UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF PATRIOTISM IN ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

ANDREW LUKE WORTHINGTON
Norman, Oklahoma
2013

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF PATRIOTISM IN ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND
ACADEMIC CURRICULUM

BY

_____
Dr. John Chiodo, Chair

_____
Dr. H. Michael Crowson

_____
Dr. Neil Houser

_____
Dr. Timothy Laubach

_____
Dr. Courtney Vaughn

Dedication

To my late grandmother Dorothy May Worthington.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deep gratitude for the ongoing support and guidance of my committee chair Dr. John J. Chiodo who has been ever present with help and advice. Without his commitment to this process, and to my growth as a student, this simply would not have happened. In addition I would like to thank my committee, Dr. Mike Crowson for his suggestions and work with the quantitative statistics, Dr. Courtney Vaughn for her proposals on the qualitative methodology, Dr. Timothy Laubach for his attention to detail and suggestions on not just writing, but managing graduate work while teaching in the high school, and Dr. Neil Houser for his consistent help and advice throughout my education at the University of Oklahoma.

This project could not have been undertaken without the support of the faculty, staff and students at Bishop McGuinness Catholic High School, in particular Principal David Morton, and Assistant Principal Anne Hathcoat, who have provided time and resources to allow me to pursue the degree, and fellow teachers Chris Braun and Tony Pennington for their patience in proof reading, providing advice, and offering their constructive comments. Others who facilitated this study include friend and mentor Margo Loflin, my sister Jennifer Worthington, and the following teachers and administration at various sites: Sir. Christopher Stone, Mr. Timothy Sanders, Mr. Tim Swain and Mr. David Roberts.

To my parents who have always allowed me to pursue my goals and provided support when often I did not deserve it, I cannot thank you enough. Finally to my family, Beth thank you for your love, patience, support, and understanding, and my sons Luke and James, you are my motivation.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

The perceptions held by high school students concerning patriotism is an indicator of whether education is influencing students to become active citizens in a democratic nation. The United States and England share a common history and philosophical values that have influenced their current democratic forms of government. Understanding the perceptions that high school students in both nations have, alongside a comprehension of the role of education in developing such perceptions, offers an insight into the student's understanding of their role as a citizen in a democratic nation.

This mixed method study looked at the perceptions of patriotism held by 120 students in England and 120 students in the United States of America. The first part of the study consisted of the administration of a 20-item Likert scale survey. The second part included follow-up interviews of 6 students at each school site. Exploratory factor analysis was administered in order to establish the dominant factors in the students' understanding of patriotism. The interviews were transcribed and then examined using narrative analysis in order to further investigate how students' perceived patriotism, and to discover emergent themes.

Exploratory factor analysis of the samples produced dominant factors that were termed constructive patriotism, importance of emotional attachment, and blind patriotism. Analysis suggested that students in both nations understood the terms used in the discussion of patriotism in a similar manner. Analysis also suggested that students were more likely to adopt a constructive patriotism over a blind patriotism. These results suggest that students understanding of patriotism in both nations are more likely to align with the democratic values.

Chapter One: Introduction

> An enduring American legend tells of a lone Indian named Squanto who rescued the pilgrims from the wilderness by teaching them to plant corn and introducing them to friendly Native Americans. In so doing, the legend implies, he symbolically brought about the union of the English colonizers and the American land (Salisbury, 2002, p. 1).

The arrival of the Pilgrims to Plymouth Rock in the winter of 1620 marks for many the beginning of the relationship between England, and what would be later known as the United States of America. From the landing at Plymouth Rock, through to the present, this relationship has endured many obstacles. The American Revolution, and the subsequent Treaty of Paris in 1783, allowed the independence of the United States in the international political arena. Fought in the wider context of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe, the War of 1812 saw the two nations face off again. This conflict would boost the military power of the United States on the world stage as Congress and government leaders saw the need for an "emphasis on the need for unity and a degree of optimism for the future". The result of this optimism was an expansion of the regular army and fortification of the coastline, setting the foundation for American global superiority in the future (Black, 2012). The American Civil War of 1861 to 1865 demonstrated the changing relationship between the new nations. Access to cheap wheat from the North, and the potential need for a source of cotton from the South, required neutrality from England in the face of potentially provoking a well armed American army and losing Canada (Henretta, Brody, and Dumenil, 2002, pp. 416–417).

The United States may have been the younger nation, but it was certainly no longer a subservient one.

In the twentieth century came the response to the two World Wars and the changing dynamic between the two countries. In the First World War, American economic and military support had been important but not decisive to the English war effort. In the Second World War the resources of the United States were the key to victory (Ferguson, 2004, p. 290). The balance of power was firmly in the control of the nation that had thrown off English rule in the eighteenth century. This balance of power, and the relationship contained within, sits at the heart of the role of citizenship education and the understanding of patriotism in both nations. The "special relationship", one that had existed as a result of the nature of the conception of the United States

> had its own special ambiguity, at the heart of which lay the Americans very different conception of empire. To the Americans, reared on the myth of their own fight for freedom from British oppression, formal rule over subject peoples was unpalatable. It also implied those foreign entanglements the Founding fathers had warned them against. Sooner or later, everyone must learn to be, like the Americans, self governing and democratic—at gunpoint if necessary (Ferguson, p. 291).

The two nations may have a shared history influenced by the same Enlightenment ideals proposed by Locke, Montesquieu and Rousseau, but it is underpinned by very different motivations. England was a nation that had been built on empire and its exploitation, whereas the United States had been built on individualism

and the rejection of monarchy and its associated aristocratic social privilege. Despite these differences, the two nations, both democratic states, and key allies in the fight against the global war of terror in the twenty-first century, demonstrate the importance of relationships in realizing domestic and foreign policy goals.

In March 2012, Prime Minister David Cameron visited the United States on a state visit. At his formal reception in the White House, President Barack Obama offered the following synopsis of the relationship between the two nations'.

> Through the grand sweep of history, through all its twists and turns, there is one constant: the rock-solid alliance behind the US and the UK. The reason is simple. We stand together and we work together and we bleed together and we fall together in good times and bad, because when we feel our nations are secure, our people are more prosperous, the world is a safer and better and more just place (Obama, 2012).

Problem Statement

In a twenty-first century defined by the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and the subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, it is important that high school students in the present have the tools to dialogue in an increasingly global and interdependent world. This dialogue is needed especially between countries with such shared histories as the United States and England in order to maintain a balance of power that promotes the rights of the individual and respects citizens' civil liberties. In order to assess the ability of future generations to maintain this "special relationship", despite their differences, an understanding of the views of high school students and their interpretation of the

concept of patriotism is essential. Patriotism, as will be discussed in depth later, gives insight into the citizens' understanding of their function in the infrastructure of the nation, alongside any emotional attachment to the country that individuals might experience.

