VIII
ワシントン大学

11/27～29/2008
University of Washington

国際市民性教育推進ネットワーク・セミナー
～アメリカにおけるシティズンシップ教育の新潮流～

27th November, 2008 (Thu) / 2008年11月27日 (木)

Venue: Large Meeting Room, Faculty of Development / 於：発達科学部大会議室

9:15～10:15

Opening Address / 開会の辞

Professor Nobushige Imatani / 今谷順重教授

(Graduate School of Human Development & Environment, Kobe University / 神戸大学大学院人間発達環境学研究科)

Lecture: Associate Professor Susumu Oshihara / 鴛原進准教授

（Associate Professor, Ehime University / 愛媛大学）

“Flexible Citizenship and History Education Based Course of Study (2008) in Japan”

10:15～12:00

Lecture: Professor Walter Parker (University of Washington)

‘ “Global Citizenship” and the “International Education” Movement: A Case Study of U.S. Schools Today’

14:00～16:30

Lecture: Ms. Carol Coe (Doctoral Student at University of Washington, Former High School teacher)

“Developing citizenship skills through deliberative discussions: Exploring the Practice/Action Distinction”

28th November, 2008 (Fri) / 2008年11月28日（金）

9:30～12:00

Venue: Large Meeting Room, Faculty of Development / 発達科学部大会議室

Workshop: Professor Walter Parker

'Deliberative discussion for democratic citizenship education: A demonstration of a Structured Academic Controversy unit'

Workshop: Ms. Carol Coe

'Deliberative discussion for democratic citizenship education: A demonstration of a Choices for the 21st Century unit'

14:00～16:30

Venue: Akashi Elementary School attached to Faculty of Human Development, Kobe University / 神戸大学発達科学部附属明石小学校

ESD Class (by Hiroshi Inoue) Visitation & Discussion / 井上博嗣（附属明石小学校教員）のESD授業参加と討議

29th November, 2008 (Sat) / 2008年11月29日（土）

All Day / 終日

Fieldwork / フィールドワーク

国際市民性教育推進ネットワーク・セミナー
活動報告書

神戸大学大学院人間発達環境学研究科
牛志玲
神戸大学大学院人間発達環境学研究科
李杰

11月27日には、神戸大学でワシントン大学の先生や院生と交流して、アメリカ教育制度に触れ、国際理解教育に関する実践事例をより深く理解することができた。

まず愛媛大学の鴬原進先生は「学習指導要領に基づく歴史学習は『国民』あるいは『日本人』の育成のみを目的としていると考えられている。しかし、取り上げられているのは「日本のいう国家の歴史」のみならず、「地域の歴史」を調べる学習もすべき内容として提示している。両者の学習から多様な見方・考え方の育成が可能となると考えられる。その場合、フレキシブル・シティズンシップ(Flexible Citizenship)という概念が重要になってくる」と提言した。

次に、パーカー先生が講演を行なった。「グローバルな市民権」や「世界市民」、「私たちの新しい世界経済のための教育」などの用語は今日、頻繁に使用されている。この研究は米国の公立学校での新しい「国際教育」運動を調べたものである。米国の公立学校はどんどん「国際教育」を採用している。パーカー先生は、「国際教育とは何ですか?」という問いを通して、その意味とプログラムの混乱を見出した。愛国心と世界主義のような相容れない勢力が争っているのである。

最後に、コーさんが自分の研究を発表した。彼女の発表テーマは「審議的な議論で市民権技能を伸ばす: 訓練（プラクティス）と行動（アクション）の区別を探る」で、概要は以下のようになる。効果的な民主社会は博識で熟練した市民を必要とする。合衆国の公立学校は、この需要に応えることが求められる。しかし、そうするにはどうするのが最適だろうか？この発表は審議的な議論の活用について調査する。審議している過程をより理解するために、コーさんは2つのタイプの審議的な議論の比較ケーススタディを行なった: 2つの質問がこの調査のための重要な視点を与えてくれる: (1)（民主的な技能を形成するための）訓練に使用される討議と、単に民主的な技能を形成するためでなく、（政策を決めて実施する）行動を起こすために使用される討議の間には、なにか違いがあるとすれば、どんな違いがあるのか? (2)「訓練のみの」討議での言葉の無力さ、あるいは「訓練して行動する」討議の言葉の力は、学生に相違を生じさせるのか? この研究の結果は審議している過程一般と、特に訓練と行動の区別への理解を知らせるものである。

先生達と院生達は交流活動の成果を踏まえ、一層アメリカのグローバル教育の真髄を知ることとなった。

二日目の午前中は、Parker 先生と Carol さんが民主主義のシティズンシップ教育につい

てそれぞれのカリキュラムを詳しく紹介した。また、ワークショップを行い、来場の方々をグループにわけて、カリキュラムを実践して頂いた。みなさんが積極的に参加し、討論を展開したことが、非常に強い印象を残した。

午後、Parker 先生と Carol さんをはじめ一行が神戸大学発達科学部附属明石小学校まで６年生の「地球温暖化について考えよう」という授業を参観しに赴いた。最初、ゲスト・スピーカーの朝日新聞社の記者の方が、世界各地で撮った写真を見せながら、温暖化について生徒たちに紹介した。そして、地球温暖化問題について関心を持たせ、原因や影響、世界的な取り組みについて調べたり記者にインタビューしたりしてから、グループにわけて、これからの地球について考えさせ、自身が取り組める温暖化対策を提案しそれぞれに発表してもらった。授業中、生徒達が積極的に討論し、ユニークな提案したことには非常に感心した。その後、校長室でミーティングがおこわなれ、担当の井上博嗣先生と話し合い、授業について討議した。特に、Carol さんは、授業中生徒達の積極さに涙がでるほど感動されたとのことである。

三日目は、フィールドワークとして、Parker 先生と Carol さんを日本の伝統的なものがあふれる京都に案内した。

2008 年告示学習指導要領における歴史学習とフレキシブル・シティズンシップの育成

鴛原　進（愛媛大学）

Flexible Citizenship and History Education Based Course of Study (2008) in Japan

Susumu Oshihara, Ehime University

Paper presented at Kobe University, November 2008

概要

学習指導要領に基づく歴史学習は「国民」あるいは「日本人」の育成のみ目的としていると考えられている。しかし，取り上げられているのは「日本のいう国家の歴史」のみならず，「地域の歴史」を調べる学習もすべき内容として提示している。両者の学習から多様な見方・考え方の育成が可能となると考えている。その場合，フレキシブル・シティズンシップ(Flexible Citizenship)という概念が重要になってくる。

Abstract

"Goal of history education is national identity."Many People think that Goal of history education based Junior high school Course of Study is very similar. History education based Junior high school Course of Study present both National History and Local History. Both histories produce diversity. It is very important concept "Flexible Citizenship". It has possibility of connect "National" and "Global".

1. 本報告の目的と手順

本報告の目的は，3 月 28 日に告示された「中学校学習指導要領」(「新指導要領」と略記）に示されている社会科歴史的分野の特色を踏まえながら，それに基づく歴史学習におけるグローバル・シティズンシップ(Global Citizenship)育成の可能性を考察することである。フレキシブル・シティズンシップ(Flexible Citizenship)という概念を適応してみると，国民育成のみと考えられてきた歴史学習においても，グローバル・シティズンシップの育成は可能であると考えられることを示すことである。具体的な手順は，次の３点である。

① 新指導要領における社会科歴史的分野の特色を考察する。

② ①における資質育成の論理を考察する。

③ ①②により歴史学習におけるグローバル・シティズンシップ育成の可能性を考察する。

2. 新指導要領における社会科歴史的分野の特色

(1) 目標

新指導要領における中学校社会科の目標

> 広い視野に立って，社会に対する関心を高め，諸資料に基づいて多面的・多角的に考察し，我が国の国土と歴史に対する理解と愛情を深め，公民としての基礎的教養を培い，国際社会に生きる平和で民主的な国家・社会の形成者として必要な公民的資質の基礎を養う。

歴史的分野の目標は次のように新指導要領に示されている。

> (1)歴史的事象に対する関心を高め，我が国の歴史の大きな流れを，世界の歴史を背景に，各時代の特色を踏まえて理解させ，それを通して我が国の伝統と文化の特色を広い視野に立って考えさせるとともに，我が国の歴史に対する愛情を深め，国民としての自覚を育てる。
> (2)国家・社会及び文化の発展や人々の生活の向上に尽くした歴史上の人物と現在に伝わる文化遺産を，その時代や地域との関連において理解させ，尊重する態度を育てる。
> (3)歴史に見られる国際関係や文化交流のあらましを理解させ，我が国と諸外国の歴史や文化が相互に深くかかわっていることを考えさせるとともに，他民族の文化，生活などに関心をもたせ，国際協調の精神を養う。
> (4)身近な地域の歴史や具体的な事象の学習を通して歴史に対する興味や関心を高め，様々な資料を活用して歴史的事象を多面的・多角的に考察し公正に判断するとともに適切に表現する能力と態度を育てる。

(2) 改訂の要点

「中学校学習指導要領解説　社会編　平成20年7月文部科学省」（「解説」と略記）には，次頁枠囲み内ア～オの５点を歴史的分野の改訂の大きな要点として示している。

(3) 内容

歴史的分野の導入的な位置付けや歴史的に考察するときの技能の習得と関心・意欲の育成を目的とする大項目(1)「歴史のとらえ方」と，通史的な構成となっている(2)「古代までの日本」(3)「中世の日本」(4)「近世の日本」(5)「近代の日本と世界」(6)「現代の日本と世界」の５つの大項目で構成されている。

ア　「我が国の歴史の大きな流れ」を理解する学習の一層の重視
　(ｱ) 「我が国の歴史の大きな流れ」の理解という目標の一層の明確化
　(ｲ) 学習内容の構造化と焦点化
　(ｳ) 各時代の特色をとらえる学習の新設
　(ｴ) 古代までの学習の大観化
イ　歴史について考察する力や説明する力の育成
　(ｱ) 政治面などの変革の特色を考えて時代の転換の様子をとらえる学習
　(ｲ) 時代の区分やその移り変わりに気付く学習
　(ｳ) 思考・判断・表現する学習と確かな理解
ウ　近現代の学習の一層の重視
エ　様々な伝統や文化の学習の重視
オ　我が国の歴史の背景となる世界の歴史の扱いの充実

グローバル・シティズンシップの育成の視点から，まず目につくのは，日本と世界との関係である。「解説」に，世界の歴史の扱いの充実について述べられている。

我が国の歴史の大きな流れの理解のために，その背景となる世界の歴史の扱いを充実させた。例えば，内容の(2)のアで世界の古代文明や宗教のおこりに関する学習を充実させたり，近現代の欧米諸国のアジア進出を独立の中項目(5)アとして構成したり，第二次世界大戦後の学習内容に冷戦やその終結を位置付けたりした。また，国際関係が重きを占める近現代の学習を重視することで，我が国の歴史の展開を世界の動きと一層関連付けて学習するようにした。

この点は，日本の歴史の理解のためには，世界との関係が必要だというスタンスを踏襲し，それを充実させている。この点からは，今求められる「日本国民の教養」としての日本と世界という関係も見受けられる。

高等学校の地理歴史科における必履修との関連で，全国民が，日本の歴史を通史的に学ぶ場は中学校しかないという，教育課程編成上の問題もある。その中学校では，歴史的分

野に 130 単位時間しか配当されない。「世界の歴史」よりも「我が国の歴史の展開」が優先されるのである。

3. 新指導要領社会科歴史的分野における資質育成の論理

あくまでも「国民」の育成を主眼とした歴史学習である。現在における「日本国民」には，我が国の歴史の大きな流れと伝統と文化の特色の理解が必要である。また，国際社会の一員である「日本国民」には，国際協調の精神を養うことが必要である。このような考え方を基本としている。ここで，とどまっていては，グローバル・シティズンシップの育成の可能性は低くなる。これは，国民教育（国家の教育政策）としての歴史学習の限界であろう。

しかしながら，「国民」はグローバル・シティズンシップではないのか？という疑問が生まれてくる。「ナショナル」は「グローバル」の対概念なのであろうか？そのようにとらえれば，帰属性を前提とする歴史学習においてグローバル・シティズンシップの育成は，そもそも不可能と言えるのではないか。

筆者は，「グローバル」のもつ傘概念としての性格をもっと積極的にとらえるべきと主張したい。そうすれば，歴史学習においてグローバル・シティズンシップの育成は可能となる。傘概念はその中に多用な様相を持つ下位概念をたくさん有し，多様であり，それらに対して寛容であるという状態であるととらえている。グローバル・シティズンシップを固定化したものととらえると，育成すべき資質の看板が異なるだけで，育成論理は新指導要領とかわらない。

4. 歴史学習におけるグローバル・シティズンシップ育成の可能性

フレキシブル・シティズンシップ(Flexible Citizenship)なる概念を核にして，育成しようとする「国民」とグローバル・シティズンシップの位置付けを考えていく。その次に，社会認識教育におけるカリキュラム構成の視点でも可能性を考察する。

