

Draft – Not for further distribution

National Academy of Education

Civic Reasoning and Discourse

**Defining and Implementing Civic Reasoning and Discourse:
Philosophical and Moral Foundations for Research and Practice**

Sarah M. Stitzlein, University of Cincinnati

With the Assistance of:

Peter Levin, Tufts University, (Steering Committee Chairman)
Anthony Laden, University of Illinois at Chicago (Panelist)
Jennifer Morton, University of North Carolina (Panelist)

July 2020

Contact:

Sarah Stitzlein, University of Cincinnati, 610F Teachers College, McMicken Circle, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, 513-556-2439, Sarah.Stitzlein@uc.edu

This draft paper was prepared for the National Academy of Education’s Civic Reasoning and Discourse Project. The research reported here is supported by the Hewlett Foundation, through Grant #2018-8363 to the National Academy of Education. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of Hewlett Foundation.

50 Following the work of Peter Levine, the citizens’ question “What should we do?” can be
51 broken up, with each word revealing the people, content, and values at stake and the physical, social,
52 and emotional effort involved.

53 • What—the tangible or meaningful products and results of our discussions and actions.

54 These could be objects we produce together, decisions we reach, norms we construct to
55 shape our interactions together, and more. In many cases, they are empirical matters,
56 dependent upon facts and evidence.

57 • Should—a normative claim about how to better a situation, improve our relations together,
58 or solve a problem. Each of these pushes us beyond what we merely *can* or *want* to do into
59 making a claim about what it is *right* for us to do or what we may have an ethical
60 responsibility to do.

61 • We—an emphasis on our shared fate in a community, collaboration in addressing issues, and
62 our responsibilities to each other, especially as part of publics that form around mutual
63 concerns. The individual’s question—“What should I do?”—also matters, but it becomes
64 *civic* when it’s about impact on or action with a “we.”

65 • Do—actions taken together, in parallel, or individually, but may also entail engaging in
66 discussion, building communities, and figuring out how to live together well. The emphasis
67 is on what we can achieve, rather than what we might expect others to do.

68 Importantly, legacies of injustice and patterns of marginalization reveal that the “we” in this
69 question cannot just be assumed. The history of civic struggle shows us that defining the “we” is a
70 source of deep disagreement. One consequence of defining it narrowly can be to exclude people
71 from the conversations that matter and essentially silence them. However, people have agency.
72 When excluded from one “we,” they may create another, demand and gain a place in the group that

73 excluded them, or both. Part of taking up the civic question is working through past exclusions to
74 create new and more inclusive understandings of the “we” in the United States today.

75 Citizens compose the groups that take up this question. The word “citizen” is widely used to
76 mean a person recognized by a given government as a member holding a full set of rights, especially
77 in liberal democracies, like that of the United States. In the terms of political philosopher James
78 Tully, this is a civil notion of citizenship that emphasizes legal status (Tully, 2008). An alternative
79 understanding, which I operate with here, defines “citizens” in terms of what they do: a citizen is
80 someone who engages in the diverse practices of citizenship that vary across groups and contexts,
81 but crucially include forms of civic reasoning and discourse. In Tully’s terminology, this is a civic
82 notion of citizenship. From this view, a citizen is someone who can and does seriously ask “What
83 should we—the members of this group—do?”

84 Citizens, then, can be people who engage in activities of citizenship, yet are not granted
85 citizenship in terms of formal legal or informal membership status. For example, undocumented
86 immigrants have taken to the streets to make demands of the nation-state and indigenous peoples
87 have refused the jurisdiction of the US government over their land as a way to require recognition of
88 their sovereign status. In this way, citizens belong to and act within many groups that are not
89 formally democratic yet are still civic. I work with a broad understanding here of what counts as
90 civic space and civic engagement, pushing us beyond common boundaries that limit such endeavors
91 to the government or formal political spheres.

92 Most of the definitions and arguments I offer in this report are phrased in universal terms.
93 Every human being is part of many overlapping and nested communities that may employ or fail to
94 honor civic reasoning and discourse. The characteristics of good reasoning and the threats that it
95 faces seem widely shared. Nation-states have diverse political systems and political cultures, but a

96 nation-state is just one venue of civic reasoning among many. Some important venues, from world
97 faiths to Facebook, are transnational.

98 At the same time, most of the examples and research findings I cite come from the United
99 States. I do not deeply explore whether aspects of civic reasoning and discourse should vary among
100 regimes or cultures. This article might be read as a theory by and for people in the United States, but
101 one that understands good American citizens as belonging to multiple communities (from the hyper-
102 local to the global) and that favors relatively general principles instead of ones that are tied closely to
103 the United States.

104 **Civic and Democratic Elements of Civic Reasoning and Discourse**

105 The reasoning we do in order to answer “What should we do?” can be civic in three senses:

- 106 1. Topic—As we consider what we should do, we are focused on issues important to our
107 shared living. Civic reasoning is reasoning about civic matters.
- 108 2. Identity of the reasoners—Figuring out what we should do is a matter of our collective
109 agency and is therefore concerned with who we are, who composes our group, and what
110 our capacities are. Civic reasoning is the reasoning we do as civic actors.
- 111 3. Manner in which we relate to each other—Answering what we should do is not merely
112 instrumental, focused only on actions and decisions, but rather is constitutive: it creates a
113 “we.” This raises norms about how we exchange ideas and interact together. Civic
114 reasoning is reasoning we engage in civically or civilly.

115 In this paper, I start from a picture of good civic reasoning as civic in these three senses. So
116 understood, good civic reasoning represents an ideal of democratic practice. Not every instance of
117 citizens discussing what to do together will satisfy these criteria, and not every (perhaps not any)
118 encounter among citizens will realize this ideal. I nevertheless try to lay out here the components
119 that go into this ideal of good civic reasoning in the hopes that it gives us a framework for

120 understanding its value to democracy, how and where we fall short of it, what might go into
121 educating children in ways that facilitate their democratic engagement, and where the obstacles lie to
122 doing so effectively.

123 Good civic reasoning is a plural and ethical endeavor that often entails inquiry, empirical
124 investigation, and/or engagement with emotions. Civic reasoning is plural because individuals rarely
125 have the wisdom, power, or resources to undertake tackling the question alone. Even apparently
126 solitary civic acts, such as casting a secret ballot, are deeply shaped by those around us, including the
127 opinions of others and media influences. Civic reasoning is ethical because answering the question
128 pushes us to assess and determine which means and which ends we ought to choose, including how
129 they might impact those both in and outside of our group. Additionally, civic reasoning is ethical
130 because it requires that we act with respect in that we treat each other as having standing in the
131 situation and give each other's claims consideration.

132 Let's consider an example of teenagers in a high school social studies class asking, "What
133 should we do?" as they deliberate about the best course of action regarding U.S. military
134 intervention in the Middle East. Even if those children are not in a position to determine the
135 outcome, they are role-playing or practicing deliberation in order to develop civic reasoning skills
136 and to make and refine opinions about the actual decision-makers. Forming opinions and arriving at
137 shared views about state action can be a significant result of engaging in reasoning that is civic in
138 topic. Ethically, students should weigh the risks of whether continued or further military
139 intervention might put additional lives at risk or bring safety to large groups of people abroad or at
140 home.

141 Civic reasoning often requires empirical investigation or evidence gathering so that we may
142 better understand a situation and the potential results that might follow from our decision or course
143 of action. For instance, the high schoolers may need to find out about the physical and political risks

144 of U.S. military force in the Middle East, which may entail investigating political geography, past
145 military intervention, and even weather in a desert or mountainous fighting environment.

146 To engage in civic reasoning is not to leave emotions behind or ignore them. Indeed,
147 emotions figure into good civic reasoning in a number of ways. Emotions can serve as inputs to the
148 reasoning process, as when anger at injustice helps us to see the injustice in the first place. Certainly,
149 women, African-Americans, and others have productively used anger to help reveal and elevate the
150 injustices behind their calls for civil rights. Emotions can also help reasoners see more clearly that a
151 point of view should be taken seriously, as when they are bound up in the personal experiences of
152 the reasoners. In the example, some students may bring personal experiences with family members
153 in the military or living in the Middle East to the classroom discussion. This may lead those students
154 to feel frightened for their well-being or angry about being separated by military deployments,
155 emotions that can draw attention to the seriousness of the matter. Finally, we may hope to engage or
156 provoke certain emotions in the course of working out what we should do, aiming to call forth
157 feelings that might help to motivate action. For instance, a student might share research on the lives
158 of war refugees in a way that is designed to call forth sympathy from her classmates.

159 Civic discourse is a means or method by which groups of people engage in civic reasoning.
160 Given our nature as largely interdependent beings that construct knowledge and solutions together,
161 civic discourse is one key way that we reason together, through discussion and deliberation, to
162 answer, “What should we do?” Civic discourse is also a social endeavor and is one way in which we
163 relate to others. Civic discourse offers benefits rarely achievable when engaging in civic reasoning
164 alone. For example, discussing with others can help to combat our individual cognitive and ethical
165 limitations and biases.

166 Civic discourse can encounter problems. Civic discourse can go badly when a group excludes
167 some perspectives, falls prey to group-think, or succumbs to other dysfunctions of group discussion.

168 It can also go badly when individuals do not relate to others well, perhaps by dominating the
169 discussion or belittling the views of others. And, while civic reasoning and discourse go hand-in-
170 hand in ideal situations, sometimes that is not the case. An individual may be engaged in good civic
171 reasoning, gathering evidence, and thinking critically about what to do, but may be unable to engage
172 in civic discourse with a group that excludes or denigrates her or others. Alternatively, participants in
173 a group may relate well to each other, yet their discourse may fall short of good civic reasoning
174 because it suffers from epistemic blind spots due to lack of plurality caused by ideological
175 homogeneity or other reasons. As a result, civic reasoning and discourse must be considered both
176 individually and together as we seek to understand and improve them.