Purpose of the Study

This study investigated the perceptions of patriotism that were held by high school students in the United States and high school students in England. In order to obtain this information, the study incorporated a Likert scale survey that asked various questions concerning patriotism to high school students in both nations. The purpose of the Likert scale is to "allow fairly accurate assessments of beliefs or opinions…because many of our beliefs and opinions are thought of in terms of graduations" (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, p. 260). Following the administration of the surveys co-operating teachers at the participating schools then selected students for follow-up interviews. Narrative analysis of the follow-up interviews allowed further investigation of the students' stories and allowed the respondent to "impose order on the flow of experience to make sense of events and actions in their lives" (Riessman, 2002, p.218). In this instance the experience is patriotism, the event is the education they have received, and the action is how the student has internalized and responded to this education. This mixed method approach allowed for deeper meanings to be established (Tashakorri, 2003, p. 15).

The study looked to address the understanding and interaction that high school students in both nations have with the concept of patriotism. Through factor analysis of

the Likert scale surveys, and narrative analysis of the interviews, it was possible to compare quantitatively the opinions held by high school students, and qualitatively attend to the emotional aspect of their understanding which was more difficult to quantify. Using this approach it was also possible to look at the impact of state mandated citizenship education in England, and compare to the United States where there is a lack of mandate, and see whether differences exist in student understanding of the concept. Comparison of their understandings are required to assess the potential ability of high school students to mature into adults who can successfully negotiate and protect their nation's economic, political, and social ideals, while simultaneously maintaining relationships, not just between England and the United States, but among all those nations who share political systems based on individual rights and rule of law. In addition, the findings of the research are intended to influence classroom pedagogy in the Social Studies that can facilitate effective citizenship education programs in both nations.

Research Questions

In administering this study, the research question was whether high school students in the United States and England perceive the concept of patriotism differently? This overarching question has multiple fundamental characteristics that could be further explored, however the focus for the purpose of this study was to specifically find out the following:

1. Are students able to discern a difference between patriotism and nationalism?
2. How does education on patriotism, whether it be mandated as in the UK with the national curriculum, or non-mandated but recommended as in the United States, potentially influence student's interpretation of the concept?

In answering these questions, a perspective can be obtained that may begin to address the following questions.

1. How can two nations with an "enduring special relationship", foster continued ties despite their differences in citizenship education?
2. How will students' interpretations of patriotism impact international relations between the two nations in the future?

Significance

In addressing these questions, educators will be able to discern better the role that the Social Studies, the school, and the state has in developing patriotic citizens. The dissemination of knowledge regarding the requirements for citizenship is a key element of a democratic society. In August 2002 Prime Minister Tony Blair oversaw the introduction of mandated Citizenship Education into the English National Curriculum (Figueroa, 2004, p. 235). Although such education in the United States is not centralized as in England, the Clinton administration enacted federal initiatives for citizenship education to be implemented at the state and local level. (Johanek & Puckett, 2005, p. 135). The success of such initiatives, whether they be mandated at the national level, or implemented at the local level, often depends on the teachers at the classroom level. This study provides a snapshot into six classrooms, three in the United

States and three in England, in order to understand the differences in students' perceptions of patriotism.

The aim of gaining insight into students' perception and application of patriotism it is possible to follow two significant lines of action. First, at the school level it is intended to help identify opportunities to develop classroom curriculum that fosters democratic patriotism in students. An understanding of a democratic form of patriotism, rather than a blind form of patriotism, will promote the maintenance of the self-governing ideals favored by both nations alongside the concomitant preservation of civil liberties. Second, outside of the classroom, it might be possible to make suggestions to both governmental and non-governmental institutions on how to develop methods to promote an active citizenry in both nations that is able to maintain economic, political and social ideals both domestically, and in their relationships with foreign nations.

Definition of Terms

ADM: Average Daily Membership is "a classification for co-curricular activities" of student attendance "as reported on the Annual Statistical Report from the State Department of Education" (OSSAA ADM List, 2012).

Authoritarian patriotism: "Authoritarian patriotism asks for unquestioning loyalty to a cause determined by a centralized leader or leading group" (Westheimer, 2006, p. 610).

Citizen: "A person owing loyalty to and entitled by birth or naturalization to the protection of a given state" (Morris, 1982, p. 245).

Citizenship: “The status of a citizen with its attendant duties, rights, and privileges” (Morris, 1982, p. 245).

Citizenship education: Education that enables “students to acquire meaningful knowledge about the political and economic system, to recognize the strengths and challenges of democracy and the attributes of good citizenship, to be comfortable in participating in respectful discussions of important and potentially controversial issues, and to be aware of civil society organizations” (Torney-Purta, 2002, p. 203).

Civil religion: Investment by the establishment that promotes a common set of values in “which every member of the nation was to be united in a common creed” (Marienstras, 2004, p. 682).

Civitas: “state; community; city; citizenship” (Traupman, 1994, p. 96)

CIVITAS:

a curriculum framework for the schools (kindergarten through grade 12) developed by scholars, professional educators, and public leaders who hold a broad range of political economic and social views…to establish a solid intellectual an scholarly grounding for civic education in the schools, propose a common core of knowledge, values and skills desirable for all students in the nation to achieve, and outline a desirable school learning environment appropriate for students holding a diversity of beliefs and outlooks and reflecting an expanding plurality of ethnic, racial, linguistic, and religious communities in the Unites States” (Center for Civic Education, 1991, p. xix)

Co-operating teacher: A teacher within a school who aids and assists other teachers "to try out innovative ideas as well as develop and understanding for an appreciation of established practices" (University of Oklahoma, 2007, p. 4)

Constructive patriotism: Concerned with the maintenance of democratic values that attempt to maintain "an effort to promote positive change and consistency with the nations ideals" (Kahne & Middaugh, 2006, p. 118).

Democratic patriotism: "Seeks to ensure that 'liberty and justice for all' serves not only as a slogan for America but also as a guiding principle for policies, programs, and laws that affect Americans. To be a democratic patriot, then, one must be committed not only to the nation, its symbols, and its political leaders, but also to each of its citizens and their welfare (Westheimer, 2006, p. 612).

Education for citizenship: The program of citizenship education implemented by Prime Minister Tony Blair in 2002 through the Department of Education in England.

> Education for citizenship equips young people with the knowledge, skills and understanding to play an effective role in public life. Citizenship encourages them to take an interest in topical and controversial issues and to engage in discussion and debate. Pupils learn about their rights, responsibilities, duties and freedoms and about laws, justice and democracy. They learn to take part in decision-making and different forms of action. They play an active role in the life of their schools, neighbourhoods, communities and wider society as active and global citizens (Department of Education, 2007).

Environmental patriotism: A commitment to "protecting the land and all its inhabitants including its non-human inhabitants (Cafaro, 2009, p. 192).

Horizontalization: In phenomenological data analysis horizontalization is when "protocols are divided into statements (Creswell, 1998, p. 51).

Humanitarian patriotism: Humanitarian patriotism has at its core the ability to focus on the "common good" of all individuals so that an inclusive patriotism can be achieved through ownership by its participants (Teachout, 2009, p. 21).

Key stage 4: A period that is mandated by the Department of Education in Great Britain and Northern Ireland in which students in Year 10 and Year 11 have to study specific subjects.