(1)「国民」とグローバル・シティズンシップ

カリフォルニア大学バークレー校の文化人類学者である Dr. Aihwa ONG は，理論的かつ実証的研究を通じて，フレキシブル・シティズンシップ(Flexible Citizenship)なる概念を提示している。この概念は，最近の米国における，Citizenship Education や社会科教育，多文化教育，グローバル教育等に影響を及ぼしつつある。(Dr. ONG 著書や分担執筆は〔参考文献〕参照。）筆者は，このフレキシブル・シティズンシップを新たな概念として捉えるのではなく，もともと存在していたものと捉える必要があると考える。それを言語化できたために注目を浴びるようになったと考えている。それは，アイデンティティ内の多様性とその柔軟性を言語化しているとも考えられるからである。

①Aihwa ONG の問題意識，研究対象

編著 2.-(3)には，次のように紹介されている。

UCバークレーの文化人類学，東南アジア研究の教授。彼女は東南アジア，中国南部，カリフォルニアでのフィールドワークを行ってきた。彼女は，現在，アジアの都市における政治(government)，危機，安全保障に関心を抱いている。

②Dr. Aihwa ONG のフレキシブル・シティズンシップ

Dr. ONG は，資本主義経済における「越境している人々」を取り上げ，その人たちの「トランスナショナリズム」と「変容」の関係を考察している。その際，中国，特に在外中国人たちを研究してきた。彼女の分析が示唆しているのは，越境人，例えば，中国人という範疇においてトランスナショナルな一員である在外中国人たちの，複雑でありながら，「順応的な」帰属意識である。

トランスナショナルな移動とネットワークは，地域に文化を形作り，個人に新たなアイデンティティを形成する。この２点は，国家戦略の転換において鍵となる重要なものであった。在外中国人が歴史的に中国と移動先国との顕著な関係を維持し続けたからだけではない。重要なのは，この在外のもつ移動性や順応性は，ただ単に中国人であるということに留まらないことである。それは，「市民」の概念の新しい理解をも促すのである。これは，現代の国民性の概念から，ある程度の地理的・歴史的な境界を有する新しい「〇〇人性」のようなものの到来を指摘できるのである。このような，「〇〇人性」を幾重にも内在させ，それをその場に「順応しながら」，「柔軟に」表出させているのである。

③グローバル教育への示唆

今までの，グローバル教育は，グローバル化社会への対応，社会のグローバル化を議論してきた。そして，そこに求められる市民，あるいは，市民性を議論してきた。比喩的に言えば，「グローバル教育としての市民教育」といえよう。Dr. ONG の考えから，市民の確立による社会の構築，並びに，個の絶対的自由（愛国心を絶対視する自由を含む）におけるグローバル化の構築を読み取ることができる。比喩的に言えば，「市民教育としてのグローバル教育」といえよう。

フレキシブル・シティズンシップとは，様々な国家で活動する人々の実態を調査する中で言語化された概念である。ここでいう「フレキシブル」とは，しなやかな，融通の利く，順応性のある，などの意味である。それは，複数の様相を同時に「体内に」もっていることが前提なのである。シティズンシップにおける帰属性を考える場合，重要な概念となる。しかしながら，大勢・体制に順応するという意味ではなく，その場その場の視野(Perspective)で考え，行動できるということである。本当にフレキシブルであるためには，全体がみえていることと，(比喩的であるが・・)「コア」がしっかりしていることである。

その「コア」を，新指導要領（に代表される伝統的な国民教育）での歴史学習は，当然ながら「国民」に求めていると解釈できる。それは，フレキシブルなグローバル・シティズンシップの一つの型となりうるのではないか。その場合，「国民」以外の様相をもちうる多様性と，それらを柔軟に行き来できる思考を保証する必要がある。

(2) 社会認識教育におけるカリキュラム構成

フレキシブルなグローバル・シティズンシップの「コア」として「国民」の育成を歴史的分野が目指すと考える。社会科における他分野では，他の「コア」が可能であろうか。例えば，地理的分野において「地域人」や「国際人」を「コア」ととらえているのであろうか。あるいは，公民的分野において各帰属性を行き来するような内容になっているのであろうか。小学校においてはどうであろうか。高等学校ではどうであろうか。社会科をはじめとする社会認識教育においては，「コア」の差からカリキュラム構成を再検討する必要があると考える。それはまた，グローバル教育の内容を再構築する手立てにもなるのであろう。

グローバル教育において，多様性と寛容の重要性は主張されてきた。しかし，それをつないでいく関係性を視野に入れなければ多様性と寛容の意味は半減する。又，現実的でなくなる。人間は様々な関係の中で生きる社会的存在であるという考え方を重視する必要がある。その関係の中の，何に，どれぐらい重きを置くかにより，その人のその時点でのアイデンティティが生まれる。多様な様相は個人内では，根底で繋がっているものと考えるべきであろう。それを，別個のものと考えたり，対立概念とみなすと，例えば，「国民」かグローバル・シティズンシップかという択一的な状態を生み出す。何に重きを置くかは異なるが，人間の持つ多様な関係性を断ち切っていく点では共通している。人間社会の関係をみ，考えていくことで，深い社会認識を通して，個人内に多様な関係間の拮抗状態をつくることができる。この拮抗状態でアイデンティティは健全に保持される。その拮抗状態を必要に応じて変化させるのがフレキシブルであるということであろう。

5. 新指導要領社会科歴史的分野におけるグローバル・シティズンシップ育成の可能性

フレキシブルなグローバル・シティズンシップ育成の視点において重要なのは，「日本と世界」という問題（「我が国の歴史の背景となる世界の歴史の充実」）よりも，「歴史のとらえ方」と所謂日本の歴史の通史的構成部分という二元論を新指導要領が採用していることを評価することである。「歴史のとらえ方」の中に，次のような中項目がある。

（内容）
イ　身近な地域の歴史を調べる活動を通して，地域への関心を高め地域の具体的な事柄とのかかわりの中で我が国の歴史を理解させるとともに，受け継がれてきた伝統や文化への関心を高め，歴史の学び方を身に付けさせる。
（内容の取扱い）
イ　イについては，内容の (2) 以下とかかわらせて計画的に実施し，地域の特性に応じた時代を取り上げるようにするとともに，人々の生活や生活に根ざした伝統や文化に着目した取扱いを工夫すること。その際，博物館，郷土資料館などの施設の活用や地域の人々の協力も考慮すること。

特に，受け継がれてきた伝統や文化への関心を，地域の具体的な事柄における学習と関連させようということを読みとることができる。今回の改訂の要点のエ「様々な伝統や文化の学習の重視」にあるように，（深読みであろうが・・・）わざわざ教育基本法には付いていない「様々な」という文言をつけている。また，人々の生活や生活に根ざした文化という文言もある。

この「様々な」の発想を，地域の歴史と日本の歴史の通史的構成とに生かすことができれば，歴史の多様性を保証することにつながる。それは，単調な「伝統と文化」という幻想に支配されない現実からのアプローチになっていくのではないか。ただし，武道や茶道，華道などの，日本の「伝統と文化」だと広く認識されているものを否定するのではない。それを，one of them　と捉えられる思考の重要性を主張しているのである。グローバル・シティズンシップ育成の可能性から，地域の歴史の学習は，重要な意味を持つと考える。

〔参考文献〕

Dr. Aihwa ONG の代表的著作（1.単著，2.編著，3.著書分担執筆，4.論文）

1.-(1) Aihwa ONG, *SPIRITS OF RESISTANCE AND CAPITALIST DISCIPLINE —Factory Women in Malaysia* —,State University of New York Press, 1987.

1.-(2) Aihwa ONG, *FLEXIBLE CITIZENSHIP —The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*—, Duke University Press,1999.（ドイツ語訳有）

1.-(3) Aihwa ONG, *BUDDHA IS HIDING —Refugees, citizenship, the new America*—, University of California Press, 2003.（イタリア語訳有）

1.-(4) *NEOLIBERALISM AS EXCEPTION —Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*—, Duke University Press, 2006.

2.-(1) Aihwa ONG and Michael G. PELETZ, editied, *BEWITCHING WOMEN, PIOUS MEN —Gender and Body Politics in Southeast Asia*—, University of California Press, 1995.
2.-(2) Aihwa ONG and Donald NONINI, editied, *UNGROUNDED EMPIRES —The Cultural Politics of Modern Chinese Transnationalism*—, Routledge, 1997.
2.-(3) Aihwa ONG and Stephen J. COLLOER editied, *GLOBAL ASSEMBLAGES —Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*—, Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
3.-(1) Modernity, Anthropological Aspects. in *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol.15, editied by Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, Oxford: Pergamon, 2001, pp.9944- 9949.
3.-(2) "Higher Learning: Educational Availability and Flexible Citizenship in Global Space" in *Diversity and Citizenship Education*, edited by James A. Banks, Wiley, 2003, pp.49-70.
4.-(1) "Muslim Feminists in the Shelter of Corporate Islam" *Citizenship Studies* 3(3), 1999,pp.355-371.
4.-(2) "Graduated Sovereignty in Southeast Asia" *Theory, Culture, and Society* 17(4),2000, pp.55-75.
4.-(3) "Cyberpublics and Diaspora Politics among Transnational Chinese", *Interventions* 5 (1), 2003, pp.82- 100.
4.-(4) "The Chinese Axis: Zoning Technologies and Variegated Sovereignty" *Journal of East Asian Studies* 4, 2004, pp.69-96.
4.-(5) "Experiments with Freedom: Milieus of the Human" *American Literary History*, 2006.

1.-(2) は，2000 年，アメリカ民族学会賞(Senior Prize, American Ethnological Association)を，そして，2001 年，アジア系アメリカ人研究学会カルチュラル・スタディーズ賞を受賞(Winner of the Association for Asian American Studies Cultural Studies Book Award)している。

3.-(2) は，自身が提起した概念であるフレキシブル・シティズンシップの育成と教育における有効性を論じたものである。

〔Aihwa ONG 著以外の主要参考文献〕

・NCSS, NCSS Position Statement on Global Education. *Social Education*，Vol. 46, No.1, 1982, pp. 36-37.

・Michael WALZER, *What It Means To Be An American*, Marsilio Editori S.P.A., 1992.
（マイケル・ウォルツァー著，古茂田宏訳『Minerva 歴史・文化ライブラリー７　アメリカ人であるとはどういうことか—歴史的自己省察の試み—』ミネルヴァ書房，2006.）
・Walter C. PARKER, *TEACHING DEMOCRACY: Unity and Diversity in Public Life*, Teachers College Press, 2003.
・James A. BANKS(edited.),*DIVERSITY AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: Global Perspectives*, Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint, 2004.
・James A. BANKS and others, *DEMOCRACY AND DIVERSITY* —*Principles and Concepts for Educating Citizens in a Global Age*—, Center for Multicultural Education, College of Education, University of Washington, 2005.
（ジェームズ・A・バンクス他著，平沢安政訳『明石ライブラリー87　民主主義と多文化　教育—グローバル化時代における市民性教育のための原則と概念—』明石書店，2005.）
・魚住忠久「21 世紀地球社会の可能性とグローバル教育」『グローバル教育』創刊号，1998 年，pp. 6～21.
・三浦軍三『米国の公民育成研究』東洋館出版，2004 年.
・日本グローバル教育学会編『グローバル教育の理論と実践』教育開発研究所，2007 年.

"Global Citizenship" and the "International Education" Movement: A Case Study of U.S. Schools Today*

Walter C. Parker, University of Washington

Paper presented at Kobe University, November 2008

Abstract

Terms such as "global citizenship," "world citizen," and "education for our new global economy" are used with frequency today. This study examines the new "international education" movement in U.S. public schools. Increasingly, U.S. public schools are adopting "international education." I asked "What is it?" and found a jumble of meanings and programs. Contradictory forces, such as nationalism and cosmopolitanism, are at play.

I. Introduction

Not far from my home in Seattle is a public elementary school that closed for a thorough remodeling and re-opened amid fanfare with "international" in its new name and dual language immersion as its focus. Several years later, the middle school nearby added "international" to its name, too, with "global perspective" as its focus. Across town, a distressed high school was divided into small schools, and one of them became the "global studies academy." Two other city high schools have added the International Baccalaureate.

These are not unusual events, which is my first point. A new "international education" movement—actually a new wave of an old movement—is underway across the United States. It consists of newly internationalized public schools along with state coalitions for international education, an annual International Education Week co-sponsored by the U.S. Departments of State and Education, an array of language initiatives, the Goldman Sachs Foundation's awards for exemplary "international" schools, and more. Phrases like "the global economy," "our increasingly interconnected world," and "global citizens" roll off many tongues. Audiences nod their heads knowingly. Indeed, "international education" is the new common sense.[1]

---

*A short version of this paper appears in the journal *Phi Delta Kappan* (November 2009).

[1] See Clifford Geertz, "Common sense as a cultural system," in C. Geertz (Ed.), *Local knowledge* (pp. 73-93) (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

But what does it mean? What forms is it taking, and what work is it doing? This is my question. I have studied the current wave from three angles: observing a handful of public schools that have transformed themselves into "international" schools, interviewing movement activists who are helping to shape them, and examining government and foundation initiatives.[2]

Before proceeding, I should clarify two things. First, this study is a continuation of my interest in democratic citizenship education. I am wanting to know if the "international education" movement has any connection to citizenship education—if, for example, the rhetoric of "global citizenship" has any real meaning in the movement.

