

Diversity, Group Identity, and Citizenship Education in a Global Age

James A. Banks

Worldwide immigration and quests for rights by minority groups have caused social scientists and educators to raise serious questions about liberal assimilationist conceptions of citizenship that historically have dominated citizenship education in nation-states. The author of this article challenges liberal assimilationist conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education. He argues that citizenship education should be reformed so that it reflects the home cultures and languages of students from diverse groups, and he contends that group rights can help individuals to attain structural equality. In the final part of the article, he discusses the implications of his analysis for transforming citizenship education.

Keywords: citizenship; citizenship education; diversity; globalization; multicultural education

Concepts of citizenship and citizenship education around the world face challenges from a number of historical, political, social, and cultural developments. Worldwide immigration, globalization, and the tenacity of nationalism have stimulated controversy and new thinking about citizenship and citizenship education (Gutmann, 2004; Koopmans, Statham, Giugni, & Passy, 2005; Torres, 1998).

In this article, I describe *assimilationist*, *liberal*, and *universal* conceptions of citizenship education;¹ state why these concepts should be interrogated; and argue that citizenship and citizenship education should be expanded to include cultural rights for citizens from diverse racial, cultural, ethnic, and language groups. I also state why citizenship education should incorporate recognition of group-differentiated rights (Fraser, 2000; Young, 1989). Liberal assimilationist notions of citizenship assume that individuals from different groups have to give up their home and community cultures and languages to attain inclusion and to participate effectively in the national civic culture (Greenbaum, 1974; Wong Fillmore, 2005). According to these conceptions of citizenship, the rights of groups are detrimental to the rights of the individual. In contrast, using the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and 1970s as an example, I argue that groups can help individuals to actualize their rights and opportunities.

I contend that an effective and transformative citizenship education helps students to acquire the knowledge, skills, and values

needed to function effectively within their cultural community, nation-state, and region and in the global community. Such an education also helps students to acquire the cosmopolitan perspectives and values needed to work for equality and social justice around the world (Appiah, 2006; Nussbaum, 2002). In the final part of this article, I argue that schools should implement a transformative and critical conception of citizenship education that will increase educational equality for all students. A transformative citizenship education also helps students to interact and deliberate with their peers from diverse racial and ethnic groups. I describe research that illuminates ways in which just, deliberative, and democratic classrooms and schools can be created.

Conceptions of Citizenship and Citizenship Education

A citizen is an individual who lives in a nation-state and has certain rights and privileges, as well as duties to the state, such as allegiance to the government (Lagassé, 2000). Citizenship is “the position or status of being a citizen” (Simpson & Weiner, 1989, p. 250). Koopmans et al. (2005) define citizenship as “the set of rights, duties, and identities linking citizens to the nation-state” (p. 7). These basic definitions are accurate but do not reveal the complexity of citizenship as the concept has developed in modernized nation-states.

Marshall’s (1964) explication of three elements of citizenship—*civil*, *political*, and *social*—have been influential and widely cited in the field of citizenship studies (Bulmer & Rees, 1996). Marshall conceptualizes citizenship as developmental and describes how the civil, political, and social elements emerged in subsequent centuries.

The civil aspects of citizenship, which emerged in England in the 18th century, provide citizens with individual rights, such as freedom of speech, the right to own property, and equality before the law. The political aspect of citizenship developed in the 19th century. It gives citizens the franchise and the opportunity to exercise political power by participating in the political process. The social aspect arose in the 20th century. It provides citizens with the health, education, and welfare needed to participate fully in their cultural communities and in the national civic culture. Marshall viewed the three elements of citizenship as interrelated and overlapping and citizenship as an ideal toward which nation-states strive but which they never completely attain.

Cultural Rights and Multicultural Citizenship

Assimilationist, liberal, and universal conceptions of citizenship require citizens to give up their first languages and cultures to

become full participants in the civic community of the nation-state (M. M. Gordon, 1964; Young, 1989, 2000). Most cultural, social, and educational policies in nation-states throughout the world, including the United States (Graham, 2005), were guided by an assimilationist policy prior to the ethnic revitalization movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Beginning in the 1600s, missionaries in the United States established boarding schools to assimilate and Christianize Indian youth (Deyhle & Swisher, in press). During the 1940s and 1950s, Mexican Americans were punished in school for speaking Spanish (Crawford, 1999). The histories and cultures of groups such as African Americans, Mexican Americans, and American Indians were rarely discussed in textbooks. When they appeared in textbooks, they were most frequently stereotyped (Banks, 1969). Policy and practice in schools, as in other institutions, were guided by Anglo-conformity (M. M. Gordon, 1964).

Since the ethnic revitalization movements of the 1960s and 1970s, marginalized racial, ethnic, and language groups have argued that they should have the right to maintain important aspects of their cultures and languages while participating fully in the national civic culture and community (Carmichael & Hamilton, 1967; B. M. Gordon, 2001; Sizemore, 1973). These groups have demanded that institutions such as schools, colleges, and universities respond to the groups' cultural identities and experiences by reforming curricula to reflect their struggles, hopes, dreams, and possibilities (B. M. Gordon, 2001; Nieto, 1999). They have also demanded that schools modify teaching strategies to make them more culturally responsive to students from different racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups (Au, 2006; Gay, 2000; González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005).

During the 1960s and 1970s, leaders and scholars in ethnic minority communities in the United States borrowed some of the concepts and language that had been used by advocates and scholars of White ethnic communities during first decades of the 1900s, when large numbers of immigrants entered the United States from Southern, Central, and Eastern Europe. Drachslor (1920) and Kallen (1924)—who were advocates for the cultural freedoms and rights of these immigrant groups and who were immigrants themselves—argued that *cultural democracy* is an important characteristic of a democratic society. Drachslor and Kallen maintained that cultural democracy should coexist with political and economic democracy and that citizens in a democratic society should participate freely in the civic life of the nation-state and experience economic equality. According to Drachslor and Kallen, citizens should also have the right to maintain important aspects of their community cultures and languages, as long as these do not conflict with the shared democratic ideals of the nation-state. Cultural democracy, argued Drachslor, is an essential component of a political democracy.

In the early decades of the 20th century, Woodson (1933/1977) made a case for cultural democracy when he argued that a curriculum for African American students should reflect their history and culture. Woodson harshly criticized the absence of Black history in the curriculum and argued that Black students were being “miseducated” because they were learning only about European, not African, cultures and civilizations. In the 1970s, Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) maintained that cultural democracy requires

teaching methods that reflect the learning characteristics of Mexican American students as well as help them become bicultural in their learning styles and characteristics.