177 Civic reasoning and discourse play important roles in democracy. While the question “What
178 should we do?” is most often posed within the civic sphere, we can engage in civic reasoning and
179 discourse in an array of settings: from inside of a religious organization, with friends on Facebook,
180 amongst leaders of a private company, or amongst scholars in a scientific discipline. None of these
181 are democracies, but democracy, as both a system of government and a way of life, *particularly*
182 promotes and relies upon good civic reasoning and discourse. In a vibrant democracy, citizens not
183 only self-govern and consent to laws, but also actively work with others to form publics around
184 shared problems, to pose and evaluate solutions, and to engage in creative imagining of how their
185 future might be improved. Good civic reasoning and discourse can keep democracy healthy by
186 welcoming a plurality of perspectives, highlighting shared responsibilities for sustained and
187 improved living, integrating citizens into decision making about the future of communities, and
188 building a collective sense of “we.”

189 Schools are important institutions that can teach good practices of civic reasoning and
190 discourse. Colleges and universities, many civic associations, and some media organizations also
191 fulfill this function. But here I focus on K-12 schools because of their ubiquity and strong influence

192 on developing youth. Teaching the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal aspects of good civic
193 reasoning and discourse may lead not only to sustained and improved democracy by virtue of new
194 generations of citizens that engage in civic reasoning and discourse well, but they may also enable
195 other forms of learning in our schools, as students experience the world together and construct new
196 knowledge about it. In the next section, I describe key components of good civic reasoning and
197 discourse which may be taught, before turning to current obstacles to improved civic reasoning and
198 discourse inside and outside of schools.

199 **Components of Civic Reasoning and Discourse**

200 Good civic reasoning and discourse require particular knowledge, skills, values, and
201 dispositions. Here, I summarize some of the most important components. The groupings employed
202 should not be understood as firm or clear distinctions; instead, the boundaries blur as components
203 relate to and build on one another in different contexts. For example, a skill may be used because
204 one has already established a disposition to act, or a value may rely upon knowledge in order for it to
205 be fulfilled.

206 **Knowledge and Skills**

207 Particular knowledge and skills work together to enable, support, and enhance quality civic
208 reasoning and discourse. They play a role in inquiry, fact finding, negotiating truth, reasonableness,
209 critical thinking, discussion, and deliberation.

210 ***Inquiry***

211 To be civic in topic is for reasoning to inquire into issues important to our lives with others.
212 Inquiry is often triggered when we find ourselves in what educational philosopher John Dewey calls
213 “indeterminate situations” (Dewey, 1927, 1938). These are moments when we are unsure how to
214 proceed—moments that give rise to the question “What should we do?” They also give birth to
215 publics because they bring people together around shared experiences or struggles. For Dewey,

216 inquiry is the process we use to investigate our world, hypothesize improved ways of understanding
217 or living within it, and then experiment with them to gauge their usefulness for moving forward out
218 of the indeterminate situation. Inquiry entails determining the stakeholders that are impacted by a
219 situation. Inquiry is cognitive and empirical. It is experimental in nature and invites multiple, and
220 often conflicting, perspectives into communication with each other to imagine, create, and test
221 potential solutions.

222 Although the focus of inquiry is more on how we can adapt ourselves and our current
223 situations, which can require a host of different sorts of information, historical and political
224 knowledge is often required in order to figure out what to do. Knowledge of what has been tried
225 and accomplished in the past and historical consciousness (Clark and Grever, 2018) can help us
226 make wiser judgments for the future. Skills of historical interpretation may be needed to distinguish
227 facts from stories or myths and to reach conclusions based on evidence from multiple sources
228 (Barton & Levstik, 2015; VanSledright, 2015; Wineburg, 2002; Reisman, 2012; Monte-Sano &
229 Reisman, 2018). These include identifying legitimate sources, attributing the source to an author
230 contextualized historically, understanding that author’s perspective, and corroborating the source to
231 assess its reliability (VanSledright, 2015). In part, this historical knowledge and content serves to
232 identify the means and ends for answering the civic question, while also considering the relevant
233 stakeholders and the individual and collective agency of those involved for taking up and solving
234 “What should we do?”

235 Within the context of a democracy, citizens need more than just historical knowledge; they
236 also need knowledge about politics and democratic practices and procedures. Citizens need to know
237 what government is, what it does, who composes it, and how power operates within it. These can be
238 thought of as “the rules of the game, the substance of politics, and people and parties” (Delli Carpini
239 & Keeter, 1996, p. 65). This sort of political knowledge can help us figure out the resources we have

240 to answer “What should we do?” Importantly, they also need to have a working understanding of
241 the law so that they understand potential constraints on what they *can* do in a representative
242 constitutional republic (Parker & Lo, 2016) and whether they might need to additionally work to
243 change policies or leadership in order to achieve the sort of action they envision (Stitzlein, 2014).

244 While much of contemporary curriculum theory and research in areas of citizenship
245 education is rightly concerned with “who” questions about stakeholders and “how” questions about
246 skills, it is important that we not lose sight of the “what”—the content—that is needed to do civic
247 reasoning well. But, citizenship education should not be boiled down to a fixed set of static
248 knowledge to convey to children. Instead, knowledge should be taught as part of active inquiry into
249 authentic controversies in our democracy and struggles to live together within it well. Such inquiry
250 does not treat those controversies and struggles as mere issues to be grasped objectively from afar or
251 to be dealt with later in life as adults, but rather immerses students into the complicated arena of
252 real, present political life. Quality citizenship education teaches both for and with inquiry, where
253 teaching *with* inquiry leads to learning content and teaching *for* inquiry develops the skills of doing
254 inquiry itself (Swan et al., 2018). Together, inquiry-based learning attends to the real challenges of
255 living in a democracy and brings “who,” “how,” and “what” questions to bear as we engage in civic
256 reasoning.

257 ***Fact Finding and Truth***

258 Inquiry and knowledge often hinge on finding, analyzing, interpreting, agreeing upon,
259 making judgments from, and reaching conclusions about facts. Both empirical and civic facts
260 provide important tools for inquiry. First, empirical facts may form the basis of the natural or
261 scientific phenomena we need to understand in order to address our situation. Second, knowledge of
262 and access to facts about civic content increases our political knowledge, helps us to feel

263 empowered, and improves our ability to influence the governing process. Scholars of civic
264 participation, Michael Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter (1996) explain,

265 A well-informed citizen is more likely to be attentive to politics, engaged in various forms of
266 participation, committed to democratic principles, opinionated, and to feel efficacious. No
267 other single characteristic of an individual affords so reliable a predictor of good citizenship,
268 broadly conceived, as their level of [political] knowledge. (pp. 6-7).

269 The facts needed for good inquiry as a part of civic reasoning may be more complicated than
270 one might assume. What we take to be facts may not be as straightforward as they seem; rather, they
271 are influenced by their source and other factors. We typically come to uphold them because of their
272 source; we accept the testimony or authority of some person or institution because of their expertise
273 or credentials, or because we may have a personal relationship with them. Yet, the facts arrived at
274 through empirical investigation and the social process of inquiry are shaped by an array of influences
275 other than mere pursuit of truth. Accepting those facts is always a matter of trust.

276 For example, no one individual has examined directly and assessed all the evidence that
277 humans are causing the earth to warm. No one can read all the relevant research, or check the data
278 reported in the research, or collect all the data, or design the instruments used to collect the data, or
279 train the people who design the instruments, or conduct the prior research that underlies all of these
280 activities. Knowledge-creation is profoundly social, often carried out by institutions—scientific
281 organizations, think tanks, news rooms, laboratories, and so forth. To have knowledge, therefore,
282 requires that we trust others and trust institutions. Yet many individuals and institutions are not
283 trustworthy, nor is automatic trust rational. The hard question is which people and organizations to
284 trust for the knowledge they produce. Learning how to make such decisions well is crucial to
285 engaging in quality civic reasoning and discourse.

286 Facts may exist independent of us, whereas knowledge is something we construct and is
287 mediated by an array of social institutions and relationships of trust between reasoners. While some
288 of these facts may exist apart from our social contexts, the emphasis here is on inquiry as a social
289 process of knowledge discovery—a moderate position between an extreme form of social
290 construction or relativism and a positivist correspondence theory of truth. Thus, when people have
291 seemingly irreconcilable disagreements about “what the facts are,” they are typically not suggesting
292 that there are no facts or that all facts are relative. Instead, they are disagreeing about what sources
293 of knowledge are trustworthy. Of course, they may be mistaken about this, but this is part of what
294 citizens seek to sort out by engaging in inquiry and knowledge construction.

295 Understanding the problems we face and deliberating about what to do is not only a matter
296 of figuring out facts; it requires thinking about values. This is often exemplified in cases of civic
297 content, where the public good is at stake and competing normative frameworks may play a
298 significant role shaping *what we should* do. The civic question leads us to have to consider what sort
299 of ends we desire and who benefits from those aims. We must consider what makes certain actions
300 worth doing or certain outcomes worth pursuing. The way we answer “What should we do?” is a
301 realization of our values. To answer the question well, we need the ability to think and talk about
302 values: including what they are, how they relate to one another, and how they are best achieved.
303 Sometimes, we face situations where we must resolve tensions between competing or conflicting
304 values. Other times, we must recognize the possibility that no option may fully realize all of our
305 values. So, in choosing among our options, we face tradeoffs in which values are realized and to
306 what degree. We may have to prioritize one value over another. These situations require being able
307 to articulate our own values—to describe them and qualify why they are important to us and to what
308 extent. And they require being able to detect the values of others and engage in discussion and
309 negotiation about them (Allen, 2019). In some cases, we may need to question or change our values

310 because they lead us to biased or problematic behaviors, such as self-interested or unjust acts. As I
311 will describe later in this report, sometimes the values at stake are actually about how we relate to
312 one another in a democracy, the third sense of reasoning as civic.

313 Relatedly, what each of us takes to be the facts depends on our values, our background
314 experiences, our sources of information, and who we trust. Indeed, our understanding of what the
315 facts are often hinges on the truthfulness of the utterer, the influence of their personal beliefs and
316 emotions, and our (potentially biased) interpretation of them. Importantly, though, different
317 interpretations of facts can be a part of a healthy deliberation of open controversial issues or thorny
318 public problems.