Second, I should clarify that the "international education" is nothing new. The current commotion is the latest instance of a perennial concern in education. Just since World War II there have been at least two waves of activity in the U.S.—today's and another that began in the 1960s. Before that, between the two world wars, was a surge of activity centered on the World Conference on Education in Geneva in 1929; and still earlier, in 1893, was the International Education Congress of the Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Indeed, there is a sizeable literature—documentary, analytic, and historical—on "international education," and one can only conclude that it has concerned educators and government officials for as long as there have been nations and their schools.[3]

II. National Security

National security appears to be the main engine of today's international education movement in the U.S. It is the movement's strong discourse. Discourse is language-in-use, or

---

[2] Methodological note: I captured a three-pronged sample of the current movement, certainly not its entirety. Discourse and frame analysis were the principal analytic tools: In each instance of "international education" examined in my samples of schools, activists, and media, I searched for problem frames, solution frames, and motivational (urgency) frames, and I deployed four methodological resources: A. Binder, *Contentious curricula* (Princeton University Press, 2002); R. Eyerman and A. Jamison, *Social movements: A cognitive approach* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991); M. Foucault, *The order of things: an archeology of the human sciences* (New York: Vintage, 1970); and R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (London: Sage, 2001). My thanks to Susan Mosborg and Steven Camicia for their able assistance.

[3] See these examples: L. F. Anderson, "An examination of the structure and objectives of international education," *Social Education, 35*(7), 1968, pp. 639-652; J. M. Becker, *An examination of goals, needs, and priorities in international education in U.S. secondary and elementary schools* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969); R. Case, "Key elements of a global perspective," *Social Education, 57*(6), 1993, pp. 318-325; D. G. Scanlon, "Pioneers of international education, 1817 to 1914," *Teachers College Record, 60*(4), 1959, pp. 209-219; R. Sylvester, "Mapping international education: a historical survey 1893-1944," *Journal of Research in International Education, 1*(1), 2002, pp. 91-125; and B. B. Tye & K. A. Tye, *Global education: a study of school change* (State University of New York Press, 1992). Of course, any demarcation of "waves," like other attempts to periodize history, is an interpretive act over which there is much disagreement.

working language. It refers to the way language rules operate in relation to social circumstances and structures. Language has effects—it gets things done. It doesn't simply convey meanings; it makes meanings, reinforcing some and discarding others. A "strong" discourse drowns out its competitors, pushing aside other ways of speaking, listening, being heard, and making sense. In a hospital, *medicine* is the strong discourse. Whether you're a patient, nurse, physician, or visitor, it is medicine's vocabulary, conceptual apparatus, view of the world, and way of behaving that lord over the scene. Someone who introduces shamanism, witchcraft, or faith healing won't get far. Similarly, in a mental hospital, the strong discourse is *psychiatry*; in a temple of worship, it is *faith* and *theism*; in a corporation it is *growth* and *the bottom line*.

To those who assumed that world mindedness, global citizenship, intercultural understanding, or something of that sort was driving the movement, this may come as a surprise. *Today's wave is dominated by nationalism.*[4]

International education as a national security discourse has two key dimensions: economic and military. The economic way to secure the nation is to improve the nation's economic competitiveness with other nations — maintaining it or regaining it if it already has been lost. The military way is to strengthen the nation's armed forces, including its intelligence communities.

II – A. Economic Security

U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings makes the economic argument for international education. "Through the No Child Left Behind Act, we are committed to having every child in the United States learn and succeed in our global economy. . . ."[5] She links school reform directly to success in today's world and defines that success in economic terms; school reform is a technology for accomplishing that goal.

The link is also expressed in a burgeoning number of state reports. For example, according to *North Carolina in the World: Increasing Student Knowledge and Skills About the World,* "Improving international education is about providing students the best opportunity for success in the emerging workforce."[6] Similarly, the Asia Society's annual conference "brings

---

4

5 "International Education Week 2005 Announced," http://usinfo.state.gov/scv/Archive/2005/Nov/09-19221.html.

6 North Carolina in the World, *North Carolina in the World: Increasing Student Knowledge and Skills About the World* (Raleigh: Center for International Understanding, 2005).

together high-level delegates from two dozen states. . . to address a significant problem in American education: the wide gap between the growing economic and strategic importance of Asia and other world regions to the United States, and U.S. students' limited knowledge about the world outside our borders."[7]

In each of these, international education is positioned to address a key problem posed by globalization: the defense of the nation's competitive edge in the new "flat" worldwide economy of the 21st century.[8] Schools are seen as *the* solution. Only they can produce the "enterprising individuals" who will be successful in this flat new world.[9] This is the calculus of neoliberalism (free-market fundamentalism), with its strategies of privatization, entrepreneurship, and free-trade agreements.[10] Without it America will lose its edge to Dublin, Beijing, or Bangalore; or if lost already, never regain it.

This is plainly put in the influential report from the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, urgently titled *Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future*. This excerpt frames the problem (competition in a flat world) and the urgency (impending loss of leadership) of finding a solution:

> Thanks to globalization, driven by modern communications and other advances, workers in virtually every sector must now face competitors who live just a mouse-click away in Ireland, Finland, China, India, or dozens of other nations whose economies are growing. This has been aptly referred to as 'the Death of Distance.' . . . The committee is deeply concerned that the scientific and technological building blocks critical to our economic leadership are eroding at a time when many other nations are gathering strength. . . . Although many people assume that the United States will always be a world leader in science and technology, this may not continue to be the case inasmuch as great minds and ideas exist throughout the world. We fear the abruptness with which a lead in science and

[7] www.internationaled.org/statesinstitute.htm.
[8] Thomas L. Friedman, *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the 21st Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005).
[9] Brian J. Caldwell, "The New Enterprise Logic of Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan*, November 2005, pp. 223-25.
[10] David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

> technology can be lost — and the difficulty of recovering a lead once lost, if indeed it can be regained at all.[11]

Gathering Storm then moves to solutions. The first among four is K-12 education: "Enlarge the pipeline of students who are prepared to enter college and graduate with a degree in science, engineering, or mathematics by increasing the number of students who pass AP (Advanced Placement) and IB (International Baccalaureate) science and mathematics courses."[12]

II – B. Military Security

The military dimension to the national security argument is framed as a communication problem: we don't know our new enemies' languages.

In 2003, Rep. Rush Holt (D-New Jersey) expressed this in the National Security Language Act: "We need to do more to make sure that America has the language professionals necessary to defend our national security. . . . Changing our (armed forces) recruiting methods alone will not solve the problem. To meet new security needs, we need to create a new domestic pool of foreign language experts and we can only do that by investing in the classroom. . . in foreign languages of critical need, such as Arabic, Persian, Korean, Pashto, and Chinese." Later came Congressional Resolution No. 100 of 2005, which urged the U.S. to "establish an international education policy" that would "promote a world free of terrorism, further United States foreign policy and national security, and enhance [U.S.] leadership in the world.' "

In 2006, President George W. Bush himself introduced the National Security Language Initiative, which would provide $114 million for the "teaching of language for national security and global competitiveness."[13] In his speech, the President laid out a combined front for the "war on terror" composed of a language-proficient military, language-proficient intelligence network, and language-proficient diplomatic corps that are able to "convince governments" in their own language, and a language-proficient American people who, all together, can participate with greater effect in "spreading freedom."

[11] Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future (Executive Summary)* (Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2007), pp. 1-3, www.nap.edu.
[12] Ibid., p. 6.
[13] www.state.gov/r/summit/.

So, at least two national security arguments are at play in the current international education movement. Both are urgent — one with economic threat, one with military threat — and they overlap.

III. "Schools Are Broken"

The popular belief that the school system is broken also fuels the international education movement. This is a discourse of derision, and it tirelessly broadcasts the claim that public schools are failing to educate students for life in the new flat world.

The national security and school failure discourses are connected. Consider this statement from Operation Public Education, a reform project geared to "transforming America's schools" so as to respond to "the challenge of human capital development" in the intensely competitive "level playing field of the global economy."[14]

> Terrorism and the war in Iraq are high on the list of the nation's concerns, but the greatest danger facing America is, as (former IBM chairman) Louis Gerstner recognized, the challenge of human capital development. Our nation's public schools, the foundation for this effort, are still failing far too many of our children despite an investment of some $500 billion annually.[15]

The author, an advisor to the Secretary of Education, continues by reminding readers that "sadly, we've known about this threat for quite some time." His reference point is the 1983 report *A Nation at Risk,* which claimed that the "mediocrity" of our schools was so profound that had it been imposed by "an unfriendly foreign power, we might well have viewed it as an act of war."[16]

This is an urgent crisis-and-salvation narrative. The crisis story is that schools are failing miserably to educate students for the new world order. The salvation story is that only schools can rescue the nation. It is a simple formula: schools caused the crisis and schools can solve it.

There is no small amount of magical thinking in the claim that schools can save society, since schools themselves are embedded in society. Schools are not autonomous agents outside

---

[14] Theodore Hershberg, "Value-Added Assessment and Systemic Reform: A Response to the Challenge of Human Capital Development," *Phi Delta Kappan,* December 2005, pp. 276-83.
[15] Ibid., p. 276.
[16] National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (Washington, D.C., 1983), p. 1.

the fray, steering society in this or that direction. They are more its caboose than its engine. Lawrence Cremin, the historian of American education, observed that this formula — he called it a "device" — has been used repeatedly across the nearly two centuries of our education system. It was used by proponents of vocational education in the early years of the 20th century, by the post-Sputnik proponents of math and science education in the 1950s, in the 1980s by *A Nation at Risk*, and now, apparently, by the international education movement. "To contend that problems of international competitiveness can be solved by educational reform," Cremin wrote, "especially educational reform defined solely as *school* reform, is not merely utopian and millennialist, it is at best a foolish and at worst a crass effort to direct attention away from those truly responsible for doing something about competitiveness."[17]

IV. Marginal Voices

While the strong discourses of national security and school failure may together dominate the movement, they don't push other meanings and programs clear off the curriculum planning table. At the edges of that table, and closer to the ground of school practice, are other interpretations of both the problem and the solution. I found three. One, *global perspective,* gives international education a transnational cultural meaning; another, *cosmopolitanism*, gives it a transnational political meaning; a third, *student body,* gives it a cultural meaning again, but in a decidedly local, student-centered way.

IV – A. Global Perspective

The first of these emerged in the 1960s during an earlier wave of excitement about international education. In 1965, Congress passed the International Education Act. In 1969, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare published an influential report that called for developing the capacity of students "to view the world system as a whole," to comprehend "the interrelatedness of the human species *qua* species," and to think in ways that are "free from the influence of ethnocentric perceptions."[18]

---

[17] Lawrence A. Cremin, *Popular Education and Its Discontents* (New York: HarperCollins, 1990), p. 103.
[18] James M. Becker, *An Examination of the Goals, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in U.S. Secondary and Elementary Schools* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969), pp. 268, 271.

The wave's high-water mark came in 1978 with the publication of Robert Hanvey's *An Attainable Global Perspective*, which argued for a transition from "pre-global" to "global consciousness." That meant understanding that we live in an interconnected world and developing what Hanvey called "perspective consciousness." Hanvey suggested that students needed to learn about political, ecological, economic, and cultural connections by studying problems that cut across national boundaries. "Perspective consciousness" was "the awareness on the part of the individual that he or she has a view of the world that is not universally shared, that this view of the world has been and continues to be shaped by influences that often escape conscious detection, and that others have views of the world that are profoundly different from one's own."[19]

The Reagan administration dealt a direct blow to this era of international education in the 1980s, a decade that saw fierce contests over the meaning of "international" and "global" in schools. A 1986 U.S. Department of Education report, "Blowing the Whistle on Global Education," accused the movement of pacifism, anti-capitalism, and capitulation to foreign enemies.[20]

The discourse of global perspective has resurfaced into today's movement as a re-scaling of "multicultural education" from the nation to the globe. Knowledge, recognition, and respect for diverse cultures are taken out of the national container and extended to peoples everywhere. This approach wants to tackle the cultural provincialism and exceptionalism of American society along with high school graduates' slim knowledge of the world.

Here is an example of how this discourse shows up in today's movement. Teachers at one new public "international" middle school embrace "global perspective" as the school mission. On the school's web site, they display their objectives. Both perspective consciousness and the interconnectedness of the world system are evident:

1. Global Challenges: Examine and evaluate global issues, problems, and challenges (e.g., students understand that global issues and challenges are interrelated, complex, and changing, and that most issues have a global dimension).

[19] Robert G. Hanvey, *An Attainable Global Perspective* (New York: Center for Global Perspectives, 1978), p. 5.
[20] Gregg L. Cunningham, *Blowing the Whistle on Global Education* (Denver: Regional Office, United States Department of Education, 1986).

2. Culture and World Areas: Study human differences and commonalities (e.g., students understand that members of different cultures view the world in different ways).
3. Global Connections: Analyze the connections between the United States and the world (e.g., students can describe how they are connected with the world historically, politically, economically, technologically, socially, linguistically, and ecologically).

