes works by Boyd H. Bode, George S. Counts, John Dewey, William H. Kilpatrick, and Harold O. Rugg.

This chapter examines their vision of schools as institutions which could participate in rebuilding American democracy. Their criticisms of traditional education are noted, including their objection to the empty vessel approach to education and the compartmentalization of curriculum. Dewey’s recommendation for an experientially based curriculum is discussed as well as their other recommendations including the use of the environment outside of the school as an educational resource, the development of links
between schools and other community groups and their call for students to be involved in community organization.

Their attempt to create an inclusive and open view of democracy that does not rely on universal abstractions is recognized but Chapter Three (3) concludes that the underlying assumption of a homogenous culture apparent in their thought undermines their potential to develop transformative practices and democratic citizenship. It is noted that the Social Reconstructionists understood schools as locations where identity is formed but in their assumption of cultural homogeneity, they did not recognize the pluralistic and potentially conflicting nature of identity and therefore, neither did they understand the need to analyze it.

Chapter Four (4) offers an analysis of the theories of the hidden curriculum. They have had a profound impact on curriculum development as they have seriously questioned the role that education can play in social transformation. These theories introduced the idea of hegemony including how it works at an unconscious level to reproduce existing economic and social inequality. Identities, in this context, are shaped in such a way as to allow individuals to accept and sometimes even choose to participate in their own subordination. Schooling could no longer be seen as neutral, serving the best interests of its students; and an education truly seeking social change would have to seriously consider identity formation and its role in social and cultural reproduction. The primary source material for this chapter includes work by Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Paul Willis, and Michael Apple.

Chapter Five (5) continues to examine curriculum theory with social change as its mandate to see if the issues of the hidden curriculum and the socially constructed nature of identity are addressed. This chapter examines some of the Reconceptualists who wrote during the 1970s and 1980s and approached curriculum as an opportunity to examine the self. It includes the work of Maxine Greene, Madeleine Grumet, James B. Macdonald and William F. Pinar. Their ideas relating to society and schooling as forces which perpetuate
alienation are examined. Responding to this and to the role that the unconscious plays in maintaining forms of oppression, they sought social transformation through the transformation of self. Their suggestions at self-transformation including autobiography and theatre are introduced.

The belief, of this representative Reconceptualist work, in a transcendent self, existing beneath the layers of social conditioning is shown as inconsistent with a democratic citizenship education. It is concluded that an awareness of the social construction of identity is not understood by the Reconceptualists as a requirement of a civic culture whereby plural and conflicting identities can co-exist within a democratic society, but rather as a means to uncover the essential self, an identity that is not socially constructed.

Chapter Five (5) concludes that the Reconceptualists, though providing practices that explore the nature of identity, do not offer an approach that leads to a democratic citizenship curriculum.

Chapter Six (6) introduces Critical Pedagogy as an approach to curriculum that functions somewhat as a synthesis of both Reconstructionist and Reconceptualist thought, and like Thomas Bridges, understands the necessity of 'narrative imagination' to a citizenship education. Although the ideas presented here have been significantly informed by the work of Paulo Freire, this chapter focuses on North American critical pedagogy, primarily the representative work of Henry A. Giroux, Roger Simon and Peter McLaren.

Critical Pedagogy understands the value for curriculum to foster an awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity. It recognizes the contradiction in attempts to define democracy while simultaneously avoiding references to universal concepts. Within the understanding of this contradiction Critical Pedagogy has been successful in articulating a democratic citizenship education.

Critical Pedagogy puts forward several recommendations for curriculum that include and emphasize forms of analysis of the nature identity. It understands that
examining the nature of identity allows the individual to challenge potentially oppressive structures. Understanding the socially constructed nature of identity is thus seen as a way to examine and challenge hegemony and therefore create an environment in which a democratic citizenship can be pursued. Interwoven with this is an understanding that with an awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity one can, it is hoped, achieve an identity that exists both within and independent of the interpretive framework defined by one’s particularistic group, thus a civic culture can be formed.

Chapter Six (6) concludes with a synthesis of ideas from Social Reconstructionism, Reconceptualist and Critical Pedagogy which is presented as an articulation of a conceptual framework for a democratic citizenship education.

Chapter Seven (7) investigates educational drama theory and its implications for democratic citizenship education. It is framed as a comparison between traditional drama in education theory as presented by Peter Slade and Brian Way and more recent developments as presented by Augusto Boal, Gavin Bolton and Dorothy Heathcote.

It demonstrates that traditional educational drama theory is based on an incorrect interpretation of the educational value of drama. Drama, rather than providing opportunities for lived experience, as traditionalists would argue, actually provides opportunities to objectify lived experiences.

The ability for drama to explore social themes across the curriculum is examined as well its power to provide the opportunities for perceptions to be explored. The acting procedure is described as a process by which the socially constructed nature of identity is explored.

Chapter Seven (7) concludes that drama can be a potentially powerful form of practice within a democratic citizenship education because it can form the basis upon which to develop an interdisciplinary curriculum; it provides opportunities for student experience to be validated and examined creating situations where action, reflection upon action, and further action can be experienced; it can help develop hopeful visions of the future; and
primarily it provides a process by which the socially constructed nature of identity can be analyzed.

Chapter Eight (8) will serve as a summary of the main ideas and findings in the descriptive study.
Chapter Two
Towards a Democratic Citizenship Education

The previous chapter introduced the idea that democratic citizenship education and drama in education may share common ground in terms of their relationship to identity formation. This chapter will seek to establish what is meant here by democratic citizenship education and will begin to clarify why an understanding of identity formation is important to it.

Democratic citizenship will be posed as a challenge to current citizenship practices and current social and economic organization. Traditional education will be examined as that which supports the current social and economic order. Democratic citizenship education is therefore presented here as a challenge to both traditional education and an attempt at social transformation.

Identity formation will be explored in the context of Thomas Bridges’ vision of a democratic civic culture. It will be explained that to effectively challenge the current liberal democracy and its implicit social inequality, a civic culture must be developed where its citizenry is aware of the socially constructed nature of its’ identity.

According to Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2000), a citizen is one who has the right and responsibility: to participate in the political process either by running for government or by voting; to become educated in either official language; to help others in the community; to care for and protect our heritage and environment; to obey Canada’s laws; to express opinions freely while respecting the rights and freedoms of others; and to eliminate discrimination and injustice.\(^2\) Citizenship thus involves questions related to the nature of community, justice, care, responsibility, government, freedom, social interaction, respect - essentially it involves questions related to values. Citizenship is how we relate to these issues and how we participate in shaping our communities. It follows then that

\(^2\) Citizenship and Immigration Canada, *A Look At Canada* (Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services, 2000), 30
citizenship education deals with values that find expression in how we participate in the political process and how we involve ourselves in our communities.

According to the classical Greek definition "...citizenship education was seen as intrinsically political, designed to educate the citizen for intelligent and active participation in the civic community. Moreover, intelligence was viewed as an extension of ethics, a manifestation and demonstration of the doctrine of the good and just life." \(^3\) Citizenship education would thus include matters concerning justice and perceptions influencing our definitions of the good life. Citizenship education in a democracy would also include issues related to democratic organization and participation and understanding the nature of civic community. This definition, however, does not characterize citizenship education in most American and Canadian schools today.

Canadian and American schools currently do not make overt the relationship between politics, schooling, and the functions of concepts of “the good and just life.” This is not because educators have failed to see this relationship; in fact, in the early history of Canadian and American public schooling, education was used openly as a means of social control.\(^4\) During the time when the two nations were being formed through massive European immigration, the school was seen as a place to eliminate diversity among immigrant groups and promote cultural homogeneity. Michael W. Apple, has written extensively about social control in education and has looked at its historical origins in the American education system. He uses the following quote from the urban historian Carl F. Kaestle to illuminate his ideas. First Kaestle quotes from the 1850 New York City Putman’s Monthly Journal,

---


"Our readers will agree with us that for the effectual defecation of the stream of life in a great city, there is but one rectifying agent - one infallible filter - the school..." Kaestle clarifies with "Most schoolmen were probably not adverse to the success of limited numbers of the poor through education, but the schools' mission - and most promoters were quite frank about it - was to inculcate cooperative attitudes among the city's children whatever the vicissitudes of urban life might bring them...The schools reflected the attitude of the general native public, who wished to Americanize the habits, not the status, of the immigrant."

But this view of schooling changed in the early 1900s as the scientific management movement developed and influenced the field of curriculum. This stated purpose of education was dismissed in order for schools to conform to the increasingly popular industrial models of technical efficiency. New production methods had emerged whereby workers were involved in the production of one part only of a larger design, labour relations were becoming increasingly hierarchical, and dependency upon others for food and shelter was developing. With the changing nature of the economy schools began to re-formulate their social function which became the fitting of the individual into the economy. Particular skills and behavior patterns were taught with the intention of producing better and more efficient workers and citizens.

The curriculum field, which was itself finding definition at this time, developed a body of work known as "scientific curriculum making." Two theorists in particular, Franklin Bobbitt and W.W. Charters, embodied this approach and have significantly influence the field of curriculum. Borrowing from the scientific management movement they advanced a theory of curriculum construction that was based upon the differentiation of educational objectives that were determined by identifying the narrow functions of a

---

6 Ibid., 66
socially efficient adult life.7 Another theorist, Frederick Bonscer, advocated a curriculum that was based upon the procedures of job analysis.8

Kaestle points out that "These developments would transform the ideal of equality of educational opportunity in America for they made segregation - by curriculum, social class, projected vocational role - fundamental to the workings of the school."9

The scientific management movement was itself reflective of a larger ideological shift. The rise of a ‘positivist’ culture had been happening since the Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century. Positivist attitudes encompassed: “1) the validation of cognitive thought by experience of facts; 2) the orientation of cognitive thought to the physical science as a model of certainty and exactness; 3) the belief that progress in knowledge depends on this orientation.”10

Many thinkers have interpreted the rise of cultural positivism in the Twentieth century to be a result of Enlightenment concepts. The Frankfurt School of Critical Theory offers an interpretation of this that has had considerable influence upon educational analysis and concepts of citizenship education that is worthy of a discussion with respect to ideology.

The Enlightenment was represented by a group of French intellectuals including Denis Diderot during the latter half of the Eighteenth century. It is defined “as the project of dispensing darkness, fear and superstition; of removing all the shackles from free inquiry and debate. It opposed the traditional powers and beliefs of the Church (branded as ‘superstition’) and raised questions of political legitimacy. All received or traditional notions, and social relations, were to be made subject to the scrutiny of the public, and

---

therefore, collective- or inter-subjective - use of reason."\textsuperscript{11} The politics and commerce of the time were characterized by more liberal social arrangements than before, and, following Newton's discoveries, science and technology flourished. "This was the epoch which first came to terms with extensive and tangible improvements in many areas of life affected by the application of science, giving rise to the dream of a world radically improved, ordered, engineered, mastered. The idea of the improvement of the human race, and of 'moral progress' was born. The desire to master nature developed into the dream of mastering society and history."\textsuperscript{12} The Frankfurt School saw a disaster in this dream. They argued that this new faith in reason and science contributed to the culture of positivism which had many negative implications including a disregard for the abstract and the restriction of human thought.

Herbert Marcuse said that "positivism is a struggle against all metaphysics."\textsuperscript{13}

Max Horkheimer argued that positivism "presented a view of knowledge and science that stripped both of their critical possibilities. Knowledge was reduced to the exclusive province of science and science itself was subsumed within a methodology that limited scientific activity to the description, classification, and generalization of phenomena, with no care to distinguish the unimportant from the essential."\textsuperscript{14}

And Habermas concluded that,

"...In the second half of the nineteenth century, during the course of the reduction of science to a productive force in industrial society, positivism, historicism, and pragmatism, each in turn, isolate one part of this all encompassing concept of rationality. The hitherto undisputed attempts of the great theories to reflect on the complex of life as a whole is henceforth itself discredited as dogma...The spontaneity of hope, the art of taking a position, the experience of relevance or indifference, and above all the response to suffering and oppression, the desire for adult autonomy, the will to emancipation, and the happiness of discovering one's identity - all these are dismissed for all time from the obligation interest of reason"\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{11} Stuart Sim, \textit{Postmodern Thought} (Cambridge: Icon Books Ltd., 1998), 239
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{13} Herbert Marcuse "One Dimensional Man", 1964 as quoted in Henry A. Giroux, \textit{Theory and Resistance in Education} (London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1983), 14
\textsuperscript{14} Max Horkheimer "Critical Theory", 1972 as quoted in Ibid., 14
\textsuperscript{15} Jürgen Habermas "Theory and Practice", 1973 as quoted in Ibid., 12
The Frankfurt School argued that as a result of this, mass-cultural institutions such as schools took on a new role. “Culture had become another industry, one which not only produced goods but also legitimated the logic of capital and its institutions. Rather than being an escape from the mechanized work process, the cultural realm becomes an extension of it.”

This is certainly reflected in “scientific curriculum making” where the curriculum sought to pattern itself upon the economic model. It should be noted that “scientific curriculum making” de-emphasized the arts as important subjects in contrast to the elevation of mathematics and science. With this new educational purpose the idea of a citizen as one who “actively participates in the civic community” changed to one who satisfies the needs of the economy. The political realm was removed from the educational realm and citizenship education became about conformity.

“...when educational theory and practice in the twentieth century shifted the philosophical basis of schooling from the political to the technical, schooling was no longer justified in terms of political values and concerns; the theoretical pillars upon which a new rationale was constructed were efficiency and control. With the age of scientific management came the celebration of a new rationality and the removal of “the political” from the terrain of schooling. Citizenship education became entwined in a “culture of positivism,” one that displayed little interest in the ways in which schools acted as agents of social and cultural reproduction in a society marked by significant inequities in wealth, power and privilege.”

This is the form of citizenship education that still characterizes schools today and although it does not appear as a mandate of public education, it, nonetheless, is taught. This has occurred through the hidden curriculum, that which “...refers to those underlying norms, values and attitudes that are often transmitted tacitly through the social relations of the school and classroom;” through the overt curriculum, referring here to the selection of skills and knowledge considered valuable to learn, through the interplay between the two curricula, and through teaching practices. What is being suggested is that values, that find expression in the interactions between students, students and teachers, teachers and

---

16 Ibid., 25
17 Ibid., 170
administrators etceteras, as well as in the relationships to knowledge and other cultural manifestations, are transmitted, through the experience of schooling, and these values reflect attitudes towards citizenship. Ken Osborne, in Teaching for Democratic Citizenship describes the process,

"In a thousand different ways, deliberately and accidentally, explicitly and implicitly, by example and by instruction, by what they say and do as well as by what they do not say and do, teachers help students to arrive at a way of seeing and interpreting the world. They teach them to be more or less active or passive, independent or submissive, cooperative or competitive, generous or selfish, trusting or fearful, and so on. And all these qualities have an impact on political life. They influence the extent to which students do or do not involve themselves in political life, both small-p and large-p. They influence the way they view and deal with other people, and thus shape the nature of neighborhood, community and society at large. My word for this is citizenship. All teachers teach it. They cannot avoid it. Every time they give an instruction, ask a question, deal with an interruption, take up an answer, make a comment, they are conveying a view of how the world works and how people should behave. Citizenship is not all those lessons on government in social studies classes. That is civics. Nor it is the singing of the national anthem or the celebration of ceremonial occasions. Those are patriotic exercises. Citizenship is far more than this."

He argues that this kind of citizenship education has generally lead to a passive, conformist understanding of citizenship. Giroux, comes to the same conclusion in an analysis of how knowledge is viewed in this educational approach.

"Knowledge in this perspective resides in a notion of objectivity and detachment that renders questions concerning the production and legitimation of its form and content irrelevant...Not only is knowledge objectified in this rationality, it is usually reduced to the mastery of technical decisions for ends already decided...this model of citizenship education ends up supporting, through its methodologies and content, behavior that is adaptive and conditioned, rather than active and critical...Teachers and students within this context are expected to be either passive consumers or transmitters of knowledge, rather than negotiators of the world in which they work and act."