319 Which facts and how many we should know poses another complication. State standards for
320 civics often suggest that developing citizens should mainly learn the structure of the United States
321 government: the branches of government, federalism, civil rights, and related topics (Levine, 2013).
322 Indeed, these *are* relevant. But the design of the government is only one relevant subject for citizens.
323 It may be equally important for citizens to understand—and to be able to inquire further about—
324 cultural groups, faith traditions, economic forces and institutions, biophysical conditions,
325 sociological phenomena, historical achievements and injustices, other countries, and many more
326 topics.

327 For instance, throughout history, marginalized and oppressed peoples have found ways of
328 acting and effecting change in constrained circumstances, and yet many of these methods and
329 achievements are not widely known or acknowledged as forms of engaged civic action. A curriculum
330 that focuses on the formal structure of the US government to the exclusion of social movements
331 and other forms of “contentious politics” (Tarrow, 2011) increases the likelihood that students will
332 miss learning about the agency of oppressed peoples. Understanding and appreciating such efforts
333 as contributions to our civic life can improve the quality of our civic reasoning in part by opening

334 our eyes to the many different forms it can take, as well as the often-overlooked contributions of
335 subordinated people to the ongoing project of democratically living together.

336 One response might be that students would benefit from knowing a vast range of facts, but
337 the information that would serve them as citizens is practically infinite. Instead, they should
338 primarily learn skills for inquiry. But that approach seems to evade any need to identify especially
339 important topics or to equip students with vocabulary and concepts that they need for inquiry. Wise
340 policy navigates between assuming, on one hand, that some discrete “core” of knowledge (usually,
341 an overview of the US Constitution and a dose of governmental structure) suffices for civic
342 education, or assuming, on the other hand, that budding citizens should inquire about anything and
343 everything. A moderate course sets priorities but defines them broadly and encourages students to
344 pursue their own questions.

345 ***Logic, Rationality, and Reasonableness***

346 Good civic reasoning requires that its participants use the skills of logic, rationality and
347 reasonableness. Logic concerns the formal relationship between statements, and so understanding
348 logic can help reasoners think well about when their conclusions are necessitated by their premises
349 or to point out fallacies in the reasoning of others. Knowing, for instance, that the negation of “All
350 swans are white” is not “No swans are white” but “Some swans are not white” is a matter of
351 understanding the logical structure of language. Though some reasoning falters in its logical
352 structure, a much more likely failure is in the substantive relation of reasons towards a conclusion.
353 Here, the skills of rationality are relevant: understanding what counts as a reason for what.

354 Though rationality can help us assess whether means are appropriate to ends (instrumental
355 reasoning) and whether the benefits are worth the costs (prudential reasoning or cost-benefit
356 analysis), it can also help us think about what ends are worth pursuing, and how conflicting reasons
357 relate to one another. It is important to recognize here that good reasons for adopting an end or a

358 set of means need not be cold and calculating: a religious commitment or belief, an emotional
359 connection to a place or action or object, might be a strong reason for acting one way or another.
360 Furthermore, working out the relation of reasons is not merely a matter of weighing up pros and
361 cons. Reasons relate to one another in all sorts of complex ways, and we can think of the skills of
362 rationality as also including understanding how to think well about the relation of various reasons to
363 one another.

364 Moreover, being rational involves being responsive to reasons, and this requires an openness
365 to challenge, criticism and contestation about the warrants and evidence cited in support of
366 particular reasons and the conclusions they lead to. Rationality, so understood, is not a matter of
367 merely accepting scientific or expert consensus on a topic.

368 When we think of reasoning as a social activity of reciprocal and responsive interaction, as it
369 is in civic reasoning, then we also need the skill or virtue of reasonableness. Being reasonable in this
370 sense involves not commanding or deferring but inviting and persuading others to see things as we
371 do, and an openness to be moved by their invitations when they see things differently (Laden, 2012).
372 It displays itself in a willingness to propose fair terms of cooperation and to abide by those terms
373 even when, later, doing so is not to our advantage (Rawls, 1996). It involves skills of listening and
374 responding to others, and not just working out the internal structure of our own thoughts and goals
375 and making persuasive arguments. Reasonableness is cultivated through social interaction as we
376 listen and talk with others about our thoughts, feelings, and reasons. Reasonableness, then, helps to
377 span the divide between reasoning as a way of deciding what we should do and reasoning as a
378 manner in which we relate to each other.

379 *Critical Thinking*

380 Quality civic reasoning is also facilitated by critical thinking. Robert Ennis defines critical
381 thinking as “reflective and reasonable thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do”

382 (Ennis, 2011, p. 1). Part of determining what to believe is not based on the ability to track down
383 every empirical claim, but rather on understanding how individuals and institutions work to produce
384 legitimate knowledge and what makes them trustworthy. Such understanding and related skills help
385 us determine which knowledge is more solidly justified. It prevents the inquiry process from being a
386 simplistic form of empiricism, where we naively set out to find the facts and apply them.

387 Certainly, this definition is well aligned with the account offered here of good civic reasoning
388 and its guiding question, but it misses an important element that a focus on critical thinking can add
389 to the picture under construction: a spirit of criticality. Criticality identifies and interrogates the
390 power that influences and sometimes distorts knowledge and inquiry, and it reveals the struggles
391 over power at play in group contexts. Recognizing the role of power helps groups of people to
392 better understand how some shared problems may disproportionately impact certain members of a
393 community. Critical thinking may also uncover how power operates to support or hinder the
394 solutions put forward in an inquiry. When supported by democratic values like political equality,
395 critical thinking leads us to ask important “who” questions: “Is everyone at the table that needs to
396 be?”, “Who is being heard?”, and “Who stands to gain or lose?” Asking “who” questions can help
397 students to name power, which is a helpful first step. But students also need to be supported in
398 going further to learn how to challenge and change power inequities, which includes cultivating the
399 ability to students to imagine more just ways of being and the skills of dissent needed to put forward
400 those alternatives. In this way, critical thinking can help us adjudicate not only what we should do,
401 but what is feasible, right, or best to do and for whom (Lim, 2011).

402 Critical thinking in this more specific sense enables thinkers to see and understand their
403 relationships with others. And it pushes them into the fray of making sense of and acting in a
404 context of multiple and conflicting perspectives, emotions, and moral claims. Indeed, critical
405 thinking is a collective practice. Nicholas Burbules and Rupert Berk (1999) explain that it is

406 a function of collective questioning, criticism, and creativity, it is always social in character,
407 partly because relations to others influence the individual, and partly because certain of these
408 activities (particularly thinking in new ways) arise from interaction with challenging
409 alternative views. (p. 62)

410 Educational approaches that describe critical thinking in more individualist and instrumentalist
411 forms of logic and argument analysis lack the components of criticality and collective work that are
412 essential to such thinking and render it a valuable tool in civic reasoning.

413 *Discussion and Deliberation*

414 Civic discourse is perhaps best undertaken through discussion or deliberation. Diana Hess
415 (2009) defines the first of these terms:

416 discussion is dialogue between or among people. It involves, at a minimum, the exchange of
417 information about a topic (e.g., a controversy, a problem, an event, a person, etc.). Second,
418 discussion is a particular approach to constructing knowledge that is predicated on the belief
419 that the most powerful ideas can be produced when people are expressing their ideas on a
420 topic and listening to others express theirs. (p. 14)

421 To construct powerful ideas and piece together solutions, discussion seeks out multiple, varied
422 perspectives and opens up all contributions to examination. This differs from debate, which typically
423 begins with proposals formed in advance, operates to name one proposal as better than another, and
424 often is carried out in a more combative and less cooperative spirit. While debate is an approach to
425 considering civic matters that is widespread in the United States today, this approach often
426 forecloses some of the possibilities offered within discussion and deliberation and thus is not as
427 aligned with ideal civic reasoning. In order for debate to play a more constructive role in fostering
428 good civic reasoning, it needs to be understood not as a competition with winners and losers but as

429 a means for exploring a topic and effectively bringing out various perspectives and positions in their
430 strongest and most persuasive forms.

431 Discussion and deliberation require certain skills, values, and dispositions beyond those
432 already mentioned. This is especially the case given that discussions may further entrench, rather
433 than expose or challenge, inequities, oppressions, and subjugations between participants and in the
434 larger society. Discussion and deliberation require listening and leaving space for others, being open
435 to and raising dissent, working through challenging ideas or competing perspectives in good faith,
436 and vulnerability to being moved by what others say. To head off further marginalization or harm,
437 they require active commitments to values of equity, anti-racism, gender equality, and other elements
438 of justice, especially when situated amongst participants with differing degrees of power.

439 Dispositions to authorize more voices and perspectives may help shore up civic reasoning as a plural
440 and ethical endeavor (Mansbridge, 1991; Parker, 2006). Engaging in discussion can help develop the
441 sort of democratic culture and political tolerance needed to more effectively work together to solve
442 complex public problems. Put in terms of educating citizens, discussion is not just a high-quality
443 strategy for teaching information, but is itself a means and end for developing good citizens who can
444 engage well in civic reasoning (Parker, 2010).

445 Deliberation is discussion aimed at a particular resolution, action, or outcome, rather than
446 discussion which creates shared understanding or just talk for the sake of talk—though importantly
447 these can play a role in the health of a democracy (Parker, 2003). Deliberation is always an endeavor
448 situated in uncertainty; it's about things that we don't know for sure and a future that we cannot
449 fully predict. Deliberation is also one way that publics form, as it calls people together around a
450 shared point of concern or decision making. Though useful across an array of philosophical
451 understandings of democracy, deliberation is particularly valued within the framework of
452 deliberative democracy (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Habermas, 1987, 1996). Within that

453 framework, it is employed to make decisions and reach binding agreements, thereby giving heft and
454 substance to conversations between citizens.