IV – B. Cosmopolitanism

Another marginal discourse for international education boldly shifts territory to global citizenship and, in so doing, raises questions about loyalty and identity.

In contrast to putting the nation first, cosmopolitanism puts humanity and Earth first. In a brief essay that has drawn wide attention, University of Chicago ethicist Martha Nussbaum proposes a cosmopolitan education for students in American schools. She wants to transform civic education so that children are taught not that they are, above all, citizens of the United States and stewards of its interests, but that "they are, above all, citizens of a world of human beings."[21]

To identify oneself as a citizen of the world breaks the old habit of loyalty to a nation and being defined primarily or solely by local origins and membership. That frees us, she argues (quoting Seneca), to dwell instead "in two communities — the local community of our birth and the community of human argument and aspiration that 'is truly great and truly common, in which we look neither to this corner nor to that, but measure the boundaries of our nation by the sun.'"[22]

If the global perspective approach to international education takes *cultural* education beyond the national container, cosmopolitanism does the same for *political* education. It tackles not only the problems of American provincialism and exceptionalism, but also *nationalism*. World citizenship, after all, is more a political than a cultural concept. In most states, students are required to recite the Pledge of Allegiance (to the nation, of course). The cosmopolitan school board member will ask why students aren't pledging allegiance to the larger civic community: the human family. One school may express this by quietly dropping the morning pledge ritual;

[21] Martha C. Nussbaum, *For Love of Country?* (Boston: Beacon, 2002), p. 6. See also Joel Spring's cosmopolitan proposal in *A New Paradigm for Global School Systems: Education for a Long and Happy Life* (Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2007); and the study by Katharyne Mitchell and Walter C. Parker, "I Pledge Allegiance To. . . : Flexible Citizenship and Shifting Scales of Belonging," *Teachers College Record*, 2008, pp. 775-804.
[22] Ibid., p. 7.

another by adding a second, cosmopolitan pledge; another by stronger forms of environmental education, teaching a course on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or introducing students to the International Red Cross curriculum on international humanitarian law.

IV – C. International Student Body

A third marginal approach returns the meaning of international education to culture but, in contrast to the global perspective, focuses squarely on the cultural composition of the school's student body. Some public "international" high schools serving high-need students in resource-starved urban areas have created a form of international education built on the demographic tapestry of the student body. Immigrant students, some of them refugees, add a new kind of diversity to the schools' already diverse populations. School leaders creatively seize the opportunity and claim theirs are international schools because they have an international student body.

Culture fairs showcase students' home cultures. English language learning is advanced as a central mission of the school and is, in effect, reframed as international education. The stresses on such schools — financial, the discourse of school failure, institutional racism — contribute to this reframing. "International education" can be deployed to mobilize new resources and media attention and, as one parent activist told me, "to attract market share back to the public schools."

The main emphasis of the approach, as a district superintendent said, "is making students and teachers aware of the diversity within their midst and finding ways to help them value that and trace that to wherever it originated." He continued:

> Being a magnet for so many different kids to come together seems to me to be an advantage. . . . You can't avoid it. The kids are going to experience it on the playground, they're going to experience it in the classroom, in the lunchroom, on the bus. They're going to see kids who are different from them. It becomes almost a way of living. Even though kids may never leave this city, the world has come to them.[23]

V. Conclusion: A Solution on the Loose

[23] Walter C. Parker and Stephen P. Camicia, "The New 'International Education' Movement in U.S. Schools: Civic and Capital Intents, Local and Global Affinities." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 2008.

International education today is a broad movement containing, even in my limited study, a disparate mix of meanings and motives. It is being deployed to bolster the nation's economic and military defenses, to liberate multiculturalism from its national container, to promote world citizenship, and, in some urban schools, to take advantage of a vibrant immigrant population. These are a handful of the alternatives curriculum planners will encounter when they consider how to "internationalize" school programs. The first two add up to a national security discourse, which is backed by no less than the federal government, major foundations, the National Academies, and the popular belief that the school system is broken. The other three aim in different directions and are peripheral by virtue of lacking this kind of institutional power to advance their goals. I have painted these five only in the broadest strokes, and no doubt there are more.

Table 1

Some strong and weak meanings of "International Education" in U.S. schools today

- economic competitiveness: "International" education will revitalize the school system while ensuring that the U.S. will retain (or if already lost, regain) its competitive edge in the new "flat" global economy. Science and math are priorities.
- military readiness: Teaching strategic languages in schools, K-12, will "make sure that America has the language professionals necessary to defend our national security" (National Security Language Act, 2003). Mandarin and Arabic are priorities.
- global perspective: Rather than only knowing and respecting diversity within our nation, students should know and respect the multitude of cultures on Earth. Multiculturalism is re-scaled from the nation to the globe, and some attention is paid to global connections and systems.
- cosmopolitanism: It is time to shift students' primary allegiance and locus of concern from the nation to the human family and Earth—from national citizen to global citizen. Some versions trumpet "multiple identities" (national, ethnic, and global), others shift fully to global humanity.
- student body: Immigration is putting the world in the classrooms, hallways, cafeteria, and playground. Seizing the opportunity, an "international" school is formed on the basis of its "international" student body. The cultural and linguistic diversity of students is prioritized.

The multiple discourses at play under the name "international education," some powerful, some weak, provide educators with a golden opportunity: to decide how best to prepare children and youth for a changing world. They can spread out the alternatives, weigh them against one another, and determine which one or two, or some hybrid, shall stand as "international education."

Deeply held values are woven into each of the alternatives, including conflicting understandings of patriotism and competing visions of what schools are for. Disagreement is inevitable. Voting against House Bill 266 in Utah, which would have provided more funding for the IB program in Utah's schools, Sen. Margaret Dayton said she is "opposed to the anti-American philosophy that's somehow woven into all the classes as they promote the U.N. agenda." Aligning herself with the first of the two national security discourses and clearly against cosmopolitanism, she clarified: "I would like to have *American citizens* who know how to function in a global economy, not *global citizens*."[24] Sen. Dayton's antipathy to IB is in stark contrast to the National Academies' support for it, but *both* operate within the strong discourse of economic competitiveness.

Is "international education" anchored somewhere? The short answer, looking through the window opened here, is "no." It would be an oversimplification to assert that international education In the United States today is nothing but a continuation of national defense education under a misleading name. It is partly and strongly that, to be sure, but more accurate is to portray the movement as plural and discordant. There are multiple meanings and practices underwritten by multiple ideologies, and there is plenty of hype. International education in U.S. schools today is a solution on the loose; it solves a variety of problems, serves an array of masters, and expresses diverse and often conflicting values. There is no coherence to the movement, only an illusion conjured by the common use of a name.

That nationalism plays a starring role really shouldn't surprise readers who, like me, were expecting the movement's centerpiece to be something different. As historians have made abundantly clear, public schools everywhere have routinely served national purposes.[25] In a nation's early years, the school system typically is devoted to developing a national community unified by common beliefs and customs. Later, the system turns to reproducing these in subsequent generations and making adjustments that are deemed necessary. International education is caught up in this pattern. As economist Kenneth Boulding observed during that earlier 1960s wave, the challenge is to

---

[24] Quoted in Ben Fulton, "Worldly Program Gets Avid Support," *Salt Lake Tribune*, 23 February 2008, pp. A1, A6.
[25] Andy Green, *Education and State Formation: The Rise of Education Systems in England, France and the USA* (London: Macmillan, 1990).

> develop an image of the world system which is at the same time realistic and also not threatening to the folk cultures within which the school systems are embedded; for if educators do not find a palatable formula, the 'folk' will revolt and seek to divert formal education once again into traditional channels.[26]

Because my sample of schools, activists, and media was limited and not random, the findings reported here cannot be generalized to the entirety of the current "international education" movement in U.S. schools. My interest was to find and clarify a set of actually-existing alternatives in hopes of expanding the universe of possibilities that educators might consider when deciding what curricular action to take. Only with some clarity about the various and at times conflicting aims of so-called "international education" can they hope to make wise curriculum decisions. Ultimately, my purpose here was to create space for thinking seriously about how education about the world is proceeding, and might otherwise proceed, in the public schools of the U.S. and other nations. Must citizenship education be forever tied to the nation-state? Can it be re-scaled to the world? These are my closing questions.

Walter C. Parker is Professor of Education and Adjunct Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington. His books include *Renewing the Social Studies* Curriculum (ASCD, 1991), *Educating the Democratic Mind* (State University of New York Press, 1996), *Education for Democracy* (Information Age, 2002), *Teaching Democracy* (Teachers College Press, 2003) and *Social Studies in Elementary Education* 13th ed. (Allyn & Bacon, 2009). Forthcoming from Routledge is *Social Studies Today: Research and Practice*.

[26] Kenneth Boulding, "Education for Spaceship Earth," *Social Education,* November 1968, p. 650.

Developing Citizenship Skills through Deliberative Discussions: Exploring a Practice/Action Distinction

Carol J. Coe, University of Washington

Paper presented at Kobe University, November 2008

Abstract

To function effectively, a democratic society needs a knowledgeable and skilled citizenry. Public schools in the United States are charged with meeting this demand. But how best to do so? This paper explores one possible avenue, the use of deliberative discussions in the high school classroom. In an effort to better understand the deliberative process, I conducted a comparative case study of two types of deliberative discussions: deliberations used primarily for skill development or practice and deliberations used primarily to decide a course of action. Two questions provide the focus for this research: (1) What differences, if any, are there between deliberations that are used for practice (to build democratic skills) and deliberations that are used not only to build democratic skills but also to take action (to decide and implement policy)? (2) Does the oral impotence of a "practice-only" deliberation or the oral empowerment of a "practice-and-action" deliberation make a difference to students? The results of this study inform our understanding of the deliberative process in general and the practice/action distinction in particular.

I. Introduction: A Dearth of Discussion

John Hughes' 1986 film "Ferris Bueller's Day Off" is a classic satire of the American high school. One scene depicts a particularly grotesque classroom. Student apathy is pervasive. The well-meaning but pedagogically challenged teacher tries to engage his students in discussion. Failing to get any responders to his plea ("Anyone? Anyone?"), time after time he ends up answering his own questions. Ferris Bueller's classroom, though fictional, is not the kind of educational environment that we want for our students. Instead we hope for classrooms in which a lively exchange of ideas is a common occurrence. Rather than a room filled by the monotone droning of a teacher and the stultifying silence of students, we hope for an atmosphere of eager engagement in which diverse opinions and multiple ideas provide solid evidence that democratic skill building and citizen preparation are underway. At least at an intuitive level academics and educators agree that deliberative discussion, when used effectively, can promote learning.

But is the absence of lively classroom discussions problematic? Some scholars would claim it is, suggesting that our democratic form of government requires a citizenry trained in effective ways to talk (Allen, Gibson, 2001). Parker (1989) posits that "[o]pen, free, authentic talk is the coin

of participatory citizenship" (p. 354), so without discussion among its citizens, democracy degenerates. Parker makes clear that asking students to engage in deliberative discussions of controversial issues is one of the most rigorous forms of education available and one of the best preparations for "the reasoned argumentation of democratic living" (Parker, 2005, p. 350).

Support for moving beyond a stand-and-deliver pedagogy and its accompanying student passivity can be found in the work of progressive educators and their belief that experiential education is an important element in relevant and lasting learning. Barber (1989) argues for programs that empower students "through decision-making processes, that give them practical political experience, and that make them responsible for developing public forms of talk and civic forms of judgment (p. 355). He further suggests that such a curriculum "will be a powerful incentive to citizenship, for it will provide an education that is aimed not only at participation but works through participation" (p. 355).

In *Talking to Strangers* Danielle Allen builds a compelling case for "a habit of citizenship" that would have deliberation at its core. By "talking to strangers"—by discussing a problem through to a mutually accepted decision—we can, Allen believes, revitalize our democratic citizenry. Deliberation is a strikingly practical technique for establishing a "habit of citizenship" in the classroom. The subjective dimension of everyday school life provides multiple possibilities for instilling in the young "the habit of political friendship," possibilities for deliberations in which they can practice this citizenly talk. If schools were to provide such practice, perhaps at graduation students would enter adult society primed for their role as informed and active citizens.

The International Education Association (IEA) Civic Education Study (Torney-Purta, 2002b) concluded its research by stating: "An ideal civic education experience in a democracy should enable students to . . . be comfortable in participating in respectful discussion of important and potentially controversial issues" (p. 203).

Sadly, the "ideal civic education experience" which the IEA study proposes is virtually non-existent in American schools. The Ferris Bueller spoof is not far from classroom truth. An examination of the educational landscape of American high schools reveals a dearth of classroom discussion (Cazden, 2001; B. E. Larson, & Parker, W. C., 1996; Oakes, 2005b). Oakes (2005a) makes the point that most U.S. classrooms are passive, "non-involving" places rather than active, engaging ones. She writes that in the 25 classrooms she and her colleagues observed, "passive activities . . . were dominant [and] the opportunities students had in any group of classes *to answer open-ended questions, to work in cooperative learning groups, to direct the classroom activity, or to*

make decisions about what happened in class were extremely limited. *In most classes these things just did not happen at all"* (p. 129, emphasis added). The reality is that there is now and always has been a dearth of discussion in our schools (Boler, 2004; Cazden, 2001; Haroutunian-Gordon, 1991; Hess, 2004; B. E. Larson, Parker, W.C., 1996; Simon, 2001). This being the case, students may leave high school ill equipped for effective citizenship, having had little or no practice in discussing controversial issues with their peers (Barber, 1989; M. Boler, 2004; Haroutunian-Gordon, 1991). Since talk is an essential skill for citizens of a democracy, the overall lack of democratic skill-building through deliberation and other forms of discussion in our public schools hardly seems wise (Barber, 1989; W. C. Parker, 2006).