Kymlicka (1995), the Canadian political theorist, and Rosaldo (1997), the U.S. anthropologist, make arguments today that are similar in many ways to those made by Drachslor and Kallen in the early 1900s and in later decades by Woodson and by Ramírez and Castañeda. Both Kymlicka and Rosaldo maintain that immigrant and ethnic groups should be able to participate fully in the national civic culture while retaining elements of their own cultures. The dominant culture of the nation-state should incorporate aspects of their experiences, cultures, and languages, which will enrich the mainstream culture as well as help marginalized groups to experience civic equality and recognition (Gutmann, 2004).

Expanding Marshall's Citizenship Typology

The paper in which Marshall (1964) presented his citizenship typology was presented as the Alfred Marshall Lectures at the University of Cambridge in February 1949. The significant post-World War II migrations to the United Kingdom from its former colonies such as Jamaica, India, and Pakistan were just beginning. Marshall was consequently unable to foresee these migrations and their consequences—such as the racialization that occurred in response or the immigrants' quests for equality and inclusion (Solomos, 2008)—and did not incorporate them into his citizenship typology.

Marshall (1964) conceptualizes citizenship as an evolutionary concept that increases equality when it expands. Lipset (1964) states that the “assumption of equality” is perhaps the most important aspect of Marshall's idea of citizenship (p. ix). Marshall viewed citizenship and class as opposing principles and stated that citizenship and the capitalist class system were at war during the 20th century because citizenship and equality expand simultaneously.

Expanding Marshall's conception of citizenship to include *cultural democracy* and *cultural citizenship* is consistent with his view that citizenship evolves to reflect the historical development of the times and expands to increase equality and social justice. Ethnic and language minority groups in societies throughout the world are denied full citizenship rights because of their languages and cultural characteristics, because they regard maintaining attachments to their cultural communities as important to their identities, and because of historic group discrimination and exclusion (Castles & Davidson, 2000; Koopmans et al., 2005; Kymlicka, 1995; Young, 1989). Consequently, the conception of citizenship in a modern democratic nation-state should be expanded to include cultural rights and group rights within a democratic framework.

Multicultural Citizenship

Global immigration and the increasing diversity in nation-states throughout the world challenge liberal assimilationist conceptions of citizenship. They raise complex and divisive questions about how nation-states can deal effectively with the problem of constructing civic communities that reflect and incorporate the diversity of citizens and yet have an overarching set of shared values, ideals, and goals to which all of the citizens of a nation-state

are committed (Banks, 2007). In the past, the liberal assimilationist ideology guided policy related to immigrants and diversity in most nation-states.

In the liberal assimilationist view, the rights of the individual are paramount, and group identities and rights are inconsistent with and inimical to the rights of the individual (Patterson, 1977). This conception maintains that identity groups promote group rights over the rights of the individual and that the individual must be freed of primordial and ethnic attachments to have free choice and options in a modernized democratic society (Patterson, 1977; Schlesinger, 1991). Strong attachments to ethnic, racial, religious, and other identity groups lead to conflicts and harmful divisions within society. Liberal scholars such as Patterson and Schlesinger also assume that group attachments will die of their own weight within a modernized, pluralistic democratic society if marginalized and excluded groups are given the opportunity to attain structural inclusion in the mainstream society. In this view, the survival of primordial attachments in a modernized democratic society reflects a “pathological condition” in which marginalized groups have not been provided with opportunities that would enable them to experience cultural assimilation and structural inclusion (Apter, 1977). If Mexican Americans are structurally integrated into mainstream U.S. society—argues the liberal assimilationist—they will have neither the desire nor the need to speak Spanish.

A number of factors have caused social scientists and political philosophers to raise serious questions about the liberal analysis and expectations for identity groups in modernized democratic nation-states. These factors include the rise of the ethnic revitalization movements since the 1960s and 1970s, which demand recognition of group rights as well as individual rights by the nation-state and by institutions such as schools, colleges, and universities (Banks, 2006); the structural exclusion of many racial, ethnic, and language groups into the United States and other Western nations (Benhabib, 2004; Castles & Davidson, 2000; M. M. Gordon, 1964); and increasing immigration throughout the world that has made most nation-states multinational and polyethnic (Kymlicka, 1995). Recent estimates indicate that “the world’s 184 independent states contain over 600 living language groups and 5,000 ethnic groups. In very few countries can the citizens be said to share the same language, or belong to the same ethnonational group” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 1).

Identity Groups in a Multicultural Democratic Society

Identity groups can both obstruct the realization of democratic values and facilitate their realization (Gutmann, 2003). Nonmainstream groups, such as Canadian Sikhs and Mexican Americans, and mainstream groups, such as Anglo Canadians and the Boy Scouts of America, all are identity groups. Democracies should treat individuals as civil equals and give them equal freedoms (Gutmann, 2003). Identity groups may try to impose their values on individuals. However, they may also enhance individual freedom by helping individuals to attain goals that are consistent with democratic values and that can be achieved only through group action.

Identity groups provide opportunities for their members to freely associate and express themselves culturally and politically

(Gutmann, 2003). Individuals more successfully attain goals through the political system when working in groups than when working alone. Important examples are the political, cultural, and educational gains that African Americans won through their participation in the Civil Rights Movement during the 1960s and 1970s, as well as the momentous changes that the movement initiated in U.S. society as a whole, with significant benefits for other racial, ethnic, and language groups, women, and people with disabilities.

The Immigration Reform Act of 1965 (which became effective in 1968) was a consequence of the Civil Rights Movement. The act abolished the quota system based on immigrants’ national origins and liberalized American immigration policy (Bennett, 1988). Immigration to the United States from Asian and Latin American nations increased substantially as a result. Primarily because of the Immigration Reform Act, the nation’s racial and ethnic texture has changed significantly. Before 1968, most immigrants to the United States came from Europe. Today, most come from Asia and Latin America. A significant number also come from the West Indies and Africa. The United States is now experiencing its largest influx of immigrants since the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The U.S. Census Bureau (2000) projects that ethnic groups of color—or ethnic minorities—will increase from 28% of the nation’s population today to 50% in 2050.

Marginalized groups have organized and worked for their group rights throughout U.S. history, bringing greater equality and social justice for all Americans. This was the case with the movements for civil rights, women’s rights, and language rights (the last promoting the right of all citizens to speak and learn their own languages in the public schools). Groups in the margins of U.S. society have been the conscience of America and the main sites for struggles to close the gap between American democratic ideals and institutionalized racism and discrimination (Okiehiro, 1994). Through their movements to advance justice and equality in America, marginalized groups have helped the nation come closer to actualizing the democratic ideals stated in its founding documents—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights (Okiehiro, 1994).