455 It is not enough to merely acknowledge pluralism or conflicting views on the good life,
456 though; we must take seriously and be responsive to the dissent that arises from them. Such dissent
457 includes critiquing the status quo, challenging accepted views, and putting forward alternatives.
458 Engaging in dissent is a form of participatory politics that legitimizes conflict and disagreement as
459 not just facts of life, but sources for better civic reasoning. An influential critic of deliberative
460 democracy, Chantal Mouffe (1996), adds,

461 A pluralist democracy needs to make room for the expression of dissent and for conflicting
462 interests and values. And those should not be seen as temporary obstacles on the road to
463 consensus since in their absence democracy would cease to be pluralistic. (p. 8)

464 Here, she shows how dissent and differing opinions are not just something to work past during civic
465 discourse, but rather are themselves an important part of a pluralistic democracy, goading change, at
466 times, through conflict.

467 Within a deliberation, dissent can help to overcome group-think momentum by pausing to
468 expose contradictory beliefs or differing viewpoints that may highlight the perspective of minority
469 members within or outside of the group, reveal faulty arguments, or improve the quality, depth, and
470 sincerity of the conversation itself. Dissenters help to ensure that more voices are being heard and
471 help to better ensure that just decisions are being made. But, rational-proceduralist forms of
472 deliberative democracy, often attributed to Jürgen Habermas, which restrict legitimate deliberation
473 to a strict formula of reason-giving, may prevent dissenters from using some of the tools of their
474 trade, including emotional ploys, radical protest, and passionate disruption (Young, 2002). Civic
475 discourse must not only preserve space for this sort of public work, but also foreground it for its
476 ability to improve the quality of civic discourse and outcomes of civic reasoning. And citizenship

477 education requires overtly teaching not only the value of dissent, but also the skills and dispositions
478 necessary to engage it (Stitzlein, 2014).

479 Even if an openness to other viewpoints is an essential attitude in civic reasoning, many
480 worry that this attitude can be taken too far. They argue that there are certainly some viewpoints that
481 are hostile to the deliberative process itself or that aim to exclude certain others from full citizenship
482 or personhood, and that good civic reasoning requires drawing a line that excludes such positions
483 from even entering into or harming our civic interactions. For teachers, a familiar example occurs
484 when one student comments on identity characteristics, such as race/ethnicity, religion, or sexuality,
485 in a way that disparages some of the other students, possibly preventing them from participating
486 fully in the discussion or feeling safe and valued in the school. Teachers face the dilemma of
487 whether to block such statements. Freedom of speech is one condition of deliberation, but including
488 everyone is another condition, and they can be in tension. The same tensions certainly arise in adult
489 contexts, from social media platforms to public meetings. One problem with blocking speech is that
490 it is unclear which principles to adopt to head off such potential problems. Moreover, it's unclear on
491 whose authority those principles would be adopted or how they might be enforced. It is unclear who
492 gets to decide which people or which views are to be excluded from civic reasoning and on what
493 grounds.

494 A different way to approach this worry is to not have rules about who can speak or what can
495 be said, but to empower participants to reject certain moves within the reasoning itself on grounds
496 that they are inconsistent with the shared project or the inclusion of all. That is, the shared aims a
497 group of people have in engaging in civic reasoning (working out “what should we do?”) serve as
498 the basis to argue, in the course of that reasoning, that certain positions or grounds ought to be
499 rejected in the reasoning itself. Rather than bar the white supremacist from entering the room, as it
500 were, we respond to her particular arguments and position by pointing out, among other things,

501 their incompatibility with our engaging in a shared project. For this to work, however, citizens need
502 to be equipped to make such arguments and to recognize the force of and respond to such
503 arguments when they are made by others. And, in particular, those who are not specifically targeted
504 or potentially harmed by the public expression of such positions need to take on an extra
505 responsibility to be mindful of and speak out against those positions. This then points to another
506 goal of education in civic reasoning: a sensitivity and responsiveness to such reasons, and an
507 attention to the conditions that make it possible for people to raise such reasons. The idea is that we
508 need to cultivate certain deliberative virtues rather than work out rules of the game. These include an
509 ability to face up to and work through complexity and fundamental disagreements rather than trying
510 to legislate them out of sight.

511 In sum, civic reasoning is best facilitated through discussion and deliberation that engages
512 inquiry, facts, knowledge, logic, reasonableness, values, emotion, and critical thinking. It relies upon
513 skills of openness and dissent.

514 **Values, Virtues, and Dispositions**

515 I use the term “values” to refer to ideas and ideals that people hold dear. Our values guide
516 our actions by helping us determine whether a course of action or a given social situation is good or
517 desirable. “Virtues” and “dispositions” refer to particular traits of individuals and their characters.
518 Dispositions are traits of character that orient individuals to care about and act on certain values.
519 Virtues are excellences of character. They involve not only being disposed properly to given values,
520 but also the capacity to see clearly when a value is relevant to a situation and act decisively in
521 response to that value.

522 We might talk about the value of toleration, for example, in terms of an ideal of accepting
523 other people’s right to act differently than we do or to uphold values we do not. When we talk of a
524 person as tolerant, we mean not only that they recognize that toleration is a value, but also that they

525 are disposed to act in a tolerant manner when the opportunity presents itself. Considerations of
526 toleration have weight in their determinations of what to do. To talk of tolerance as a virtue or to
527 say that someone has the virtue of tolerance is to say that not only do they have a disposition
528 towards tolerance, but that they have an acute sense of when toleration is called for and the strength
529 of character to act tolerantly in such situations even when it is difficult.

530 Values, virtues and dispositions play a role in civic reasoning in at least three ways: First, the
531 very activity of civic reasoning embodies and relies on certain values and virtues to be done well.
532 Empathy, a willingness to compromise, a concern to look for consensus, a collaborative spirit, and
533 civility all can improve the quality of civic reasoning. This makes them all what might be called civic
534 virtues. They will be the main focus of this section below. Before turning to these values and virtues,
535 I briefly discuss additional roles values play in civic reasoning.

536 Second, in the course of engaging in civic reasoning, we invoke and contest commitments to
537 various values: both political values like liberty, equality and toleration, and more particular values
538 that are tied to other aspects of our identities or the situation at hand. Good civic reasoning is not a
539 value-neutral or value-free activity. Figuring out what we should do involves figuring out what values
540 we want to realize or be true to, which values we share, and how to best understand them. Thus,
541 values can serve as the input and subject matter of civic reasoning. We might invoke a value like
542 liberty when arguing against a law that would make it hard for certain religious communities to live
543 according to their religious commitments. We might employ a value like equality when advocating
544 policies, like the recognition of same-sex marriage, or civil rights for transgender people, that may
545 conflict with certain religious teachings and commitments. In these cases, values serve useful roles in
546 our reasoning.

547 In other cases, our civic reasoning might involve working out the precise nature of a value or
548 whether it is truly shared. So, we can also reason about how to best understand the value of freedom

549 or equality, and which conception of these values can serve as a basis for “our” decisions about what
550 to do. Here, we are not directly asking a practical question about what to do, but working out
551 something closer to where we stand vis-a-vis one another. In this sense, reasoning together about
552 our values can be a way of working out our relationships to one another and insofar as we are
553 interested in our civic relations, then this highlights how civic reasoning is civic insofar as it concerns
554 the civic identity of the reasoners.

555 Recognizing that civic reasoning not only invokes values but also can be *about* them means
556 that civic reasoning necessarily involves contestation about what “our” values are. When someone
557 invokes a particular value as “American” or “ours” in the course of genuine civic reasoning, then it
558 is always open to others to reject or question that claim. That is part of what is involved in
559 “reasoning” about such matters, and not merely dogmatically insisting on them. Because civic
560 reasoning can invoke and be about questions of value, learning to engage in this kind of reasoning
561 requires learning how to think about values. It also entails a disposition to work through moments
562 when values conflict within ourselves or between us and other citizens. At times, we must navigate
563 substantial lasting tensions between values.

564 Third, civic reasoning can generate new understandings of or commitments to various values
565 and can be part of a process by which citizens come to develop or shift their dispositions towards
566 those values and perhaps help them to develop the virtues necessary to pursue those values well.
567 This can happen when citizens come to change their minds about a topic of civic reasoning: I might
568 enter a discussion about who should be allowed to use what bathroom in a public school or whether
569 we should change our immigration policy committed to a particular conception of toleration but
570 come away from that discussion with a transformed commitment to the value of inclusion or respect
571 rather than mere toleration. But, in addition, in the course of engaging in civic reasoning with others,
572 I can come to change my values as a result of the process of reasoning itself: I might, for instance,

573 develop a new understanding of equality as a result of being confronted with the positions of others,
574 and learning to give them equal weight in our deliberations.

575 In the US context of liberal democracy, values like liberty, equality, and justice are often
576 invoked and contested in the course of civic reasoning. Though these values may play a direct role in
577 the quality of civic reasoning by supporting practices which give everyone a say, they also play an
578 important role in the second and third senses above, and so participants in civic reasoning in an
579 American context will be well served to understand these values, their various interpretations and
580 their role in unfolding debates about particular laws, policies, and decisions. Beyond training
581 students in the skills needed to engage in civic reasoning, including reasoning about values generally,
582 civic education designed to improve the quality of civic discourse needs to familiarize students with
583 values that have played a role in the civic reasoning of a given country, including the various debates
584 over how to understand them and their relation to one another. Admittedly, though, many citizens
585 do not share these values and we must be careful not to assume that they are universally held or that
586 they function to give us a shared language or aims for civic discourse.

587 In the rest of this section, I focus on the values, virtues, and dispositions that are central to
588 engaging in the activity of civic reasoning well. These include empathy, a willingness to compromise,
589 an eye on the possibility as well as the pitfalls of consensus, a collaborative spirit, and civility.
590 Notably, this is not an all-inclusive list, nor should this list always be upheld as ideal goals. For
591 example, sometimes justified resistance or a resolute response to an injustice may require one to dig
592 in one's heels and to hold tight to one's position, rather than to seek consensus or compromise.
593 Additionally, not all learners are developmentally capable of enacting these values, virtues, and
594 dispositions, nor can they do so in all contexts.