During Key Stage 4 most pupils work towards national qualifications - usually General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE). Subject's children have to study: English, maths, science, information and communication technology (ICT), physical education, citizenship. Schools must also offer at least 1 subject from each of these areas: arts, design and technology, humanities, modern foreign languages" (Department of Education, 2012)

Nationalism: "The discourse of nationalism places the nation state as the lens through which the world is viewed, in which all actions, both local and global, are there to strengthen the nation state (Camicia & Zhu, 2011, p. 604).

National Curriculum: Curriculum requirements that outline "essential knowledge that all children should acquire…for both primary and secondary schools" mandated by the Government of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Department of Education, 2011).

Patria: "native land, native city, home" (Traupman, 1994, p. 298).

Patriotism: “In ordinary use the term ‘patriotism’ means ‘love of one’s country’” (Kodelja, 2011, p. 130).

Phenomenology: “a phenomenological study describes the meaning of the lived experiences for several individuals about a concept or the phenomenon (Creswell, 1998, p. 51).

Polis: “a small but autonomous political unit in which all major political, social, and religious activities were carried out at one central location. The polis consisted of a city, town, or village and its surrounding countryside” (Duiker & Spielvogel, 2004, p. 96).

Social studies: The National Council for the Social Studies defines Social Studies as

> …the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence. Within the school program, social studies provides coordinated, systematic study drawing upon such disciplines as anthropology, archaeology, economics, geography, history, law, philosophy, political science, psychology, religion, and sociology, as well as appropriate content from the humanities, mathematics, and natural sciences. The primary purpose of social studies is to help young people make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world. (National Council for the Social Studies, 2012).

4A school: A distinction made between schools based on ADM by the Oklahoma Secondary Schools Activities Association for the purpose of institutional classification. A 4A school in 2012 has a population between 366 students and 660 students (OSSAA, 2012).

5A school: A distinction made between schools based on ADM by the Oklahoma Secondary Schools Activities Association for the purpose of institutional classification. A 5A school in 2012 has a population between 678 students and 1254 students (OSSAA, 2012).

6A school: A distinction made between schools based on ADM by the Oklahoma Secondary Schools Activities Association for the purpose of institutional classification. A 6A school in 2012 has a population between 1287 students and 4586 students (OSSAA, 2012).

Summary

Civic education in the socialization of students is vital for the maintenance of democratic societies. By addressing how students perceive and interact with the concept of patriotism in the United States and England it is possible to view both the current nature of student's understanding of citizenship in both countries, while simultaneously looking to the future potential for them to mature into adults who can successfully negotiate and protect their nation's economic, political and social ideals in a globalized and interdependent world. This research is specifically intended to help identify opportunities to promote education on democratic patriotism for students as this form of patriotism is more likely to maintain self-governance and the preservation of

civil liberties, not just in the United States or England, but also in those nations that share the fundamental characteristics of democratic governments.

Chapter two will provide the historical context for the development of patriotism in both nations. Chapter three will introduce scholarly discussion over the types of patriotism. Chapter four will discuss the methodology for the study including the limitations. Chapter five will address the results of the research. Chapter six will be concerned with the implications of the findings and how they can be implemented.

Chapter Two: Patriotism in History

The protection of the nation sits at the historic root of patriotism. Patriotism comes from the Latin root patria, which concerns the individual's homeland or fatherland. Indeed the concept of *patria*, extends beyond just "country" in the political sense. The word also carries a sense of family obligation on a larger country-wide level (Cafaro, 2009). In Ancient Rome, "the term *patria* designated either one's native place – patria sua – or the city of "all" subjects, regardless of their membership in a patria sua, who recognized Rome as their communis patria, that is, their common fatherland" (Kodelja, 2011, p. 130). The concept of *patria* as fatherland, and the duty of citizens to support, maintain, and defend their homeland, traverses the Western political tradition, and it is through this lens that patriotism will be investigated in this research. It is essential to the success of human societies that civic education concerning the issue is present in society (Cafaro, 2009). This chapter will begin by providing a brief discussion of select events in the historical development of patriotism by the century in England, and the United States.

England in the 16th Century

The "first recorded use of the word 'patriot'" is used in 1596 (Brennan, 2003, p. 1). Although the Tudor monarchs may have been ambivalent regarding what would come to be called "patriotism", the royal advisors recognized that patriotism was useful in mollifying citizens in the face of "disunity" (p. 15). It has been suggested (Coby, 2009) that the court of Henry VIII, under his Secretary Thomas Cromwell, was more likely to adopt Machiavellian political goals, rather than promote an environment where

people upheld the nation for the common good. What was important was satisfying the desires of the king: "…the adviser should eschew ethics and take as his guide the prince's desires, however unholy or illicit they may be. The good adviser…knows the prince's mind, executes the prince's will, and represents the prince's policies as the product of pure virtue" (p. 31). A style of leadership that truly adopted and respected the rights of the citizen, rather than the will of the monarch, at least in name, would not be evident until the introduction of the Bill of Rights in 1688 (Goldie, 1998, p. 10). In the case of Niccolo Machiavelli and his impact on the Tudor England of Henry VIII, the constant political machinations of Renaissance Europe left little for the citizens to do in the pursuit of protecting the *patria*. In discussing the role of government in the city-state of Florence, Machiavelli wrote "certainly a country can never be united and happy, except when it obeys wholly one government, whether a republic or a monarchy" (Machiavelli 1517/1989, p. 224).

For the monarch, patriotism in Elizabethan England was a vessel through which the head of state could appear to meet the needs of the citizens, while simultaneously serving her own interests (Brennan, p. 14-15). Of particular interest is the Statute of Artificers of 1563, which mandated specific qualifications for those in charge of apprentices. The statute's goal was to restrict the population of apprentice masters to those willing to promote traditional notions of vocation and class division, at a period in English history when such divisions were becoming increasingly blurred (Woodward, 1980, p. 40). In London especially, class divisions were distorted as the increased wealth of the mercantile class threatened the landed gentry. Unsurprisingly some members of the Gentry class sought access to some of this wealth and power. Gentry

fathers would an investment in placing their sons as apprentices as "sons could become citizens and guild members and even enjoy a higher standard of living than their parents. Upward mobility was… possible within this middling group that fell between the commoner and gentry" (Rickman, p. 26). In a society of primogeniture, those who were not in line to inherit wealth required an avenue to procure status and moved away from the traditional path for the gentry of attending university and looked to what the City offered them, therefore altering traditional boundaries of class (p. 27).

One interesting example of education to promote the interests of the state is found within Sir Henry Billingsley's translation of Euclid's *Elements* in 1570, the first translation of the work into English. In the preface by John Dee, published in English and not in Latin as would be used in the universities, there is written

> Here is (gentle Reader) nothing (the word of God onely set apart) which so much beautifieth and adorneth the soule and minde of ma, as doth the knowledge of good artes and sciences…In histories are contained infinite examples of heroicall vertues to be of us followed, and horrible examples of vices to be eschewed. Many other artes also are there are which beautifie the minde of man: but of all other none do more garnish & beautifie it, then those artes which are calculated Mathematicall. Unto the knowledge of which no man can attaine, without perfecte knowledge and instruction of the principles, groundes, and Elementes of Geometrie (Billingsley. H, & Dee. J., 1570, p. ii).