In America calls for more classroom discussion, dialogue, deliberation, and debate are nothing new (Apple, 1995; Gutmann, 1987; Sleeter, 2004). In fact, recommendations for more frequent use of classroom discussion abound (Allen, 2006; Kelly, 1989). Parker (2003) argues that "dialogue plays an essential and vital role in democratic education, moral development, and public policy" (xviii). In a later article Parker (2005) posits that "[e]ngaging students in deliberations of academic controversies is arguably the most rigorous approach to disciplinary education available. . . . At the same time, such engagement prepares them for the reasoned argumentation of democratic living" (p. 350). In spite of such recommendations, discussion remains one of the least used educational strategies (Barber, 1989; Hess, 2004). Clearly, our commitment to this particular democratic skill is more one of lip service than actual practice.

Since deliberation is a requisite skill for effective citizenship (Goldfarb, 1998; W. C. Parker, 2005) and a requirement for a healthy democracy (Mendelberg, 2000), an examination of deliberation may prove beneficial to teachers who are always in search of a better educative activity or a more effective pedagogy and to scholars who, according to Mendelberg and Oleske (2000), "know little about how deliberation in fact works" (p. 169). My research attempts to change that; it offers a close examination of the process of deliberation as it occurs among high school students who have little formal training in discussion. Further, it provides insights into the meaning that deliberations have for them.

II. Deliberative Discussion and the Practice/Action Distinction

In my study I focus on one form of discussion – the practice of deliberation – examining it as a pedagogical tool for citizen preparation and trying to better understand it, especially from the student point of view.

What separates deliberation from other forms of discussion? Gastil (2008) offers a shorthand definition of deliberation, stating that people deliberate when "they *carefully examine a problem and arrive at a well-reasoned solution after a period of inclusive, respectful consideration of diverse points of view*" (p. 6, emphasis in original). To qualify as deliberation, then, various claims or various ideas must be given a fair hearing. Parker (2006) draws a distinction between deliberations and other classroom discussions, particularly seminars, and notes that deliberations are discussions for the purpose of making a decision about what a community should do. Consistent with Gastil's and Parker's conception of deliberation, I use the term deliberation to mean any discussion in which the participants consider more than one policy option as they attempt to reach a decision. My exploration of deliberation focuses on its *process*, studying the interactions and argumentation that occur as students work their way forward toward a decision.

An examination of classroom deliberation reveals at least two distinct purposes: (1) one for democratic skill development or *practice,* and (2) one to decide a course of *action*. Practice deliberations are meant to prepare students for effective citizenship. This is most often attempted by asking students to deliberate on controversial issues. They are expected to discuss different alternatives, giving each a careful hearing, and then reach a decision on what the best alternative is. Their decision is hypothetical, merely the end result of a discussion that offers practice in critical thinking. Students experience no consequences, no repercussions, because their decision is not put into place. Their decision does not affect policy. On the other hand, deliberations that call for decision-making action give students a voice in an authentic process. This moves the deliberation from a hypothetical or theoretical plane and places it firmly in the discussion-for-action category of authentic decision-making. Once enacted, proposals have various effects or consequences.

With this practice/action distinction in mind, I examined the following two questions: *(1) What differences, if any, are there between deliberations that are used for <u>practice</u> (to build democratic skills) and deliberations that are used not only to build democratic skills but also to take <u>action</u> (to decide and implement policy)? (2) Does the oral impotence of a "practice-only" deliberation or the oral empowerment of a "practice-and-action" deliberation make a difference to students?*

III. Methods

In order to better understand the distinction between deliberations for "practice only" and deliberations for "practice and action," I conducted a study of four deliberations that occurred in the socio-cultural setting of a high school classroom. I focused on both the argumentation and

interaction that occurred during the process of deliberation and the meaning the deliberation had for the students who participated in it. Therefore, both the actual deliberations and the reflections of student participants were used to inform my understanding of the deliberative process.

Setting: Although deliberation of any kind is rare in most high schools, when it does occur, it usually happens in the confines of a single classroom. Therefore, I wanted to locate my observations in the socio-cultural setting of the classroom. The deliberations I observed took place at East Bay High School[1] located on the campus of Berkwald Community College. The students who choose to attend East Bay do so knowing that they will be taking some college classes while in high school. The students who choose to attend East Bay are probably not typical of high school students as a whole; they may have higher than average motivation and a greater interest in obtaining a college degree.

East Bay is in its second year of operation. During its first year, a single class of 35 freshmen was enrolled. During its second year, another class of freshmen was added, so the school enrollment stands at a relatively stable 70 students. This year a new freshman class will be added and that number will grow to over 100. In its fourth year of operation, the plan is to cap enrollment at 140 students in grades nine through twelve. East Bay draws from an economically stable, middle-class population. Many of its students come from a home-school environment, and East Bay is their first exposure to a public-school education. Many choose it, they admit in their pre-enrollment interviews and essays, because they do not feel comfortable or would not fit in at a traditional comprehensive high school. In many cases, these students are not “socially adept.” They have had a very limited exposure to life beyond their local area, which is known as one of the whitest counties in all of California. Therefore, the demographic fact that 99% of the students at East Bay are white should come as no surprise.

Participants: The participants in the deliberations were ninth- and tenth-grade students enrolled at East Bay. The size of each discussion group hovered between 15 and 20 students. In addition to listening to students during the deliberations, I also interviewed six student participants four weeks after the deliberations. This allowed time for the deliberations to be transcribed and available for their analysis and observations. Since these particular students were asked to examine, reflect on, and respond to transcripts of their previous deliberations, they served as informants, helping to deepen my thinking and aid my understanding of the deliberative process from a student’s point of view.

---

[1] East Bay and all other names used in this study are pseudonyms.

Selecting East Bay as a site for my study was a practical and expedient choice because the principal and teachers allowed me to hold the four deliberations during the school's advisory time. Since few classrooms would provide a setting in which I could observe regularly scheduled deliberations, my selection is a clear case of purposeful sampling (Patton, 2002). I believe the benefits of using a school in which the deliberations were not only allowed but scheduled for "researcher convenience" outweighed any possible drawbacks. I made this decision in much the same way that Mitra (2003) conducts in her "student voice" work. She chooses a sample based on how *representative* it is of the concept of student voice rather than how *representative* it is of school sites. If I had not chosen East Bay and worked with the principal and staff to schedule the deliberations on a specific day and class period, I could have ended up observing for days at a time without ever getting to see a deliberative discussion. Such was the experience of Cazden (2001) as she studied classroom discourse. Since I used the criterion of "availability of deliberative discussions" in choosing my research site, I make no attempt to generalize my findings to other school settings.

Data Collection[2]*:* Four deliberative discussions served as the foundation of this study. In addition, I gathered 48 written responses from student participants (reflections on the deliberations), and I interviewed six students, asking them to reflect on the experience and examine various portions of the transcripts. The four deliberations were designed to study the *practice-action* distinction. Two deliberations were designated as *practice-only* (for democratic skill-building); the topic under consideration was global terrorism.[3] The other two deliberations were designated as deliberations for *practice-and-action* because the decisions that were reached would be put into effect. In the deliberations for practice-and-action the students had been given instructions (and permission of the principal) to develop guidelines for holding future discussions of controversial issues. It was up to the students to propose, decide, and enforce the guidelines.

---

[2] In setting up my research design I was aware that answers to my central question (What differences, if any, are there between classroom deliberations for practice only and deliberations for practice and action?) might differ considerably, depending on whom I asked. I was especially interested in the opinions of students. What meaning did they make of their participation in these two types of deliberative discussions? Students may view the deliberations differently than do their teachers or other adult observers. Because of my interest in student voice, I attempted to learn from all student participants. Both written responses and interviews were important in helping me understand the deliberative process from the student point of view. In this manner, I was attempting to follow the example set by Glesne (2006), who expresses a desire to locate some of her research "with and not on others" (p. 2, emphasis in original). I share that desire, and consequently, it influences my research and my findings.

[3] The materials used for this deliberation (*Responding to Terrorism: Challenges for Democracy*) were adapted from Choices for the 21st Century Education Program, a program of the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University. The materials may be accessed online at <www.choices.edu>.

My primary methods of data collection were ethnographic in nature (Glesne, 2006). I used observation, interviews, and questionnaires:

1. Observation of the deliberations: Data were gathered from four deliberations. Each deliberation had approximately 15 to 20 students participants, although not every participant chose to speak during the actual deliberation. The deliberations were audio-taped[4] and transcribed (Bogdan, 2007), and the transcripts were coded and studied in much the same way as Cazden (2001) looks at classroom discourse.

2. Written Reflections: During a follow-up visit to East Bay, students were asked to write short responses to several questions. These written reflections were used to further investigate the meaning that students made of their participation in the deliberative discussion process, helping me better understand the practice-action distinction from the students' points of view. All students who participated in the deliberation were invited to respond to these open-ended prompts (Maxwell, 2005). This collection of reflections written by the student discussants provided insight into the students' feelings and beliefs about their participation in the deliberations and their perceptions and interpretations of the deliberations.

3. Interviews: During my follow-up visit I conducted six semi-structured interviews (Opie, 2004) with a purposeful sample drawn from the field of student participants (Patton, 2002). These interviews were audio-taped and subsequently transcribed. During the interviews participants were shown transcripts of their deliberations and asked to further reflect on their meaning; thus students served as informants as well as subjects, since they were asked to reflect on and respond to previous deliberations. This decision was in keeping with my original intent to understand deliberation from the students' points of view or perspectives. The selection of students was intentional rather than random: I interviewed three males and three females representing high, medium, and low deliberative participation and a range of academic abilities. Open-ended questions were used to elicit student beliefs about the similarities and differences they observed in the two types of deliberations.

---

[4] I audio-taped the deliberations in an attempt to increase student anonymity. No student names were connected to any of the deliberations. In the transcriptions and coding students are referred to by numbers rather than names or pseudonyms. In fact, I don't even know their names. This student anonymity allowed me to focus on the words that were said and the ideas that were presented in the deliberations. However, it did limit my understanding of some of the interactions that ensued. At times during my transcription of the data I would have liked to know some of the non-verbal reactions to what someone was saying. Ultimately, I was satisfied with the decision I made to use only voice data. It forced me to focus my analysis on the content of a student's ideas and arguments, a focus which was sufficient for this initial exploratory work.

Data Analysis: To analyze my data I used ideas gleaned from Gastil (2008), Horn (2007), Toulmin (1958), and Gee (2005). First, I examined the deliberations as a whole. Using criteria developed by Gastil (2006a) that identify the "ideal deliberation," I considered both the analytic and the social processes of deliberation. According to Gastil, an "ideal deliberation" has a five-part *analytic* process containing (1) a solid information base; (2) key values; (3) a broad range of solutions; (4) the weighing of pros, cons, and tradeoffs among solutions; and (5) a "best possible" solution. Additionally, an "ideal deliberation" has a four-part *social* process containing (1) adequately distributed speaking opportunities; (2) mutual comprehension; (3) the consideration of everyone's ideas and experiences; and (4) respectful communication.

Influenced by the work of Horn (2007), especially her development of the unit of analysis that she calls "episodes of pedagogical reasoning" or EPRs, I broke the transcripts into "units of argumentation" or UAs. Not everything that was said in the deliberations could be classified as UAs; however, as students attempted to explain or justify their positions, the vast majority of what was said did fit this category. Once the UAs had been identified, I analyzed them using an argumentation taxonomy developed by British philosopher, Stephen Toulmin (S. E. Toulmin, 2003) in 1958. Using his categories of claim, data, and warrant, each argument (or claim) was dissected so its strength and validity could be assessed.

I also attempted a rudimentary discourse analysis (S. Florio-Ruane, & Morrell, E., 2004; Gee, 2005) of the deliberations. Based especially on the discourse analysis work of Gee (2005), I asked several questions of the data. First, I asked how the discourse in the two different types of deliberation were "enacted." Was one type of deliberation more "schoolish" than the other? Were the students "enacting" their identities differently from one deliberation to another? What did the data tell me about what students felt was "normal," "right," "good," "correct," "proper" (or the opposite) in a deliberation? What kinds of language were privileged or predominated (e.g., technical, everyday)? What kinds of evidence were privileged or predominated (e.g., statistical, expert opinion, personal experience)? What types of elaborations were privileged or predominated (e.g., words, images)? How were claims made? How were lines of argument developed? What persuasive "turns" were evident in the deliberations?