Although there are pockets of people all over successfully seeking to actively shape and transform their communities, politics in general is currently distinguished by a lack of

---

18 Ibid., 198
19 Ken Osborne, Teaching for Democratic Citizenship (Montreal: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation, 1991), 117
participation. The absence of an active citizenship education in schools only reflects a larger social phenomenon. Osborne asserts that, “The state of democratic citizenship leaves much to be desired. Canadian society continues to be characterized by unacceptable inequalities. Large groups of people are effectively excluded from the political process.”

The current liberal democratic process has supported the rise of corporate capitalism and with that the unequal distribution of resources. Wealth has continued to be shared by a smaller percentage of the population and our political process has allowed wealth to be synonymous with power. This inequality has increased with the rise of corporate globalization. According to the United Nations Human Development Report (1999), “Since the 1970s in the United States, the top 1% of households have doubled their share of the national wealth. The top 1% now have more wealth than the entire bottom 95%....The assets of the top three billionaires are more than the combined Gross Domestic Product of the least developed countries which have a total population of more than 600 million.”

With this inequality a cynicism towards the democratic process has developed. In a recent article on economic democracy in the Canadian Centre For Policy Alternatives Monitor, John Richmond argues “Political democracy has become a charade...No matter who is in power, they all grease the wheels of the corporate agenda, making voting and politics seem like a bigger and bigger waste of time.”

This corporate agenda has also made its way into the policy formation of public schools. Policies are being justified in relation to the goals of an internationally competitive economy including the reduction of educational funding and the promotion of economic and cultural partnerships between public schools and private corporations. “Recent Canadian and American commentaries have continued to point to the hegemonic vision and

---

22 As quoted from the “New Internationalist” article Blueprint for Change, January/February 2000
logic of corporate capitalism and individual consumerism as the still-dominant justifying framework within which such (educational policy) decisions are being made."

If Democratic Citizenship Education challenges the current nature of citizenship education as that which supports the ‘status quo’ and the ‘status quo’ is characterized by a lack of democratic participation and an unjust distribution of resources, then Democratic Citizenship Education demands the posing of the question - Is Democratic Citizenship Education about challenging this current state of liberal democracy and seeking to encourage active participation towards social change, or is it about supporting the status quo? If it is about social change, then what are the curricular implications of this?

The ideology of Thomas Bridges, encompasses a type of a Democratic Citizenship Education that opposes the current form of liberal democracy. In his book, The Culture of Citizenship - Inventing Postmodern Civic Culture, Bridges calls for a challenge to liberal democracy and corporate globalization, and articulates a vision of citizenship and citizenship education. He, like the Frankfurt School, interprets the current crisis in liberal democracy as rooted in Enlightenment world views, which, he maintains have been the cultural vehicle for the hegemony of this economic and political power.

He argues that Enlightenment world views embody universalistic concepts of nature, freedom, reason, and knowledge. “Its’ claim was to provide a purely universal language for a universal humanity, a language purged of all perspectives grounded in particularistic religious belief and the accidents of local history”25 These concepts have defined cultural modernity, and he argues, have seemed inseparable from economic and technological modernization. They provided “an interpretation of the basic liberal democratic ideas of individual freedom and equality and were used to articulate the concept of political justice underlying liberal political institutions...notions of social contract,

---

24 Ken Osborne, Educating Citizens: A Democratic Socialist Agenda for Canadian Education (Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Educational Foundation, 1988)
natural human rights, ideas of authentic individuality and autonomous personhood."

The scientific method was seen as the harbinger of universal truths and therefore guaranteed supposedly cultural neutrality and objectivity. "These enlightenment concepts of reason and knowledge have led many Europeans and Americans to believe that they should and could adopt a universalistic, culture-neutral, value-free standpoint on all cognitive, moral and political matters." These concepts are hostile to other religious, ethnic and political traditions and look down upon cultural particularism. But, "It has become clear that this totalizing cultural posture is itself a form of Western cultural particularism," that has been used to protect particular private interests in the economic sphere by the subordination and exploitation of other particular groups.

Liberal democratic institutions have used the rhetoric of these universal concepts to justify themselves and have hidden the way in which they in fact perpetuate forms of social injustice. The question Bridges seeks to answer is how to reformulate democratic citizenship in a way that does not employ concepts from the Enlightenment and which is supportive of pluralistic societies, and simultaneously supportive of democratic organization and goals. He believes the answer lies in the development of a civic culture, a citizenry that is aware of the social construction of identity.

Social identity, he reasons, is formed within the particularistic group by which an individual is distinguished. Values, including what constitutes 'the good life' and what determines personal worth, shape identity. These values are learned unconsciously within the particular groups within which one is located. These values will include both affirming and oppressive constructs but the point here is that they are socially constructed. These values are formed through narratives offered by particular cultural communities. Narratives, in this context, are understood primarily as life stories, many of which find expression in popular media.

\[26\] Ibid., 6
\[27\] Ibid., x
\[28\] Ibid., x
The way in which human beings achieve self-understanding as desiring, living beings is embodied linguistically through narration, in the form of the life story. Life stories are narratives of desire in the sense that they provide a linguistic representation of the quest for the good, the quest for the object of desire. But life stories are narratives of desire, also in the sense that they constitute the way in which desire itself becomes intelligible to itself as human desire. The story of his or her life that a particular person relates to others is a construction of hope, ordered by a plot that anticipates, as the narrative closure or conclusion, the eventual possession of the object of desire, the eventual realization of some particular concept to the good life. 29

In the ideal civic culture, the culture where people from different groups come together to organize democratically, that Bridges envisions, people would develop an awareness of the constructed nature of their identities. The concept of self (identity), is thus removed from the ideological underpinnings of universality, and is understood as being constructed by particular 'narratives of desire' formed in particular groups. Life stories are open ended narratives vulnerable to continual reinterpretation and reconstruction as values change and new understandings are formed that put events in a new light. When this concept is understood one can develop the capacity to become the author of one's own narrative. Following this ability to perceive the social construction of one's identity, it is hoped, that one can achieve an identity that exists both within and independent of the interpretive framework defined by a particular life narrative. A civic culture can then be formed. Bridges refers to this understanding of the socially constructed nature of identity as narrative imagination and suggests that it is this type of imagination that civic education should develop.

"A capacity for civic freedom consists of a capacity to incorporate into every narratively constructed identity or self a recognition and affirmation of its own narratively constructed status. This is to say that the capacity for civic freedom is the capacity to construct a human life narrative as an open-criterion narrative.... To develop this capacity, citizens must... exercise a very peculiar form of narrative imagination...It is the task of civic education to cultivate this from of imagination." 30
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In this context of a critique of totalizing Enlightenment concepts, it is necessary to clarify that the term democracy can be understood as a concept that fixes notions of citizenship to essential categories such as nation state. If democracy is understood, though, according to Torfing's definition of radical democracy as the project to "extend egalitarian participation and emancipatory struggle to all social spheres in such a way as to recognize plurality of identity, not as essential or transcendent, but as socially constructed,"31 then citizenship is not attached to an essential category. Citizenship, as a form of social identity, is constituted within the realm of social experience and is not transcendent.32

Fundamental to the interpretation of citizenship and citizenship education offered here is an understanding of the nature of identity as socially constructed in the context of a democracy supportive of equal participation and social transformation among all social spheres. What approaches to curriculum will accommodate this kind of citizenship education? What tools are available to educators that will help foster this form of 'narrative imagination'?

This chapter has shown that current educational practices, following the lead of the scientific management movement, have contributed to a citizenship education that is passive and conformist. But curriculum theories have developed that attempt to challenge mainstream educational practice and articulate strategies that advance social transformation. The next chapters will examine some of these theories. They will be analyzed in terms of their insights into citizenship education, including a look at how they deal with issues pertaining to identity.

Chapter Three

Social Reconstruction

The previous chapter introduced an ideal citizenship education as that which deals with values that find expression in how we participate in the political process and how we involve ourselves in our communities. This form of citizenship education was contrasted to that which is practiced within traditional North American schools. It was demonstrated that traditional education leads to a passive, conformist view of citizenship where issues related to political participation and active community involvement are not addressed and forms of social inequity are in fact supported. Positivist culture, with its roots in Enlightenment concepts of reason and truth, was examined for its effects on schooling and on the current practice of liberal democracy. It was shown that the social acceptance of the concept of universal values and an emphatic faith in the scientific method as the harbinger of truth has lead to a disregard for other forms of knowledge and inquiry, as well as a hostility towards pluralistic societies where the interests of some are protected while others are subordinated. It was argued that a challenge to this would involve the creation of a democratic civic culture not grounded in universal concepts, but rather, grounded in the socially constructed nature of identity. It was concluded that Democratic Citizenship education would thus involve a challenge to traditional education and the pursuit of the awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity in the context of social transformation. This chapter begins the examination of some curriculum theories that address these concepts of a democratic citizenship education.

Although traditional educational practices have dominated schooling, it has not done so without protest. Opposition to scientific curriculum making formed alongside with it. As early as the 1920s, alternative curriculum strategies were being advocated. One such alternative has become known as the Reconstructionist Movement and includes the work of Boyd H. Bode, George S. Counts, John Dewey, William H. Kilpatrick, and Harold O.
Rugg. They strongly believed that education had a significant role to play in the development of a democratic society.

The Reconstructionists interpreted their society as being in a state of moral decay with a crumbling social order. Democracy itself was in question as, in current practice, it seemed to lack clarity in intent and purpose. Boyd H. Bode commented

"it is not clear that this historic conception of democracy represents a real contribution to the world's thinking on the subject of social organization. It seems to boil down to the confusion that a people living chiefly under rural conditions and not seriously threatened by foreign enemies can afford to take its dictatorship in small doses and in a great variety of forms."33

The Reconstructionists were firm believers in democracy as a form of social control, but thought that it needed to be Reconstructed to better reflect both its principles and practices. They understood education as one means by which social problems could be rectified and democracy re-built. The purpose of education, they postulated, was fundamentally social and should be concerned with human welfare. "The economic, political and social problems arising out of present-day conditions require a kind of insight and disposition which we expect to come in large part from the schools."34

Traditional educational practices, in their view, only contributed to the problems that they perceived in society. Traditional schools did not manage themselves according to democratic principles and, in fact, created an environment where students developed behaviours contrary to democratic participation. John Dewey outlined that in traditional schools, the subject matter and skills required to be learned were handed down from the past and transmitted to the student via the textbook, mediated by the teacher who had authority over the students. Students in this view were likened to empty vessels, waiting to be filled. This required the students to adopt attitudes of docility, receptivity and obedience

and also rendered subject matter irrelevant. Among the negative effects of this practice, was the development of bad habits,

"those in charge of such schools practically shut their eyes to the bad traits built in the many by a regime of assigning tasks under penalty with small regard to individual interest or readiness. Youth, working thus without heart in what they do, live, and so tend to learn, inattention, dawdling, and slipshod habits. Of the less vigorous, many learn subserviency and frustration: while the more vigorous learn resentment, rebelliousness, and antagonism; and many of both kinds learn cheating to make grades otherwise denied them. The list of bad traits thus built is long and ugly."^{35}

Bode argued that one of the significant problems with traditional education was the way in which it compartmentalized subject matter. He saw this as a phenomenon outside of schools as well, perceiving it as detrimental because it leads one to think in separate and fixed terms and makes one inhibited to deviate from these patterns. Consequently, one "acquire(s) an insensitiveness to contradictions in beliefs and practices."^{36} Not only did it lead to narrow modes of thinking, but as issues were perceived only from within their separate compartments, relationships between issues were not perceived. As Bode believed that schools were influenced by outside interests, he noted that this process of compartmentalization allowed for social institutions to hide their implication to social issues, for example, unemployment:

"Our educational practice of compartmentalization not only keeps basic problems out of sight, but adds to the difficulty of locating them. At present, for example, our millions of unemployed are curiously disposed to take their misfortune as merely 'hard luck', to be endured as best they can...That such views should prevail when we are dealing with a phenomenon which is obviously a matter of social organization, pure and simple, is passing strange."^{37}

The Reconstructionists were aware of the role schools played in supporting a crumbling social order, but they believed that just as schools could play a destructive role, with appropriate and significant changes and guidance, they could equally play a constructive role. Among the significant changes asserted (first by Dewey and then

^{36}Bode, "The Confusion in Present Day Education," 7
^{37}Ibid., 6
supported by the others in the movement) was that education should be grounded in a philosophy of education and that this philosophy should be based on a philosophy of experience that in turn was in harmony with the principles of growth. True learning occurs only through experience, and “Experience is truly experience only when objective conditions are subordinated to what goes on within the individuals having the experience.” This notion is in sharp contrast to the traditional view of students as empty vessels where it is their experiences that must be subordinated in order to accommodate objective conditions.

But Dewey was careful to clarify that not all experiences were supportive of a reconstructed education in the service of democracy. Some experiences were in fact destructive, or as Dewey put it, miseducative, and education and experience were thus not to be directly equated with each other. The difference between an educative and a miseducative experience lay in the differing effect they had upon future experience. Miseducative experiences were those that, for example, developed insensitivity, impatience, or a lack of thoughtfulness and therefore had a negative impact on future experiences. For instance, one with these developed negative characteristics may not be able to appreciate the richness of a future experience and therefore begin a process of restricting future opportunities. On the contrary, educative experiences were those that lead to further educative experiences, thus expanding the opportunity set and possibilities for learning. This understanding of experience was known as the experiential continuum. Dewey observed that traditional education offered an excess of miseducative experiences:

“...the experiences which were had, by pupils and teachers alike, were largely of a wrong kind. How many students, for example, were rendered callous to ideas, and how many lost the impetus to learn because of the way in which learning was experienced by them? How may acquired special skills by means of automatic drill so that their power of judgment and capacity to act intelligently in new situation was limited? How many came

---
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to associate the learning process with ennui and boredom? How many found what they did learn so foreign to the situation of life outside the school as to give them no power of control over the latter? How many came to associate books with dull drudgery, so that they were "conditioned" to all but flashy reading matter? 41

He counselled that experience needed to be evaluated in terms of two qualities, its level of agreeableness and disagreeableness, and its influence on further experience. The first was easy to judge but the second presented considerable challenges to educators and should, in fact, be their primary concern.