This focus on the virtues of geometry was for a patriotic vision that Dee had for Elizabethan England. By translating the text into English, Billingsley had made it available to the people. The preface specifically entreats its reader, who hails from the

gentry ("gentle reader"), to work through the Euclidean material and in doing so help England with minds that could envision and build a maritime empire. Indeed his later work, "*General and Rare Memorials Pertayning to Perfect Arte of Navigation*, was partly composed of tables for the use of mariners, but it also had a narrative section "pleading for a strong navy for the purpose of a patriotic expansion" (Brennan, p. 16). The patriotic expansion that was hoped for by Dee was not realized in Elizabeth's reign, but the attempted invasion by Spain in 1588, and the defeat of its Armada, would serve as a patriotic crossroads for future generations (p. 60-61).

17th Century England

There are two events that serve as the basis for understanding the development of patriotism in England in the Seventeenth Century. The first is the English Civil War and the rise of Oliver Cromwell (Pincus, 1996). The second is the Glorious Revolution and the introduction of the Bill of Rights in 1688–1689 (Cruickshanks, 2000). The English Civil War saw the beheading of the English monarch Charles I in January 1649, and the installation of Cromwell as regent of the Commonwealth. Much of the indignation felt by Cromwell was motivated by his perceived need to protect England from Catholic Europe. Protection of the fatherland necessarily included a religious element since

> English Protestants were sure that since the Reformation, England had been a nation specially favored by God. The frustrating of Mary Stuart's conspiracies to capture the throne, the nation's rescue from the Spanish Armada, the narrow escape from the Gunpowder Plot – these and other events testified that England

enjoyed God's protection from international Catholicism" (Gentles, 2011, p. 93).

Although those who supported the rise of Cromwell may have understood his actions as patriotic, this was not the case. It has been suggested (Pincus, 1996) that the result of the monarchical overthrow was a "conventional Protestant nationalism" that masqueraded under the guise of national self-protection by politicians interested mainly in avoiding war. Indeed, government policies of the "new aristocracy" sought to protect individual interests, rather than the interests of the citizenry as a whole. Citizens were removed from politics and "if English men and women outside Westminster pondered the world beyond their county communities at all, they thought about retreating farther away from it" (p. 4).

The political event that helped transfer some power away from central government and to the people were the events of the Glorious Revolution. This revolution was the deposition of the Catholic King of England James II, and the accession of the Protestant William of Orange and his wife, James' II daughter Mary. In this transfer of power Parliament instituted the Declaration of Rights that forever changed the relationship between the monarch, the elected government, and the people. The "Declaration of Rights…was profoundly significant for the future of the Monarchy in Britain" and held such significance because there were to be "no more standing armies; no dispensing power; no resort to extra-parliamentary taxation; no resurrection of special courts and tribunals, ecclesiastical or civil; freedom to petition guaranteed; free elections; annual parliaments" (Schama, 2002, p. 321–322). In short the

protections that are required, and will be discussed in depth later, for citizens to practice a democratic form of patriotism.

In addition to this the Glorious Revolution introduced into the political arena the writings of John Locke and his ideas concerning social contract that were to so influence not just the English, but also the writings of Thomas Jefferson and Americans' understanding of the Declaration of Independence. What is interesting to note at this point is that "Locke argued that William owed the Crown to the choice of the people, the only foundation of lawful government" and defended the right to rebel and to prevent as well as to resist tyranny" (Cruickshanks, p. 36–37). Although these ideas were present at the time of writing the Declaration of Rights, they were too incendiary for the monarchy to accept and were excluded from the document.

Certainly there was a limit to how much investment from ordinary citizens the political establishment would allow in the governance and protection of the nation. It is interesting to note, especially in the context of a comparative study such as this, that the Declaration of Rights "was less concerned with the rights of individual as with the rights of Parliament. The American Declaration asserted rights for the individual that had not been secured in England in 1689" (Cruickshanks, p. 41).

18th Century England

> They'd fought for centuries, and they would fight again. The Hundred Years' War of the Middle Ages would become the Seven Years' War of the 18th century. Agincourt, fought, not on a muddy field, but in battles around the globe. It turned out that the combo the British most despised—Jesuits, professional

> soldiers and bureaucrats—were stealing the empire before their very eyes, starting with continental America. Singing patriotic anthems wouldn't stop them, only war would. And war, as the Romans discovered, changes everything. The first victim is liberty and the second is profit (Schama, 2002).

Patriotism in England in the 18th century is characterized by two developments. The first is the rise of Enlightenment thought developed by the likes of John Locke (1690), Montesquieu (1748) and, in particular for this discussion, Rousseau and his development on the idea of the *Social Contract* (1762). The second is the English response to, and involvement in, the conflicts of the growing Empire that were influenced by this Enlightenment philosophy, in particular the American and French Revolutions.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau was born and raised in Geneva. He left Geneva at the age of 16 and, after traveling through Europe, settled in Paris. After publishing *The Social Contract* (1762), and other controversial essays, Rousseau was ordered for arrest in both Geneva and Paris and his books were ordered burned. He landed in England in 1766 and lived in Derby. He later died in poverty in 1778. Although Rousseau lived in England only for a brief time, his writings, like that of Locke and Montesquieu exerted significant influence on events of the day. Supporters of the Glorious Revolution, along with social philosophers such as Rousseau, Locke, and Montesquieu, favored the voice of the citizen in the protection of the nation, thereby promoting a more inclusive and democratic aspect to patriotism over blind loyalty to a top-down autocracy. Such patriotism was historically rooted in Athenian direct democracy (Porter, 1989, p. 333–334). As Rousseau's discussion below demonstrates, compared to the suffocating

patriotism that influenced the Tudor Court under Thomas Cromwell, this ideal of inclusive citizenship stands in stark contrast.

> In order for the general will to be well expressed, it is therefore important that there be no partial society in the State, and that each citizen give only his own opinion. Such was the unique and sublime system instituted by the great Lycurgus. If there are partial societies, their number must be multiplied and their inequality prevented, as was done by Solon…these precautions are the only valid means of ensuring that the general will is always enlightened and that the people is not deceived (Rousseau, 1762/1989, p. 367).

The Enlightenment existed within a prism of duality as a movement that despite being grounded in reason and humanity, often found itself at odds with peace (Emsley, 1991, p. 104). The contradicting nature of the Enlightenment had a considerable impact on England and English patriotism. Evidence suggests the American and French Revolutions were two such events that affected English patriotism but in vastly different aspects. (Evans. E., 2011, p. 82).

The loss of colonies in the American Revolution forced a response by both politicians and citizens against the government of King George, which was led by Prime Minister Lord North. The negative criticism stemmed from not only the loss of the colonies, but also the "unusual experience" of losing. After all England was a nation in the midst of an impressive economic and military winning streak highlighted by the Seven Years War, 1756 – 1763. The loss of the colonies destabilized the political establishment and was exacerbated, in particular, by the Treaty of Paris in 1783, which

formalized the terms of the loss of the colonies to the new United States of America (Evans. E, p. 87).