Data Quality and Limitations: The data I gathered have allowed me to begin an initial exploration of the deliberative discussion process and the practice/action distinction. However, the data are limited. First of all, the four deliberations I chose for analysis were all conducted in one school, a school that has virtually no racial and very little economic diversity. This limitation may

have provided me with a skewed understanding of what goes on in a deliberation. Given a larger basis of comparison—deliberations from several different schools and more racially and ethnically diverse student populations—I might find significant differences in the deliberations.

As with any ethnographic study, there is a danger of researcher subjectivity. My study is no exception. I tried hard to stay objective. I worried that collecting data at a school in which I had worked might affect student behavior as they tried to "please the teacher." I worried that my knowledge of the students might also affect how I read the data. I decided to locate my research in a school in another state, at a school where I had no pre-conceived ideas of the various student participants. My positionality to the students was as an outsider, viewed (it seemed) as someone they did not need to impress. They were able to talk about the discussion topics without worrying "what Mrs. Coe will think." I wasn't grading them. In fact, my presence had no effect on their grades in any way. Their behavior appeared authentic; they had nothing to gain or lose from how they behaved in the discussion circle.

IV. Findings

The central finding of this study is that differences exist between deliberations for practice (to build democratic skills) and deliberations for practice-and-action (to decide and enact decisions). At first, this may seem intuitively obvious. Clearly, in this particular study the practice-action distinction was built into the deliberations. In the deliberations on terrorism, the discussants were well aware of the fact that any decision they reached would have no impact on local, national, or international policies of any kind. They voiced their opinions, presented evidence in support of those opinions, and grappled with one another's ideas, but they knew that this was merely a classroom exercise. In the deliberations concerning the policies for controversial issues, the discussants were equally aware that they had been empowered to decide the policies and that they would be expected to live with the decision(s) they reached. Therefore, it is not surprising to find differences emerging from these two processes; however, the exact nature of those differences was impossible to predict before the data were analyzed. After data analysis several themes emerged. In this lecture I will list five of them but, in the interest of time, discuss just two.

Theme #1. Analytic and social processes vary between the two types of deliberation.

Using Gastil's (2006) analytic and social process criteria, I looked at each deliberation as a case. First, I considered the deliberations in light of his five-part *analytic* process criteria: (1) a solid information base, (2) key values, (3) a broad range of solutions, (4) the weighing of pros, cons, and

tradeoffs among solutions, and (5) a "best possible" solution. Specific differences soon came to light. The information base used by the students for the practice deliberations was almost exclusively academic in nature. The students cited information from the Choices curriculum that they had been provided. Consequently, the information they used came from "outside" themselves. By contrast, the information base for the action deliberations was entirely personal in nature. When information was offered by the students, it consisted of stories or analogies used in an attempt to support their points of view. That information came from "inside" the students' lives. An illustration of this phenomenon is the student who chose to personally reveal information about herself to help support her claim that Internet conversations "can get so out of hand":

> If you use Internet responsibly, it's fine. Like sometimes it can get so out of hand. I know that personally I am not a good face-to-face kind of person. I am always really worried that they're going to get mad at me—that's just me—but I know that I can't do things face-to-face very well, but if I'm online, then I'm just like hey, ya know, and then whatever happens happens. But I'm not worried that they're gonna' whack me or anything. (laughter)

This "information from inside" phenomenon is further illustrated by a second example, this one from a student who is offering support for her claim that "being mean can sometimes help a person change behavior." She uses a personal anecdote:

> Sometimes like I'll be teasing my mom, and I'll think that it's fun, and I think she's going along with it. I'll think it's all cool and I'll be like . . . ha ha . . . Mom, make me a sandwich, and she's like "I don't feel good," and I'm like, "It's your job. Make me a sandwich, like make me a chicken pot pie, b-word." And then she's like (student giggles), "You are being rude" and then she calls ME the b-word, and then I'm like "Wow, that hurt!" And then maybe I shouldn't call her the b-word, and "I'm sorry mom." But if she answers like "Alicia, I really don't appreciate it," I'd be like . . . "ha ha, you're fat," and "Alicia, I don't like the way you're talking to me!" and I'd be like . . . "ha ha, you have grey hair!" (several students laugh)

That type of personal example was used frequently during the "practice-and-action" action deliberations but was used only once during the "practice-only" deliberations, when a student was trying to argue against an isolationist stance that another student had proposed. To give support to her claim, she offered this analogy:

> Just letting them [other countries] fight their fight sometimes isn't the smartest idea because once they are done fighting their fight with them, they come after you or the person that is on the side. If you've ever played Risk or any of those games—I always played it with my brother—and my brothers, actually—and they would fight against each other, and then they would go against me after they were done, and then, like okay, let's combine forces because I was building up my force. So it's pretty much if you . . . if you put yourself in isolation or something—someone's gonna come along and—no matter what—I'm saying that if you put yourself in an area and don't actually care what's going around you, it usually comes back to hurt you.

Another analytic part of the deliberation process, according to Gastil (2006), is the range of solutions that are offered in a deliberation. Are different solutions, ones expressing both conservative and liberal positions, expressed? Is there a range of solutions that include both middle-of-the-road and more extreme positions? Here again I found differences between the two types of deliberation. In the "practice-only" deliberations the students expressed a variety of different positions, ranging from an isolationist to a one-world stance. In the "practice-and-action" deliberation students struggled to articulate any variety at all. A kind of groupthink emerged with students agreeing that discussions should be respectful and that freedom of speech should be allowed, but they failed to look for differences as to where they would draw their personal lines. Most often, they merely restated the importance of respect, for example, rather than introducing a new or different position. Consequently, they never moved beyond these general platitudes to begin hammering out a specific policy for the discussion of controversial issues at their school.

The three remaining analytic processes (values, weighing of pros and cons, and solutions) showed similarities between the two types of deliberation. In both cases values were implied but seldom articulated, the weighing of pros and cons was minimal, and time was up—the discussions were stopped—before solutions had been decided. Using Gastil's analytic criteria, neither type of deliberation taken as a whole would be considered strong. Potential conflicts over values were ignored as were attempts to argue against someone else's position. Students tended to offer their own arguments in favor of their position but seemed unable to mount a serious challenge against someone else's argument. The overall effect was one of several alternating monologues. Table #1 summarizes the analytic process similarities and differences between deliberations for practice and deliberations for action.

Table #1. Analytic Processes of Practice and Action Deliberations

Process	Gastil's Criteria	Practice-Only Deliberations	Practice-and-Action Deliberations
Analytic	Information Base	Academic	Personal
	Key Values	Implied	Implied
	Range of Solutions	Sufficient	Lacking
	Weighing Pros & Cons	Minimal	Minimal
	Solution	Incomplete	Incomplete

Using Gastil's (2006) analytic and social process criteria, I also analyzed the four-part *social* process of deliberation, which contains (1) adequately distributed speaking opportunities, (2) mutual comprehension, (3) consideration of everyone's ideas and experiences, and (4) respect. As with the analytic processes, here again there were both similarities and differences between the two types of deliberation. In both cases, there were sufficient opportunities for everyone who wanted to speak to have his or her turn. In both cases, the deliberations were marked by attempts at respectful discussion. Students listened to one another, and when they were talking, they addressed the entire group rather than initiating a "side bar" conversation. Differences between the two deliberative cases occurred with the two remaining criteria: mutual comprehension and consideration of ideas. With both, there was a stark contrast between "practice-only" and "practice-and-action" deliberations. For example, in the "practice-only" deliberation no checking for understanding of another's viewpoint occurred. It is impossible to say, based on the transcripts alone, why this was the case. Perhaps it was because students felt they already understood all the comments that were being made. Perhaps it was because they were more invested in what their peers said during the "practice-and-action" deliberation; perhaps with a forthcoming decision on the line that would affect their school lives, they felt the need to make sure they understood one another. Regardless of the reason(s), students frequently asked one another what they thought. Care was taken to include all voices in the conversation. Several times students who had not yet participated were invited to share an idea or opinion.

Another difference between the two types of deliberation came with the consideration of ideas. In the "practice-only" deliberation students seemed willing to occasionally disagree with one another's positions. Limited consideration of a couple of different ideas surfaced, but not enough to

claim that the consideration of ideas was sufficient. On the other hand, during the "practice-and-action" deliberations, there was no clash between ideas whatsoever. It was as though the group had a tacit agreement to let any statement go unchallenged. The reason(s) for this reticence are not clear. Additional data would need to be collected to hypothesize about the possible causes. As was mentioned previously, both deliberations were respectful. However, turn-taking and invitations into the discussion were more obvious in the "practice-and-action" deliberation. In fact, there were occasions in these deliberations for respectful silences. No such silences occurred in the "practice-only" deliberations. Each time a person finished speaking, another was quick to jump in—not with a comment that built on what had just been said, but rather with a brand new idea or argument. Table #2 summarizes the social process similarities and differences between deliberations for practice and deliberations for action.

Table #2. Analytic Processes of Practice and Action Deliberations

Process	Gastil's Criteria	Practice-Only Deliberations	Practice-and-Action Deliberations
Social	Speaking Opportunities	Sufficient	Sufficient
	Mutual Comprehension	Not Attempted	Attempted
	Consideration of Ideas	Insufficient with some clash	Insufficient with no clash
	Respect	Sufficient	Sufficient

Theme #2. The amount and use of data to build an argument vary between the two types of deliberation.

The data clearly indicate that deliberations for practice only more closely conform to standard forms for argumentation (Cappella, 2002; S. E. Toulmin, 2003) than do deliberations for practice and action. They were by no means complete in their argumentation, but more often than not, an effort had been made by the student to provide some support in the form of evidence or example for the claim he or she was making. So, for example, if a student asserted that "countries other than the U.S. experience terrorism," he supplied examples of terrorist acts directed against both France and Britain. In other words, he offered evidence—what Toulmin (2003) calls data—to support his claim. If a student asserted that the United States should act in conjunction with the United Nations, she provided support for that position—by suggesting that such a position would reduce the drain on U.S. resources and increase our military strength.

This attempt to provide data in support of various claims occurred frequently in the deliberations for practice. However, data were most always missing when claims were made in the deliberations for action.

The four arguments chosen for inclusion in Table #3 are typical of the larger body of arguments contained in the transcript. Claims were made. If the deliberation was for practice only, often those claims were backed up with data of some kind (evidence, examples, stories, analogies, illustrations, etc.). Most of the claims made during the deliberations for practice and action were presented without accompanying data. Warrants of any kind were seldom made explicit. If no data were presented in the argument, then of course a warrant is not possible either (since the warrant is what ties the data to the claim). Table #3 illustrates this theme.

Table #3. Analysis of Argumentation: Claims, Data, Warrants

Practice-Only Deliberation		Practice-and-Action Deliberation	
UA #1	Claim Terrorism is not just directed against the U.S. Data France and Britain have been attacked Warrant (No warrant stated)	UA #3	Claim Discussing ideas and beliefs is how we grow Data (No data offered) Warrant (No warrant possible)
UA #2	Claim We should go with the United Nations Data Limits drain on resources; gives us bigger army Warrant (No warrant stated)	UA #4	Claim We should review the ground rules Data (No data offered) Warrant (No warrant possible)

Other themes that emerged include the following:

Theme #3. The level of student engagement varies between the two types of deliberation with greater engagement resulting during “practice-and-action” deliberations.

Theme #4. A disconnect exists between the deliberations with stronger arguments and the deliberations that students claim have stronger arguments.[5]

---

[5] This theme requires an operationalization of the term “stronger arguments.” For the purpose of this study, “stronger arguments” are arguments with some support (or data) rather than no support (or data) to back up their claims. Thus, if a student makes a claim that he/she supports with some kind of data, that will (by definition) be a stronger argument than one in which no support is offered. Using this fairly standard assessment of argument strength, we realize from the findings of Theme #2 that deliberations for practice consistently had stronger arguments presented than did

Theme #5. A disconnect exists between the deliberations with stronger arguments and the deliberations considered more engaging by the students. [6]

Themes #4 and #5 are, for me, the most perplexing and the most intriguing of all the ideas to emerge from this study. The disconnect between the quality of the deliberations, on the one hand, and the students' belief in both their quality and their appeal on the other, startled me. As a classroom teacher who facilitated hundreds of discussions during my 35-year teaching career, I held frequent classroom deliberations, some for practice only and some for practice and action. It didn't occur to me at the time that I might be sacrificing discussion quality to buy some increases in student interest and engagement. It didn't occur to me, either, that the skill-building that I knew was occurring as we practiced deliberation might not transfer over to other types of deliberation. A follow-up study could explore the differences that engagement (either intellectual or emotional) can play in shaping one's experience. In what ways can deliberation become both intellectually rigorous and emotionally satisfying?

V. Conclusion: Research Recommendations

Because my study was limited to deliberative discussions at one high school, the findings reported here cannot be generalized to deliberations in other high schools across the United States. However, based on this preliminary work, I believe additional research is warranted, and I would like to suggest three areas for additional exploration.

First, I propose to study the deliberative process among students from culturally diverse and/or traditionally marginalized populations. Since the issue of student voice is at the heart of deliberation, cultural influences that may shape a student's willingness or affinity to talk could play a significant role in how that student participates. Culture has such a powerful impact on shaping behavior that its effects are certainly worthy of examination.