Universal and Differentiated Citizenship

Group differences are not included in a universal conception of citizenship. Consequently, the differences of groups that have experienced structural exclusion and discrimination—such as women and people of color—are suppressed. A *differentiated* conception of citizenship, rather than a universal one, is needed to help marginalized groups attain civic equality and recognition in multicultural democratic nations (Young, 1989). Many problems result from a universal notion of citizenship according to which “citizenship status transcends particularity and difference” and “laws and rules . . . are blind to individual and group differences” (Young, 1989, p. 250). A universal conception of citizenship within a stratified society results in the treatment of some groups as second-class citizens because group rights are not recognized and the principle of equal treatment is strictly applied.

When universal citizenship is determined, defined, and implemented by groups with power and when the interests of marginalized groups are not expressed or incorporated into civic

discussions, the interests of groups with power and influence will determine the definitions of universal citizenship and the public interest. Groups with power and influence often equate their own interests with the public interest. This phenomenon occurs in the debate over multicultural education in the nation's schools, colleges, and universities. Critics of multicultural education such as D'Souza (1991) and Schlesinger (1991) define the interests of dominant groups as the "public" interest and those of people of color such as African Americans and Latinos as "special" interests that endanger the polity.

The Challenges of Global Citizenship

Cultural and group identities are important in multicultural democratic societies. However, they are not sufficient for citizenship participation because of worldwide migration and the effects of globalization on local, regional, and national communities (Banks, 2004a). Students need to develop the knowledge, attitudes, and skills that will enable them to function in a global society. Globalization affects every aspect of communities, including beliefs, norms, values, and behaviors, as well as business and trade. Worldwide migration has increased diversity in most nation-states and is forcing nations to rethink citizenship and citizenship education. National boundaries are eroding because millions of people live in several nations and have multiple citizenships (Castles & Davidson, 2000). Millions have citizenship in one nation and live in another. Others are stateless, including millions of refugees around the world. The number of individuals living outside their original homelands increased from approximately 33 million in 1910 to 175 million in 2000 (Benhabib, 2004).

National boundaries are also becoming more porous because of international human rights that are codified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and by the European Union. These rights are specified for individuals regardless of the nation-state in which they live and whether they are citizens of a nation or not. Explicated in the declaration are the rights to freedom of expression and religious belief, the right to privacy, and the right for an individual charged with a crime to be presumed innocent until proven guilty (Banks et al., 2005; Osler & Starkey, 2005). Serious tensions exist between the conceptions of international human rights and national sovereignty. Despite the codification of international rights by bodies such as the United Nations, nationalism is as strong as ever (Benhabib, 2004).

Global Migration: A Challenge to Nations and Schools

Migration within and across nation-states is a worldwide phenomenon. The movement of peoples across boundaries is as old as the nation-state itself (Luchtenberg, 2004b). However, never before in history has the movement of diverse racial, cultural, ethnic, religious, and linguistic groups within and across nation-states been so extensive, so rapid, or raised such complex and difficult questions about citizenship, human rights, democracy, and education. Many worldwide developments challenge the notion of educating students to function in one nation-state. These developments include the ways that people move back and forth across national borders and the rights of movement

permitted by bodies external to nation-states such as the United Nations and the European Union.

Before the ethnic revitalization movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the aim of schools in most nation-states was to develop citizens who internalized their national values, venerated their national heroes, and accepted glorified versions of their national histories. These goals of citizenship education are inconsistent with the citizen's role in a global world today because many people have multiple national commitments and live in multiple nation-states. However, the development of citizens with global and cosmopolitan identities and commitments is contested in nation-states throughout the world because nationalism remains strong. Nationalism and globalization coexist in tension worldwide (Benhabib, 2004; Castles & Davidson, 2000).

When responding to the problems wrought by international migration, schools in multicultural nation-states must deal with complex educational issues in ways consistent with their democratic ideologies and declarations. There is a wide gap between the democratic ideals in Western nations and the daily experiences of students in schools (Banks, 2004a). Ethnic minority students in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Germany, and France—as in other nations throughout the world—often experience discrimination because of their cultural, linguistic, religious, and value differences. Often, both students and teachers perceive these students as the "Other." When ethnic minority students—such as Turkish students in Germany and Muslim students in the United Kingdom—are marginalized in school and treated as the "Other," they tend to emphasize their ethnic identities and to develop weak attachments to the nation-state.

Multicultural democratic nation-states must grapple with a number of salient issues, paradigms, and ideologies as their school populations become more culturally, racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse. The extent to which nation-states make multicultural citizenship possible, the achievement gap between minority and majority groups, and the language rights of immigrant and minority groups are among the unresolved and contentious issues with which these nations must grapple.

Nation-states throughout the world are trying to determine whether they will perceive themselves as multicultural and allow immigrants to experience multicultural citizenship or continue to embrace an assimilationist liberal ideology (Kymlicka, 1995). In nation-states that embrace multicultural citizenship, immigrant and minority groups can retain important aspects of their languages and cultures while exercising full citizenship rights. Nation-states in various parts of the world have responded to the citizenship and cultural rights of immigrant and minority groups in significantly different ways. Since the ethnic revitalization movements of the 1960s and 1970s, many national leaders and citizens in the United States, Canada, and Australia have viewed these nations as multicultural democracies (Banks, 1986). An ideal exists in these nations that minority groups can maintain important elements of their community cultures and become full citizens of the nation-state. However, there is a wide gap between the ideals of these nations and the experiences of ethnic minority groups. Most ethnic minority groups in nations that view themselves as multicultural—such as the United States, Canada, and

Australia—experience discrimination in both the schools and the wider society.

Other nations, such as Japan (Murphy-Shigematsu, 2004) and Germany (Luchtenberg, 2004a, 2004b; Mannitz, 2004), have been reluctant to view themselves as multicultural societies. Citizenship has been closely linked to biological heritage and characteristics in these nations. Although the biological conception of citizenship in both Japan and Germany has eroded within the past decade, it has left a tenacious legacy in both countries. Castles (2004) refers to Germany's response to immigrants as "differential exclusion," which is "partial and temporary integration of immigrant workers into society—that is, they are included in those subsystems of society necessary for their economic role: the labor market, basic accommodation, work-related health care, and welfare" (p. 32).

Since the 1960s and 1970s, the French have dealt with immigrant groups in ways distinct from those of the immigrant nations of the United States, Canada, and Australia. In France the explicit goal is assimilation—called *integration*—and inclusion (Bowen, 2004, in press; Castles, 2004; Hargreaves, 1995; Scott, 2007). Immigrants can become full citizens in France but are required to surrender their languages and cultures. Integration assumes that cultural and ethnic differences should and will disappear (Hargreaves, 1995; Scott, 2007).