The political fallout was significant as both North and George III lost considerable support. Fuelled by independent politicians, the public sought to influence policy makers and patriotically regain the dominance that England had enjoyed after the Seven Years War. Consequently the period following 1782–1783 was a difficult time for the government as there were ministerial divisions over domestic and foreign policies and a path to reform was needed to prevent further loss of empire overseas (Black, 1994, p. 28–29).

Adversely, it was an overseas conflict that sparked a spirit of royalism within England. While the American Revolution swayed political opinion, it was the French Revolution that inspired a sense of unity and loyalty to the crown (Philp, 1991, p. 16–17). This newfound wave of patriotism was influenced by the periodic threat, after the 1790s, of a French invasion. The impending invasion served to mobilize the patriotic ideal to protect the homeland, even though it was based more on a nationalism that sought to prevent radicalism from developing in England (Dinwiddy, 1991, p. 48). This form of patriotism was clear in the instructions of Henry Dundas, Minister of War in the Home Office in 1792

> It becomes the duty of everyone capable of judging the advantages to be derived from our excellent Constitution to exert his endeavours for its support, especially at times like the present, when evil minded people of different descriptions are employed in every part of the Country to overthrow it (Eastwood, 1991, p. 152).

This call for patriotic action, though it supported the goals of those who were in power, gave a role to the public. The politicians needed support and although "reliance on the landed elite might appear conservative, the attempt to encourage a mass movement of loyalism revealed a willingness to turn to, and an ability to use, the public politics of the present" (Black, 1994, p. 413). By the end of the 18th century, the English government recognized that patriotic action was not solely governed by the dictates of the aristocratic class and the military, but also needed the public's voice and action in order to maintain the Constitution and prevent radicalism.

19th Century England

In the century after Rousseau, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel was "judged by many as the greatest philosopher of the nineteenth century" (Porter, p. 385). Hegelian philosophy "made the most significant impact on representative English thought" as much of his writing was concerned with progress (Tibor, 1980, p. 49). This progress was reflected in English society, developmentally as the progenitor of the Industrial Revolution, and philosophically as a society that respected liberal ideals (Davis, 2006, p. 97). Hegel's patriotism distributes the power to the people but asks of its adherents an involvement and regard for the fundamental institutions of society. It is not, for Hegel, the acts of valor and courage that constitute patriotism, but the everyday actions that citizens participate in to maintain society:

> Under patriotism one frequently understands a mere willingness to perform extraordinary acts and sacrifices. But patriotism is essentially the sentiment of regarding, in the ordinary circumstances and ways of life, the weal of the

> community as the substantial basis and the final end. It is upon this consciousness, present in the ordinary course of life and under all circumstances, that the disposition to heroic effort is founded. But as people are often rather magnanimous than just, they easily persuade themselves that they possess the heroic kind of patriotism, in order to save themselves the trouble of having the truly patriotic sentiment, or to excuse the lack of it (Hegel, 1821/1989, p. 419).

In this manner it is incumbent on all citizens to maintain the institutions that protect the nation. A patriot is not the individual who goes out of his way to participate in the welfare of their community or nation when others are watching rather, a patriot is the citizen that understands how everyday actions protect and help maintain the *patria.*

The visible symbol of progress in English society was the Great Exhibition of 1851. After the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 the England became a modern economy. This modern economy saw the rise of a middle-class, a class that took resources from the working poor, and threatened the upper class. In a Continental Europe fraught with revolutions in 1830 and 1848, the Great Exhibition of 1851 served to bring the nation together in celebration, rather than follow a path of conflict (Davis, 2006, p. 98-99). The Great Exhibition was to reveal the industrial and manufacturing marvels of the age to its own citizens, and to the world. Patriotism was to be tied up with wealth creation, and the wealth was to be generated by the Industrial Revolution. At the Exhibition Banquet in March 1850, Prince Albert, husband of Queen Victoria, formally announced the event. What was most interesting about this, however, was the speech given by the Archbishop of Canterbury in which he said

> whilst we are ministers of religion we are at the same time citizens, and we do not cease to be patriots; and as citizens and as patriots we take a lively interest in whatever tends to promote the national prosperity…I rejoice in this the more because it will tend to carry into effect one of the most glorious characteristics of out holy religion-good will among men (Davis, p. 99).

Economic success and industrial development were key aspects of Victorian England's identity; consequently a patriot of the time was expected to uphold the mechanisms of this success. The English philosopher John Stuart Mill, in *On Liberty* (1859) examined the relationship between government and its citizens; in particular, he wrote about the role citizens have in forming the interests of the nation. This patriotism requires investment by its citizens in the nation, and regulation of the government in order to protect the country.

> What was now wanted was that the rulers should be identified with the people; that their interest and will should be the interest and will of the nation. The nation did not need to be protected against its own will. There was no fear of its tyrannizing over itself. Let the rulers be effectually responsible to it, promptly removable by it, and it could afford to trust them with power of which it could itself dictate the use to be made. Their power was but the nations own power, concentrated, and in a form convenient for exercise (Mill, 1859, p. 437).

In the 19th century Mill viewed the protection of the nation in terms of the collective will of the country defending the form of government that most reflected the spirit and motivations of the nation. In the 19th century the English people's spirit was concentrated on the Industrial Revolution and how, as a small island nation, England

could satisfy its resource needs. Imperialism, especially after 1860, became a "strategic and political necessity" for the nation, in order to promote the English sense of paternal civility on various parts of the world. The manner in which this was achieved, and the strength of a national patriotism based ironically on inclusion at home, but oppression abroad, became more difficult as the century progressed and a more heterogeneous citizenry emerged (Parry, 2006, p.20).

England in the 20th Century

England's imperial grip began to loosen at the beginning of the 20th century as the patriotic sentiment that had encompassed the nation in the 19th century dissipated. Instead it was replaced with the rise of Labor Unions and a nationalism that was driven by race and economics. This period sought to remove non-whites from employment in England, and to promote Anglo labor abroad in colonies like South Africa and Australia (Barrow, p. 275-277). A major reason for this change was the rise of Germany and France competing for influence in Africa, and an increased interest in India by Russia (Parry, p. 20). These colonial threats would at least politically, and only in the eyes of the Europeans, be resolved by the partitioning of Africa in 1884-1885. This change in the global power structure from the mid 19th century, to the increased competition from other industrialized nations of the late 19th and early 20th century, altered public attitudes from Victorian liberal policies to a more conservative insular outlook in Edwardian society. This change remained in place until the onset of World War I in 1914.