"The effect of an experience is not borne on its face. It sets a problem to the educator. It is his business to arrange for the kind of experiences which, while they do not repel the student, but rather engage his activities are, nevertheless more than immediately enjoyable since they promote having desirable future experiences. Just as no man lives or dies to himself, so no experience lives and dies to itself. Wholly independent of desire or intent, every experience lives on in further experiences. Hence the central problem of an education based upon experience is to select the kind of present experiences that live fruitfully and creatively in subsequent experiences." 42

But how were educators to arrange for such educative experiences? Where were they to find experiences of this quality from which to select? The Reconstructionists argued strongly that educators should go outside of the classroom. The necessary resources for education lay beyond the textbook and were to be found within the larger community. Curriculum makers should go to society to select materials of instruction. "(An educator) must become a student of human society and its institutions as well as of the nature of the child." 43 In this context teachers would need to learn intimately about the local community and environment around it as well as be able to utilize it in the creation of educative experiences. Teachers would also need to provide students with the opportunities for experiences that taught them about democratic social organization. Students would thus be encouraged to involve themselves in community action groups and community decision making. George S. Counts suggested that:
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"The school must be viewed as part of the larger community; and teachers and classes can share with the citizens outside in democratically deciding upon and carrying out such community enterprises as lie within the range of pupil and student endeavor. Thus to work with adults on real community projects will give a dignity to youthful effort which can bring learning efforts beyond anything otherwise known."\(^{44}\)

William H. Kilpatrick believed that certain 'social traits' were required for democratic social organization and argued for community involvement as essential to the development of these social traits. "The procedures necessary for building certain essential social traits are possible only in the pursuit of social aims in their natural and social settings....Social traits must be socially lived or they cannot be effectively learned."\(^{45}\)

Though the Reconstructionists did not refer specifically to identity formation, it is clear that they understood the role of schooling in identity formation. As a place where social traits, habits, attitudes and dispositions towards future experiences are learned, it is a place where identities are, at least partially, formed. Kilpatrick demonstrates this understanding:

"We learn what we live...To accept that the pupils learn what they live, only and precisely what they live, and in the degree in which they live it-- to accept these things at once means and demands that attention be directed to the quality of the living. The school must hold itself responsible for the living that goes on under its auspices; for the quality of that living has now become a matter of supreme importance. That pupils and students learn what they live means that if their living is of low quality, they learn that low quality and build it into character so that they become therefore low quality persons. The low-quality living did it."\(^{46}\)

Although recognizing the role schools play in the construction of identity, the Reconstructionists did not, however, require that students recognize this. Rather, it was the responsibility of educators to create the environment where the right kind of identities were formed. Behaviours, attitudes, skills, and outlooks were to be developed that were consistent with democratic citizenship. This was to be done through a curriculum grounded in a theory of experience. But not *guided* by a theory of experience.
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Reconstructionists were clear to make this separation for they believed that for teachers to be able to choose and evaluate educative experiences they would need a clear criteria of value or guiding principles by which to make decisions. The goal of democratic reconstruction must guide curriculum design. Without this, a curriculum based on experiential learning, would become absorbed in the self and not consider issues of democratic social organization. This is how they described the Progressive Education Movement of their time.

Based upon Dewey’s ideology that learning could only truly occur through experience, an experientially based curriculum movement, known then as the Progressive Education Movement, also developed at this time and in opposition to traditional education. This curriculum theory has come to be known as Child Centered Curriculum. They had a lot in common with the Reconstructionists and shared an opposition to the traditional view where children were seen as empty vessels waiting to be filled (the transmission model). They preferred to think of children as seeds, borrowing the metaphor from the German educator Friedrich Froebel. The teacher in this context, was a gardener encouraging the natural growth of the child and did not play a significant role in designing experiences. In fact curriculum design, in this view, was largely left to the students.

The Reconstructionists argued that this Progressive Movement took the ‘natural growth’ of the child to an extreme, considered guidance from the teacher to be an interference, and did not distinguish between educative and miseducative experience. They did not see this movement as contributing to the social concerns of the time nor did it prepare students to understand their role in society, or to participate in shaping it. Dewey contested, that in regards to experiential learning, “it is not a curriculum designed by the students for, it is not to be assumed that they have the maturity to distinguish between experiences that initiate appropriate subsequent experiences and those that provide only
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immediate enjoyment." Counts supported this view by suggesting that, "Guidance in the construction of the curriculum is to be derived from knowledge about the learner rather directly from the learner himself."

The Reconstructionists argued that curriculum must be designed upon a sound theory of "man in society." Both traditional and child centered curriculum were missing an ethical, moral and social vision. Although the Reconstructionists strongly supported the scientific method of inquiry and experientially based learning, they did not believe they provided adequate guiding principles and without these, as Bode put it, "...there is imminent danger that class interests will brush aside the common good," and as Counts put it:

"In the absence of criteria of value, an objective study of human activities will not reveal which activities are good and worthy of perpetuation or which are evil and merit elimination from social life.... It would not provide certain basic criteria of value necessary to a definition of social welfare. It might, to be sure, give us a consensus of popular opinion and show what men generally regard as valuable. But criteria determined in this manner would merely reflect the ends for which the society under study might at times be striving. These ends might include the merciless annihilation of another people, the enslavement of a less favored race, the exaltation of the mortification of the flesh, or the perpetuation of some religious, economic, or political dogma."

Of utmost importance, therefore to a Reconstructed education was the establishment of these guiding principles. Democracy alone, could not represent the guiding principle because as mentioned above, the Reconstructionists saw that this was regarded with some confusion. It therefore required definition. Bode provided an articulate definition.

Responding to the changing nature of American society, including increased population, industrialization and urbanization, Bode believed that democracy had to include an acceptance of and accommodation to change and represent common interests not as static
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but in the context of dynamic and expanding social relationships. This meant that there could be no absolute reference. His definition follows:

"...if there is no absolute standard of judgment, then our judgments must be made in terms of participation in common interests, regardless of other consideration. Conduct on the part of communities or of individuals must be evaluated with reference to its effect on promoting common interests among men. Liberty grows as the area of common interests is widened. Democracy then becomes identified with this principle of relativity as contrasted with the absolutism of dictatorships. There is no middle ground. From the standpoint of democracy the fact that a community is a community of interests and purposes is the most important thing about it."\(^5\)

Bode's view of democracy attempts to avoid the use of universal and essential categories, and is thus similar to Torfing's definition presented in chapter two where democracy was defined as the project to "...extend egalitarian participation and emancipatory struggle to all social spheres in such a way as to recognize plurality of identity, not as essential or transcendent, but as socially constructed." Promoting 'common interests among men' is similar in intent to the 'extension of egalitarian participation and emancipatory struggle to all social spheres' if common interests is understood as egalitarian participation and emancipatory struggle. Bode's consideration that it must accommodate change in terms of expanding social relations keeps the idea of democracy from attaching itself to a fixed category.

In this definition the Reconstructionists seem aware of the danger of fixing democracy to a category that may, in fact, prove to be exclusive or exploitative of certain groups in society. However, there is a contradiction within their thinking that they seemed not aware. This lies in the American nationalism as represented in their faith in the American people.

Addressing the possibility for democratic reconstruction, Rugg stated that the American people "are governed by peaceable intentions, by a spirit of live and let live—even, live and help live."\(^5\) Bode claimed that, "As our national faith gains a clearer understanding of itself, we will be deepened and strengthened and the genius of the American people will be
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set free to make its distinctive contribution to the welfare and happiness of mankind."\(^{54}\) Did these peaceable intentions or this genius apply only to the American people or to all people? How were the American people defined? Did they, for example, include first nations people? Were the American people somehow different than the rest of mankind to which Americans were to make a contribution? Although defining it to the contrary, it seems as if they did fix democracy to American nationalism.

But perhaps this faith in the American people does not represent democracy as fixed to the American nation, but rather to a belief in the transcendent nature of the human spirit. Given the right circumstances, including a Reconstructed education, the ‘peaceable intentions’ would shine through, suggesting that The Reconstructionists viewed that the values of a democratic society were indistinct from their own primary values, perhaps that of personal freedom and self-fulfillment for all.

There are other inferences to be made from Reconstructionist writings, that suggest a form of exclusion. The Reconstructionists imply an understanding of culture as homogeneous. An ideal democracy has one culture, based upon values determined by that culture. This is evident in Counts’ description of educational goals in which there is an assumption of a unified group with a single spiritual cohesiveness.

"The end of education is to be found...in the growth of the power of the learner to cope with his environment... to give him master over his world and to make him a guardian of the spiritual possessions of the group."\(^{55}\)

Perhaps this idea of a single culture is most revealed in their understanding of identity. As described above, the educator should have an awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity so that they can manipulate student experience to shape identities consistent with democratic participation. Identities not consistent with this are considered wrong, and need to be changed. There is no understanding that a plurality of identities is formed within the particularistic groups in American society or that some of these may include values that are
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conflicting with democracy but still provide meaning and significance to people’s lives. Without an appreciation of the plural and conflicting nature of identity formation, this form of citizenship education may in fact be hostile to pluralistic communities. How can a democratic citizenship education then proceed? This points to a rationale for developing an awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity, not so the educator may manipulate identities but for individuals, including educators, to attempt to seek an identity beyond the framework of their already formed self-perception.

Before moving on to see how other curriculum theory has dealt with this issue, it will be useful to briefly summarize the Reconstructionist approach so that it can be easily compared and contrasted to other approaches. It may be that only in comparison to other approaches that their contribution will be fully understood. The Reconstructionists possessed a strong belief that the schools could play a role in social change, in rebuilding democracy. Education though, would have to undergo some significant changes if it were to meet this challenge. These changes would include: a curriculum designed with an understanding of the role of experience in education; a relationship to the community and environment outside of the schools whereby they are used as educational resources and locations where community action can be practiced; an understanding that experiences must be had within the context of democratic participation; an interdisciplinary approach avoiding compartmentalization; structuring of life within the school to be reflective of democratic principles and ethical and moral relationships; and a curriculum designed within a well articulated moral and ethical vision of democracy that does not claim universality.

Despite their view of culture as homogeneous and their lack of recognition of the conflicting and pluralistic nature of identity formation, the Social Reconstructionists were aware of the role that schooling played in identity formation. This aspect of schooling has come under examination in studies of the hidden curriculum. These studies thoroughly
analyzed this concept of identity formation within schooling and demand that more attention be given to it. These theories will be examined in the next chapter.
Chapter Four

The Hidden Curriculum

The previous chapter introduced the Social Reconstructionists whose approach to curriculum was rooted in an understanding of education as a powerful tool in the development of a democratic society. Their approach was analyzed in terms of its implications for citizenship education. It was noted that their assumption of a homogeneous society and their lack of recognition of plural and conflicting identities undermine the inclusivity of their approach and question its ability to truly achieve a democratic citizenship.

The idea that education can act as a powerful tool in the development of a democratic society has since been challenged. This chapter will examine the work of some theories of the hidden curriculum, including social and cultural reproduction theories that began to emerge in the education literature in the 1970s, specifically the work of Bowles and Gintis and Paul Willis. These theories have had considerable impact on curriculum development and have indeed altered our understanding of the nature of curriculum. They have demanded a recognition that curriculum is not only formal content and teaching methods but a complex nexus of social, economic and cultural influences that more often than not reproduce economic inequality and maintain the hegemony of the dominant culture and modes of capitalist production.

These theories developed in part as a response to the continued efforts at education reform that have continued since the 1930s. This chapter will therefore also introduce the reform movement of the 1960s to establish the context into which social and cultural reproduction theories emerged.

Social and school criticism that lead to the reform movement of the 1960s and 1970s was already finding a voice in the 1950s. Paul Goodman, a forerunner of the free school movement, wrote Growing Up Absurd in 1956 as an inquiry into the problem of
disaffected youth. He criticized organized government and policy making for structuring society in such a way as to create alienation and increase social problems. For example, he discussed the issue of social housing, primarily for Blacks and Hispanics, and found that the policies related to this were such that they exacerbated the problem; for example, the whole sale destruction of slums destroyed communities, the construction of one room flats excluded or made it difficult for families, the relation of subsidy to income punished those who earned above a certain (already low) limit. He wondered how we could blame youth for staying out late when their only alternative was to return home to an overcrowded apartment where they probably shared a bed with their siblings. He also looked at the media, pointing to its monopoly like control, that silenced dissent and made quality programming impossible. The education system did not escape his criticism. Of the previous progressive education movement, he commented that "This radical proposal, aimed at solving the dilemmas of education in the modern circumstances of industrialism and democracy, was never given a chance," and of compulsory education, he claimed,

"This gave to all children a certain equality of opportunity in an open expanding industrial society. Formal elementary discipline was sufficient when the environment was educative and provided opportunities for advancement. In our circumstances, official interference make individual attention and real teaching impossible; so that it could be said that the schools are as stupefying as they are educative, and compulsory education is often like jail."

The problems of youth, he concluded, are the problems of an alienating social life which do render growing up absurd.

The reform movement of the 1960s sought to address this problem as well as to respond to other criticisms of schooling that had emerged at this time. For example, illiteracy was identified as a growing problem as well as the lack of good work habits; schools were experiencing low attendance and test scores were falling. Lack of access to social mobility continued especially among Blacks and Hispanics. It was thought that public education could and should equalize this access and overcome the constraints to it.
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Parents, particularly those from minority communities, were demanding changes in education.\(^{58}\)

Thus a reform movement emerged similar to the Progressive Education Movement of the 1920s and 1930s. Practical innovations began to appear including Montessori programs and free schools. By the 1970s, even within mainstream education, “alternative programs” were offered where students supposedly had more control over their learning. The ideas of Neil Postman, George Dennison, Jonathan Kozol, and John Holt, although radical, were considered in an attempt to change schools.\(^{59}\)

The general concept behind the free school movement was that alienation within the educational system was the major cause behind students not doing well in school. This alienation was caused by the “straight” curriculum, authoritarian leadership, and uninspired teachers. The free school, therefore, attempted to design curriculum and school organization that was relevant to students’ lives, that was more flexible and included a range of learning options and that included parents and students in this process. Educator, Stanley Aronowitz participated in the development of a free school in New York in the 1970s and states that, there was an awareness that a high school degree might not really improve the opportunities of Black, Hispanic or working class white students, “Yet, we were believers in the power of schools to provide these communities with a fair chance in the scramble for mobility for those historically excluded from the ball park, much less allowed to play the game.”\(^{60}\)

But as the 1970s wore on a rise in conservative educational policy brought retreat to the movement. Illiteracy was still an issue and despite the increase in general education, economic inequality remained. The reform movement was attacked, and several reports on education were published declaring the inefficiency of the school system. “By the early
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1970s, a broad spectrum of social science opinion was ready to accept the view...that a more egalitarian school system would do little to create a more equal distribution of income or opportunity. Conservative educational policy, emphasizing standards, was re-introduced. The conservative counter attack included the revival of the hereditary intelligence debate. For example, in 1975, Arthur Jenson published an article on IQ, basically claiming that poverty was a result of low IQ.

Thus the reform movement was declared a failure; it did not equalize mobility and address the social and economic problems it sought to alleviate. Partly in response to the failure of this movement, a number of analyses on the nature of schooling developed that looked into not what the schools should do, but what in fact the schools do do.

In 1976, Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis published Schooling in Capitalist America where they argue that in fact, schools were established from the very beginning to reproduce labour power and a hierarchical industrial order, not to equalize opportunity. They claim that since World War One, dramatic increases in the general level of education and its distribution among people has been observed. Yet economic mobility, or the degree to which economic success is independent of family background has not changed. The effect of family background has remained constant. Schools foster, nurture and reproduce attitudes and behaviours that are constant with participation in the labour force.

Bowles and Gintis provide a thorough analysis of the capitalist economy in the United States examining how profits are made, how surplus value is generated and how these practices relate to education. They conclude that education not only teaches technical skills but it contributes to the ‘diffusion and depoliticization’ of the class relations of the production process. This helps maintain the social, political and economic conditions that allow for a portion of the produce of labour to be turned into profit. Bowles and Gintis describe this process:
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"the educational system does not add or subtract from the overall degree of inequality and repressive personal development. Rather it is best understood as an institution which serves to perpetuate the social relationships of economic life through which these patterns are set, by facilitating a smooth integration of youth into the labor force...schools legitimate inequality through the ostensibly meritocratic manner by which they reward and promote students, and allocate them to distinct positions in the occupational hierarchy. They create and reinforce patterns of social class, social and sexual identification among students which allow them to relate "properly" to their eventual standing in the hierarchy of authority and status in the production process. Schools foster types of personal development compatibly with the relationships of dominance and subordinancy in the economic sphere, and finally, schools create surpluses of skilled labor sufficiently extensive to render effective the prime weapon of the employer in disciplinary labor- the power to hire and fire." 63

The system of education, they argue, does not achieve this through conscious intention but rather through a close correspondence between the social relationships which govern personal interaction in the workplace and the social relationships found in schools. The relationships of authority and control at place in the school system replicate the hierarchical divisions of the workplace. For example, a rule oriented high school reflects the close supervision of low level workers whereas the freedoms and responsibilities that students have at elite colleges reflect the social relationship of upper level white collar workers and state universities and colleges conform to the behavioral requisites of low level technical, service and supervisor personnel.