Education for National and Global Citizenship

Multicultural societies are faced with the problem of constructing nation-states that reflect and incorporate the diversity of their citizens and yet have an overarching set of shared values, ideals, and goals to which all of their citizens are committed. In a democratic society, civic equality and recognition are important values (Gutmann, 2004). These values give ethnic and immigrant groups the right to maintain important elements of their ethnic cultures and languages as well as to participate in the national civic culture.

Nationalists and assimilationists around the world worry that if citizens are allowed to retain identifications with their cultural communities they will not acquire sufficiently strong attachments to their nation-states. Such concerns reflect a "zero-sum conception of identity" (Kymlicka, 2004, p. xiv). The theoretical and empirical work of multicultural scholars indicates that *identity is multiple, changing, overlapping, and contextual, rather than fixed and static*—and that thoughtful and clarified cultural identifications will enable people to be better citizens of the nation-state. Writes Ladson-Billings (2004):

The dynamic of the modern (or postmodern) nation-state makes identities as either an individual or a member of a group untenable. Rather than seeing the choice as either/or, the citizen of the nation-state operates in the realism of both/and. She is both an individual who is entitled to citizen rights that permit one to legally challenge infringement of those rights [and one who is] acting as a member of a group. . . . People move back and forth across many identities, and the way society responds to these identities either binds people to or alienates them from the civic culture. (p. 112)

The Challenge of Unity and Diversity

Balancing unity and diversity is a continuing challenge for multicultural nation-states. Unity without diversity results in hegemony and

oppression; diversity without unity leads to Balkanization and the fracturing of the nation-state (Banks, 2004b). A major problem facing nation-states throughout the world is how to recognize and legitimize difference and yet construct an overarching national identity that incorporates the voices, experiences, and hopes of the diverse groups that compose it. Many ethnic, language, and religious groups have weak identifications with their nation-states because of their marginalized status and because they do not see their hopes, dreams, visions, and possibilities reflected in the nation-state or in the schools, colleges, and universities (Ladson-Billings, 2004; Osler & Vincent, 2002).

The diversity brought to European nations such as the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and France by immigrants from their former colonies has increased racial, ethnic, and religious tension and conflict (Koopmans et al., 2005). A bitter controversy arose in France regarding the wearing of the *hijab* (veil) by Muslim girls in state-supported schools. In March 2004 the French parliament passed a law that prohibits the wearing of any ostensible religious symbol in state schools. Although this law prohibits the wearing of the Jewish yarmulke as well as large Christian crosses, its target was the hijab. The French policy is a contentious and divisive attempt by a nation with a strong assimilationist ideology to deal with religious expression in the public sphere in a way that is consistent with its ideals of equality, liberty, and republicanism (Bowen, in press). Bowen (2004) describes incisively the different meanings of the headscarf controversy to the mainstream French and to French Muslims:

For many non-Muslim French, [the headscarves] represent multiple dangers to the Republic; the oppression of women, urban violence, international terrorism, and the general refusal of Muslim immigrants to integrate into the broader society. For many of the five million or so Muslims living in France, the scarves represent the freedom of religious expression guaranteed by French law, the toleration of cultural pluralism, the value of modesty, and the general importance of developing ways to be both good Muslims and good citizens. (p. 31)

As worldwide immigration increases diversity on every continent and as global terrorism intensifies negative attitudes toward Muslims, schools in nation-states around the world are finding it difficult to implement policies and practices that respond to the diversity of students and also foster national cohesion (Banks et al., 2005). The four young Muslim men who are suspected of being responsible for the bombings of the London underground on July 7, 2005, had immigrant parents but were British citizens who grew up in Leeds. They apparently were not structurally integrated into British mainstream society and had weak identifications with the nation-state and with other British citizens. The immigrant background of most of the suspects and perpetrators of worldwide violence (Suárez-Orozco, 2006) has contributed to the rise of Islamophobia and racial tensions in Europe.

The Complicated Characteristics of Student Identifications

Historically, schools in Western democratic nations, such as the United States, Canada, and Australia, have focused on helping students to develop commitments and allegiance to the nation-state

and have given little attention to their need to maintain commitments to their local communities and cultures or to their original homelands. Schools assumed that assimilation into the mainstream culture was required for citizenship and national belonging and that students could and should surrender commitments to other communities, cultures, and nations. Greenbaum (1974) states that U.S. schools taught immigrant students *hope* and *shame*. These students were made to feel ashamed of their home and community cultures but were given hope that once they culturally assimilated they could join the U.S. mainstream culture. Cultural assimilation worked well for most White ethnic groups (Alba & Nee, 2003) but not for groups of color, which continue to experience structural exclusion after they become culturally assimilated.

Recent ethnographic research indicates that the narrow conception of citizenship education that has been embraced historically by schools is not consistent with the racial, ethnic, and cultural realities of U.S. society because of the complicated, contextual, and overlapping identities of immigrant students. Research by scholars studying immigrant high school students indicates that these students have complex and contradictory *transnational* identifications. This finding is consistent across studies of Palestinian American youth by El-Haj (2007), of Vietnamese American high school youth by Nguyen (2008), and of working-class Indian American, Pakistani American, and Bangladeshi American youth by Maira (2004). These researchers describe the nuanced and intricate identifications that immigrant youth have with the United States, their countries of origin, and their local communities. This research also indicates that the cultural and national identities of immigrant youth are contextual, evolving, and continually reconstructed.

El-Haj (2007), Nguyen (2008), and Maira (2004) found that the immigrant youths in their studies did not define their national identities in terms of their places of residence but felt that they belonged to national communities that transcended the boundaries of the United States. They defined their national identities as Palestinian, Vietnamese, Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi. They believed that an individual can be Palestinian or Vietnamese and live in many different nation-states. The youth in these studies distinguished between *national identity* and *citizenship*. They viewed themselves as Palestinian, Vietnamese, or Pakistani but also recognized and acknowledged their U.S. citizenship, which they valued for the privileged legal status and other opportunities it gave them. Some of the Vietnamese youth in Nguyen's study said, "I am Vietnamese *and* a citizen of the United States."

Although the immigrant youth in Nguyen's (2008) study viewed themselves as citizens of the United States, they did not view themselves as Americans. They felt that they were not Americans because to be American required an individual to be White and mainstream. Their construction of the criterion for becoming American was a consequence of the racism, discrimination, and exclusion that they experienced in their schools and communities. Both El-Haj (2007) and Nguyen describe how the marginalization that immigrant students experience in schools and in the larger U.S. society reinforces their national identification with distant nations, in which they imagine that they would experience equality and structural inclusion.