595 *Empathy*

596 Ideally, participation in civic reasoning and discourse is not just a one-way street emanating
597 out from individuals. We must also take in the opinions, perspectives, and concerns of others as we
598 work together to figure out “What should we do?” Listening has epistemic benefits. It can help us to
599 see what we are missing or not sufficiently appreciating about an issue or its impact. Listening also
600 has benefits for the manner in which we relate to each other. Active listening is ethical and relational
601 in that it is a way of treating others as political equals, respecting them as individuals, and perhaps
602 enabling relationships to form. Listening can help us to see that others have reasoned beliefs, many
603 of which are worthy of our time and consideration, and may even come to influence our own
604 beliefs. It can help us to see our shared humanity and our shared fate as well as appreciate our real
605 and enduring differences.

606 Our capacities to be genuinely open to others can be blocked by attitudes and prejudices like
607 sexism, homophobia, and other discriminatory practices that serve as impediments that prevent
608 some citizens from treating others as equals, from forming relationships with them, and learning
609 from them. While some aspects of listening may develop naturally, the sort of active listening
610 needed for effective civic reasoning is best developed through overt curriculum and instruction that
611 cultivates students’ skills and dispositions to proceed cautiously, with humility and reciprocity, as
612 they work to combat the lineages of injustice that they confront in the publics they inhabit and
613 create (Parker, 2006; Allen, 2004).

614 Empathy—working to see the world from another person’s perspective—can help us to
615 overcome some of the impediments to listening and can improve our ability to relate to each other
616 civically. There are times when empathy may be rightfully withheld from those who have repugnant
617 views. Indeed, to empathize with a racist, for example, might actually demonstrate a civic failing.
618 Nonetheless, empathy generally offers significant benefits to civic reasoning and discourse. Through
619 empathizing with others, we come to recognize their personal stake in issues and the emotions they

620 experience related to those issues. These dispositions can lead us to make better decisions because
621 they push us to attend to the well-being of our fellow citizens. They require openness to hear and
622 learn from others, understanding of our own proclivities and limitations, openness to how others
623 might reshape ourselves, and imagination to cross the boundaries between us. These social practices
624 reveal that civic reasoning and discourse is not merely problem solving, but rather is a responsive
625 and social endeavor where we become mutually attuned to each other (Laden, 2012).

626 Moreover, Nicole Mirra (2018) explains,

627 If we are able to adopt the perspectives of those unlike ourselves, then perhaps we are more
628 likely to make decisions and take steps that benefit not only our own selfish interests, but the
629 interests of those other people as well. Writ large, empathy becomes the foundation for a
630 democratic society. (p. 4)

631 Empathy helps us to achieve democratic values of liberty, equality, and justice that are often upheld
632 in the U.S., while also helping us to relate to each other as citizens working together toward shared
633 understanding.

634 Especially when employed with those quite different from ourselves, empathy requires work.
635 It may first require learning more about our fellow citizens, their lives, their experiences, and their
636 worldviews. This is noteworthy when one takes into account that often those who most need to
637 learn empathy are those from dominant groups, whose experiences and opinions tend to be
638 reflected in mainstream outlets and may have been able to traverse life without having to see or
639 understand the perspectives of others. Those with less power, however, have often had to detect
640 and navigate the perspectives of others to get by in life. Such power differentials should not be
641 glossed over, but rather must be accounted for as part of, what Mirra calls, “critical civic empathy”
642 (Mirra, 2018, p. 7). This notion of empathy acknowledges power inequalities, historicity, and

643 positionality. It works to foster understanding across difference in ways that build a new identity
644 together as citizens, one directed toward equity-oriented action.

645 ***Consensus, Compromise, and Collaboration***

646 As empathy helps to bridge between citizens when engaging in civic reasoning and
647 discourse, so do an eye for the possibility of consensus and a willingness to compromise. Consensus
648 entails coming to unanimously consent to the same desire or conclusion, even though not all
649 differences between individuals' desires or conclusions may be resolved. It builds solidarity and can
650 produce a sense of being united with other citizens. Compromise, however, means being willing to
651 strike a deal between one's desire or conclusion and someone else's desire or conclusion, often by
652 giving up parts of it in order to reach an agreement with those whose views differ considerably from
653 one's own. It can help us to arrive at necessary agreements across warring groups or individuals, or
654 to create middle or mutually acceptable ground.

655 On some occasions, consensus or compromise are aims we hope to achieve through our
656 reasoning and discourse. In those instances, consensus or compromise may be seen as an indication
657 of fulfilling the common good or achieving mutually beneficial goals. On other occasions, looking
658 out for the possible paths to genuine consensus and being open to compromise can be important
659 for engaging in discourse and reasoning well. On still others, they help us take up the civic question
660 effectively so that we can move out of impasses between citizens (Thompson, 2008). Reaching
661 moments of compromise, for example, may require changing our stances, giving some ground, or
662 building new shared perspectives between us. Striking this middle ground may rely upon skills of
663 collaboration, where participants work together to understand their differences and propose
664 alternatives that might be amenable to all parties. Similarly, compromise as a means of discourse may
665 require the disposition of moderation, summarized by Robert Boatright (2019) as

666 a willingness to pursue a pragmatic politics that accepts the humanity of one’s opponents,
667 that abandons the assumption that there is an ultimate goal for human endeavors, and that
668 seeks to place the goal of fostering an inclusive political community above the goal of
669 dictating what the community is or should do. (p. 3)

670 Rather than carving out middle ground, navigating and negotiating some situations may rely
671 on skills of persuasion, including the ability to make a convincing case for one’s stance and to
672 persuade others to share it. Persuasion requires some handle not only of rhetoric, but also of the
673 emotions and motivations that shape how others commit to a stance. Persuasion must be balanced,
674 however, with appropriate accommodations of others and humility toward others. While there are
675 some instances in which individuals are right and should aim to convince others of that case, we
676 must be careful not to just assume that we are right or to behave in ways that foreclose our ability to
677 hear and respond to the alternative stances put forward by others, for such actions shortchange civic
678 reasoning.

679 We must also be careful that consensus or compromise do not become avenues to simply
680 avoid confrontation, downplay significant tensions between values, or to do the hard work of
681 reaching challenging or controversial conclusions. This is especially the case when there is a need to
682 disrupt the status quo or work against power imbalances, where more resolute stances may be
683 necessary, especially in the face of injustice. We must be cautious that even a conclusion that seems
684 to favor the common good is not hiding disparity or injustice. Similarly, we must be leery of a rush
685 to consensus, as this may curtail or silence some perspectives or not sufficiently engage some points
686 of concern. We must hold open questions and tensions during a discussion in order to provide
687 sufficient time and space for inviting and reflecting on the contributions of participants (Backer,
688 2019). Sometimes, support networks and identity-based advocacy groups are needed to empower or
689 champion those hidden or overlooked perspectives, instead of focusing on a shared conclusion

690 (Mansbridge et al., 2012). In sum, values that enable good civic reasoning and discourse include
691 willingness to compromise and appreciating the solidarity-building of consensus, but remaining open
692 to new views and challenges to conclusions.

693 *Civility*

694 Civility is sometimes affiliated with a call to compromise, especially between feuding political
695 groups. But, as I will explain, holding firm political views may be warranted, especially when that
696 view is on the side of justice, promotes equal participation, and supports relationships between
697 citizens. Many people more quickly define civility by what it is not than by what it is, pointing to
698 instances of ad hominem attacks, the demeaning of opponents, and rude, vulgar, or threatening
699 speech. When citizens do speak affirmatively of civility, it is often invoked merely in terms of
700 manners, as being polite or respectful in civic discussions, especially when it comes to the tone and
701 content of what we say. But, civility should be understood in a richer way. Rather than think of
702 civility in terms of politeness, we should think of it primarily in terms of responsiveness (Laden,
703 2019).

704 Civility is a form of engagement with others that relies upon skills and dispositions of being
705 open to and cooperating with diverse participants toward continued mutual engagement in a just
706 dialogue. It affirms the dignity and humanity of one's interlocutors, even as it allows for questioning
707 or critiquing their claims. It is aligned with values of equal participation and inclusivity. And in order
708 to be aligned with liberty, civility must not overly restrict free speech. It has significant democratic
709 implications for the outcomes of our reasoning, as well as the manner in which we engage in
710 discourse, because it foregrounds relationships. Civility requires participation that emphasizes
711 respect for others and could actually help to build democracy, not only sustain it through discussion
712 or to enable it to move smoothly.

713 Understood this way, civility can actually be compatible with impolite speech or action,
714 especially when it is necessary to express outrage, forward a political cause (Rossini, 2019), or
715 “transform unjust relationships into just ones. Hence, civility can only be measured within the
716 context of existing and aspired relations, rather than according to a predetermined code of conduct”
717 (Dishon & Ben-Porath, 2018, p. 439). To enact civility in civic discourse, then, one must focus on
718 the impact of one’s participation (in content, form, and tone) on the ability of others to participate
719 and hold oneself accountable to reacting to and reshaping unjust interactions.

720 When civility is seen only as politeness, norms of politeness can be used to silence or
721 marginalize some participants, often by holding them to participation norms that they did not create
722 or that may favor other participants. This loses sight of whether one’s participation is responsive to
723 others. Civility supports civic reasoning in the sense not only of the manner in which we relate to
724 each other, but also civility, as responsiveness, impacts our identity as reasoners together. Under that
725 understanding, civic reasoning entails foregrounding how we respond to and work together as
726 members of society and how our relations with each other may give rise to some responsibilities and
727 may call for enacting certain virtues.

728 In sum, knowledge, skills, values, and dispositions related to listening, empathy, consensus,
729 compromise, collaboration, and civility all work together to help us engage in civic reasoning and
730 dialogue well. And, they help to produce better outcomes in terms of our civic inquiries as well as
731 our identity and treatment of each other as citizens reasoning together.