Bowles and Gintis point out that this correspondence between the school and the workplace that serves the interests of profits, is not comparable to a tool that can be easily manipulated by socially dominant groups because schools have also been the "arena in which a highly politicized egalitarian consciousness has developed among some parents, teachers and students... Schools produce not only workers but misfits and rebels as well."64 They claim that this contradictory nature of the American educational system is in part caused by the imperatives of capital pulling in opposing directions. They postulate that changes in schooling will occur, but that these changes are dependent on the nature of the
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As far as free schools are concerned, they will only become integral to the system of education when the work processes themselves are self-initiated and controlled by workers. "Educational policy in the United States is severely limited by the role of schooling in the production of an adequate labor force in a hierarchically controlled and class-stratified production system. Capitalism, not technology or human nature, is the limiting factor."\textsuperscript{65}

Theories of social reproduction undermined the mainstream assumption that school curriculum was socially and politically neutral. They allowed for schools to be seen as "...agencies of socialization and political institutions, inextricably linked to issues of power and control in the dominant society"\textsuperscript{66}

Bowles and Gintis, though providing a detailed economic analysis, do not offer an account of the cultural aspects of the education system, nor how culture is implicated in the process of the reproduction. Although noting the contradictory nature of education, their work shows the schools reflecting the economic order in a rather oversimplified fashion that portrays students and teachers as passive. Marxist theories, like those of Bowles and Gintis, lack an analysis of concrete social relations in the classroom because they assume that the classroom is a dependent variable in the structure of social reproduction and that whatever happens in the classroom is subordinate to the reproductive functions of the school. "Consequently Marxists had almost no critique of the tradition of scholarship that focused on teacher-student relations and the students own group organizations"\textsuperscript{67}

Cultural reproduction theory, on the other hand, sees schools not just as a mirror of society, but argues that they are relatively autonomous institutions only indirectly influenced by more powerful economic and political institutions. Schools are part of a larger universe of symbolic institutions that, rather than impose docility and oppression,
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reproduce existing power relations subtly via the production and distribution of a dominant culture that tacitly confirms what it means to be educated. In this theory culture is the mediating link between ruling class interests and everyday life. Schools are important sites because they are seen as neutral, working towards the best interests of all its students, and can therefore promote inequality in the name of fairness and objectivity.

Bourdieu has put forth a theory of cultural reproduction that introduces the concept of cultural capital. Cultural capital is that which students acquire through their family and class upbringing. It includes sets of meaning, styles, ways of thinking, types of dispositions and linguistic and cultural competencies. Schools legitimate cultural capital that is consistent with the dominant classes.

"Schools offer information and training which can be received and acquired only by subjects endowed with the system of predispositions that is the condition for the success of the transmission and of the inculcation of the culture. By doing away with giving explicitly to everyone what it implicitly demands of everyone, the educational system, demands of everyone alike that they have what they do not give."

Students who possess alternative forms of cultural capital find it harder to succeed and are therefore made to feel inferior. This sense of inferiority thus encourages them to actively participate in their subjugation.

But do students passively participate in their subjugation? Do teachers stand by and let this happen? School culture is characterized by those who resist, student groups who rebel and teachers who seek to modify their practices. This theory does not adequately address forms of resistance that are found in schools. Paul Willis, in Learning to Labor (1977), provides an analysis that reveals that, in fact, it is within these forms of resistance that students are participating in their subjugation, but ironically not with a sense of inferiority, but with a sense of pride.

Learning to Labor attempts to show how the reproduction of the hierarchical work force is reproduced culturally through the schools. Paul Willis conducted an ethnographic
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study into an English comprehensive school to question how it is that working class kids get working class jobs, or more to the point, how it is that working class kids choose working class jobs. He studied a group of boys in this school, referred to as ‘the lads’, who came from working class backgrounds and went on to work in working class, low wage jobs. He analyzed the boys “counter culture” or forms of protest against the school or “official culture”. His analysis is extensive and discusses the lads’ relationship to formal culture, popular culture, the work place, women, law etc. in an attempt to understand how it is that they choose with a sense of pride to enter exploitative working conditions.

“The astonishing thing which this book attempts to present is that there is a moment- and it only needs to be this for the gates to shut on the future- in working class culture when the manual giving of labor power represents both a freedom, election and transcendence, and a precise insertion into a system of exploitation and oppression for working class people. The former promises the future, the latter shows the present. It is the future in the present which hammers freedom to inequality of contemporary capitalism.”

It is within the lad’s forms of resistance, or counter culture where this occurs. The lads rebel against school culture and develop a counter culture with its own system of rewards, and sense of community. These forms of protest generally take on the forms of working class culture. Actions that are usually associated with working class adults, like smoking and drinking are “valorized as an act of insurrection before the school. The adult world, specifically the adult male working class world, is turned to as a source of material for resistance and exclusion.”

In Willis’s description of the lads counter culture he notes that,

“ There is also a sense in which...manual work stands for something and is a way of contributing to and substantiating of a certain view of life which criticizes, scorns and devalues others as well as putting the self, as they feel it, in some elusive way ahead of the game. These feelings arise precisely from a sense of their own labor power which has been learnt and truly appropriated as insight and self-advance within the depths of the counter-school culture as it develops specific class forms in the institutional context. It is difficult to think how attitudes of such strength and informal and personal validity could have been formed in any other way. It is they, not
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formal schooling, which carry ‘the lads’ over into a certain application to the productive process. In a sense, therefore, there is an element of self-domination in the acceptance of subordinate roles in western capitalism. However the damnation is experienced, paradoxically, as a form of true learning, appropriation and as a kind of resistance.”

Willis makes an important contribution to curriculum for he explains that it is within the complex network of relationships and experiences that comprise the cultural landscape of the school where the reproduction of the economic landscape occurs. Culture, including forms of resistance and what we call counter culture, are a part of the system of reproduction. This phenomenon of self-subordination as resistance must be analyzed if the schooling process is to be understood.

Jean Anyon in her 1980 article, “Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work” describes her study of five schools and comes to a similar conclusion. She demonstrated that it is through the students’ relationships to the system of ownership, to authority and control and to their productive activity that culture is reproduced. Schools promote class interests and, therefore, only if a student attends a school belonging to the social economic class to which self growth, for example, is an appropriate tool, will this process be valued, otherwise self growth will not be on the school’s agenda.

She illustrates, similar to Willis, how working class children are developing a potential conflict relationship to capital. The methods of resistance that they develop in school (towards their teachers, towards rote learning and the emphasis on fragmented procedures) are highly similar to the modes of resistance carried out by adult workers in the lower working class places of employment. Anyon describes them as highly constrained and limited in their ultimate effectiveness. This type of resistance in industry does not produce, nor is it meant to produce substantial changes in the relationship of exploitation and control. Thus, students replicating this behaviour are subordinated by their own acts of defiance.

Research was also conducted during the 1970s and 1980s that provided not only class analysis but gender analysis as well. It looked at the ways in which schools reproduced gender attitudes and behaviours that worked against the success of woman in certain academic fields or limited their opportunities in the larger society. Extensive research revealed how girls were presented as inferior to boys in the presentation of tasks and activities, in text-book biases, and in the differing curriculum and tracking procedures.

---
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These theories of the hidden curriculum point to the unconscious level at which domination occurs. The maintaining of the economic and political interests of the dominant class become natural elements of the social order. It is unconscious because it is the very nature of our identities which are at stake here - Who we think we are, what we think we can do and what we think we should do with our lives.

This idea of unconscious domination was first introduced by Antonio Gramsci. He called it hegemony, and it refers not only to the unconscious domination occurring in schooling, but in the larger society as well and within all social institutions. Hegemony was introduced as an attempt to understand how the ruling class, without the use of physical force, is able to maintain its dominance. It is not a form of manipulation by the ruling class for they themselves are unconsciously dominated by hegemonic forces. Educator, Michael Apple, has attempted to understand the nature of hegemony. He quotes from Raymond Williams:

"Hegemony supposes the existence of something which is truly total, which is not merely secondary of superstructural, like the weak sense of ideology, but which is lived at such a depth, which saturates the society to such an extent, and which, as Gramsci put it, even constitutes the limit of common sense for most people under its sway, that it corresponds to the reality of social experience much more clearly than any notion derived from the formal of base and superstructure."

Schools are but one institution implicated in the process of hegemony and if their value in changing society is to be understood then hegemony must be analyzed. Michael Apple has taken seriously the role of hegemony and argues that the educator must seek to illuminate it. Questions must be asked in terms of knowledge- who selected it and why and in terms of the relationships within the school- who is supported by what sorts of relationships? These questions must be asked within a context that seeks to understand the role of education in the development of consciousness in an unequal society.

"Let me just state now that one of our basic problems as educators and as political beings, then, is to begin to grapple with ways of understanding how the kinds of cultural resources and symbols schools select and organize are dialectically related to the kinds of normative and conceptual consciousness required by a stratified society."

---
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Apple points to the need for educators to understand themselves within this process. Educators cannot separate their practice from the institutional arrangements in which they work, nor from the forms of consciousness that dominate society. Curriculum work, he claims, is deeply seated in the political and economic views and practices of those involved. Educators cannot help but have their work informed and influenced by their views and practices. "A politically neutral position is impossible." Given their implication in this process Apple feels that educators must explore and state their own political views and answer the question - where do I stand?. He acknowledges that this is a hard question because it may challenge so many of our taken for granted assumptions.

"To hold our day to day activities as educators up to political and economic scrutiny, to see the school as part of a system of mechanisms for cultural and economic reproduction is not merely to challenge the prevailing practices of education. ...The kinds of critical scrutiny I have argued for challenge a whole assemblage of values and actions "outside" of the institution of schooling. And this is exactly the point, for if taken seriously, it must lead to a set of commitments that may be wholly different than those many of us commonsensically accept. It requires the progressive articulation of and commitment to a social order that has at its very foundation not the accumulation of goods, profits, and credentials but the maximization of economic, social, and educational equality." But given the disheartening view that theories of the hidden curriculum offer to educators, Apple does not take a pessimistic outlook. Their are places, he suggests, where successful resistance has and will continue to occur. In his 1980 article, “The Other Side Of The Hidden Curriculum: Correspondence Theories And the Labor Process”, Apple describes his study of both men and women in their working class jobs, including retail and manufacturing. He found both formal and informal resistance - formal being that of strikes and informal being subtle ways of resisting authority like workers helping each other to avoid confrontations with authority. He saw that there were times when these forms of resistance were in fact successful. He believes that if successful resistance can occur in the work place, then it can occur in schooling as well and that analyses needs to be done to locate these forms and learn if they can be used towards social transformation.

78Ibid., 109
The theories of the hidden curriculum make it impossible to view schooling as a neutral activity with the best interests of the students as their mandate. This chapter revealed the apparatus which establishes the conditions under which people subconsciously reproduce existing social and economic inequality. It points to the need to examine the socially constructed nature of identity because much of the subconscious internalization of inequality has to do with the formation of identity. For democratic citizenship education then, it points to the need for the socially constructed nature of one’s identity to be studied. It is not only outward structures that needs to change in order for democracy to be reconstructed, but internal forms of identity need to be questioned and challenged where they represent a reproduction of inequitable conditions. As Chapter Two and Three suggested, it is also important to understand the socially constructed nature of identity in order to recognize a plurality of identities, and hopefully achieve an identity that exists both within and independent of the interpretive framework by which the individual has been conditioned. The next chapter will look at curriculum theory that seeks social change, as did the Reconstructionists, but unlike the Reconstructionists, this theory proposes an examination of the nature of identity.
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Chapter Five
The Reconceptualists

The previous chapter described the nature of hegemony. It was articulated as an overwhelming cultural vehicle in which economic, social and cultural inequalities are reproduced and the dominance of the ruling class is maintained. It is within this process of hegemony that the subconscious allows individuals to participate in their own oppression. Identities are formed within this subconscious regime where individuals find their place in society. It points to the need for an analysis of identity formation if social and economic inequity are to be challenged and social change made possible. Citizenship education would thus have to take identity formation seriously. This chapter offers an examination of a group of curriculum theorists who may have some insight to offer on this issue.

In 1971, James B. Macdonald prepared a report on curriculum where he identified the work of three groups of curriculum theorists. The first and largest group he said understood theory as, “prescribing and guiding practical activity in relation to curriculum,” whereas the second group uses a scientific approach where “research would be utilized for empirical validation of curriculum variables and relationships.” The third group was described as a “group of individuals who look upon the task of theorizing as a creative intellectual task which they maintain should be neither used as a basis for prescription or an empirically testable set of principles and relationships.”

In 1975, William Pinar, who classified himself as being in the third group, labeled this group the “Reconceptualists” and included within it the work of several curriculum theorists such as Michael W. Apple, Maxine Green, Herbert Kliebard, James B. Macdonald, John Steven Mann, Ross L. Mooney, and Philip Phenix. As a group, the
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Reconceptualists have contributed significantly to the field of curriculum introducing new approaches and broadening the field to include other disciplines. The work of Apple, as discussed in the previous chapter, placed emphasis on uncovering the process of hegemony in schooling. The work of Mooney questioned the nature of curriculum research and its role in reflecting capitalist modes of production and consumption and it validated other forms of research and inquiry such as poetry. This group, however, is quite diverse and the individuals within it often share no more with each other than the fact that they do not fit into the first two categories that Macdonald identified. None the less, Pinar edited them together in book titled, *Curriculum Theorizing. The Reconceptualists*. He further classified them into two subgroups, the “Critical”, under which Apple and Mooney were categorized, and the “Post Critical.” The “Post Critical” group, diverging from the “Critical”, has argued for a curriculum approach based on an inquiry into the nature of self. It is to these theorists that this chapter turns in an attempt to articulate a citizenship education that includes an analysis of identity formation. This smaller group of Reconceptualists includes some of the work of Maxine Greene, Madeleine Grumet, James B. Macdonald and William F. Pinar.

The Reconceptualists were responding both to the backlash of the reform movement and to the social problems they saw in their time. The primary problem that they recognized in their society was alienation. William Pinar, drawing primarily from Heidegger, equates existentialism with alienation and says that “modern man is estranged and severed from self.” He defines the self as ‘essence or unconscious’ and contends that man is not aware of himself, he is ‘dehumanized.’ He views himself as a character in a novel (that he did not write) — “a series of episodes or adventures with boring, meaningless stuff in between.” Maxine Greene saw the young people of her day as

---
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oppressed, as feeling a sense of “powerlessness, expressed in cynicism and privatism, a loss of trust tinged with despair.”

They, like the Social Reconstructionists, viewed traditional education as a significant part of the problem. The backlash of the reform movement de-emphasized the student in the learning process. Objectives were established according to behavioural results, test scores, and the abilities of management. They argued that the schooling process, by and large, was an alienating experience. Greene observed that:

“Curriculum, from the learner’s standpoint, ordinarily represents little more than an arrangement of subjects, a structure of socially prescribed knowledge, or a complex system of meanings which may or may not fall within his grasp. Rarely does it signify possibility for him as an existing person, mainly concerned with making sense of his own life world”

Pinar declared that “the cumulative effect of the schooling experience is devastating. We graduate, credentialed but crazed, erudite but fragmented shells of the human possibility.”

They were sensitive to the issues surrounding the nature of identity formation and how one’s perceptions were shaped within the process of cultural and social production as described in the previous chapter. Curriculum in their view should seek ways for individuals to become emancipated from this conditioning; and in so doing create a more just world. Greene believed that,

“The one who can look from diverse vantage points, who knows that he must constitute his world, is the one who is free to think about producing a new reality in association with others. In the name of that new reality, he is likely to seek higher knowledge in the effort to organize his thinking and

constitute with his brothers and sisters a richer, more unified, less unjust world."  