Maira (2004) used cultural citizenship to describe the transnational aspects of the citizenship identity held by the South Asian students in her study. These youths maintained contacts and connections with their homeland cultures through popular culture venues, such as websites, films, music, TV serials, cable TV, and DVDs made in their homelands.

Schools and Citizenship Education in Multicultural Nations

The nuanced, complex, and evolving identities of the youth described in the studies by El-Haj (2007), Nguyen (2008), and Maira (2004) indicate that the liberal assimilationist notions of citizenship are ineffective today because of the deepening diversity throughout the world and the quests by marginalized immigrant, ethnic, and racial groups for cultural recognition and rights. Schools need to work to implement multicultural citizenship (Kymlicka, 1995), which recognizes the right and need for students to maintain commitments to their cultural communities, to a transnational community, and to the nation-state in which they are legal citizens.

Citizenship education should also help students to develop an identity and attachment to the global community and a human connection to people around the world. Global identities, attachments, and commitments constitute *cosmopolitanism* (Nussbaum, 2002). Cosmopolitans view themselves as citizens of the world who will make decisions and take actions in the global interests that will benefit humankind. Nussbaum states that their "allegiance is to the worldwide community of human beings" (p. 4).

Cosmopolitans identify with peoples from diverse cultures throughout the world. Nussbaum contrasts cosmopolitan universalism and internationalism with parochial ethnocentrism and inward-looking patriotism. Cosmopolitans "are ready to broaden the definition of public, extend their loyalty beyond ethnic and national boundaries, and engage with difference far and near" (W. C. Parker, personal communication, July 18, 2005). Cosmopolitans view social justice and equality globally and are concerned with threats to the world community such as global warming, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and war. Students can become cosmopolitan citizens while maintaining attachments and roots to their family and community cultures. Both Nussbaum (2002) and Appiah (2006) view local identities as important for cosmopolitans.

Schools should help students to understand how cultural, national, regional, and global identifications are interrelated, complex, and evolving (Banks, 2004b). These identifications are interactive in a dynamic way. Each should be recognized, valued, publicly affirmed, and thoughtfully examined in schools. Students should be encouraged to critically examine their identifications and commitments and to understand the complex ways in which they are interrelated and constructed.

Citizenship education should help students to realize that "no local loyalty can ever justify forgetting that each human being has responsibilities to every other" (Appiah, 2006, p. xvi). As citizens of the global community, students also must develop a deep understanding of the need to take action and make decisions to help solve the world's difficult problems. They need to participate in ways that will enhance democracy and promote equality

and social justice in their cultural communities, nations, and regions, and in the world.

Increasing diversity throughout the world today and increasing recognition of diversity—as well as the intractable problems that the world faces—require a reexamination of the ends and means of citizenship education if it is to promote inclusion, civic equality, and recognition (Gutmann, 2004). Liberal assimilationist conceptions of citizenship education that eradicate the cultures and languages of diverse groups will be ineffective in a transformed “flat” world of the 21st century (Friedman, 2005). Citizenship education in the United States—as well as in other Western nations—should be reinvented so that it will enable students to see their fates as intimately tied to those of people throughout the world. Citizenship education should help students to understand why “a threat to justice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere” (King, 1963/1994, pp. 2–3).

Mainstream and Transformative Citizenship Education

Citizenship education must be reimagined and transformed to effectively educate students to function in the 21st century. For reform to succeed, the knowledge that underlies its construction must shift from mainstream academic knowledge to transformative academic knowledge. Mainstream knowledge reinforces traditional and established knowledge in the social and behavioral sciences as well as the knowledge that is institutionalized in the popular culture and in the nation’s schools, colleges, and universities (Banks, 1993). Transformative academic knowledge consists of paradigms and explanations that challenge some of the key epistemological assumptions of mainstream knowledge (Collins, 2000; Harding, 1991; Homans, 1967). An important purpose of transformative knowledge is to improve the human condition. Feminist scholars and scholars of color have been among the leading constructors of transformative academic knowledge (Collins, 2000; Harding, 1991; Takaki, 1993, 1998).

Mainstream citizenship education is grounded in mainstream knowledge and assumptions and reinforces the status quo and the dominant power relationships in society. It is practiced in most social studies classrooms in the United States (Parker, 2002) and does not challenge or disrupt the class, racial, or gender discrimination in the schools and society. Mainstream citizenship education either does not include each of the four elements of citizenship identified in the first part of this article—*civil, political, social, and cultural*—or includes them at superficial and limited levels. It does not help students to understand their multiple and complex identities, the ways their lives are influenced by globalization, or what their roles should be in a global world. Instead, the emphasis is on memorizing facts about constitutions and other legal documents, learning about various branches of government, and developing patriotism to the nation-state (Westheimer, 2007). Critical thinking skills, decision making, and action are not important components of mainstream citizenship education.

Transformative citizenship education needs to be implemented in schools if students are to attain clarified and reflective cultural, national, regional, and global identifications and understand how these identities are interrelated and constructed. Transformative

citizenship education also recognizes and validates the cultural identities of students. It is rooted in transformative academic knowledge and enables students to acquire the information, skills, and values needed to challenge inequality within their communities, their nations, and the world; to develop cosmopolitan values and perspectives; and to take actions to create just and democratic multicultural communities and societies. Transformative citizenship education helps students to develop the decision-making and social action skills that are needed to identify problems in society, acquire knowledge related to their homes and community cultures and languages, identify and clarify their values, and take thoughtful individual or collective civic action (Banks & Banks, 1999). It also fosters critical thinking skills and is inclusive of what DeJaeghere (2007) calls *critical citizenship education*.

Intergroup Relations Research and Transformative Citizenship Education

In democratic and transformative classrooms and schools, students from diverse groups interact and deliberate in equal-status situations. They also develop positive racial and ethnic attitudes as well as the knowledge, skills, and perspectives to deliberate with students from diverse groups. Deliberation among citizens from diverse groups is essential for a democratic society (Gutmann, 1987; Parker, 2002). Research indicates that equal status among diverse groups in contact situations is an essential condition for effective intergroup interactions and deliberations. Cohen and Roper (1972) found that White middle-class students dominated classroom interactions with African American students unless interventions increased the status of African Americans. Transformative classrooms create conditions in which students from different groups can interact in ways that enable them to view events from diverse perspectives and to deliberate in equal-status situations.

Allport (1954/1979) theorized that contact between groups will improve intergroup relations if the contact has the following characteristics: (a) The individuals experience equal status; (b) they share common goals; (c) intergroup cooperation exists; and (d) the contact is sanctioned by authorities, such as teachers and administrators, or by law or custom (Pettigrew, 2004). Multicultural textbooks and other materials (Banks, 2007; Takaki, 1993) help to create equal status in classrooms by giving voice to the histories and experiences of all students in the class and by enabling all to experience equality and recognition (Cohen, 1994; Gutmann, 2004).