732 **Obstacles and Future Research**

733 We must prepare students not only for an ideal democracy, but also to live in and improve
734 the one that currently exists (Dahl, 1999). I recognize that is one where civic reasoning and discourse
735 are often bogged down or steered off course by hyper-partisanship, fake news, uncivil behavior, and
736 other problems in our physical and digital communities. Citizens shout at each other in the streets

737 and attack each other on social media. Some engage in civic discussions in ways that flout rationality
738 or dodge empathy. Citizens struggle to reach consensus or agree on foundational understandings or
739 values. And even when a consensus is reached or a course of action is decided, it is often met by
740 ongoing contestation. Navigating and responding to that contestation is an important part of
741 continued civic discourse. Finally, even when some citizens wisely and rightfully engage in political
742 dissent or resistance, our society structurally often withstands or silences their efforts. We are far
743 from the best forms of civic reasoning and discourse depicted here, though, with improved
744 education, we may move closer toward them.

745 There are many constraints on and disincentives to engage in civic reasoning and discourse.
746 Some of those are institutional, others are cultural, others are psychological, while still others are
747 based on peer group norms. In this section, I describe some of those obstacles, using them to
748 highlight areas particularly in need of ongoing or future research. I also offer a few suggestions for
749 improved citizenship education curricula and pedagogy. I begin with general challenges arising in
750 society and then move into particular challenges in schools.

751 **Understanding Changes in Truth, Facts, and News**

752 Inquiry, facts, and the historical and political knowledge related to them, inhabit an especially
753 precarious position in the United States today. Acknowledging the connection between truth and
754 facts, some argue that we currently live in a “post-truth” world, where “objective facts are less
755 influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief.” (Oxford English
756 Dictionary, 2019). Relatedly, “truth decay” describes the social phenomenon whereby members of a
757 society increasingly struggle to draw clear and sharp distinctions between fact and opinion, where
758 personal experience outweighs fact, and where traditionally respected sources of facts, such as
759 newsrooms and scientific reports, are increasingly distrusted (Hodgin & Kahne, 2019, p. 93).

760 Engaging in civic reasoning requires some level of trust as we sift through varied ideas and
761 accounts. Yet, the problematic situation today has been exacerbated by fake news, which no longer
762 is a term that simply indicates information that is verifiably false, but now also refers to a host of
763 other problems. Sometimes news outlets circulate only limited facts or emphasize some stories over
764 others, which provides only a partial or distorted account to citizens. Sometimes news sites circulate
765 targeted disinformation, which misleads or tricks citizens. Sometimes media outlets present incorrect
766 information as fact to nefariously back particular political positions. Sometimes factually accurate
767 news that contradicts one’s ideological beliefs is delegitimized by calling it “fake” (Journell, 2019).
768 Fake news sows confusion, doubt, and mistrust. In this way, it disrupts civic reasoning that is topical
769 as well as reasoning that is about our shared identity and ways of relating to each other. Information
770 derived from fake news can mislead civic reasoning and concerns over fake news can bring
771 reasoning to a halt or even turn us away from our fellow citizens. Given the challenges of fake news
772 and post-truth, careful research is needed in these areas and investigations of how we might head off
773 problems related to them through quality citizenship education.

774 Importantly, fake news is not just about accepting different or competing facts; problems
775 posed by fake news are matters of trust. Fake news derails quality civic reasoning because it prevents
776 citizens from appealing to a shared set of accepted facts or sources of information because they
777 disagree about who is trustworthy and how much trust to put into our knowledge of facts. Seen this
778 way, educating for improved civic reasoning would require learning how to assess the
779 trustworthiness of authority figures or institutions. This is a set of skills that one can learn through
780 social studies classes on critical media literacy, but also in literature courses that examine character
781 and motivation and in STEM courses that focus on good argumentation and data sourcing.

782 **Attending to Changing Psychology of Citizens**

783 The spread of fake news and mistrust of other citizens is also related to several other recent
784 alarming trends in the psychology and behaviors of citizens (Garrett, 2019). Some of the phenomena
785 are longstanding, but they are increasing in intensity and impact, and others are being brought under
786 study and classified in new ways. Recent hyper-partisanship is having a marked impact on the
787 makeup of groups and reasoning that occurs within them. Citizens increasingly engage in echo
788 chambers, surrounding themselves with peers and news sources that confirm their worldview. In
789 some instances, citizens willfully chose to isolate themselves in these ways, but in others,
790 socioeconomic and racial segregation exacerbate citizen silos. Sometimes these communities develop
791 group think which blocks thorough and effective civic reasoning, and keeps it from being
792 sufficiently pluralistic. In part, citizens may be prone to motivated reasoning, where their social
793 group or political affiliation may lead them to advantage their previously held views when they
794 encounter new information (Kraft et al., 2015). In other words, citizens are resistant to information
795 that would cause them to change the worldview they already have. These citizens accept what
796 matches with their current views and dismiss the rest. Hence, this limited form of rationalizing is
797 only mobilized to support conclusions already reached and it falls far short of the plural endeavor of
798 civic reasoning.

799 Similarly, confirmation bias leads citizens to only seek evidence that is partial to their current
800 beliefs or to interpret evidence in ways aligned with hypotheses that they already hold. And, when
801 they encounter evidence that counters their views, they dismiss that information and double down
802 on their prior beliefs—a phenomenon known as the backfire effect. Additionally, a process known
803 as magical thinking happens when what citizens desire to be true comes to feel more true or real
804 than actual reality. It leads citizens to treat their subjective experiences and desires as facts. Finally,
805 affective polarization occurs when individuals not only seek out similar peers, but evaluate those

806 from their own political party positively and those in opposition parties negatively (Clark & Avery,
807 2016).

808 Collectively, these psychological responses suggest that we cannot improve civic reasoning
809 simply by giving citizens more information. And, while integrating citizens into more diverse
810 communities can have positive benefits, some citizens will continue to engage in self-confirmatory
811 practices. Indeed, one study revealed the worrisome result that even when given extensive evidence,
812 citizens disregarded it in favor of their own previous beliefs and another study showed that
813 motivated reasoning is actually greatest among those with the most political knowledge (Crocco et
814 al., 2017; Kahne & Bowyer, 2017). Yet, political knowledge is also known to increase positive civil
815 participation and identity (Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996).

816 Citizens need more skills and more motivation to work against or overcome confirmation
817 bias. This is an area especially in need of research, in both general public life and in schools. Such
818 research might include studies of how classroom teachers use metacognition to attune students to
819 their own biases and experiences of positive or negative feelings to opinions encountered; studies of
820 how employing critical media literacy may reduce biased practices; studies of how teachers' own
821 political partisanship and political environments influence their teaching of civic reasoning (Curry &
822 Cherner, 2019); studies of how to genuinely engage with competing perspectives when situated in
823 increasingly ideologically, racially, and socioeconomically homogenous schools; and studies of how
824 classroom deliberations work through instances of these problems critically, while still allowing for
825 students to hold strong views (Kahne & Bowyer, 2017; Nyhan & Reifler, 2010; Lavine et al., 2012).

826 **Building Capacity for Civic Reasoning and Discourse Online**

827 Given the prevalence of using online materials to find facts, problems related to sources and
828 verification are especially prevalent today. In online spaces, many people are irresponsible in their
829 employment of facts, so consumers of online information have to employ a heightened level of

830 scrutiny and care. As indicated by studies of civic online reasoning by the Stanford History Group,
831 citizens need dispositions and strategies to ask questions, investigate sources, and verify claims
832 online (McGrew et al., 2017). Such determinations expose the influence of power on facts and
833 knowledge. A 2009 National Council for the Social Studies position statement importantly
834 highlighted the need for developing critical media literacy skills to detect and analyze power and
835 ideology at play in media and how they can manipulate our emotions and our cognitive biases.
836 Additionally, new curricula is needed to help budding citizens understand the complex ways in
837 which knowledge is produced and credentialed so that they have principled grounds for trusting
838 some online sources over others.

839 Another perennial obstacle related to civil reasoning is that public deliberation, and even
840 classroom deliberation, is often irrational and not driven by facts, justified reasons, or efforts to
841 remove problematic bias. Indeed, some citizens even seem to prefer those sorts of exchanges over
842 calls to rationality and order, and some are quite adept at using persuasive tricks and disinformation
843 (Segall et al., 2019). These sorts of practices may further drive away citizens who increasingly feel
844 cynical about democratic life and may exacerbate the distaste of those who already feel dissuaded to
845 participate in civic discourse because they feel that participation is inauthentic or not likely to
846 actually influence public policy (Stitzlein, 2020). Researchers might craft curricula that guide teachers
847 on how to detect these sort of persuasive tricks and walk students through understanding how they
848 are manipulative approaches that lead to unwise reasoning and discourse that runs counter to
849 longstanding values of democracy, as well as giving them means to respond to such discourse in
850 ways that steer it towards better civic reasoning.

851 The longstanding struggle to achieve broad and inclusive communities of inquiry faces
852 particular challenges in digital spaces today. Patterns of media usage tend to reflect distinct
853 demographic groups and citizens seek out like-minded peers online. Many of the psychological

854 phenomenon posing problems in our face-to-face communities are even more pronounced online.
855 Changes within the media environment have also exacerbated the problems, including the
856 diminished role of gatekeepers, enabling wide circulation of inaccurate information and increasingly
857 partisan interpretations of news (Hodgin & Kahne, 2019).

858 Relationships that support good civic reasoning and discourse can be especially challenging
859 to achieve and maintain in online spaces, where we are separated from our fellow citizens by time
860 and space. Moreover, online settings sometimes produce a “disinhibition effect,” where people are
861 emboldened to act in more outlandish or disrespectful ways behind a screen of anonymity than they
862 typically would in face-to-face conversation (Suler, 2015). And yet, online spaces also provide
863 important outlets for the airing of perspectives that run counter to the mainstream, where the
864 anonymity of the screen may also provide protective cover. Future research into the skills and
865 dispositions of civility and dissent in online spaces is needed.