Pinar stated, in a refreshingly blunt manner that “the way to improve the public world, in short, is to improve oneself.”  

They attempted to articulate curriculum approaches that would lead individuals to an increased awareness of the themselves. This, it was assumed would allow individuals to feel a sense of control over their lives, to overcome their feelings of alienation, to overcome the restrictive forces of social conditioning that have brought about their dehumanization. Pinar elaborates on this idea:

“(With the knowledge of self,) one develops this transcendent perspective, this 'heightened consciousness,' and one is able, in some instances, to choose or write one's own script, or come to understand how the complex interplay of forces -- psychological, sociological, and historical -- in nature converge to write the script you act out, to form the particular personality you have, with the particular work you are to perform in the world. Without the anchoring of being in and from oneself, one is indeed...a character of the stage.”

This sounds similar to Bridges when he describes the individual, having developed an awareness of the socially constructed nature of his/her identity, is thus able to become the narrator of his/her own story.

The Reconceptualists considered that to develop this kind of awareness, it was necessary for the individual to perceive reality through different perspectives. Greene called the development of this awareness ‘awakening’ and suggested the use of autobiography or as she puts it “the recovery of one’s own biography” to bring this about. In the practice of articulating and examining one’s own history, one may discover where one has been shaped by external forces. “The self-conscious deriving from self-recovery may at least enable him to feel himself to be subject and thereby to escape, on his own
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activities that encouraged autobiography such as journal writing were thus encouraged. the reconceptualists believed that the involvement in the various arts would provide students with opportunities for autobiographical exploration.

madeleine grumet and pinar suggested the use of theatre in curriculum as a way to develop ‘awakening.’ grumet argued that theatre was a form of inquiry. as a conscious re-enactment of reality where every action performed is previously meditated, a questioning into the nature of reality is initiated. she observed that “what makes the play different from life...is that the play takes none of it for granted, and someone must give his name to every gesture, every prop, every sound, every step.”

borrowing from the thought of antonin artaud she suggested that theatre was a way of understanding “attitudes in the realm of thought and intelligence that words are incapable of grasping and that gestures and everything partaking of a spatial language (referring to theatre) attain with more precision.”

they did not, however, believe that any kind of theatre was appropriate to this form of analysis and they were critical of the kind of theatre practices they saw in schools. “the class plays and creative dramatics offer us opposing options: form and formlessness, which despite their apparent polarity conspire to legitimize the forms which currently dominate our expression, our movement, our space, manners and stories.”

what they suggested was a kind of theatre based on the writing of gerzy grotowski, a polish theatre artist and author of towards a poor theatre. grotowski’s idea was to strip the theatre of its trappings (sets, lights, costumes, etc.) to arrive at “what is essential, the actors’ response to situation and subsequent action...grotowski...demanded that his actors turn back on themselves to work through
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the habits of movement, breathing, interaction and thought to find and test the limits of their freedom. Rehearsals in this context were considered investigations where "individual actors, and the players as a group, experiment with the elements and conditions of action." The idea was that students, participating in these activities where it is their own actions and re-actions that are under examination, would begin to question the nature of their responses and therefore gain an insight into the nature of their being.

James B. Macdonald, also sought to discover the nature of being. He took a slightly different angle when looking at the existential nature of contemporary society. He suggests that even in this alienation and despair there are signals of transcendence. He describes these signals as "the propensity for order and the automatic assurance of the adult to the child that everything is all right (that is, you can trust the world); the existence of play; the existence of hope; and the existence of damnation." Macdonald explains that these signals of transcendence point to the wealth of human potential that curriculum needs to help bring forth. He supported the self-exploration approach and saw it as a means by which to unleash the transcendent nature of man.

"Think for a moment about the mysteries of human experiences rather than our achievements. How can people walk on coals as hot as 250 degrees without visible signs of burning either on their feet or clothing? What explains the various forms of extrasensory perception?...There is no reason to suspect that we have realized our human potential, and their is reasonable evidence that we may be readily approaching a new level of psychological and cultural growth from which dramatically new understanding of human potential will emerge."

Macdonald called for an inward journey, which he called 'centering', where this potential would be realized and argued that "Centering does not mean self-actualization ... it is essentially a religious experience."

95 Madeleine Grumet, "Curriculum as Theatre: Merely Players," Curriculum Inquiry, v8 n1 1978, pg. 49
96 Grumet, "In search of Theatre," 108
98 Ibid., 93
99 Ibid., 104
What the Reconceptualists seem to be suggesting then, is something beyond self-awareness. There is an assumption of an essential, transcendent self or being that exists beneath the layers of social conditioning. Self-awareness is a vehicle for a more transcendent experience. Pinar writes:

"There is the possibility of another, if you will, level of being, a possibility of freedom and volition, that might transcend, in some fashion I dimly understand, the bondage of the public world we know....the route is understood to lie within; in part, in making contact with oneself...It is an attempt to fill, if you will, a metaphysical vacuum that has persisted since the death of God in the nineteenth century."100

The assumption here is that the transcendent self is the harbinger of social change. Social transformation only occurs when ‘awakening’ occurs. And, as it was thought that social transformation would be positive, creating a more just world, the transcendent self is somehow equated to social and economic justice.

It is perhaps worth considering whether this faith in transcendence plays the same role for the Reconceptualists as faith in American nationalism played for the Reconstructionists; an elaboration of primary values indistinct from personal freedom and self-fulfillment for all. Can one impose the ideas and values of this transcendence into a public education system and not rub against values in conflict with this? Is it safe to assume that all students will equally believe that they have an essential self beneath their conditioning? Or, if we are to assume that the self has no values, and if it were possible to strip one of one’s values to reach that self, is that valueless self really in a position to evaluate social justice and what criteria would be used?

The methods articulated here for self-discovery do not provide opportunities to engage in issues of social organization. The awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity is not understood here as a requirement of a civic culture, a means by which plural identities can co-exist within a democracy. It is understood here as a means to
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uncover the essential being, and it is questionable as to whether or not this can lead to positive social change.

With this essential self as the principle by which to guide curriculum, it is unlikely that issues of social organization and social inequality will be addressed in such a way as to empower students to participate in social change. Although the self is analyzed in terms of its’ social construction, it does not go far enough in addressing questions of hegemony and the problems raised by theories of the hidden curriculum. Michael Apple, criticizing this form of curriculum observes that,

“it is not enough just to see the constructed nature of knowledge. We must ask why a particular form exists and why and who benefits from it. The overemphasis on the notion that reality is socially constructed seems to have led to the neglect of the consideration of how and why reality comes to be constructed in particular ways and how and why particular constructions of reality seem to have the power to resist subversion.”

Chapter three concluded that without an analysis of the nature of identity by the students themselves, a citizenship education would fall short of meeting its mandate. The Reconceptualists, although seeming to offer an alternative in examining the nature of identity, have failed to provide a successful approach that marries identity analysis with social reconstruction. For citizenship education then, it is clear that identity analysis alone will not suffice to create a democratic citizenship education. The next chapter will examine “Critical Pedagogy” in an attempt to see if it offers an approach that might support a democratic citizenship education.

Chapter Six

Critical Pedagogy

The importance of understanding the socially constructed nature of identity to a citizenship education has been demonstrated in the previous chapters in an examination of the Social Reconstructionists and theories of the hidden curriculum. The previous chapter analyzed the Reconceptualists, who attempted to articulate an approach to curriculum that focuses on the nature of identity as a means for social transformation. It was revealed, however, that this focus was not sufficient to allow for transformative practices to develop. This chapter will look at critical pedagogy, another approach to curriculum that seeks social change and takes seriously the implications of the theories of the hidden curriculum.

Critical pedagogy has been used to categorize several theorists. It is not the intention of this chapter to examine them in their entirety, nor analyze their overall contributions, but to focus on a few who contribute to a discussion of identity and citizenship education. To this end, this chapter will attempt a synthesis of some of the work of Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren, and Roger Simon.

Critical pedagogy offers an approach to curriculum that attempts to forge a democratic citizenship while acknowledging the role that schooling plays in hegemony. It arose in response to various aspects of contemporary social life. One is the nature of the current political climate which is characterized by increasing capitalist corporate control and decreasing participation among citizens. Society at large (health care, education, social programs, housing) is feeling the effects of capitalist globalization including the education system where the rhetoric of cost efficiency, restructuring and down sizing tie education closely to the economic imperatives of the market. At the level of “higher education,” liberal arts programs have become expendable while programs that prepare students for
work in technical and managerial fields, such as the MBA program have been on the rise.  

Traditional educational practices are viewed as supportive of these trends and contrary to the development of democratic citizenship. In traditional education, 

"...management issues become more important than understanding and furthering schools as democratic public spheres. Hence, the regulations, certification, and standardization of teacher behavior is emphasized over creating conditions for teachers to undertake the sensitive political and ethical roles they might assume as public intellectuals educating students for responsible, critical citizenship."  

Critical pedagogy recognizes that schools are implicated in the formation of hegemony and is perceptive to the role schooling plays in shaping the consciousness of its students. It understands this as a complex operation, not without contradictions, where power, including the sanctioning process fabricate the scope of possibilities and regulate behaviour, including thought, speech, image, style and action. Identities, knowledge, and modes of expression are evaluated, privileging some while labeling others as inferior. This frequently is manifest as acts of racism, classism and sexism. Critical pedagogy is particularly sensitive to the effects this has upon minority students: 

"Embodying dominant forms of cultural capital, schooling often functions to affirm the Eurocentric, patriarchal histories, social identities, and cultural experiences of middle-class students while either marginalizing or erasing the voices, experiences and cultural memories of so-called "minority" students."  

Critical pedagogy assumes a responsibility to examine and challenge the relationship between power, culture and politics in such a way as to foster transformative social action. Educators, in this context, must construct educational practices that help
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students confront and assess existing modes of thought, social conventions, and relations of power, while simultaneously developing practices that effect positive social change. Students are thus encouraged to look at the formation of their own identities, and to realize both oppressive and positive constructs.

"The task of a critical educator is to provide the conditions for individuals to acquire a language that will enable them to reflect upon and shape their own experiences and in certain instances transform such experiences in the interest of a larger project of social responsibility."\(^1\)

Despite the limitations to the transformative possibilities of education that the theories of the hidden curriculum have suggested, critical pedagogy remains optimistic about its potential. They, like Apple, see schools also as places where social reproduction is being challenged. They contend that schools are not mere reflections of society, and argue that schools have historically been sites where various groups have attempted to reformulate their relationship to authority and culture, to re-evaluate their relationships to each other, and to share a renewed vision of their social and physical environments.\(^2\) In response to theories of the hidden curriculum Simon argues,

"While I do not wish to contest the outlines of this rather bleak picture nor diminish the need for structural change, this view of schools cedes too much. The current hegemony over how schooling is to be done remains a project, not an accomplishment. Within the spaces that do exist in certain schools, courses of study, and classrooms, this hegemony has been and is being contested by students, teachers, and parents who remain genuinely hopeful that pedagogies which support social transformation can be realized."\(^3\)

Within an understanding of the role that schooling plays in shaping and narrowing the scope of possibilities an individual perceives, critical pedagogy seeks to widen this scope. It sees itself as a pedagogy of possibility, an educational practice that contributes to the development of alternative and hopeful visions of the future. If hopeful visions never move beyond upward mobility in the given social and economic order, the goal of
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schooling can never move beyond reproducing the existing economic order. Increased consumption is inherent in upward mobility and this concept assumes an expanding economy. The limitation upon physical resources and the rapidity of current consumption puts the viability of this concept in question. What then does one hope for? How does one imagine a future? Critical pedagogy sees the role that schools play in, and understands the importance of, asking these questions and helping to answer them.

"At times we fail to remember that such ("better life") dreams do not simply appear, but rather are the representational effects of the lives of people situated in social relations that complexly structure both desires and ways of making sense...I see education implicated in the production of, 'that which is not yet'... For without a perspective on the future, conceivable as a desired and possible future, there can be neither human venture nor possibility."\(^{109}\)

It does not, however, forget that these practices, of both questioning and answering, dwell within an existing framework where different cultural forms, including schooling, mediate the production of meaning. Critical Pedagogy understands its own implications in the process of cultural and social reproduction and, therefore, demands that the moral and ethical principles which guide it are articulated. One must question for whom and by whom this vision is developed and how relations of power are structured within it. Teachers must answer these questions as they are caught up in practices that express and support specific world views, social relations and political positions. "As educators who act as agents in the production, circulation, and use of particular forms of cultural and symbolic capital, teachers occupy an inescapable political role."\(^{110}\)

Educators must state their position and define the sets of premises used in their practice. This is important if a pedagogy is to be supportive of the development of democratic citizenship. Critical Pedagogy is seen as a

"...cultural practice that must be accountable ethically and politically for the stories it produces, the claims it makes on social memories, and the images of the future it deems legitimate. As both an object of critique and a
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method of cultural production, pedagogy refuses to hide behind claims of objectivity and works vigilantly to link theory and practice in the service of expanding the possibilities for democratic life."

Unlike the Reconceptualists, those supportive of a critical pedagogy try not to become solely absorbed in the self, and lose sight of the importance of social organization and of its guiding principles. "Teachers must be accountable in their teaching to the ways in which they take up and respond to the problems of history, human agency and the renewal of democratic public life."[112]

In articulating guiding principles, does critical pedagogy refer to universal or essential categories and end up supporting a potentially exclusive or contradictory purpose as did the Reconstructionists and Reconceptualists? Democracy is not clearly defined in their arguments; instead, each individual must formulate their vision of social change and future possibilities. Simon argues that it is not possible to base teaching principles outside of human history and that the guiding principles function, not as universal abstractions but as a discursive practice. McLaren on the other hand suggests that critical pedagogy makes no claim to an absence of universality in its approach suggesting that some form of a shared vision is necessary to a democratic civic culture.

"Without a shared vision of democratic community we risk endorsing struggles in which the politics of difference collapses into new forms of separatism. As Steve Best (1989: 361) points out, poststructuralists rightly deconstruct essentialist and repressive wholes, yet in so doing they often fail to see how repressive and crippling the valorizing of difference, plurality, fragmentation, and antagonisms can be. He writes: The flip side of the tyranny of the whole is the dictatorship of the fragment ... (and) ... without some positive and normative concept of totality to counter-balance the poststructuralist/postmodern emphasis on difference and discontinuity, we are abandoned to the seriality of pluralist individualism and the supremacy of competitive values over communal life. Best is correct in suggesting that what needs to be abandoned are the reductive uses of totality, and not the concept of totality itself. Otherwise we risk undermining the very concept of the democratic public sphere."[114]
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Critical pedagogy thus offers two interpretations regarding the universality of guiding principles. One, that they are not universal in that they are defined by each educator and exist within the frame of a discursive practice, or two, democracy in and of itself is a universal abstraction and is necessary if a democratic civic culture is to be developed. In this sense, the contradiction must be addressed and it would be necessary to articulate a definition of democracy like Bode or Torfing that attempts not to tie itself to fixed categories.

Given its guiding principles and overall purpose, critical pedagogy attempts to develop practices consistent with these. It offers curricular approaches that attempt to develop ways for students to critically examine the nature of their identity, their society and to construct transformative practices. Giroux has put forth an approach that uses cultural studies as a base for pedagogy. He argues that cultural studies is a key analytical approach to the exploration of power relations and their reproduction in society and culture.

"Cultural studies has emerged as one of the few fields to have traveled across multiple borders and spaces loosely uniting diverse intellectuals who are challenging conventional understandings of the relationship between culture, power, and politics....(Cultural studies) is a field that holds enormous promise for progressives who are willing to address some of the fundamental dilemmas of our times.... (It) is increasingly interested in how and where "knowledge needs to surface and emerge in order to be consequential" with respect to expanding the possibilities of a radical democracy."  