Students have positive attitudes toward different racial and ethnic groups in transformative classrooms and have equal status in classroom discussions and deliberations. Teachers in transformative classrooms use strategies and materials that help students to acquire democratic racial attitudes and behaviors. Since the 1940s, a number of curriculum intervention studies have been conducted to determine the effects of teaching units and lessons, multicultural textbooks and materials, role playing, and other kinds of simulated experiences related to the racial attitudes and perceptions of students. These studies indicate that the use of multicultural textbooks, other related teaching materials, and cooperative teaching strategies can enable students from different racial and ethnic groups to develop democratic racial attitudes and to interact in equal-status situations. Such materials and

teaching strategies can also result in students' choosing more friends from outside their own racial, ethnic, and cultural groups (Slavin, 2001).

These studies provide guidelines that can help teachers to improve intergroup relations, interactions, and deliberations in transformative classrooms and schools. One of the earliest curriculum studies was conducted by Trager and Yarrow (1952), who examined the effects of a democratic multicultural curriculum on the racial attitudes of children in the first and second grades. The curriculum had a positive effect on the attitudes of both students and teachers. The authors gave their study the title *They Learn What They Live* to highlight its major finding: If students experience democracy they will internalize it.

Research indicates that curricular interventions such as multiethnic readers (Litcher & Johnson, 1969); multicultural television programs (Bogatz & Ball, 1971); simulations (Weiner & Wright, 1973); multicultural social studies materials (Yawkey & Blackwell, 1974); folk dances, music, crafts, and role-playing (Ijaz & Ijaz, 1981); plays (Gimmestad & DeChiara, 1982); discussions about race (Aboud & Doyle, 1996); and discussions combined with antiracist teaching (McGregor, 1993) can have positive effects on the racial attitudes and interactions of students.

Research on Cooperative Learning and Interracial Contact

Transformative and democratic classrooms foster cooperation rather than competition among students from diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural groups. Cooperation promotes positive interracial interactions and deliberations. Since 1970, a group of investigators, guided by Allport's (1954/1979) theory, have produced a rich body of cumulative research on the effects of cooperative learning groups and activities on students' racial attitudes, friendship choices, and achievement. Much of this research has been conducted as well as reviewed by investigators such as Aronson (2002) and his colleagues (Aronson & Bridgeman, 1979; Aronson & Gonzalez, 1988), Cohen and her colleagues (Cohen, 1972, 1984; Cohen & Lotan, 1995), Johnson and Johnson (1981, 1991), Slavin (1979, 1983, 1985), and Slavin and Madden (1979). Schofield (2004) has written an informative review of this research. Most of it has been conducted using elementary and high school students (Slavin, 1983, 1985).

This research strongly supports the notion that cooperative interracial contact situations in schools—if the conditions described by Allport (1954/1979) are present in the contact situations—have positive effects on both student interracial behavior and student interactions (Aronson & Gonzalez, 1988; Slavin, 1979, 1983). In his review of 19 studies of the effects of cooperative learning methods, Slavin (1985) found that 16 showed positive effects on interracial friendships. In another review, Slavin (2001) also described the positive effects of cooperative groups on racial attitudes and cross-racial friendships. Other investigators have found that cooperative learning activities increased student motivation and self-esteem (Slavin, 1985) and helped students to develop empathy (Aronson, 2002; Aronson & Bridgeman, 1979).

Equal status between groups in interracial situations has to be deliberately structured by teachers or it will not exist (Cohen & Roper, 1972). If students from different racial, ethnic, and

linguistic groups are mixed in contact situations without structured interventions that create equal-status conditions, then racial and ethnic conflict and stereotyping are likely to increase. Students from both privileged and marginalized groups are likely to respond in ways that will reinforce the advantage of the higher status group. In a series of perceptive and carefully designed studies, Cohen and her colleagues consistently found that contact among different groups without deliberate interventions to increase equal-status and positive interactions among them will increase rather than reduce intergroup tensions (Cohen, 1984; Cohen & Lotan, 1995; Cohen & Roper, 1972).

Transformative Classrooms and Levels of Citizenship

Transformative classrooms and schools help students to acquire the knowledge, values, and skills needed to become *deep citizens*. Clarke (1996) states that a deep citizen,

both in the operation of [his or her] own life and in some of its parameters . . . [is] conscious of acting in and into a world shared with others . . . [and is] conscious that the identity of self and the identity of others is co-related and co-creative, while also opening up the possibility of both engagement in and enchantment with the world. (p. 6)

I have developed a typology designed to help educators conceptualize ways to help students acquire increasingly deeper citizenship that contains four levels (see Figure 1). Like the categories in any typology, these levels of citizenship overlap and are interrelated. Nevertheless, differentiating levels of citizenship is useful.

Legal citizenship, the most superficial level of citizenship in the typology, applies to citizens who are legal members of the nation-state and have certain rights and obligations to the state but do not participate in the political system in any meaningful ways.

Minimal citizenship applies to those who are legal citizens and vote in local and national elections for conventional and mainstream candidates and issues.

Active citizenship involves action beyond voting to actualize existing laws and conventions. Active citizens may participate in protest demonstrations or make public speeches regarding conventional issues and reforms. The actions of active citizens are designed to support and maintain—but not to challenge—existing social and political structures.

Transformative citizenship involves civic actions designed to actualize values and moral principles and ideals beyond those of existing laws and conventions.² Transformative citizens take action to promote social justice even when their actions violate, challenge, or dismantle existing laws, conventions, or structures.

Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat to a White man on a bus in Montgomery, Alabama, on December 1, 1955. Her action was a pivotal event in the Montgomery bus boycott that ended segregation in transportation in the South and thrust Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. into national leadership. A group of African American college students sat down at a lunch counter reserved




FIGURE 1. *Types of citizens, defined by four levels of participation. Transformative, or deep, citizenship is exemplified by Rosa Parks and the students who started the sit-in movement in Greensboro, North Carolina, in 1960.*

for Whites in a Woolworth's store in Greensboro, North Carolina, on February 1, 1960. The students initiated the sit-in movement that ended segregation in lunch counters throughout the South. Both Parks and the students violated existing segregation laws. They were engaging in transformative citizenship because they took action to actualize social justice, even though what they did was illegal and challenged existing laws, customs, and conventions.

The important difference between active and transformative citizens is that the actions taken by active citizens fall within existing laws, customs, and conventions, whereas the actions taken by transformative citizens are designed to promote values and moral principles—such as social justice and equality—and may violate existing conventions and laws. Although transformative educators recognize and respect students at all levels of citizenship, their aim is to help students become transformative and deep citizens.