866 Importantly, today’s digital platforms also present significant tools for finding alternative
867 views, seeking out minority perspectives, and reaching out to other citizens otherwise separated by
868 space, time, or other constraints. Additionally, digital platforms offer opportunities to expand
869 beyond our face-to-face networks and form new relationships. Civic reasoning and discourse would
870 be improved by learning more approaches to fulfilling diversity, inclusivity, and equality through
871 technology and media. And we must simultaneously nurture the proclivity of citizens to use media
872 and technology for civic purposes, rather than narrowly viewing it merely for entertainment or even
873 education (Levine, 2015).

874 **Supporting Diverse and Open Environments**

875 Open environments, where citizens are invited to discuss meaningful and controversial
876 issues can help build inclusivity and tolerance, especially when participants discover that they learn
877 from and improve their overall decision-making process as a result of including multiple and

878 conflicting perspectives. Yet despite these benefits, civic and classroom deliberations often are, in
879 some ways, exclusive. We know that many civic decisions are made in spaces that include only a
880 small subset of the overall population and that often those who participate or are welcomed to
881 contribute are those who inhabit positions of power by virtue of their demographics, wealth,
882 community status, and more. Exclusivity and elitism tend to lead to some voices wielding more
883 power or impact than others, if those others are even included at all.

884 Additionally, we know that classrooms are increasingly racially and economically segregated,
885 making it even more challenging to create diverse and inclusive communities within the confines of
886 the school. These conditions call for additional research to understand how we can work within
887 them to teach and enact civic reasoning, as well as research into how trends of exclusion and
888 segregation might be countered. Such research might entail demonstrating for civic and school
889 groups the improved reasoning that comes about through more inclusive decision making, as well as
890 its positive impact on the identity of the group of reasoners. Relatedly, recognizing that all groups
891 cannot be fully inclusive, research into how to educate citizens to understand and assume the
892 responsibility of being representatives for those not present is needed.

893 **Alleviating School-Based Problems**

894 In addition to influences that seep from larger society into our classrooms, schools also face
895 a set of challenges in the teaching of good civic reasoning and discourse. While all classrooms are
896 civic spaces and ideally should contribute to citizen development, that doesn't mean that all classes
897 are equally tasked with emphasizing citizenship or preparing for democracy. These aims have
898 historically been most pronounced in social studies and history courses. Put simply, there is often
899 insufficient time and attention devoted to citizenship education across the curriculum. This is
900 especially the case in social studies and history. While some recent trends show renewed emphasis
901 on these areas, they have been squeezed from the school day in order to accommodate more

902 instruction in heavily tested subject areas like math and language arts across the past two decades
903 (Hodgin and Kahne, 2019; Gould et. al, 2001; Center on Education Policy, 2008). And within social
904 studies and history courses that do remain, more focus should be placed on determining the content
905 needed within them and how it might be tied to the teaching of related civic skills and dispositions
906 situated with an inquiry-based classroom.

907 Moreover, even within the heavily tested disciplines, more integration of the knowledge,
908 skills, values, and dispositions of civic reasoning is needed. This includes mathematics education that
909 engages in data literacy, explanatory modeling, and making arguments based on numerical evidence
910 from charts and info graphs. It also includes science education that helps students to understand
911 how scientific communities work in order to build justified trust in them and participation in them
912 (citizen science, for example), while also enabling budding citizens to critically investigate scientific
913 information. Math and science curricula should be organized around joint problem solving as well as
914 critical discussions of methods and results. Finally, this includes focus in language arts and foreign
915 language classrooms on exploring differing points of view, practicing empathy with characters in
916 literary and non-fictional texts, engaging with morally complex scenarios, practicing self-reflection
917 sparked through engagement with literature, and learning critical media literacy.

918 Even when citizenship education is taught, we know that there is considerable inequity in its
919 quality and quantity, with poorer students and children of color more likely to be underserved
920 (Levinson, 2014). Moreover, the digital resources and critical media literacy instruction needed to
921 attend to the particular challenges raised in online settings varies considerably across places and
922 populations (Kahne, et. al, 2012). Within schools, we must also draw attention to the conditions that
923 run counter to participation in civic reasoning and discourse. Silence policies and “no excuses”
924 disciplinary approaches stamp out spaces for practicing discourse, let alone engaging in warranted
925 dissent (Ben-Porath, 2013). But even in far less extreme situations, the norms of our schools may

926 favor passive learning about government operations over the sort of active engagement needed to
927 cultivate habits of participation in civic reasoning and discourse. Instead, we must craft engaging
928 action and experiential civic education that takes up the civic question, that *does* civic reasoning and
929 discourse, rather than simply teaching about it, if at all.

930 Teacher education courses can equip teachers with approaches that help to establish new
931 classroom norms and particular knowledge of critical civic media literacy that can be shared with
932 students. Education scholars, including curriculum designers, might especially focus on practices
933 that align the College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards and
934 socio-emotional learning (CASEL and others) with civic reasoning and discourse, offering
935 approaches that integrate teaching for civic reasoning and discourse with other valued aspects of the
936 curriculum. The C3 Framework, for example, is an inquiry-based approach to compelling and
937 authentic questions which requires inclusive participation and aims to answer those questions with a
938 summative argument, an approach well aligned with that articulated here. Finally, educational
939 publics, composed of education researchers, curriculum makers, teachers, and members of particular
940 school communities, must take up the question “what should we do?” as they deliberate and
941 determine the particular content knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed for learning how to
942 participate well in civic reasoning and discourse.

943 **Allowing for Differences Amongst Citizens**

944 While I have articulated here knowledge, skills, dispositions, and values that support and
945 enhance civic reasoning and discourse, not all citizens should be expected to learn and demonstrate
946 the same ones. Indeed, we can bring differing and complimentary components together to produce
947 good civic reasoning and discourse.

948 But, significantly, not everyone is situated in our society as equal reasoning partners and
949 some of the components of civic reasoning and education for it depicted here have long been

950 wrapped up with practices of injustice and inequity in the United States. Some have been
951 systematically denied to Americans of color or those with less wealth or power. Some have been
952 crafted by only a sliver of the population and therefore lack not only the voice and input of others,
953 but also fail to encapsulate the experiences of those from whom some longstanding American ideas
954 have rarely been achievable or equitably provided. And yet it's important to recognize that despite
955 those injustices and inequitable educational opportunities, many members of communities not in
956 positions of recognized power have substantially contributed to civic reasoning and have resisted
957 undemocratic practices.

958 On the other hand, the reasoning of citizens inhabiting positions of privilege is also
959 sometimes undermined by an array of limitations that arise from their privilege, some of which are
960 overlooked or downplayed because they are common amongst powerful or mainstream people.
961 These components, then, have been shaped by agendas of power that must be acknowledged,
962 analyzed, called out, and challenged. While we do need some shared ways of communicating that
963 build upon common skills and values, we can also be more inclusive of multiple approaches and
964 more critical of dominant ways. Some of the prevailing ways that have served many Americans well
965 in the past may then be revised, broadened, and improved to serve us well now and in the future.

966 Recognizing that demographics and injustice impact participation and the development of
967 citizenship, our schools may need to vary the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and values they teach.
968 Given inequitable starting positions for participation that grow out of social injustice as well as
969 differing experiences at home, some citizens may need to learn components that depend on how
970 they are positioned in society or on aspects of their personalities. For just one example, some may
971 need to develop assertiveness, while others learn humility. And, given problems in our non-ideal
972 democracy, we may need to emphasize some components over others. Currently, this might mean
973 teaching more about digital civility and critical media literacy. While educating for civic reasoning

974 and discourse requires sufficient access to the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and values depicted
975 here, teachers and communities can vary their emphasis on those components to respond to the
976 strengths and needs of their citizens as well as the particular struggles they face in democracy.

977 **Moving Forward**

978 In this report, I have articulated civic reasoning as the reasoning we do as we answer the
979 civic question: “What should we do?” Such reasoning is civic in that it addresses topics of shared
980 concern, is a matter of our collective identity, and shapes the manner in which we relate to each
981 other. Civic discourse is a means or method by which we engage in civic reasoning. Both face some
982 significant challenges today. Better understanding the obstacles and constructing pathways past them
983 will require cross-disciplinary research, bringing together education scholars with philosophers,
984 psychologists, political scientists, and more. Moreover, we must go beyond just civic reasoning and
985 discourse to understand and nurture civic action and agency in students. The contributions of this
986 report on the philosophical and moral foundations of civic reasoning and discourse may help lay a
987 groundwork for continued discussion as we work to determine what we should do about citizenship
988 education.¹

989

990 **References**

- 991 Allen, D. (2020). *Talking to strangers: Anxieties of citizenship since Brown v. Board of Education*.
992 University of Chicago Press.
- 993 Allen, D. (2019). An inspiring conversation about democracy. *The Ezra Klein Show*.
994 www.stitcher.com/podcast/the-ezra-klein-show/e/64250447
- 995 Backer, D.I. (2019). The critique of deliberative discussion. *Democracy & Education*, 24(1), 5.
- 996 Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (2015). Why don't more history teachers engage students in
997 interpretation? In W. Parker (Ed.) *Social studies today: Research and Practice* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

- 998 Ben-Porath, S. (2013). Deferring virtue: The new management of students and the civic role of
999 schools. *Theory and Research in Education*, doi: 10.1177/1477878513485172
- 1000 Boatright, R.G. (2019). Introduction: A Crisis of Civility. In Boatright, R.G., Shaffer, T.J., Sobieraj,
1001 S. & Young, D.G. (Eds.), *A Crisis of Civility? Political Discourse and its Discontents* (pp. 1-6).
1002 Routledge.
- 1003 Burbules, N., & Berk, R. (1999). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences, and
1004 limits. In T.S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Eds.), *Critical theories in education: Changing terrains of*
1005 *knowledge and politics*. Routledge.
- 1006 Campbell, D.E. (2012). Civic education in traditional public, charter, and private schools. In D.E.
1007 Campbell, M. Levinson & F. Hess (Eds.), *Making civics count*. Harvard Education Press.
- 1008 Clark, C. & Avery, P. (2016). The psychology of controversial issues discussions. In W. Journell
1009 (Ed.), *Reassessing the social studies curriculum: Promoting critical civic engagement in a politically polarized*
1010 *post-9/11 world* (pp. 109-119). Rowman & Littlefield.
- 1011 Clark, A. and M. Grever (2018). Historical consciousness: Conceptualizations and educational
1012 applications. *The Wiley international handbook of history teaching and learning*. S. A. Metzger and L.
1013 McArthur Harris. Wiley-Blackwell Publishers: 177-201.
- 1014 Crocco, M.C., Halvorsen, A., Jacobsen, P., & Segall, A. (2017). Less arguing, more listening:
1015 Improving civility in classrooms. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 98(7), 67-71.
- 1016 Curry, K., & Cherner, T.S. (2019). Red states, blue states, and media literacy: Political context and
1017 media literacy. *Democracy & Education*, 27(2), 1-16.
- 1018 Dahl, R. (1999). *On democracy*. Yale University Press.
- 1019 Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. Yale
1020 University Press.
- 1021 Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. Gateway Books.