Giroux suggests that pedagogy in this case can focus on cultural manifestations as a way to examine the power relationships among culture and politics. Students would engage, analyze and challenge different forms of media including forms that students experience daily, as well as other various cultural sites. Culture would provide the basis of study to which political critique and intervention would follow.  

Simon articulates that what is being called for is semiotic analysis in a curricular approach combining cultural studies and pedagogy. Meaning is created through semiotic production, and dominant forms of semiotic production are involved in the process of

---
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hegemony, in shaping identity and regulating world views. Semiotic analysis allows one to probe cultural materials in order to create openings of meaning, to explore one's response, to try and understand how and why certain meanings are created. It is "simultaneously educational and political in that it attempts to inform a sense of what is significant and true as well as what is desirable and possible....As educators our work is explicitly located within the realm of semiotic production."117

The mass media, in this context, is understood as an important enterprise upon which to base analysis because of the extensive influence it has upon society and therefore, its substantial role in hegemony. "The role of media culture, including the power of the mass media with its massive apparatuses of representation and its mediation of knowledge, is central to understanding how the dynamics of power, privilege, and social desire structure the daily life of a society."118 A pedagogy based upon cultural studies would then include an analysis of a full range of diverse and dense forms of culture including media, popular culture, film, advertising, mass communication, and religious organizations. Pedagogy thus acknowledges sources outside of the school as potential learning sites.119 Critical pedagogy thus encourages the forging of relationships between schools and other institutions and between teachers and other cultural workers (including artists, religious leaders, journalists, etceteras.)120 As in Reconstructionist thought, importance is placed upon moving beyond the school and into the community to find educational resources.

Another parallel between the Reconstructionists and Critical Pedagogy is their call for a curriculum that is cross disciplined. Critical Pedagogy argues that subjects should be taught, not as separate subjects, but as themes that both cross disciplines and deal with issues related to students' experiences. Themes could be studied that develop an
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awareness of social responsibility and moral accountability, themes related to their experiences yet touching upon larger social issues like gender, class, sexuality and race.\textsuperscript{121}

Critical Pedagogy also deems it important to move beyond theory and actively participate in public life—another principle which links them to the Reconstructionists.

"Equally important is the need to link the imperatives of cultural studies to pedagogical projects in which students traverse different public spaces in order to learn the dynamics of practical politics and active citizenship. Whether through historical inquiry, public service, or analysis of larger public events, educators can provide students with the opportunity both to engage problem solving projects that teach the lessons of civic education and provide students with opportunities to interact with diverse groups that engage social issues within specific public arenas."\textsuperscript{122}

Essential to a Critical pedagogy is an understanding of how language plays an elemental role in the social construction of reality including the production of meaning and the development of identity and visions of the future. Language is the vehicle through which experiences are interpreted and understood. Language is fundamentally interwoven with the shaping of consciousness. It exists within and across numerous areas of learning and actively "produces and mediates content and context."\textsuperscript{123} There is a fundamental dynamic between language and power, and Critical Pedagogy therefore emphasizes analysis that pertain to language. For example critical pedagogy would seek to analyze how language functions to include or exclude certain meanings, support or marginalize ways of behaving and produce or prevent certain desires.

"For educators, the study of language becomes essential for revealing how power functions as a condition for and a form of representation. Education policies and pedagogical practices are impossible to grasp critically without focusing on how language works in deploying the machinery of power, discipline, and regulation."\textsuperscript{124}

Critical Pedagogy also understands the importance of language in developing transformative practices. Language should also be considered as a way of initiating challenges to dominant power and changing social relationships.
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To achieve a level of analysis that is meaningful as a transformative practice, the educator must encourage the analysis of the self in relation to the production of meaning and within power relations. That the student develop an analysis that questions her or his interconnectedness to the hegemonic discourse is the essential concern. It is not enough to look at a cultural product, like a film for example, and examine it in terms of how it relates to the dominant ideology, one must also look at one's own responses to the film, and question how one's own thinking relates to the dominant ideology. In terms of language, one must understand how one's own use of language is representative of values and question what these values are. Do they hinder social transformation? It is essential to understand how individual experience is meditated within these discourses, and how identity is formed. For teachers to establish the context for this form of analysis, the questions must be rooted and understood in relation to the direct experience of the students.

But it is also thought that before one can begin to question the nature of one's identity, one's own experience must be validated. Critical pedagogy, therefore, roots its practice in the validation of individual voices. Students are thus encouraged to tell their own stories or narratives. Critical pedagogy grasps the role that narrative plays in the understanding of identity.

"Stories...help shape our social reality as much by what they exclude as what they include. In fact, making an experience into a story is perhaps the most fundamental act of human understanding. Terry Eagleton (1981: 72) notes that, 'We cannot think, act, or desire except in narratives...’ Our histories have referents but our access to them takes textualized forms, meaning, and feelings - all of which become narrativized."\(^{125}\)

Stories are understood as reflecting the consciousness of the community, both in terms of what is spoken and what remains silent. Stories need to be voiced, heard and affirmed. They also need to be criticized when they manifest, often unconsciously, racism, sexism or other forms of oppressive antagonisms.\(^{126}\)
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The reflection upon experience is crucial to a critical pedagogy. As important as it is for teachers to validate student voices, they must simultaneously encourage the interrogation of such voices. Experience is not equated with truth: truth is manufactured within a specific context.

"Experience does not speak for itself, but is a way in which individuals confront the contingency of the present and the politics of daily living. Though one should not deny the importance of non-discursive experience, experience is an understanding constructed largely linguistically as an interpretation over time of a specific concrete engagement with the world of symbols, social practices, and cultural forms... Experience is never transparent to itself and always occurs within particular social and cultural forms that have been produced within specific relations of power and regimes of discourse serving particular interests."127

For experience to be useful in the context of a critical pedagogy there needs to be a continued process of practice/ reflection and practice again. Students' stories must be told, their experiences validated and then critiqued. New experience is had, reflection occurs again. Necessary is an ongoing process of action, reflection and action again. Previous experience is held up to the light of interpretations of newer experience. There is the constant interpretation and re-interpretation of experience as new experiences are had and further reflections are formulated. Activities that encourage simultaneous action and reflection are called for in this context. In order to grasp the formation of their perceptions, students must feel the intensity of the lived experience while simultaneously being critical of it. When direct experiences can be under examination, this process is possible, as one is both engaged in the experience and critical of it. As students gain an understanding of the relations that shape their experiences and their interpretations, relations that are inextricably linked to cultural hegemony, they can take some control in directing their experience. This direction of one’s experience is referred to as historical agency, and critical pedagogy claims that,

"Within narrative identity, historical agency is understood as assuming authorship of one’s life, as a narrator who constantly revises and reinterprets one’s own story in relation to its historical and discursive connections to the cultural archives of the wider community such that
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personal identity is always located in the interests of the broader public. Personal history in this view is always the history of a collective past and future, the relation of self to other. \textsuperscript{128}

To be the narrator of your own story is to be conscious of the construction of your own values and of the constructed nature of identity in general, among other groups. It allows for the formation of values guided by democratic citizenship, the formation of a democratic civic culture. This is what Bridges refers to as narrative imagination. Critical pedagogy attempts to create the conditions for its students to understand the socially constructed nature of their own identity within the context of social transformation.

When students have been empowered to narrate their own stories and are able to interpret and reinterpret their stories in relation to and situated within the interests of the civic community then a democratic citizenship education has been successful. When people in general construct their identities in this way than democratic citizenship is possible. This is the goal of Critical Pedagogy.

Critical Pedagogy has put forth ideas towards a democratic citizenship education that seem consistent with Bridges ideas as described in chapter two. Some recommendations are made for curriculum design, largely congruent with those recommended by the Reconstructionists including a cross disciplined curriculum, links to the wider community, and practice in democratic social organization. The emphasis in Critical Pedagogy though, is not on the design of curriculum but on a pedagogical approach. It is as if the curriculum is secondary. What is important to critical pedagogy is the approach or the conceptual framework underlying any and all pedagogical work. Teachers then, in any school, regardless of the curriculum can try to use this conceptual framework to guide their own teaching. Critical Pedagogy emphasizes the conceptual framework over the design, suggesting that it is here, where the difference lies between a curriculum that leads to democratic citizenship and one that does not. The Reconstructionists and the Reconceptualists have demonstrated that curriculum design

\textsuperscript{128} Ibid. , 78
alone will not lead to democratic citizenship and that the conceptual framework is crucial to the outcomes of curriculum. The Reconstructionists, it was demonstrated, though articulating curriculum reform seemingly consistent with democratic citizenship, would not have achieved democratic citizenship because their conceptual framework was flawed in that they assumed a homogenous American culture. The Reconceptualists, it was shown, although offering practices that lead to an understanding of identity, fail to create the context where these practices can lead to democratic citizenship. Thus, Critical Pedagogy offers a conceptual framework and contends that it must be in place if democratic citizenship education is to be achieved.

The conceptual framework for a democratic citizenship education, put forth by Critical Pedagogy is summarized here. It is presented as an italicized list, with references to Reconstruction and Reconceptualization appearing as notes, not italicized, beside. After the conceptual framework, a list of recommendations for curriculum design has been synthesized from the three curriculum approaches.

Conceptual Framework for a Democratic Citizenship Education:

- Schools are implicated in a process of hegemony where through their relationships to power and authority and their ability to legitimize knowledge and behavior, they regulate forms of identity. While the Reconstructionists seemed aware of the power of schooling to regulate identity it wasn’t till after the development of the Theories of the Hidden Curriculum that this process began to influence curriculum theory. Both the Reconceptualists and Critical Pedagogy address this issue though Critical Pedagogy addresses to a more substantial degree.

- A democratic citizenship education would seek to understand and challenge this hegemony as part of a challenge to social, cultural and economic inequity. This idea is apparent in all three groups, although not successfully articulated until Critical Pedagogy.

- A democratic citizenship education would seek to articulate hopeful and alternative visions of the future. This has primarily been put forth by Critical Pedagogy.
Guiding principles are crucial to a democratic citizenship education. Guiding principles must be established that are consistent with democratic citizenship. Democracy must be defined in such a way as to not fix itself to any essential categories or universal abstractions that may limit its ability to address the concerns of a pluralistic society. Both Reconstructionism and Critical Pedagogy have emphasized the importance of this, although the Reconstructionists were not entirely successful in their attempts to not use essential categories. The Reconceptualists, in their absorption in the self, lack guiding principles consistent with democratic citizenship.

Educators must articulate their guiding principles and their visions of the future and seek to understand (and challenge when in contradiction to their stated goals) their role in the process of hegemony. The Reconstructionists seem to have the naive assumption that if curriculum is designed appropriately, teachers' own views are not necessary to illuminate. Perhaps this is one of the most striking differences between Critical Pedagogy and Social Reconstructionist thought. Social Reconstruction is a curriculum design, not necessarily a pedagogical practice. Reconstructionism calls for the wholesale transformation of the curriculum if it is to be realized. Critical Pedagogy is not only a curriculum design, it is a pedagogical approach. The theories of the Hidden Curriculum have narrowed the possibilities for successful school reform, but within a Critical Pedagogy, teachers can take up the practice now, within their own contexts, and only to certain extents, but without having to wait for school reform.

The development of an awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity is a curriculum goal in a democratic citizenship education. It challenges the power of hegemony as it creates the possibility for individuals to challenge their own assumptions and world views, and it considers the plural and contradictory nature of identity and makes it possible for an individual to live within the framework of their own constructed identity as well as within the framework of a democratic civic community. Given the Reconstructionists assumption of a homogenous culture, they were not sensitive to this.
Both the Reconceptualists and Critical Pedagogy recognize the need for the development of this kind of awareness.

For educational practices to be of value they must be rooted in experience and validate individual experience, but experience must contain the possibility for reflection upon experience. Action-reflection and action again is a key process if analysis is to be meaningful and for the nature of identity to be perceived. All practices and analyses must be sensitive to the role that language plays in shaping identity. All three curriculum approaches seem sensitive to this understanding of experience. Dewey acknowledged the role of experience and reflection upon experience in his distinction between educative and miseducative experience. The Reconceptualists sought to uncover perceptions through reflection upon action, Critical Pedagogy has articulated an understanding of this as well. Critical pedagogy is the only group that clearly identifies the power of language in shaping identity.

Within this conceptual framework the following recommendations for curriculum design have been synthesized from the analysis of the three curriculum approaches.

A democratic citizenship education would seek to articulate educational practices that: 1) encourage the development of the socially constructed nature of identity and 2) encourage critical examination of and participation in democratic social organization. While the Reconstructionists clearly saw the importance of the second, and the Reconceptualists the first, Critical Pedagogy has explained the necessity of both.

These practices would include cultural studies including mass media and popular culture, and participation in the arts. Cultural studies has been put forth by Critical Pedagogy, and the arts, by the Reconceptualists.

These practices form part of an interdisciplinary curriculum where subjects are approached through themes related to student experiences. This idea has been suggested by both the Reconstructionists and Critical Pedagogy.
The community and cultural landscape outside of the school are used as educational resources. Relationships would be developed between schools and community institutions as well as between teachers and other community and cultural workers. The curriculum includes participation in community social action and organization. Again, this idea has been postulated by both Social Reconstructionists and Critical Pedagogy.

With this conceptual framework established, drama in education can now be addressed and examined for its potential relationship to a democratic citizenship education. The next chapter will therefore provide an exploration of drama in education theory.
Chapter Seven

Summary of Chapter's Two - Six

A conceptual framework for a democratic citizenship curriculum has been outlined in the previous chapter as a synthesis of ideas examined throughout chapters two to six of this study. The next chapter will examine the implications of this framework for educational drama. It will be necessary first to summarize chapters two through six, in order to clarify the concepts that link educational drama to a democratic citizenship curriculum. This chapter, therefore, will provide that summary and articulate the specific concepts that will be used to understand the implications of the conceptual framework for a democratic citizenship curriculum for educational drama.

Chapter two sought to establish what is meant by democratic citizenship education and introduced the concept of the socially constructed nature of identity as a potentially necessary component to it. An ideal citizenship education was suggested as that which deals with values that find expression in how we participate in the political process and how we involve ourselves in shaping our communities.

Traditional education was examined and it was explained that, following scientific curriculum making with its adherence to a positivist culture informed by enlightenment world views, science was viewed as the harbinger of truth while alternative forms of knowledge and inquiry were rejected. Traditional education, not only devalued alternative cultural perspectives, but it supported forms of social and economic inequity in the larger society by developing as its mandate the fitting in of the student to the economy. This resulted in a passive and conformist form of citizenship education. It was argued that this form of citizenship is practiced in the larger society as well, which is characterized by social and economic inequity and a lack of participation in the political process. Democratic citizenship education was thus proposed as a challenge to both traditional education, and current political practice.
Chapter two also discussed Enlightenment world views and positivist culture in terms of their reference to universal truths and stated that these have been fundamental to the development of liberal democracy and its current practices. It was argued that the current use of universal abstractions are, in fact, a form of Western cultural particularism and that they have been used to protect particular private interests in the economic sphere by the subordination and exploitation of other particular groups. Democratic citizenship, in a pluralistic society, would thus challenge the use of universal abstractions. Thomas Bridges' citizenship ideology was introduced emphasizing his suggestion that an awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity is critical to a democratic civic culture that seeks to challenge the current practice of liberal democracy. Identity, within this ideology, is understood as being learned through narratives offered by particularistic groups. If the socially constructed nature of one's identity could be understood, one could achieve an identity that exists both within the framework of a particularistic group and within a democratic civic culture. Bridges called this awareness 'narrative imagination' and argued that it was the goal of democratic citizenship education to foster this form of imagination. The next four chapters examined how these concepts were addressed by some of the curriculum theories, both historical and current, that have developed in response to a recognized need for social change, and that have presented a challenge to traditional educational practices.