Conclusion

Students experience democracy in classrooms and schools when transformative citizenship education is implemented. Consequently, they are better able to internalize democratic beliefs and values and to acquire thoughtful cultural identifications and commitments. The total school, including the knowledge conveyed in the curriculum, needs to be reformed to implement transformative citizenship education. Inequality and stratification within the larger society are challenged and are not reproduced in transformative and democratic classrooms and schools. Transformative citizenship education helps students to develop reflective cultural, national, regional, and global

identifications and to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote social justice in communities, nations, and the world.

NOTES

I presented versions of this article in a seminar at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS), in Stanford, California, April 26, 2006, and as the Tisch Lecture at Teachers College, Columbia University, September 24, 2007. I am grateful to the CASBS's staff for their help and support during my residency at the center and to the fellows at the center for their thoughtful reactions and comments. I am indebted to my colleagues and students at Teachers College for the stimulating intellectual community that I experienced when I was the Tisch Distinguished Visiting Professor for the fall semester in 2007.

¹I am using the terms *assimilationist*, *liberal*, *liberal assimilationist*, and *universal* as synonyms in describing conceptions of citizenship education.

²My ideas regarding convention and action beyond conventional levels are adapted from Lawrence Kohlberg's (1971) stages of moral development.

REFERENCES

- About, F. E., & Doyle, A. B. (1996). Does talk foster prejudice or tolerance in children? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 28(3), 161–171.
- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Allport, G. W. (1979). *The nature of prejudice* (25th anniversary ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. (Original work published 1954)
- Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: Norton.
- Apter, D. E. (1977). Political life and cultural pluralism. In M. M. Tumin & W. Plotch (Eds.), *Pluralism in a democratic society* (pp. 58–91). New York: Praeger.
- Aronson, E. (2002). Building empathy, compassion, and achievement in the jigsaw classroom. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 209–225). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Aronson, E., & Bridgeman, D. (1979). Jigsaw groups and the desegregated classroom: In pursuit of common goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5(4), 438–446.
- Aronson, E., & Gonzalez, A. (1988). Desegregation, jigsaw, and the Mexican-American experience. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 301–314). New York: Plenum.
- Au, K. (2006). *Multicultural issues and literacy achievement*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Banks, J. A. (1969). A content analysis of the Black American in textbooks. *Social Education*, 33(8), 954–957, 963.
- Banks, J. A. (1986). Multicultural education: Development, paradigms, and goals. In J. A. Banks & J. Lynch (Eds.), *Multicultural education in Western societies* (pp. 1–29). London: Holt.
- Banks, J. A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher*, 22(5), 4–14.
- Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2004a). *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. A. (2004b). Introduction: Democratic citizenship education in multicultural societies. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 3–15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. A. (2006). *Race, culture, and education: The selected works of James A. Banks*. New York: Routledge.
- Banks, J. A. (2007). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (with Clegg, A. A., Jr.). (1999). *Teaching strategies for the social studies: Decision-making and citizen action*. New York: Longman.
- Banks, J. A., Banks, C. A. M., Cortés, C. E., Hahn, C. L., Merryfield, M. M., Moodley, K. A., et al. (2005). *Democracy and diversity: Principles and concepts for educating citizens in a global age*. Seattle: Center for Multicultural Education, University of Washington.
- Benhabib, S. (2004). *The rights of others: Aliens, residents, and citizens*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bennett, D. H. (1988). *The party of fear: From nativist movements to the New Right in American history*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Bogatz, G. A., & Ball, S. (1971). *The second year of Sesame Street: A continuing evaluation*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Bowen, J. R. (2004). Muslims and citizens: France's headscarf controversy. *Boston Review*, 29(1), 31–35.
- Bowen, J. R. (in press). Republican ironies: Equality and identities in French schools. In M. Minow, R. A. Shweder, & H. Marcus (Eds.), *Just schools: Pursuing equality in societies of difference*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bulmer, M., & Rees, A. M. (Eds.). (1996). *Citizenship today: The contemporary relevance of T. H. Marshall*. London: UCL Press.
- Carmichael, S., & Hamilton, C. (1967). *Black power: The politics of liberation in America*. New York: Vintage.
- Castles, S. (2004). Migration, citizenship, and education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 17–48). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Castles, S., & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. New York: Routledge.
- Clarke, P. B. (1996). *Deep citizenship*. London: Pluto Press.
- Cohen, E. G. (1972). Interracial interaction disability. *Human Relations*, 25(1), 9–24.
- Cohen, E. G. (1984). Talking and working together: Status, interaction, and learning. In P. Peterson, L. C. Wilkinson, & M. Hallinan (Eds.), *The social context of instruction* (pp. 171–186). New York: Academic Press.
- Cohen, E. G. (1994). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohen, E. G., & Lotan, R. A. (1995). Producing equal-status interaction in the heterogeneous classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(1), 99–120.
- Cohen, E. G., & Roper, S. S. (1972). Modification of interracial interaction disability: An application of status characteristics theory. *American Sociological Review*, 37(6), 643–657.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services.
- DeJaeghere, J. G. (2007). Intercultural and global meanings of citizenship education in the Australian secondary curriculum: Between critical contestations and minimal construction. In E. D. Stevick & B. A. Levinson (Eds.), *Reimagining civic education: How diverse societies form democratic citizens* (pp. 293–316). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Deyhle, D., & Swisher, K. G. (in press). Connecting the circle in American Indian education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education*. New York: Routledge.
- Drachler, J. (1920). *Democracy and assimilation*. New York: Macmillan.
- D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus*. New York: Collier Macmillan.
- El-Haj, T. R. A. (2007). "I was born here, but my home, it's not here": Educating for democratic citizenship in an era of transnational migration and global conflict. *Harvard Educational Review*, 77(3), 285–316.
- Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking recognition: Overcoming displacement and reification in cultural politics. *New Left Review*, 3, 107–120.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gimmestad, B. J., & DeChiara, E. (1982). Dramatic plays: A vehicle for prejudice reduction in the elementary school. *Journal of Educational Research*, 76(1), 45–49.
- González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gordon, B. M. (2001). Knowledge construction, competing critical theories, and education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 184–199). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The roles of race, religion, and national origin*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Graham, P. A. (2005). *Schooling in America: How the public schools meet the nation's changing needs*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Greenbaum, W. (1974). America in search of a new ideal: An essay on the rise of pluralism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 44(3), 411–440.
- Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gutmann, A. (2003). *Identity in democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gutmann, A. (2004). Unity and diversity in democratic multicultural education: Creative and destructive tensions. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 71–96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hargreaves, A. G. (1995). *Immigration, "race," and ethnicity in France*. New York: Routledge.
- Homans, G. C. (1967). *The nature of social science*. New York: Harcourt.
- Ijaz, M. A., & Ijaz, I. H. (1981). A cultural program for changing racial attitudes. *History and Social Science Teacher*, 17(1), 17–20.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1981). Effects of cooperative and individualistic learning experiences on interethnic interaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73(3), 444–449.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1991). *Learning together and alone* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kallen, H. M. (1924). *Culture and democracy in the United States*. New York: Boni and Liveright.
- King, M. L., Jr. (1994). *Letter from the Birmingham jail*. New York: HarperCollins. (Original work published 1963)
- Kohlberg, L. (1971). *Stages of moral development*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from <http://www.xenodochy.org/ex/lists/moraldev.html>
- Koopmans, R., Statham, P., Giugni, M., & Passy, F. (2005). *Contested citizenship: Immigration and cultural diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2004). Foreword. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. xiii–xviii). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). Culture versus citizenship: The challenge of racialized citizenship in the United States. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 99–126). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lagassé, P. (Ed.). (2000). *The Columbia encyclopedia* (6th ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