- 1022 Dewey, J. (1938). *Logic: The theory of inquiry*. Holt.
- 1023 Dishon, G., & Ben-Porath, S. (2018). Don't @ me: Rethinking digital civility online and in school.
1024 *Learning Media and Technology*, 43(4), 434-450. doi:10.1080/17439884.2018.1498353
- 1025 Ennis, R. (2011). The nature of critical thinking: An outline of critical thinking dispositions and
1026 abilities. [https://education.illinois.edu/docs/default-source/faculty-documents/robert-](https://education.illinois.edu/docs/default-source/faculty-documents/robert-ennis/thenatureofcriticalthinking_51711_000.pdf)
1027 [ennis/thenatureofcriticalthinking_51711_000.pdf](https://education.illinois.edu/docs/default-source/faculty-documents/robert-ennis/thenatureofcriticalthinking_51711_000.pdf)
- 1028 Garrett, H.J. (2019). Why does fake news work? On the psychological dynamics of learning, belief,
1029 and citizenship. In W. Journell (Ed.) *Unpacking fake news: An educator's guide to navigating the*
1030 *media with students* (pp.15-29). Teachers College Press.
- 1031 Gould, J., Jamieson, K.H., Levine, P., McConnell, T., & Smith, D.B. (2001). *Guardian of democracy: The*
1032 *civic mission of schools*. Lenore Annenberg Institute for Civics and the Civic Mission of Schools.
- 1033 Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton University Press.
- 1034 Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action*. Beacon Press.
- 1035 Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. MIT
1036 Press.
- 1037 Hess, D. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom*. Routledge.
- 1038 Hodgin, E., & Kahne, J. (2019). Judging credibility in un-credible times: Three educational
1039 approaches for the digital age. In W. Journell (Ed.), *Unpacking fake news: An educator's guide to*
1040 *navigating the media with students* (pp. 92-108). Teachers College Press.
- 1041 Journell, W. (2019). *Unpacking fake news: An educator's guide to navigating the media with students*. Teachers
1042 College Press.
- 1043 Kahne, J., Ullmann, J., & Middaugh, E. (2012). Digital opportunities for civic education. In D.E.
1044 Campbell, M. Levinson & F. Hess (Eds.), *Making civics count*. Harvard Education Press.

- 1045 Kahne, J., & Bowyer, B. (2017). Educating for democracy in a partisan age: Confronting the
1046 challenges of motivated reasoning and misinformation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 3-
1047 34.
- 1048 Kraft, P. W., Lodge, M., & Taber, C. S. (2015). Why people “don't trust the evidence”: Motivated
1049 reasoning and scientific beliefs. *The annals of the American Academy of Political Science*, 658(1),
1050 121-133.
- 1051 Laden, A.S. (2019). Two concepts of civility. In R.G. Boatright, T.J. Shaffer, S. Sobieraj, & D.G.
1052 Young (Eds.), *A Crisis of Civility? Political Discourse and its Discontents* (pp. 9-30). Routledge.
- 1053 Laden, A. S. (2012). *Reasoning: A social picture*. Oxford University Press.
- 1054 Lavine, H.G., Johnston, C.D., & Steenbergen, M.R. (2012). *The Ambivalent Partisan: How Critical*
1055 *Loyalty Promotes Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- 1056 Levine, P. (2013). What the NAEP civics assessment measures and how students perform. *Center for*
1057 *Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement*. www.civicyouth.org/?p=5219.
- 1058 Levine, P. (2015). Media literacy for the 21st century. A response to the need for media education in
1059 democratic education. *Democracy & Education*, 23(1).
- 1060 Levine, P. (2016). The question each citizen must ask. *Educational Leadership*, 73(6), 31-34.
- 1061 Levinson, M. (2014). *No Citizen Left Behind*. Harvard University Press.
- 1062 Lim, L. (2011). Beyond logic and argument analysis: Critical thinking, everyday problems and
1063 democratic deliberation in Cambridge international examinations' thinking skills curriculum.
1064 *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(6), 783-807. doi:10.1080/00220272.2011.590231
- 1065 Mansbridge, J. (1991). Democracy, deliberation, and the experience of women. In B. Murchland
1066 (Ed.), *Higher education and the practice of democratic politics* (pp. 122-135). Kettering Foundation.

- 1067 Mansbridge, J., Bohman, J., Chambers, S., Christiano, T., Fung, A., Parkinson, J., Thompson, D.F.,
1068 & Warren, M.E. (2012). *A Systematic Approach to Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge University
1069 Press.
- 1070 McGrew, S., Ortega, T., Breakstone, J. & Wineburg, S. (2017). The challenge that's bigger than fake
1071 news: Teaching Students to engage in civic online reasoning. *American Educator*, 41(3), 4-9.
- 1072 McMurrer, J. (2008). *NCLB Year 5: Instructional time in elementary schools: A closer look at changes for specific*
1073 *subjects*. Center on Education Policy.
- 1074 Mirra, N. (2018). *Educating for empathy: Literacy learning and civic engagement*. Teachers College Press.
- 1075 Monte-Sano, C. and A. Reisman (2016). Studying historical understanding. *Handbook of educational*
1076 *psychology*, 3rd Edition. Routledge: 281-294.
- 1077 Mouffe, C. (1996). Deconstruction, pragmatism, and the politics of democracy. In S. Critchley, J.
1078 Derrida, E. Laclau, & R. Rorty (Eds.), *Deconstruction and Pragmatism*. Routledge.
- 1079 Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2010). When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions.
1080 *Political Behavior*, 303-330.
- 1081 Parker, W (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. Teachers College Press.
- 1082 Parker, W. (2006). Public discourses in schools: Purposes, problems, possibilities. *Educational*
1083 *Researcher*, 35(8), 11-18.
- 1084 Parker, W. (2010). Listening to strangers: Classroom discussion in democratic education. *Teachers*
1085 *College Record*, 112(11), 2815-2832.
- 1086 Parker, W.C. & Lo, J.C. (2016). Reinventing the High School Government Course: Rigor,
1087 Simulations, and Learning from Text. *Democracy & Education*, 24(1).
1088 <https://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol24/iss1/6/>
- 1089 Rawls, J. (1996). *Political liberalism*. Columbia University Press.

- 1090 Reisman, A. (2012). "Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention in
1091 urban high schools." *Cognition and Instruction* 30(1), 86-112.
- 1092 Rossini, P. (2019). Disentangling uncivil and intolerant discourse in online political talk. In R.G.
1093 Boatright, T.J. Shaffer, S. Sobieraj, & D.G. Young (Eds.), *A Crisis of Civility? Political Discourse*
1094 *and its Discontents* (pp. 142-152). Routledge.
- 1095 Segall, A., Smith Crocco, M., Halvorsen, A.L., & Jacobsen, R. (2019). Teaching in the twilight zone
1096 of misinformation, disinformation, alternative facts, and fake news. In W. Journell (Ed.),
1097 *Unpacking fake news: An educator's guide to navigating the media with students* (pp. 74-90). Teachers
1098 College Press.
- 1099 Stitzlein, S.M. (2014). *Teaching for dissent: Citizenship education and political activism*. Routledge.
- 1100 Stitzlein, S.M. (2020). *Learning how to hope: Reviving democracy through schools and civil society*. Oxford
1101 University Press.
- 1102 Suler, J. (2015). *Psychology of the digital age*. Cambridge University Press.
- 1103 Swan, K., Lee, J., & Grant, S.G. (2018). *Inquiry Design Model: Building Inquiries in Social Studies*. National
1104 Council for the Social Studies.
- 1105 Tarrow, S.G. (2011). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. Cambridge University
1106 Press.
- 1107 Thompson, D. (2008). Deliberative democratic theory and empirical political science. *Annual Review*
1108 *of Political Science*, 11, 497-520.
- 1109 Tully, J. (2008). *Public philosophy in a new key* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- 1110 VanSledright, B. (2015). What does it mean to think historically...and how do you teach it? In W.
1111 Parker (Ed.) *Social studies today: Research and Practice* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- 1112 Wineburg, S. (2002). *Historical thinking and other unusual acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*.
1113 Temple University Press.

1114 Young, I.M. (2002). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford University Press.
1115 Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1997). *Community service and social responsibility in youth*. University of Chicago
1116 Press.
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125

¹ I thank Anthony Laden for his significant contributions to the section on logic and rationality and the section on values, virtues, and dispositions. I appreciate Jennifer Morton for bringing attention to some of problems of civic discourse. I am grateful to Walter Parker, whose work not only shapes the vision for citizenship education advanced here, but also for helpful suggestions throughout this paper, including emphasizing the role of content in education for civic reasoning and discourse. I thank Barrett Smith for his careful reading of a draft. Finally, a special thank you to Peter Levine, whose ideas on the key civic question, trustworthiness of knowledge creation, and ideas on balancing inquiry and content in citizenship education have significantly shaped this report.