---

deliberations for action. That's why Theme #4 came as such a surprise to me. I had already analyzed the data when I met with students to conduct interviews. I already "knew" that the practice-only deliberations contained a far greater number of strong arguments (i.e., claims backed by data) than did the practice-and-action deliberations. And then as I interviewed the students, one after another told me how much better or stronger or more powerful the deliberations for practice-and-action were. I pressed them to explain what made these deliberations stronger, and their responses made clear that they were basing their decisions not on a traditional assessment of argument strength (e.g. Toulmin, 2003, or Cappella, 2002) but on the level of engagement that they remembered experiencing.

[6] Applying the same operationalized definition of "stronger arguments" that I used in Theme #4, the data show a negative correlation between the deliberations with stronger arguments and the deliberations that most engaged the students. Data indicate that students believed that the deliberations for practice and action were significantly more engaging that the deliberations for practice only. In the interviews and written responses not one student reported that the practice-only deliberations were more engaging. On the other hand, well over half of the students responding to a generic question about differences between the two types of deliberation chose to comment on the greater involvement and engagement during the practice-and-action deliberations.

Second, I propose to study the effects of status differences on the deliberative process. American high schools are notorious as places in which friendship groups can morph quickly into powerful cliques that sort and separate students by “popular” and “unpopular” designations. Such status differences may have a sizable impact on the deliberation process. Literature on small group practice theorizes that the participation of one or two high-status members in a group can lead to discussions that are less open and less balanced in participation than groups with member of relatively equal status (Humphreys, 1981).

Third, I propose to study the effects of participation in the deliberative process over time. The deliberations that were held at East Bay were conducted over the course of a two-day period. The students were new to the deliberative process. However, if given a regular diet of discussion, the students might very well deliberate in a more sophisticated manner. Their argumentation techniques might improve with practice. So a question for future research is *what effects, if any, occur as students receive training and practice in deliberation over the course of an entire school year?*

Clearly, there is still much to learn about deliberation in general and about the practice-action distinction in particular. My study is one attempt to shine a light on the deliberative process. While such information cannot help the pedagogically challenged teacher of Ferris Bueller’s classroom, it may serve as a point of discussion and possibility for those teachers who participate in the daily challenges of real high school classrooms and who work to turn inexperienced and immature teenagers into seasoned and effective citizens.

References

Allen, D. S. (2006). *Talking to strangers: Anxieties of citizenship since Brown v. Board of Education* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Apple, M. W., & Beane, J. A. (ed). (1995). *Democratic schools.* Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Barber, B. R. (1989). Public talk and civic action: Education for participation in a strong democracy. *Social Education, 53*(6), 355-356+.

Bogdan, R. C., Biklen, S.K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods (fifth edition).* Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Boler, M. (2004). *Democratic dialogue in education: Troubling speech, disturbing silence*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Cappella, J. N., Price, V., & Nir, L. (2002). Argument repertoire as a reliable and valid measure of opinion quality: Electronic dialogue during Campaign 2000. *Political Communication, 19*, 73-93.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse (2nd ed.)*. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann.

Florio-Ruane, S., Morrell, E. (2004). Discourse analysis In N. K. Duke & M. H. Mallette (Eds.) (Ed.), Literacy research methodologies (pp. pp. 46-61). New York: Guilford.

Gastil, J. (2008). *Political communication and deliberation.* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, & Singapore: Sage Publications.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method (Second edition).* New York and London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Goldfarb, J. C. (1998). *Civility and subversion: The intellectual in democratic society.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hahn, C. L. (1998). *Becoming political: Comparative perspectives on citizenship education.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Haroutunian-Gordon, S. (1991). *Turning the soul: Teaching through conversation in the high school.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hess, D. E. (2004). Discussion in social studies: Is it worth the trouble? *Social Education, 68*(2), 151-155.

Horn, I. S. (2007). Fast kids, slow kids, lazy kids: Framing the mismatch problem in mathematics teachers' conversations. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 16*(1), 37-79.

Humphreys, P., & Berger, J. (1981). Theoretical consequences of the status characteristics formulation *The American Journal of Sociology, 86*(No. 5), 953-983.

Kelly, T. E. (1989). Leading class discussions of controversial issues. *Social Education, 53*(6), 368-370.

Larson, B. E., & Parker, W. C. (1996). What is classroom discussion? A look at teachers' conceptions. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 11*, 110-126.

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interpretive approach*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Mendelberg, T., & Oleske, J. (2000). Race and public deliberation. *Political Communication, 17*, 169-191.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applicaions in education*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Mosher, R., Kenny, Jr., R. A., & Garrod, A. (1994). *Preparing for citizenship: Teaching youth to live democratically*. Westport, Conneticut: Praeger Publishers.

NASSP. (2004). *Breaking ranks: Strategies for leading high school reform*. Arlington, VA: NASSP.

Oakes, J. (2005a). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality (2nd edition)*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Opie, C. (Ed.). (2004). *Doing educational research: A guide to first time researchers*. London: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Parker, W. C. (1989). Participatory citizenship: civics in the strong sense. *Social Education, 53*(6), 353-354.

Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Parker, W. C. (2005). Teaching against idiocy. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(5), 344-351.

Parker, W. C. (2006). Public discourses in schools: Purposes, problems, possibilities. *Educational Researcher, 35*(8), 11-18.

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods, 3rd ed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Piaget, J. (1955). *The Child's Construction of Reality*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Power, F. C., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). *Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Purcell-Gates, V. (2004). *Discourse analysis. In N. K. Duke & M. H. Mallette (Eds.), Literacy research methodologies (pp. 46-61). New York: Guilford.*

Simon, K. G. (2001). *Moral questions in the classroom: How to get kids to think deeply about real life and their schoolwork*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Sleeter, C. E., & Bernal, D. D. (2004). Critical pedagogy, Critical Race Theory, and antiractist education: Implications for multicultural education. In J. A. Banks, & Banks, C. A. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The Civic Mission of Schools. (2003). Carnegie Corporation and Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement.

Torney-Purta, J. (2002a). The school's role in developing civic engagement: A study of adolescents in twenty-eight countries. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(4), 203-212.

Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The uses of argument (Updated edition)*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Designs and methods (Second ed. Vol. 5)*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Carol Coe is a doctoral student in the College of Education at the University of Washington, Seattle. Her work focuses on citizenship education, particularly deliberative discussions in high school classrooms. During her 35-year classroom career Ms. Coe taught high school social studies and language arts. As a member of the National School Reform Faculty, she has also worked with adult learners, most recently engaging in collaborative assessment of student work. She has published a dozen articles on teaching and learning and been a regular presenter at state and national education conferences.

Walter Parker

"Structured Academic Controversy" (SAC)

Description This is an ambitious yet feasible form of instruction that helps students (a) join and discuss academic controversies that are at the heart of a course curriculum, (b) learn to deliberate controversies in groups, and (c) learn to take and defend positions. (d) If writing is added as the culminating activity/homework, then persuasive writing becomes the fourth objective.

Procedure: [1]

1. Introduction.
   1a. Tell students the academic, social (group process), and higher-order thinking (HOT) objectives.
   1b. Display the materials needed: Background Information, Point, Counterpoint
   1c. Give an overview of the procedure.

2. Pair/Team assignments. Assign each student to a pair, and two pairs to a team.
   2a. Display pair and team assignments on a poster or transparency.
   2b. Students meet in teams and choose a team name.

3. Pairs Study and Prepare.
   3a. Pairs independently study the handout labeled Background Introduction and, below this, the controversial issue stated as a question (e.g., Background Information: *Should Britain Return the Elgin Marbles to Greece?*) It introduces the controversial issue and should be no longer than 1-3 pages.
   3b. Pairs study the position to which they have been assigned: the point or the counterpoint. The position, with supporting arguments, is stated on a handout of 1-2 pages, the pair's task is either to do additional research on the issue and this position or to go directly to 3c.
   3c. Each pair prepares a presentation that it will make to the other pair in the team. In this presentation, the pair states its position on the controversial issue and argues *for* it. Prompt students to develop *multiple* lines of reasoning to support their positions. Allow for additional research if needed.

4. Teams.
   4a. Pairs present positions and supporting arguments to one another.
   4b. Pairs reverse positions, feeding back each other's position and reasoning to the other's satisfaction (proving that each pair has listened and understood the other pair's presentation).
   4c. Teams discuss the issue.
   4d. Teacher invites students to drop the position to which they were assigned and continue to discuss the issue in teams, now reaching for a consensus.

5. Whole Class. Ask each team to report on its discussion (4d). Say something like, "Tell us about your consensus on the issue or, if you didn't come to a consensus, then where your disagreement is."

6. De-briefing. De-brief each objective in turn, asking students to what degree they think it was achieved. Then, for each objective
   6a. Social objective: Identify group process problems that need attention next time.
   6b. HOT objective: Identify higher-order thinking skills that need attention next time (e.g., distinguishing the *position* taken on an issue from the *arguments* mounted for or against it).
   6c. Academic: Explain why this controversy is important to the course of study.

7. Follow-up Writing. Using the NAEP persuasive writing rubric, have students individually write an essay in which they express their 'own' post-discussion position and reasoning on this issue.

---

[1] Read more about it: Johnson & Johnson, "Critical Thinking Through Structured Controversy," *Educational Leadership 45*(8), May l988. Walter C. Parker, *Teaching Democracy* (Teachers College Press, 2003);and *Social Studies in Elementary Education*, 13th ed. (Allyn & Bacon, 2009).

Handout #1

W. Parker
Structured Academic Controversy (SAC)

Should Voting Be Required in Democracies?

The issue: Over twenty nations require citizens to register and vote. Should Japan have such a law?

Procedure

Discourse

1. You and a partner will be assigned to take a pro or con position on this controversial issue.
2. You will study the issue and develop an argument for the position to which you were assigned.
3. You will make a presentation to the opposing side, laying out your position and the reasons for it. And, you will listen carefully to the opposing side do the same.
4. The two sides will come together and discuss the issue, and see if it is possible to arrive at a consensus.

Writing

5. Follow-up writing: You will draft a persuasive essay, arguing for the position you truly support.

Handout #2

Compulsory Voting

Background Information

Should Voting Be Required in Democracies?

Over twenty countries have some form of compulsory voting which requires citizens to register to vote and to go to their polling place or vote on election day. With secret ballots, it's not really possible to prove who has or has not voted so this process could be more accurately called "compulsory turnout" because voters are required to show up at their polling place on election day.

One of the most well-known compulsory voting systems is in Australia. All Australian citizens over the age of 18 (except those of unsound mind or those convicted of serious crimes) must be registered to vote and show up at the poll on election day. Australians who do not vote are subject to fines although those who were ill or otherwise incapable of voting on election day can have their fines waived.

Compulsory voting in Australia was adopted in the state of Queensland in 1915 and subsequently adopted nationwide in 1924. With Australia's compulsory voting system comes additional flexibility for the voter - elections are held on Saturdays, absent voters can vote in any state polling place, and voters in remote areas can vote before an election (at pre-poll voting centers) or via mail.

Voter turnout of those registered to vote in Australia was as low as 47% prior to the 1924 compulsory voting law. In the decades since 1924, voter turnout has hovered around 94% to 96%. [source: Matt Rosenberg www.geography.about.com]

These countries also have compulsory voting: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay. (Note: underlined nations have strict enforcement; others vary on enforcement, some weak, some none) [source: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance]

Handout #3

Compulsory Voting

Point: Require voting.

Advocates for compulsory voting have several arguments for why the practice should be adopted by democratic societies. First, compulsory voting laws do increase voter turnout. Political scientists estimate that compulsory voting increases voter turnout by 8 to 15 percent. The increase is most often seen among people who normally do not vote, particularly the poor and less educated. As Simon Jackman notes, "to the extent that compulsory voting increases turnout, compulsory voting also removes socioeconomic differences in electoral participation." In other words, say advocates, the higher the rate of voter participation in democratic elections, the more those elections can be said to represent legitimately the will of the people.

Advocates also see important civic outcomes in compulsory voting. In their view, voting is a necessary part of the work of a citizen. While they acknowledge that this responsibility might compel people to vote against their will, as American legal commentator John Dean notes, "so is the compulsion to drive only on the right side of the road. Requiring citizens to vote is no more restrictive than requiring them to register for the draft. And it is far less restrictive than requiring, for example, school attendance; to serve on juries, possibly for weeks or months at a time; to pay taxes; or to serve in the military when drafted. Voting is the least a citizen can do for his or her country."

Furthermore, advocates claim an element of civic education through voting: if people know they must vote, they will pay closer attention to the issues and go to the polls more informed.

Handout #4

Compulsory Voting

CounterPoint: Do <u>not</u> require voting

Opponents of compulsory voting argue that citizens do not want compulsory voting, a fact supported by a 2004 survey conducted in the United States, by ABC News. In fact, opponents argue that low voter turnout may well be a sign of overall voter satisfaction, not disappointment, with the current system. Canadian academic Filip Palda agrees: "Those who obsess about voter turnout are perhaps the ones to whom we should pay the least attention. Politicians of established parties see low turnout as a rebuke. The less legitimate politicians feel, the more they try to pass laws that build around their regimes a Potemkin facade of citizen involvement. This is why Soviet Bloc countries forced their citizens to vote." Because voting is an expression of faith in the political system, opponents of compulsory voting argue that deciding not to vote is one of the few tools citizens have to challenge corruption or fraud. When the people have reason to believe that their votes will not be counted, will be tampered with by election officials, or will be otherwise misrepresented, forcing them to vote compels them to endorse a false outcome. When there is only one candidate or when all candidates appear as poor options, compulsory elections only breed cynicism about the political process. In short, forcing people to vote in a corrupt or meaningless election actually weakens citizen power in a democratic society.