Out of the need for national unity emerged what iconic journalist of the time G. K. Chesterton called a nation that "reacted against racial definitions of national character and acquired a new willingness to acknowledge the influence of a larger European cultural heritage in forming the liberal, antistatist elements in the British tradition" (Hanssen, 2006, p. 188–189). Patriotism in England during World War I was about the defense of the nation and it cut across class distinctions. In

> working-class soldiers letters of the First World War, patriotism can be seen to derive from a sense of duty and obligation; it had no adventurous flamboyance about it, more of a feeling that mates should stick together and see things through (Cunningham, 1989, p. 78)

This patriotism concerned the position of the soldier in not just defending the state, but the communal patriotism of maintaining the physical state of those immediately in their care. The shadow of World War I certainly impacted England in the interwar years and the 1930's "saw a drastic drop in the national birth rate. The year 1933 was a nadir in the fertility rate which dropped to 1.72". These changes in the social structure upset the traditional values of the nation threatened engendered notions of class that existed in England (Bell, 2008, p. 111). With this in mind, unsurprisingly when war broke out in 1939 the focus on maintaining civilian morale was concerned with the role of the family. A need for national unity for the success of the nation in it's war effort gave the role of the family a new importance in public debates and in social policy. Wartime propaganda focused on the family as the central unit that would drive the nation to victory. The family being referred to was the traditional social unit, but it was also given wider connotations to promote protection of the city, or the nation as a

whole. This unity was needed to protect the nation and it was a patriotic duty for everyone to come together to achieve this (Bell, 2008, p. 109–111).

The individual that was to co-ordinate this unified force against Nazi Germany was Winston Churchill who played the vital role in stirring the nation to resist (Jefferys, 1991, p. 35). In this role Churchill was the unquestioned leader and "the Prime Minister was suddenly assuming the mantle of national saviour" (p. 48). Especially in 1940, the year of the Blitz against London, it "is an article of patriotic faith that Britain…was united as never before or since in a mood of resolute defiance" (Ziegler, 1995, p. 82). Under Churchill however, the patriotic mood offered "little strident jingoism" as the focus was on repelling the invader from England's shores rather than empty threats and needless nationalism (p. 85).

The two World Wars caused the economic downfall of England and consequently the loss of empire that for so long had served as a patriotic backbone in England. Instead of sending people around the world, it was now people from the former empire that came to England (Ferguson, 2004, p. 303). This influx of people set the foundation for both patriotic and nationalistic responses that are evident all the way to the present. These responses are core to development of the citizenship education in England and will be discussed toward the end of this chapter.

United States in the 18th Century

In the century prior to the formal recognition of the United States in 1783, the ideals of the new nation were generally situated in two environments. The first environment was the New England towns and communities where homogenous groups

in the late 17th and 18th centuries dictated the ideas and expectations of the establishment through the family and the local church. The second environment consisted of the various ethnic communities that existed throughout the Republic and were made up of different groups such as Dutch, French, Swedish and English. Regardless of whether it was a unity based on religion as seen in New England, or dictated by national origin, it was necessary for those who propagated rebellion against King George III to find a common threat (Butts, 1989, pp. 54–55).

That threat occurred in 1765 when Prime Minister of Great Britain George Grenville instituted the Stamp Act. The legislation sparked a fundamental shift in patriotic attitudes among American colonists and fanned the flames of rebellion against Great Britain. The primary goal of the Stamp Act was to offset a portion of the estimated two hundred thousand pounds per year expenditure to station soldiers in the colonies. In taxing "all court documents, land titles, contracts, playing cards, newspapers and other printed items" the British parliament sought to recoup an estimated 60,000 pounds and in a vote that included the Quartering Act, it was passed by a margin of 245 to 49 (Kaplanoff, 2004, p. 121). The Stamp Act included a directive for any transgressors to be tried in an admiralty court, which was a key problem among colonial residents as it featured only one judge rather than common jury trials. Tensions in response to the acts continued to escalate particularly on the streets of Boston. The fallout from the threat of perceived violations of their civil liberties would forever impact the American view of patriotism, and led to the development of a new and revolutionary tool necessary for the gestation of a new nation state. (Henretta, et al., 2002, p. 132–133).

The Stamp Act Congress, which met in New York in October 1765, outlined grievances against the British government and petitioned Parliament to repeal the act. The Congress was not alone in challenging British authority. The Sons of Liberty questioned the act's legitimacy along three lines. First, they urged for broad application of English common law, which had evolved to protect the civil liberties individuals from arbitrary government action. Second, the Sons of Liberty espoused western European Enlightenment philosophy, including ideas borne from 17th-century figures such as John Locke (1690) and were renewed by 18th-century philosophes such as Montesquieu (1748). Locke maintained that all people held inalienable rights, and Montesquieu addressed the need for a separation of powers to prevent tyranny. Third, the Sons of Liberty revisited the English Civil War, the execution of Charles I, and the establishment of the Commonwealth under Oliver Cromwell. In doing so, the Sons of Liberty defended the right of oppressed subjects to overthrow a despot, as some perceived George III. In the case of the colonies, such usurpation would prevent what was perceived as an impending permanent servitude to the Crown. Underlying the arguments of the Sons of Liberty was the notion that force was justified in order to remedy a perceived denial of individual rights by a coercive power (Henretta et al., 2002, p. 138–139).

Patriotic reaction to the Stamp Act was evident across the social classes of colonial America. To a degree previously unseen, colonists banded together regardless of class to protest Great Britain. The Sons of Liberty, which counted Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams among its members, used the Stamp Act to focus colonial discontent with the monarchy. Among the working class, discontent had been rising due to

stagnant wages blamed on previously enacted Parliamentary policies. For middle- and upper-class colonists, the Stamp Act directly impacted incomes with its levies on printed documents such as court records. A popular sentiment for protecting individual wealth and forging a crown-independent identity spread through the colonies. The philosophical undercurrent for the protests centered on the inalienable rights of a people to be free from a government that had broken the social contract and failed to provide sufficient protection to its citizens (Teachout, 2009, p. 18–25).

The individual motives among the upper-class protesters, however, were not as egalitarian as they might first appear. Upon further historical inspection, it is arguable that many protesters were not so much interested in equality for all as with supplanting the existing monarchical power structure and establishing the interests of wealthy bankers, merchants, lawyers and planters. Still, the Stamp Act fostered an increasingly unified sense of patriotism and American identity. Patriotism became something to be shared regardless of social class, and patriotic fervor was a catalyst for reaction against the tyranny perceived to be embodied in the monarchy (Teachout, 2009, pp. 22–25). As Patrick Henry wrote in his March 23, 1775, address to the Virginia Convention, discussing reasons to go to war with Great Britain:

> No man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as the abilities, of the every worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the house…If we wish to be free, if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending…and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained, we must fight!...Three millions of people armed in the holy cause of liberty and in such a

country as that which we possess are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us. (Patrick Henry in Bell et al., 1991, pp. 104–107)

Ten years after the Stamp Act protests, a socially inclusive patriotism was steering "three millions of people" and the future of the nation-state away from monarchy and the perceived tyranny of Great Britain. In the colonies, at least for men of European descent, the notion grew of a society with social mobility, free from the baggage of centuries of entrenched aristocracy, religious intolerance, and limited economic opportunity. The emerging United States offered its citizens the chance to participate in a nation-state that idealized egalitarianism. In 1791 the publisher Robert Coram explained to his Delaware Gazette readers the importance of educating all citizens in the essay *Political Inquiries, to Which Is Added a Plan For the Establishment of Schools Throughout the United States.* "Education, then ought to be secured by government to every class of citizens, to every child in the state…Education should not be left to the caprice or negligence of parents; to chance, or confined to the children of wealthy citizens" (Coram, 1791, para 83–84).