Chapter three examined the curriculum theory of the Social Reconstruction movement that occurred between the 1920s and 1940s to discern how a curriculum theory that addressed the issue of democratic reconstruction might contribute to an articulation of a democratic citizenship education and further the exploration of identity within that context.

The Social Reconstructionists believed that their society was in a state of decay and believed that education could play a strong role in rebuilding democracy; in fact, they saw this as the primary purpose of education. They criticized traditional education for its 'empty vessel' approach where students were perceived as empty, waiting to be filled with
knowledge and skills, and its compartmentalization of subjects. They thought that traditional education contributed to the development of bad habits that were contrary to democratic citizenship and hid the implications of schooling in the social problems of their time.

They believed, after Dewey, that curriculum must be grounded in a theory of experience because true learning only occurred through experience. But not all experiences were 'educative'; some were in fact miseducative, like those found in traditional schools. 'Educative' experiences were those that could lead to further educative experiences, and thus expand the students' opportunities and possibilities for learning. Educators had to learn to distinguish between educative and miseducative experiences and how to provide educative experiences. Social Reconstructionists argued that teachers should go outside of the classroom and into the community to find learning opportunities, materials and resources. They also thought that students should be actively involved in community social organization.

The Social Reconstructionists understood that schooling played a role in shaping identity. They attempted to develop curriculum and schooling practices that would shape identity differently than did traditional education in that students would become democratic citizens. In order to do this, they argued, curriculum would need strong and moral principles upon which to be guided. Democracy, as the guiding principle, would need to be re-defined and a definition was advanced by Bode. He attempted to define it in such a way as to avoid the use of universal principles that may in fact be exclusive to certain cultural and social groups.

But the Social Reconstructionists revealed an assumption that culture, in a democratic society, was in fact homogeneous and therefore, undermined the inclusivity of their definition of democracy. They assumed that the American people were to be of one culture. They also assumed that their values were indistinct from those of democratic citizenship and that Americans, if educated properly, would come to share these same
values. They did not, therefore, recognize the need for students to develop an understanding of the socially constructed nature of identity. They did not recognize the plurality of identity, nor the potential contradictions between the values of particular groups and democratic citizenship. This chapter concluded that the underlying assumption of homogeneity apparent in Social Reconstructionist thought undermined its potential to develop transformative practices and democratic citizenship, emphasizing that an awareness of the social construction of identity is important to a democratic citizenship education.

Chapter four offered an examination of the theories of the Hidden Curriculum that began to emerge in the 1970s, because they had a significant impact on the development of curriculum theory and seriously challenged the notion that schools could play a role in the formation of democratic citizenship.

Theories of social reproduction were introduced through an examination of Schooling in Capitalist America, by Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis. They postulated that schools were established to reproduce labour power and a hierarchical industrial order. Through an economic analysis of the United States they concluded that schools, by corresponding the social relations within them to the social relationships which govern the work place, actually reproduce the hierarchical divisions of labour and smoothly integrate students into the labour market and to the imperatives of capital.

Theories of cultural reproduction were introduced in this chapter through an examination of Learning to Labor by Paul Willis. He demonstrated that through the students’ own forms of resistance to schooling, and through the creation of their ‘counter culture’ that reproduction of the labour market actually occurs, and seemingly voluntarily. Jean Anyon’s similar study was also examined and the same conclusion was drawn: working class children develop a conflict relationship to capital which eventually leads them to choose working class jobs.

This chapter also mentioned developments in gender analysis that demonstrated how girls, through schooling, develop feelings of inferiority to boys.
These theories pointed to the unconscious level at which domination occurs in schooling and how schooling contributes to the shaping of identity. This chapter then introduced the concept of ‘hegemony’ where schools are viewed as but one institution in the overwhelming cultural process by which our identities are unconsciously shaped to maintain the power of the dominant class. The theories of the hidden curriculum have made it impossible to view schooling as a neutral activity with the best interests of the students as their mandate. This chapter revealed the apparatus which establishes the conditions under which people subconsciously reproduce existing social and economic inequality. It pointed to the need for a citizenship education to thus take seriously the socially constructed nature of identity.

Chapter Five continued to examine curriculum theory that claimed social change as a mandate, to see if the issues of the hidden curriculum and the socially constructed nature of identity were addressed. This chapter examined some of the Reconceptualists, who wrote during the 1970s and 1980s, for they approached curriculum as an opportunity to examine the self.

They, like the Social Reconstructionists, responded to what they perceived as a primary social problem of their time. In their case, the problem was alienation, the state where one feels disconnected from oneself. Also like the Social Reconstructionists, they saw the role that traditional education played in perpetuating the problem. They thought that the curriculum, as an imposition of unrelated subjects, having little to do with the learner, contributed to this alienation. Understanding the role that schools played in the formation of identity - or as they understood it, the conditioning of self, they sought practices that would free one from this conditioning and uncover the 'true self.' They believed that this process of self discovery would lead to social change. They suggested that practices that lead to the development of 'autobiography' would lead to this form of self-discovery and suggested the use of journal writing as a method to achieve this.
Also suggested was the use of theatre. It was thought that theatre, through Gerzy Grotowski's acting methodology, would provide students with the opportunity to examine their actions and reactions and begin, therefore, to question the nature of their being.

The Reconceptualists, however, seemed to consider that there was a transcendent self beneath the conditioning, capable of just social organization. This belief may contradict other beliefs within a pluralistic society. Also the methods articulated here for self-discovery do not provide opportunities to engage in issues of social organization. The awareness of the socially constructed nature of identity is not understood here then as a requirement of a civic culture, a means by which plural identities can co-exist within a democratic civic culture. It is understood here as a means to uncover the essential being and it is questionable as to whether or not this can lead to positive social change.

This chapter concluded that the Reconceptualists, although seeming to offer an alternative curriculum and examining the nature of identity have failed to provide a successful approach that marries identity analysis with democratic citizenship education.

Chapter Six continued to look at developments in curriculum theory to find an approach that addressed issues raised by the theories of the hidden curriculum and contributed to the articulation of a democratic citizenship education. This chapter focused on some of the writings of an approach known as Critical Pedagogy (1980s - today).

Critical Pedagogy is aware of the implications of schooling in the process of hegemony and how this is often manifest as acts of racism, sexism and classism. It seeks to develop practices that illuminate the power relations within schooling and challenge the process of social and cultural reproduction. Although aware of the theories of the hidden curriculum, Critical Pedagogy believes that there are places within schooling where these processes can be challenged and transformative practices realized. Understanding the role that schools play in limiting the range of possibilities that students may perceive as available to them, Critical Pedagogy feels that it has a role to play in expanding these possibilities and developing hopeful visions of the future.
Critical Pedagogy demands that educators state their political positions, acknowledge their role as political beings, and articulate their own visions for the future. Guiding principles are important to establish and must avoid the use of universal abstractions, although Critical Pedagogy recognizes the potential contradiction between democratic civic culture and attempts to avoid fixed categories. Understanding this contradiction, efforts must be made to define one's own vision of democracy, while at the same time being careful to keep this definition open, based on an understanding of the socially constructed nature of identity. Critical Pedagogy avoids the problems related to universal abstractions that underlie the failure of the Reconceptualists and the Social Reconstructionists to construct transformative educational practices.

Semiotic analysis within cultural studies is offered as form of analysis that seeks to examine hegemony and offer students with situations where their identities can be explored and where potentially oppressive constructs can be overcome. A cross disciplined approach to curriculum is required that would address a wide variety of themes touching upon various social issues.

Essential to critical pedagogy is an understanding of the role of language in the shaping of consciousness and all analyses must consider this.

Critical Pedagogy believes that student experience must be validated. Student voices form part of the cultural landscape that is to be examined, and their experience forms the basis on which to understand other cultural manifestations and sites. Student voices must be heard and opportunities given for students to tell their stories. But, they emphasize, these voices and stories must also be critiqued. Stories are the narratives in which identity is formed, and, therefore, they must be analyzed. The form of analysis called for is one that would allow for simultaneous action and reflection upon action. Critical Pedagogy seeks practices that allow for this form of analysis to occur and for the constructed nature of identity to be grasped. This is understood as essential to the process of students becoming the authors of their own narratives and essential to the development of
democratic citizenship. Critical Pedagogy thus proposes an approach to democratic citizenship education where the importance of the socially constructed nature of identity is understood and articulated.

Chapter six concludes with a synthesis of ideas and develops a conceptual framework for a democratic citizenship curriculum. Within this framework, there are three interwoven concepts that have been identified as essential to a democratic citizenship curriculum which are of primary relevance to a discussion of educational drama. These concepts are the social construction of identity, an integrated curriculum, and the creation of alternative and hopeful visions of the future.

Chapters two through six have illuminated the concept of the socially constructed nature of identity, and have pointed to the reason why developing an awareness of the social construction of identity is essential to a democratic citizenship curriculum. It allows democracy to be defined in such a way as to avoid potentially exclusive universal abstractions; it allows the individual to both participate and create meaning within their particular group and within a democratic civic culture, being able to distinguish between the two value systems; and it challenges hegemony in that it is within the subconscious development of identity where hegemony is perpetuated.

To develop this awareness a form of analysis has been called for that both validates students’ voices and experiences while simultaneously being critical of them - a form of analysis that leads to action and reflection upon action. This activity should take place in the context of developing democratic practices and should go beyond the classroom and into the social and cultural realm.

The concept of an integrated curriculum is reflected in this type of analysis. Curriculum is integrated when subject matter is related to, and understood in terms of experience. When this kind of connection is made between a particular subject and experience, meaning is produced and a new experience is had. This can lead to further connections being made, not only between experience and subject matter, but between the
various subjects as well. As Dewey described, an 'educative' experience is that which leads to further 'educative' experiences. Experience, therefore, is not meant to refer only to the limited set of activities that a student may routinely involve themselves in, or declare their interest in, although these experiences are not to be devalued. The point here is that teachers must help students to make connections, to see how their experiences are related to other experiences and to subject matter. Organizing curriculum around social themes relevant to student experience can help make connections apparent. Understanding these connections begins to unravel the nature of social issues and may uncover the power relations and economic base upon which certain issues have emerged. An integrated curriculum, therefore, challenges hegemony in that it exposes the relationships between experience and the social and economic relations which govern it.

Within this context of challenging hegemony, it is important to a democratic citizenship curriculum to help students create hopeful and positive visions of the future. These visions shape action towards positive change and allow the present, including one's identity, to be critiqued without causing the student to fall into despair or apathy.

These three connected concepts form the base underlying the implications of democratic citizenship curriculum for educational drama. The next chapter will analyze educational drama in terms of its relationship to these concepts.
Chapter Eight

Implications for Educational Drama

Three concepts have been identified in the previous chapter as fundamental to a democratic citizenship curriculum that will form the basis of an analysis of educational drama. These concepts are the social construction of identity, an integrated curriculum, and the creation of alternative and hopeful visions of the future. This chapter will offer an analysis of educational drama focusing on these concepts in an effort to understand the implications of educational drama to a democratic citizenship curriculum. The analysis will proceed as a comparison between traditional drama in education theory that has been presented by Peter Slade and Brian Way and more recent developments that are being presented by Augusto Boal, Gavin Bolton and Dorothy Heathcote. It will be shown that recent drama in education theory is rooted in an understanding of the nature of theatre which incorporates it as a powerful tool in the analysis of the socially constructed nature of identity, the integration of curriculum and the construction of alternative visions of the self in society.

Traditional drama education theory has as its primary spokespersons Peter Slade and Brian Way. However, it found its inception in the child-centered education movement at the early part of this century. Child-centered curriculum was discussed in chapter three as a central part of the Progressive Education Movement to which the Social Reconstructionists were opposed. Child-centred curriculum developed in response to the oppressive nature of traditional education where students were considered empty vessels, and determined that the goal of education should be the development of innate potentials of the individual. Child-centered curriculum was experientially based and considered teacher authority in curriculum design to be invasive. Gavin Bolton suggests in his history of drama in education that drama educators at that time, in an attempt to gain support and develop a theoretical framework, aligned themselves with the child-centered movement and
molded educational drama theory so that it would fit the postulates of child-centered education. Drama educators thus adopted the goal of child-centered curriculum to be that of educational drama as well. For example, Brian Way stated that, "drama is concerned with the individuality of individuals, with the uniqueness of each human essence."  

The "play way" of learning had become popular at this time, at least in theory, as did "learning by doing." Both seemed examples of natural processes by which children grow. Drama in education theory appropriated this vocabulary and described drama as an opportunity to "do" and to "play." Brian Way described "...the function of drama is direct experience." Play was considered a form of direct experience so dramatic play became the form of drama to be employed by teachers. Peter Slade identified the essential qualities of dramatic play to be absorption and sincerity. A good drama lesson became an extended period of "dramatic play," its success measured by the degree of absorption and honesty that the teacher could observe.

It was considered that theatre, as opposed to dramatic play, required the students to be artificial because in one's attempt to communicate to an audience one lost the sincerity of really "doing." Thus Brian Way claimed

"...there are two activities, which must not be confused — one is theatre, the other is drama... Theatre is largely concerned with communication between actors and audience, drama is largely concerned with experience by the participants, irrespective of any function of communication to an audience."

He described, as an example, that to be blind-folded was drama, while pretending to be blind though actually seeing was theatre. Thus a dichotomy between drama and theatre as educational tools emerged.
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In order to enable teachers to introduce dramatic play into the classroom, Peter Slade suggested the use of stories as a means of initiating the activity. The idea of merely letting the students play was not easily accepted by teachers so the use of story offered them structure and short term goals (i.e. finish the story). This led to educational drama, in practice, becoming the acting out of stories, shifting the emphasis away from individual expression and on to the plot. Bolton argues that group dramatic play does not sufficiently allow for individual expression anyway. Individuals involved regularly subordinate their own ideas in favour of the group or to the plot inherent in the story based drama. Bolton argues that drama is not about self expression. It is a social activity. He suggests that traditional theory is based on an incorrect understanding of the nature of theatre.

"The notion of child centredness in drama has been a myth. There has always been ...an alternative pull of gravity ... In overstating the case of child centredness they have often inadvertently misled their followers into believing that pure undisciplined self-expression should be the basis for drama in education. The result has been that some teachers have either seriously encouraged the most uninhibited forms of self-expression or, more commonly, they have in practice shifted the centre of gravity away from the child whilst giving lip service to self-expression. Much teacher training in drama has been based on this kind of self deception."

It is interesting to note that although child centredness in drama has dominated theory and training in the field, practice has not seen the absence of theatrical performance in education. The conventional school production (usually a musical) is still very much part of our children’s school experience, but neither does this form of drama offer the appropriate use of drama in education. The production is usually based on a naturalistic view of theatre, leaving it void of potential symbolic richness. Students are trained in the clichés of naturalism, which undermines the essence of the art form of theatre and discourages students from spontaneity and honesty in acting even when there is no

---
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audience. If neither the school play nor child centered drama are based on a correct analysis of theatre, what then is the correct analysis?

As opposed to understanding the value of drama in its ability to provide lived experience, recent theorists suggest that the key to drama as an educational tool lies in its ability to objectify lived experiences. Augusto Boal has developed extensive educational practices aimed at using drama to help students develop alternative perspectives of their reality. Some of his work is quite political, aimed at empowering oppressed classes in Latin America, while he has also worked within European educational and psychiatric institutions. His methodology is based upon the following understanding of theatre.