Opponents of compulsory voting also worry about the central government's control of the information that compulsory voting requires. Today, when computers and information databases can reveal so much about a person, decentralized control of election information is an important way to protect citizens from an increasingly powerful national government. More fundamentally, opponents argue that voting is not an obligation but a privilege. If the goal is to foster citizen participation, then there are easier—and better—ways than compulsory voting to foster civic it. By increasing the level of education people receive, countries can help their citizens better understand public issues and to address them meaningfully. Finally, critics of compulsory voting say that forcing participation of millions of people who neither know nor care about an election is counterproductive.

Carol Coe

Choices for the 21st Century Educational Program

Description
Choices for the 21st Century is a national education program produced by the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University.* The program is designed to introduce substantive international content into secondary school curriculum. The goal of the program is to empower young people with the skills, habits, and knowledge necessary to be engaged citizens who are capable of addressing international issues with thoughtful public discourse and informed decision making.

Procedure
1. Introduction
   - Focus attention on the subject (e.g., terrorism), setting a context and conveying its importance.
   - Review the purpose of deliberation, which is to consider a broad range of alternatives and give each alternative a thorough and fair hearing.
   - Present a brief overview of this procedure.
2. Small Group Preparation
   - Divide the class of students into four groups of equal size, assigning each group responsibility for one option. (Depending on the size of the class, the four groups may need to be sub-divided as they prepare for the forum.)
   - Give each person in the group a copy of the appropriate handout (e.g., group one gets the handout on option #1, group two gets the handout on option #2, etc.). If time allows, students may be asked to do additional research their assigned positions.
   - Individuals read and study the handout, selecting the strongest arguments. (The teacher may ask students to write a brief summary of their assigned option before discussing it with others in their group.)
   - Groups discuss their assigned option, considering its merit and building the strongest case for its adoption.
   - Each group selects a spokesperson to present its position and a spokesperson to answer questions. (Multiple spokespeople may be selected, each responsible for presenting one of the arguments in favor of the option or for fielding questions.)
3. Public Forum
   - Presentations: Spokespersons will present their groups' position, one option presented at a time. (The maximum time allowed for each presentation should be announced in advance.)
   - Question and Answer (Q&A) Period: Following each presentation, members of the audience may ask questions. (The time allowed for this Q&A period should be announced in advance.)
   - Open Discussion: Following all of the presentations and the focused Q&A period, the moderator "opens the floor" for general discussion (a weighing of the issues). At this time, new options may be proposed and the original options altered or combined in new ways.
4. Decision and Reflection: Depending on the purpose of the forum, this concluding period may vary.
   - The moderator may call for a vote on each option individually and on any new alternatives that have emerged.
   - Students may be asked to develop their own options and defend them in a written response and reflection paper.
   - The group may reflect together or individually on the process itself. What worked? What didn't? How can changes be made to improve the process in the future?

---

* Read more about the Choices Education Program by visiting its website at <http://www.choices.edu/>.

Carol Coe, Kobe Workshop
November, 2008

Handout #1

Option 1: Direct an Expanded Assault on Terrorism*

Our country cannot tolerate acts of terrorism, those who perpetrate them, or those nations who harbor terrorists. As a peace-loving country, we have no choice but to take on the job of rooting out terrorism wherever it exists. It is our responsibility and duty to protect ourselves and help make the world safe from terrorists. The war on terrorism is a worldwide struggle and we must move forward with a worldwide offensive to combat it until all who threaten peace and security are destroyed. Although it is helpful to have the cooperation of other nations, we must be prepared to fight terrorism—using whatever methods it takes and alone if necessary—wherever and whenever it threatens. Nothing less than our own freedom is at stake.

Arguments for this position	**Arguments against this position**
• Acting alone when necessary avoids the difficulties that arise from seeking cooperation with other nations that have different political interests and constraints. • The only way to avert imminent threats to our security is to act preemptively. • By engaging indigenous forces to fight terrorist groups and their government sponsors, we can save lives. • Being free of the bureaucracy and political constraints of multinational decision-making will allow us to respond more quickly where and when we need to.	• If we expand the war on terrorism on our own terms, other countries may feel antagonism toward us, and such a unilateral action may fuel further terrorism. • If we act without regard for international law, we will lose international support and isolate ourselves from the international community. • The response fails to address the underlying causes of terrorism, so it does not interrupt the cycle of violence. • Using force as a response to terrorism is bound to result in the deaths of innocent civilians. Our country must respond to terrorism in ways that preserve our national ethics and democratic traditions.

* This handout is a reproduction of the "Options 1" page from a *Choices for the 21st Century* unit on terrorism. It has been modified to use as a demonstration model with an international audience.

Carol Coe, Kobe Workshop
November, 2008

Handout #2

Option 2: Support United Nations Leadership to Fight Terrorism*

Terrorism is a global, not a national, problem. Today our security and the security of the rest of the civilized world depend upon our ability to work together to address this universal threat. We must recognize the United Nations as the entity with the legitimacy to develop and maintain a long-term, truly international effort to control and eventually wipe out terrorism worldwide. We must play a leadership role in strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations on security matters and offer our military, intelligence, and economic support to a UN-led effort to eradicate terrorist cells wherever they are found. We must stand with the world community against lawless terror.

Arguments for this position	Arguments against this position
• Cooperating as a partner with other nations through the UN will create a truly international response to terrorism, one that reflects the interests and needs of all of the international community, and denies hiding places to terrorists anywhere. • International cooperation brings together the financial, diplomatic, and intelligence tools necessary to address international terrorism. • The UN is only as strong as its member states. In order to make the UN effective as an international organization it must have the full support of our country. • We cannot afford to isolate ourselves from the international community.	• When our interests are threatened—here or abroad—we have a right to do what is necessary to defend ourselves, with or without the support of the other nations and international organizations. • The UN already has conventions prohibiting terrorism and biological weapons and has been unable to enforce them. Why will the UN be any more effective now? • The UN is too slow, too weak, and too indecisive to make any real difference. Giving the institution more power is at best a long-term proposition. It won't do anything for the terrorist threat today. • Terrorism will not end until we address its root causes. • If we pledge to join with the UN in an all-out campaign against international terrorism, we may be forced to spend our own resources on international initiatives that we may not fully approve of at the expense of defending ourselves at home.

* This handout is a reproduction of the "Options 2" page from a *Choices for the 21st Century* unit on terrorism. It has been modified to use as a demonstration model with an international audience.

Handout #3

Option 3: Defend Our Homeland*

On March 20, 1995 members of Aum Shinrikyo attacked Tokyo's subway system by releasing Sarin nerve gas aboard the trains. These terrorists brought death and destruction to our country. Twelve people died and over 5,500 were harmed, many with permanent injuries. We were attacked on our own homeland, and we now feel vulnerability. Clearly, we have enemies who are intent on doing us harm. The time has come to build up our national defenses against such terrorist acts. While civil liberties are important, we must recognize that we are in a new world. Our government must be allowed to take new steps to protect our security.

Arguments for this position	Arguments against this position
• We live in a world where a small handful of angry individuals can wreak havoc with a small amount of weapons-grade biological or chemical material or a "dirty bomb" in a suitcase. Being prepared for such attacks will save lives. • By limiting any response only to those who directly threaten us, we will avoid needlessly drawing the wrath of a wider circle of terrorist organizations. • Taking sides in the battles of other nations (such as Israel's struggles with Hezbollah) only increases our own vulnerability by drawing the attention of a wider circle of terrorists. The less we are involved in the affairs of other nations, the more secure we will be. • Resources saved from international involvement can be redirected to promote enhanced security at home.	• Terrorism is globalized. It will be impossible to get a full picture of the terrorist threats facing us if we do not bring our intelligence resources together with those of the rest of the world. That integration of intelligence capacity will not happen if we withdraw from the international community. • Withdrawing from the international community will not protect us from possible attack. As long as there are haves and have-nots in the world, we will remain a target for terrorism. There is nowhere to hide. • We cannot defend our country against all possible means that terrorists have at their disposal. Our only practical and moral choice is to address the root causes of international terrorism. • The terrorist threat is everywhere. It is better to fight terrorism on foreign soil than to have it come again to our own shores.

* This handout is a reproduction of the "Options 3" page from a *Choices for the 21st Century* unit on terrorism. It has been modified to use as a demonstration model with an international audience.

Handout #4

Option 4: Address the Underlying Causes of Terrorism*

Terrorism is a crime against humanity and cannot be tolerated. However, strong military or police action will only perpetuate the cycle of violence. We must abandon any plans for such action and join with others to address the deeper issues underlying terrorism. Terrorism feeds on the frustration of some of the world's most disadvantaged peoples. We must join with the developed world to devote our attention and our resources to launching programs that address the underlying causes of terrorism. We must also examine our own policies in many parts of the world to see that we are not inflaming longstanding local and regional conflicts, fueling discontent, and creating a breeding ground for anti-Japanese sentiment.

Arguments for this position	Arguments against this position
• If we do not address the underlying causes of terrorism—including poverty, injustice, powerlessness, and hatred—we risk feeding the anger or the terrorists and creating new recruits to terrorist networks. • Taking a leadership role in addressing the humanitarian needs of populations in failing states will reduce animosity toward our country. • In order to be a credible force in addressing terrorism, we must demonstrate that we understand the causes of terrorism and are committed to taking action to address them. • By addressing the underlying causes of terrorism, we will be able to avoid putting our civil liberties at risk from repressive homeland security measures.	• Addressing the underlying causes of terrorism will take time. Meanwhile we remain vulnerable to more terrorist attacks. We have to act now to stop terrorist attacks at their source. • Neither our country nor the international community has the resources to address all of the underlying causes of terrorism. • We cannot afford to redirect so much of our national budget to development efforts overseas at a time when those resources are needed to build up our defenses here at home. • If we focus our efforts on long-term solutions, we will be allowing terrorists to commit horrible crimes without immediate consequences. This will invite additional attacks both at home and abroad. • There will always be hatred. There will always be violence. No amount of foreign aid will change this. We have no real control over anything but our own security.

* This handout is a reproduction of the "Options 4" page from a *Choices for the 21st Century* unit on terrorism. It has been modified to use as a demonstration model with an international audience.

Carol Coe, Kobe Workshop
November, 2008

Handout #5

Responding to Terrorism
Challenges for Democracy*

Option 1: Direct an Expanded Assault on Terrorism

Our country cannot tolerate acts of terrorism, those who perpetrate them, or those nations who harbor terrorists. As a peace-loving country, we have no choice but to take on the job of rooting out terrorism wherever it exists. It is our responsibility and duty to protect ourselves and help make the world safe from terrorists. The war on terrorism is a worldwide struggle and we must move forward with a worldwide offensive to combat it until all who threaten peace and security are destroyed. Although it is helpful to have the cooperation of other nations, we must be prepared to fight terrorism—using whatever methods it takes and alone if necessary—wherever and whenever it threatens. Nothing less than our own freedom is at stake.

Option 2: Support United Nations Leadership to Fight Terrorism

Terrorism is a global, not a national, problem. Today our security and the security of the rest of the civilized world depend upon our ability to work together to address this universal threat. We must recognize the United Nations as the entity with the legitimacy to develop and maintain a long-term, truly international effort to control and eventually wipe out terrorism worldwide. We must play a leadership role in strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations on security matters and offer out military, intelligence, and economic support to a UN-led effort to eradicate terrorist cells wherever they are found. We must stand with the world community against lawless terror.

Option 3: Defend Our Homeland

On March 20, 1995 members of Aum Shinrikyo attacked Tokyo's subway system by releasing Sarin nerve gas aboard the trains. These terrorists brought death and destruction to our country. Twelve people died and over 5,500 were harmed, many with permanent injuries. We were attacked on our own homeland, and we now feel vulnerability. Clearly, we have enemies who are intent on doing us harm. The time has come to build up our national defenses against such terrorist acts. While civil liberties are important, we must recognize that we are in a new world. Our government must be allowed to take new steps to protect our security.

Option 4: Address the Underlying Causes of Terrorism

Terrorism is a crime against humanity and cannot be tolerated. However, strong military or police action will only perpetuate the cycle of violence. We must abandon any plans for such action and join with others to address the deeper issues underlying terrorism. Terrorism feeds on the frustration of some of the world's most disadvantaged peoples. We must join with the developed world to devote our attention and our resources to launching programs that address the underlying causes of terrorism. We must also examine our own policies in many parts of the world to see that we are not inflaming longstanding local and regional conflicts, fueling discontent, and creating a breeding ground for anti-Japanese sentiment.

* This handout is a reproduction of the "Options in Brief" page from a *Choices for the 21st Century* unit on terrorism. It has been modified to use as a demonstration model with an international audience.