- Lipset, S. M. (1964). Introduction. In T. H. Marshall, *Class, citizenship, and social development: Essays of T. H. Marshall* (pp. i–xx). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Litcher, J. H., & Johnson, D. W. (1969). Changes in attitudes toward Negroes of White elementary school students after use of multiethnic readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 60*(2), 148–152.
- Luchtenberg, S. (2004a). Ethnic diversity and citizenship education in Germany. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 245–271). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Luchtenberg, S. (Ed.). (2004b). *Migration, education and change*. London: Routledge.
- Maira, S. (2004). Imperial feelings: Youth culture, citizenship, and globalization. In M. Suárez-Orozco & D. B. Qin-Hilliard (Eds.), *Globalization, culture, and education in the new millennium* (pp. 203–234). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mannitz, S. (2004). Collective solidarity and the construction of social identities in school: A case study of immigrant youths in post-unification West Berlin. In S. Luchtenberg (Ed.), *Migration, education and change* (pp. 140–166). New York: Routledge.
- Marshall, T. H. (1964). *Class, citizenship, and social development: Essays of T. H. Marshall*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- McGregor, J. (1993). Effectiveness of role playing and antiracist teaching in reducing student prejudice. *Journal of Educational Research, 86*(4), 215–226.
- Murphy-Shigematsu, S. (2004). Expanding the borders of the nation: Ethnic diversity and citizenship education in Japan. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 303–332). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nguyen, D. (2008). *In between worlds: How Vietnamese immigrant youth construct social, cultural, and national identifications*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2002). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country* (pp. 2–17). Boston: Beacon.
- Okihiro, G. Y. (1994). *Margins and mainstreams: Asians in American history*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education*. New York: Open University Press.
- Osler, A., & Vincent, K. (2002). *Citizenship and the challenge of global education*. Stoke-on-Kent, UK: Trentham Books.
- Parker, W. C. (2002). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Patterson, O. (1977). *Ethnic chauvinism: The reactionary impulse*. New York: Stein and Day.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (2004). Intergroup contact: Theory, research, and new perspectives. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 770–781). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ramírez, M., III, & Castañeda, A. (1974). *Cultural democracy, bicultural development, and education*. New York: Academic Press.
- Rosaldo, R. (1997). Cultural citizenship, inequality, and multiculturalism. In W. V. Flores & R. Benmayor (Eds.), *Latino cultural citizenship: Claiming identity, space, and rights* (pp. 27–28). Boston: Beacon.
- Schlesinger, A. M. (1991). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society*. Knoxville, TN: Whittle Direct Books.
- Schofield, J. W. (2004). Fostering positive intergroup relations in schools. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 799–812). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, J. W. (2007). *The politics of the veil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Simpson, J. A., & Weiner, E. S. C. (Eds.). (1989). *The Oxford English dictionary* (2nd ed., Vol. 3). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sizemore, B. A. (1973). Shattering the melting pot myth. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Teaching ethnic studies: Concepts and strategies* (43rd Yearbook, pp. 72–101). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Slavin, R. E. (1979). Effects of biracial learning teams on cross-racial friendships. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71*(3), 381–387.
- Slavin, R. E. (1983). *Cooperative learning*. New York: Longman.
- Slavin, R. E. (1985). Cooperative learning: Applying contact theory in desegregated schools. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*(3), 45–62.
- Slavin, R. E. (2001). Cooperative learning and intergroup relations. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 628–634). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1979). School practices that improve race relations. *American Educational Research Journal, 16*(2), 169–180.
- Solomos, J. (2008). *Race and racism in Britain* (4th ed.). New York: Pelgrave Macmillan.
- Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2006, March 13). Commentary: A question of assimilation. *U.S. News & World Report*, pp. 34, 36.
- Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Takaki, R. (1998). *Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans* (Rev. ed.). Boston: Little, Brown.
- Torres, C. A. (1998). Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world. *Comparative Education Review, 42*(4), 421–447.
- Trager, H. G., & Yarrow, M. R. (1952). *They learn what they live: Prejudice in young children*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights. (1948). Retrieved December 4, 2007, from <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *Statistical abstract of the United States* (120th ed.). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Weiner, M. J., & Wright, F. E. (1973). Effects of undergoing arbitrary discrimination upon subsequent attitudes toward a minority group. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 3*(1), 94–102.
- Westheimer, J. (Ed.). (2007). *Pledging allegiance: The politics of patriotism in America's schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (2005). When learning a second language means losing the first. In M. M. Suárez-Orozco, C. Suárez-Orozco, & D. Qin (Eds.), *The new immigration: An interdisciplinary reader* (pp. 289–307). New York: Routledge.
- Woodson, C. G. (1977). *The mis-education of the Negro*. New York: AMS Press. (Original work published 1933)
- Yawkey, T. D., & Blackwell, J. (1974). Attitudes of 4-year-old urban Black children toward themselves and Whites based upon multiethnic social studies materials and experiences. *Journal of Educational Research, 67*(8), 373–377.
- Young, I. M. (1989). Polity and group difference: A critique of the ideal of universal citizenship. *Ethics, 99*(2), 250–274.
- Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

AUTHOR

JAMES A. BANKS is the Kerry and Linda Killinger Professor of Diversity Studies and Director of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, Box 353600, 110 Miller Hall, Seattle, WA 98195-3600; jbanks@u.washington.edu. His research focuses on multicultural education and diversity and citizenship education in a global context.

Manuscript received December 10, 2007

Revision received February 21, 2008

Accepted February 22, 2008