United States in the 19th Century

The development of the United States was spurred by a patriotism that broke down social barriers and influenced the role of women in the society. As an outgrowth of Enlightenment thinking from Locke and others, women emerged as a primary conduit for patriotic ideals by the early 19th century (Kerber, 1976; Zagarri, 1992). Linda Kerber (1976) notes that Locke's social philosophy regarding women must be framed within the context of 17th century England. Locke acknowledges the domestic,

child-rearing role of women, but he is unable to define an active position for women in civic society (p. 190). The Lockeian assertion of inalienable rights, however, provided philosophical grounding to the American Revolution, and this political revolution consequently spurred an evolution of gender norms in America. In the latter colonial period and in the early days of the Republic, women advanced beyond the traditional domestic existence into-- "hesitantly – a political role" (p. 188).

The revolutionary changes in women's experiences between 17th-century England and late 18th century America were incorporated into an ideal that Linda Kerber calls the "Republican mother." One of the most cited examples of the Republican mother is Abigail Adams, whose behind-the-scenes political activities are prime examples of patriotic action. As Kerber (1976) discusses, Adams "would be a shrewd private commentator on the political scene, assuming as active an obligation to judge good and evil as though she were called on annually to vote on it" (p. 201). Adams's ideas, though, necessarily were constrained to correspondence and private discussions. Moreover, Adams's will could only have been exercised through her husband, without attribution to Adams herself.

The model Republican mother transmitted patriotic virtues to her sons and daughters, who would then transmit the virtues to the next generation, and so on. Single women even had a responsibility as caretakers of society, although this was a "more abstract conception of motherhood, one that enabled women…to carve new roles for themselves as cultural custodians at large" (Miller, 2002, p. 158). The Republican mother was "dedicated to the service of civic virtue; she educated her sons for it; she condemned and corrected her husband's lapses from it" (Kerber, 1976, p. 202).

Although women of the Revolutionary era remained unable to directly exercise political power, the model of the Republican mother was a modicum of progress. It was a new reality that facilitated an indirect absorption of women's views into the political arena. The Republican mother helped shape the fortune of the United States through the care of her sons and husband and the formation of their patriotic virtue.

Rosemarie Zagarri (1992) writes of this post revolutionary development in society in her work "Morals, Manners and the Republican Mother."

> It congratulated Americans for having moved farther along the road of social progress than any other nation, but did not require a basic alteration in the relations between sexes. It extended a kind of equality to women, but at the same time justified the status quo. It acknowledged the importance of female education, but generally saw its function in terms of women's relationship to men. It recognized the political significance of the family, but did not give women the right to vote. It represented, in other words, an intellectual compromise between the insights of the European Enlightenment and the rhetoric of the American Revolution (p. 210–211).

An intellectual compromise it may have been, but it was a step forward compared to other nations of the time. The patriotic duty of the Republican mother expanded the significance of the nuclear family within the Republic. The family was viewed as an independent entity within the broader nation-state, rather than a subservient unit subject to the English monarchy.

In the late 19th century, a new patriotic fervor had mounted in America. This reinvigoration of patriotism surrounded two widely celebrated anniversaries. In 1890

the nation marked 25 years since the conclusion of its destructive and bloody Civil War. Although the United States continued to endure deep sectional and social divisions, the anniversary was tapped by the moral guardians of the country as an opportunity to unify citizens through their patriotic sense. The second anniversary, coming in 1892, was the 400th anniversary of Christopher Columbus's arrival in the New World. This anniversary provided for an even stronger national rallying point. The arrival of Columbus was emblazoned in the minds of citizens as seed that set into motion the manifest destiny of American expansion across the continent. Both these celebrations expanded individual patriotism and the collective sense of the American nation-state (Sica, 1990, p. 380).

A quarter of a century after the end of the Civil War those who had participated in the conflict saw a nation very different to the vision they had fought for in the period 1861-1865. Prior to the Civil War, the North promoted a free-soil policy, while the South sought to protect states' rights, including the right of states to secede from the Union, and an economic system built on slave labor. After secession occurred, President Lincoln demanded that the Confederate states either return to the Union or face war. The Confederacy chose confrontation, and the result was the loss of more American lives than in all other United States wars. This memory was with the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR), the veteran soldiers of the civil war who had patriotically signed up to fight over 25 years earlier (Henretta et al., 2002, p. 406).

The GAR pressed the government to instruct patriotism as part of the daily life of the school in order to promote their ideals of citizenship education. One concrete patriotic expression promoted by GAR for was for an American flag to be displayed on

every schoolhouse and for flag ceremonies to be carried out. However, some promoters of patriotic fervor believed that the flags and the concomitant ceremonies were insufficient affirmations of American pride and loyalty to the Republic. Waves of immigrants, many of whom were Roman Catholics from southern and eastern Europe, were arriving into the United States. The loyalty of many such immigrants did not go unquestioned and against this social backdrop the Pledge of Allegiance was born and changed the role of patriotism irrevocably (Sica, 1990, p. 380).

The port of entry for many of the immigrant arrivals was New York, and as early as 1887, the auditor of the City Board of Education, Col. George T. Balch, had already written a Pledge. Balch's pledge read simply "We give our heads and our hearts to God and our country; one country, one language, one flag" (Ellis, 2005, p. 18). Balch, a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, was a school administrator who perceived a need to assimilate students from other cultures and to cultivate a core set of patriotic values. Balch presented the idea that these core values could be aided by the recitation of a pledge. A pledge would help to inculcate American values and ideals in the new immigrants who spoke different languages, practiced different religions, and held different values from the largely Protestant immigrants who had come in previous eras from Western Europe. The core text of the Pledge of Allegiance as it is now known, however, was penned not by Balch, but a Christian Socialist by the name of Francis Bellamy. Bellamy's pledge began as part of a marketing campaign for the magazine *Youths Companion* to sell flags as part of the 1892 Columbus Day celebrations (O' Leary, 2007, p. 159). This was achieved through

students selling “shares in the flag” to United States residents willing to part with ten cents for their piece of patriotism.

> The usual method was to offer to any pupil in any school, free, a hundred cards on which were printed the words: This Certificate, representing a 10 cent contribution, entitles the holder to One Share in the patriotic influence of the School Flag (Bellamy, 1953, p. 1).

Throughout the late 19th century and the early 20th century the pledge was adopted by many school districts, and its cause forwarded by individuals such as Col. George Balch. Balch proposed forced patriotism in the form of flag salutes that extended from the school into the daily lives of all civilians. This celebration saw patriotism intertwined with the motives of rampant capitalism particular to the Gilded Age. More than ever patriotism became a marketable commodity that could be purchased and traded for political gain and leveraged to rally the masses to act in accordance with political will (Chiodo, Martin & Worthington, 2011).