"Theatre is born when the human being discovers that it can observe itself; when it discovers that, in this act of seeing, it can see itself - see itself in situ: see itself seeing. Theatre - or theatricality - is this capacity, this human property which allows man to observe himself in action, in activity. The self - knowledge thus acquired allows him to be the subject (the one who observes) of another subject (the one who acts). It allows him to imagine variations of his action, to study alternatives. Man can see himself in the act of seeing, in the act of acting, in the act of feeling, the act of thinking. Feel himself feeling, think himself thinking."\(^1\)

Gavin Bolton clarifies that the fundamental educational value of theatre is that it allows one to hold two worlds in mind at the same time - that of seeing, and that of seeing oneself seeing. He states that the two worlds of theatre are the fictional one of the drama, and the knowledge that it is fictional. The drama invites one into a fictitious world, yet the knowledge of its being fiction gives one objective distance necessary to examine it while actually participating in it.\(^2\)

For illustrative purposes, the blindfold analogy will be used again. Brian Way would say that the power of drama as an educational device lies in the actual experience of being blindfolded and therefore, the students would learn really what it is like to be blind. Bolton would argue that the power of drama lies in the act of pretending to be blind once having taken the blindfolds off. In pretending to be blind for an audience, the student watches himself and determines the nature of the action. He borrows from his experience
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with the blindfold but it is in the attempt to pretend or to communicate blindness, though being able to see, that the student is forced to examine the actions of blindness and therefore question what blindness really means to him and to question his assumptions about blindness. It is when the student can observe his actions that he will begin to question them.

Bolton suggests that the essential power of theatre lies in this way of framing an action that involves one critically in that action. Theatre thus allows for the form of analysis suggested in the conceptual framework towards a democratic citizenship curriculum. Theatre allows the student to engage in action, while simultaneously being able to reflect upon it - action, reflection and further action.

Theatre, understood in this way, does not lead to an opposition between dramatic play and performance, although unstructured or story based play is not what is proposed. Dramatic play is performed within groups where communication is practiced within the interaction between group members. Although there is no audience, the intent to communicate is equally as substantial. Because of the social nature of dramatic play and theatre, recent theorists suggest that drama can be used to critically examine society, particularly social relations, and one’s relationship to it. Dorothy Heathcote argues that “we have all of history and the affairs of mankind to use as a resource in learning,” and suggests that the primary function of drama is the exploration of the affairs of humankind. She notes that drama allows this exploration to happen in the present tense. She explains;

“What’s possible with drama has to do with the way time is used in drama. Much learning tends to be what I’d call ‘over there’ learning. In other words, when we say ‘Let’s consider that matter or those people,’ we are ‘here’ (in time and space) pondering on the matters ‘over there’. But in drama you can’t do that, because suddenly you are walking in the time of the event.”

This allows the students to perceive the situation from within their own experience. Their own perceptions, in this larger context, become the focus of study. As an example, the
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object under study might be a famous historical battle. Heathcote would set up a dramatic situation based on this battle where the students, and perhaps herself, play various roles and improvise within it. The student playing the General, may not know all the facts of the battle, but when he is faced with his soldiers wanting to know what to do, he must act. His fellow students/soldiers are waiting for their orders. He suddenly perceives the nature of the moment including the responsibility that that General had to face. The student, in order to play the General, uses the information and assumptions he already has about Generals and in actually playing the General he may have to reconsider his assumptions or seek new knowledge. This allows for a situation where the student is in a position to analyze his previously held assumptions and perhaps modify them. “Drama, whilst appearing to develop a story forward, actually unpacks previously held conclusions because it stands still.”141 Drama in this way can be used as a tool to make connections between subject matter and experience and to develop an integrated curriculum.

Subject matter, in this form of drama, as opposed to traditional drama in education, is now more important than plot and can be used to explore themes that move across the curriculum while simultaneously rooting it in student experience. This exploration is meant to go beyond a factual level and embrace “issues, principles, implications, consequences and responsibilities behind the facts.”142 Dorothy Heathcote’s work has been described in the following way: “She uses drama to expand their (her students’) awareness, to enable them to look at reality through fantasy, to see below the surface of action to their meanings.”143

Boal suggests that theatre can be used to explore and create new possibilities for the future. Expanding on his understanding of the nature of theatre as that which allows
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one to see oneself seeing, he argues that because humans can see themselves in action and imagine themselves in alternative actions, humans can project themselves into the future. He suggests that theatre as well as other art forms are symbolic representations of "what does not exist." 144

Theatre can therefore, look at reality, examine it and attempt to offer alternative visions. He articulates his view of educational theatre as "a system of physical exercises, aesthetic games, image techniques and special improvisations whose goal is to safeguard, develop and reshape this human vocation (for theatre) by turning the practice of theatre into an effective tool for the comprehension of social and personal problems and the search for their solutions." 145

He attempts to describe the process of the actor/student, in acting out a scene from her own life to explain the acting procedure and its educational value. In the actor's efforts to act out a scene from her life, the scene, becomes the object of her analysis.

When the (actor) lives a scene in her own life, she tries to concretise her declared desires, be they love or hate, attack or flight, construction or destruction. But when she relives the same scene in an aesthetic space ... her desire becomes a dichotomic: she wants simultaneously to show the scene and to show herself in the scene. In showing how the scene was experienced, she is seeking to achieve for a second time the concretisation of her desires, as they were realized or frustrated at that time. In showing herself in the scene, she is seeking to make progress towards the actual concretion of this desire. To desire becomes a thing. The verb becomes a palpable noun.

In living the scene, she is trying to concretise a desire, in reliving it, she is reifying it. Her desire, because it is aesthetic, transforms itself into an object which is observable, by herself and by others. The desire, having become a thing, can better be studied, analyzed, and (who knows?) transformed. In daily life, the actor tries to concretise a declared, conscious desire; the desire to love, for example. In the aesthetic space, she makes the concretaion of this love. In this process of reviviscence, not only avowed, overt desire but also unconscious, covert desires become reified. Not only what one wants to reify is reified, by sometimes also things that are there, but hidden. 146

In the actor's attempt to communicate her experience through reliving it in such a way as to convince an audience of its authenticity, it becomes observable to the actor as a
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potential object of study and perhaps transformation. The act of communication is essential to this process. It is not in individual self expression but in efforts to communicate that the educational value of theatre is found. “This theatrical process of recounting, in the present, and in front of witnesses ‘in solidarity’, a story lived in the past, offers, in itself, an alternative.”

Boal has formulated the following three hypotheses that are fundamental to his work: 1. Osmosis- This is the way values are subconsciously internalized. 2. Metaxis- This is the state of belonging to two worlds at once, “the image of reality and the reality of the image” 3. Analogical Induction- Linked to being in two worlds at once, this is the reflection upon action that being in two worlds allows for.

With these in mind, Boal provides students with opportunities in drama to act out scenes from their own lives, and to re-enact them again with alternate conclusions. Drama, in this case, provides the students with the opportunity to explore their identities, to question who they have been and who they would like to be as reflected in action. The audience is made up of the other students who will also be acting out scenes from their own lives. Students are encouraged to become involved in other peoples’ scenarios, sympathetically living them as well and offering alternative actions. Theatre in this context becomes an opportunity to analyze one’s previous actions and rehearse alternative possibilities.

Acting allows for the possibility of engagement with and distancing from an experience. The practice of simultaneous reflection and action encourages the questioning of one’s own perceptions. Experience becomes an object to be reflected upon. Recent educational drama theory suggests that this can free an individual from habits of perception and conception. Gavin Bolton says that drama, as a tool for learning, “…rests in its capacity to: 1) separate and objectify an event, and 2) break down established concepts and
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As in the example of the General used above, it is not only when acting out scenes from one’s own life where one’s perceptions are put into question, but it is within the acting of any narrative where identity is questioned. Theatre is the creation of narratives, and identity is understood through narrative. In an attempt to create a narrative, the actor recreates an identity. In so doing, the social construction of their own identity is perceived and analyzed.

Whereas traditional drama in education theory interprets drama as an opportunity for lived experience and self-expression, recent theory interprets drama as an opportunity to change established concepts and perceptions, to question the nature of identity, through an involved yet critical exploration of one in society. Gavin Bolton says that “teaching is a process concerned with breaking, challenging, supplementing or eroding a child’s present achievement in conception and perception.”

Recent theory on drama in education suggests that it can be a potentially powerful form of practice within a democratic citizenship education. Drama can form the basis from which to develop an integrated curriculum. As a tool to explore social themes, drama can find the link between social issues and lived experience, making the analysis meaningful and allowing the themes to be addressed in such a way as to illuminate their relationship to individual experience.

Drama provides opportunities for student experience to be validated and examined. Recent theory points to the ability of drama to create situations where action, reflection upon action, and further action can be experienced. Essentially, acting is this process. Acting is the process where identity is examined, where assumptions are questioned, where perception is challenged. It is the theatrical moment of holding two worlds in mind at once that allows for this.

If hegemony is the subconscious way in which our identities are formed to reproduce existing social and economic inequity, then the questioning of our identity is a

149 Gavin Bolton, Drama as Education, 144
challenge to hegemony. Acting is this practice of questioning identity. It is clear that drama is linked to citizenship education in its power to provide the educational experience whereby students can develop an awareness of the socially constructed nature of their identity.

Not only does drama provide opportunities for this, but as a symbolic representation of the future, drama can help students create hopeful visions of the future. It can provide them with the space where these visions can be practiced, experimented with, and refined.

Narrative imagination, according to Bridges, allows one to exist within the framework of one's identity as established by one's communities, as well as within the framework of a democratic civic culture. It is to hold two identities in mind simultaneously. Narrative imagination is thus a form of acting and democratic citizenship a possible action. Only a possible action. Drama alone will not lead to democratic citizenship, but within the context of a democratic citizenship curriculum, guided by clear principles, drama can be a powerful practice in the quest for social change.
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Chapter Nine

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

Democracy, as currently practiced in North America, is characterized by an unequal system where many groups are marginalized from involvement in the political process. Citizenship is neither generally pursued or understood in terms of active participation in the political process and in the shaping of one's community. Citizenship education only reflects this passive approach to community and political action. This study has developed a conceptual framework for a democratic citizenship curriculum that challenges the current passivity of democratic citizenship and seeks the development of a just and participatory democracy. It has done so through an examination of certain curriculum theories, both historical and present, that have addressed the issue of social change. Educational drama has been examined as a pedagogical practice that supports this approach to a democratic citizenship curriculum.

Democratic citizenship, as expressed within this conceptual framework for a democratic citizenship curriculum, is a challenge to the hegemony of the dominant classes. Hegemony is defined here as the ideological apparatus by which social and economic inequality is perpetuated, and democracy therefore, undermined. Hegemony is perpetuated in the subconscious way that our identities are formed including our visions of what is possible and desirable to achieve.

The formation of a democratic civic culture is important to a democratic citizenship in a pluralistic society. Essential to a democratic civic culture is narrative imagination or an awareness of the social construction of identity. This awareness allows the individual to become the author of their own narrative or life story and in the context of a democratic citizenship, to choose to develop an identity both within their own community and within a democratic civic community. It, therefore, challenges hegemony in that it exposes potentially limiting and oppressive constructs in the formation of one's identity. The value
systems, self-perceptions and future visions that may oppose democratic citizenship become open to evaluation.

Democracy, in this context of an understanding of the social construction of identity, is defined without reference to essential truths or universal abstractions that may limit or exclude the participation of certain particular groups. At the same time, democracy is understood as an abstraction, a hopeful vision of the future. A democratic citizenship curriculum provides opportunities for students to develop these hopeful alternatives.

Narrative imagination can be developed through forms of analysis that allow the individual to examine their identity. This involves examining their actions, reflecting upon them and re-examining them in a continual process of action and reflection upon action. For this to be possible, students’ experiences and stories must be validated, heard, and critiqued.

Reflected in this form of analysis, and important to a democratic citizenship curriculum, is an integrated curriculum. This curriculum would be organized along social themes relevant to student experience. It would prioritize the understanding of connections between subjects and between subject and experience over the mastery of a particular skill or the memorization of facts. It would utilize resources outside the school and encourage relationships among schools and other sites of cultural production. In this context students become producers, rather than consumers of meaning. A democratic citizenship curriculum would also provide opportunities for students to participate in and examine forms of democratic social organization.

The implications of this conceptual framework towards a democratic citizenship curriculum for educational drama are to be found in more recent developments in the theory of educational drama as opposed to the traditional theory. Traditional drama in education theory has its roots in child-centered curriculum and developed a theoretical framework consistent with the vocabulary of child centredness. It argued that drama provided
opportunities for lived experience and self expression and that theatre, as an artificial
collection, had little value in an educational tool.

Recent theory challenges this understanding of the nature of drama and theatre,
arguing that the power of drama and theatre as educational tools lies in their ability to
objectify lived experience. Educational drama, in this context, includes theatre as it enables
one to see oneself seeing oneself. It allows one to hold two worlds in mind
simultaneously, the fictional one of the drama, and the knowledge that it is fictional. This
allows one to simultaneously experience and examine that experience. It is in the student’s
attempt to communicate, to act, where these two worlds are held at once and this kind of
examination of experience can occur. Because of the social nature of drama, acting can
thus provide the student with the opportunity to examine society and one’s relationship to
it. As a process where themes can be analyzed in terms of one’s experience, educational
drama provides a tool in the integration of curriculum.

Drama is a narrative construction. The actor constructs an identity within that
narrative and as the actor is both simultaneously engaged in the construction of that identity
and critical of it, the actor develops an awareness of social construction of identity. As the
actor uses their own perceptions to construct the identity, the actors’ own identity is under
examination. Narrative imagination is thus developed through the acting process.

Recent theory also points to the role that drama plays as a symbolic representation
of the future. Drama, thus allows alternative visions of the future to be imagined and
rehearsed.

Educational drama, therefore, can be a powerful practice within a democratic
citizenship curriculum. It provides a form of analysis that can be used to integrate
curriculum, to create possible visions of the future, and to develop an awareness of the
socially constructed nature of identity. These three interrelated concepts are fundamental to
a democratic citizenship curriculum and inherent in the practice of educational drama.
But there are several barriers to the use of drama as a form of practice in a democratic citizenship curriculum. This understanding of the educational value of drama is not widespread in the literature on educational drama and, as Chapter Seven demonstrated, stands in opposition to the traditional theory. Although teacher training in drama has evolved from its traditional roots and drama is now more commonly understood in its connection to the wider curriculum, it is primarily taught as a tool to enhance the teaching of other subjects, primarily language arts. Also, teacher training in drama is not a priority and when it is offered it is quite limited - few hours are allocated to it and class sizes are usually large. Teachers wanting to use drama must take it upon themselves to seek training beyond the courses required for certification, and as mentioned above, it is not likely that they will be introduced to an understanding of theatre that realizes its implications for democratic citizenship within the drama courses offered by education departments. Ways to improve the quality and quantity of teacher training in drama must be sought. Drama educators interested in democratic citizenship must begin to examine their own practice and explore the implications of their teaching to democratic citizenship. Suggestions for further study include an examination of how and when drama is used within schooling and why the arts, in general, are marginalized within the schooling process.

Just as drama is not a priority in teacher training and public schooling, neither is democratic citizenship. The mandate of public schooling has not been to challenge hegemony, and as Chapter Four suggested, schooling is bound up in the process of social and cultural reproduction. But, as has also been previously suggested, there are places within schooling where this process is challenged. There are educators, parents and students seeking to develop transformative educational practices and encourage the development of social and economic justice. Those interested in democratic citizenship are encouraged to consider the importance of an integrated curriculum; of developing alternative and hopeful visions of the future; and of the formation of identity - not as a distant entity but as an area where issues concerning social organization are lived,
struggled with and determined. It is hoped that educators of both democratic citizenship and of drama will discover their potential for integration and begin to collaborate with each other.

This study has focused attention on the implications of educational drama to a democratic citizenship curriculum, considering the relationship between narrative, identity and drama. It opens up the question about the relationship between narrative, identity and the other arts. What other art forms deal with narrative so that issues of identity are explored? How might they be integrated into a democratic citizenship curriculum? Are there not perhaps significant ways that identity is understood other than through narrative and what are the art forms that would be implicated in this? Perhaps this study will form the springboard for further analysis of these issues.
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