United States in the 20th Century

The reaction to the wave of immigrants of the late 19th century, at least in part, stimulated the creation of new patriotic conventions and began a new and increasingly myopic development to patriotic attitudes in the United States. This reaction was closed and required obedience to central tenets decided by a white Protestant majority who often sought to control the values and mores of society. This style of patriotism, which will be termed blind patriotism and will be discussed in Chapter 3, is most evident in the reinvigoration of the Klu Klux Klan in 1915. The origins of the Klu Klux Klan

developed out of a Tennessee social club in 1866, but quickly became a paramilitary group under the leadership of Nathan Bedford Forrest, the Confederate's most decorated general (Henretta et al., 2002, p. 448). The goal of the original Klan was to subvert the goals of white Republican politicians seen sympathetic to the black cause, and prevent the expansion and growth of black influence in the South. Although never completely eradicated, the denial of Southern black opportunities diminished the goals of the Klu Klux Klan following its disbandment in 1869. By 1915 though, some felt that there were new enemies. The Klan reemerged under William Joseph Simmons, and its reincarnation focused not only on supplanting the rights of Blacks but of groups such as Catholics, Jews, and political radicals. In addition to the fight against political corruption and immorality, the Klan sought to replace the influence of foreign cultures and customs with traditional American family values and a newly defined patriotism (Leepson, 2005, p. 198).

The rebirth of the Klan took place in Atlanta, Georgia, coinciding conspicuously with two inflammatory events. The first event was the 1915 release of the D. W. Griffith movie "Birth of a Nation", the film that reinvented the Klan as noble knights who saved white princesses from the vicious blacks in society. The second event was the Leo Frank murder trial in Atlanta. Frank was accused of murdering a 14-year old worker by the name of Mary Phagan. Despite the fact that he was acquitted, a decision that would cost the Governor of Georgia a second term, Frank was an easy target and painted as an outsider. He "was Jewish, an agent of industrialization and a big city man." He was a scapegoat for the bigotry of the time and William Joseph Simmons

knew this and used it to his own political advantage to mobilize the people of Georgia to his cause (Teachout, 2009, p. 131–134).

The other major catalyst for the rebirth of the Klan was World War I. The domestic reaction to European events was nationalistic fervor. The formal entry of the United States into the Great War lent societal and governmental legitimacy to this fervor. Jingoistic speech and outward displays of national allegiance became more pronounced and this shift in the popular mindset gave the Klan an opportunity to enter the mainstream political order. As Woden Teachout writes (2009):

> World War I led up to nationalist patriotism run amok. For a year before the United States entered the hostilities, Americans held "preparedness parades": flag filled events replete with marching bands and rows of patriotic citizens. Schools and communities held pageants featuring flags, marching songs, and drills. In case anyone missed these events, they were shown as newsreels in the new moving-picture houses (p. 136).

Nationalism masquerading as patriotism became the focus of the Klan's agenda giving legitimacy to its intimidation tactics, coercing citizens to follow the official governmental line. Three developments supported the Klan's cause. The first was the passage of the 1917 Espionage Act, which censored the press. The second was the Sedition Act of 1918, which "prohibited criticism of the government and the flag." The third and most utilized development was the release, in accordance with the Sedition Act, of lists of people suspected of disloyalty to the United States. The Klan carried out its perceived civic duty by apprehending and intimidating not only those who appeared on the disloyalty lists, but others whose background and/or beliefs set them outside the

Klan's definition of a patriotic American. Nationalism veiled as patriotism was being used to drive the nation-state into an entity that repressed free thought and subverted the Bill of Rights (Teachout, 2009, p. 138).

The Klan utilized patriotic symbols such as the Liberty Bell, and especially the American flag to support its recruitment drives. The group's propaganda was successful, and Klan membership peaked at four million members by 1924. By 1930, however, widespread corruption in the organization resulted in the decline of the Klan's numbers to 45,000. The widespread legitimacy of the Klan was diluted, but it certainly did not disappear. The Klan and other nativist groups stifled dissent and the free discussion of ideas that were deemed threatening to the political, social, and economic order controlled by politicians and the media. The legacy of the Klan and its appropriation of patriotism showed that the guarantee of individual rights in the nation-state could be compromised by fear, ignorance, and the intimidation of those perceived to be "un-American" (Teachout, 2009, p. 149).

The domestic aftermath of World War I, along with the fascist threat in Europe in the 1920s and 1930s, further influenced the role of patriotism in the development of the nation-state. These events nurtured a patriotism that in some instances developed into bigotry against those perceived to hold ideas inconsistent with the values of the establishment. As discussed previously, the bigoted activities and positions of some of these organizations, such as the Klu Klux Klan, stunted the growth of the evolving nation-state in a manner that was non-commensurate with its egalitarian ideals. The establishment of the American Legion after World War I, along with other organizations advanced a more diverse impression of patriotism. The American Legion

primarily supported disabled veterans and their families; however, despite its officially non-political agenda, even the Legion sought to foster an ideal Americanism. The Legion's Americanism called for the protection of the nation-state from the potential ravages of radicals (Leepson, 2005, p. 194).

The sheer number of "patriotic" organizations, and the Legion's influence in channeling patriotic activity in the 1920s, is evidenced by the National Flag Conferences of 1923 and 1924. These conferences, organized by the Legion's Americanism Committee, developed a Flag Code that provided specific instructions on respecting and handling the flag. The Committee also introduced the words "to the flag of the United States of America" to the Pledge of Allegiance (Leepson, 2005, p. 198).

In discussing the development of patriotism in the United States in the 20th century, it is important to note the groups that attended the National Flag Conferences. In 1923 groups such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, the Boy Scouts of America, the National Congress of Mothers and Parent Teachers Associations, the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the Klu Klux Klan were in attendance at the conference, demonstrating the diverse nature of patriotic influence in the United States. In 1924 this roster had grown to include "fifty-one additional patriotic, hereditary, and veterans organizations," which showed the growth of a demographic that supported the status quo and furthered a patriotism that reflected "traditional" American values (Leepson, 2005, pp. 197–198).

Ironically, the limitations in American society in guaranteeing individual freedoms for all was exposed by the country's response to German fascism in the 1930s. In this instance, violent actions by the American Legion were focused on

Jehovah's Witnesses who refused to say the Pledge due to religious reasons. Two legal cases that examined the state's interest in mandating Pledge recitation for Jehovah's Witness were *Minersville School District v. Gobitis* in 1940 and *Barnette v. West Virginia* in 1943 (Parker, R., 2003, p. 98–99).

Minersville School District v Gobitis initially "ruled that public schools could require all enrolled students to engage in a ceremony saluting the flag of the United States" (Parker, R., 2003, p. 101). This case originated when Jehovah's Witnesses Lillian and William Gobitis refused to say the Pledge of Allegiance on religious grounds in school, stating they could not demonstrate obedience to anything but God. Although lower courts upheld the Gobitis's right to not say the pledge, it was overturned in the Supreme Court. Justice Felix Frankfurter argued "the flag salute ceremony is best understood as an activity designed to inculcate values of citizenship central to the functioning of an effective democracy – a democracy necessary for the support of religious liberties" (Parker, R., 2003, p. 102).

Upon the courts decision it was denounced by many in the legal community "claiming that the decision amounted to official approval for state regulation and prohibition of religious liberties in cases of a clear and national interest" (Parker, R., 2003, p. 104). This was later overturned by Barnette v West Virginia as the judicial system recognized that individuals did not have to take part in the Pledge of Allegiance, providing the refusal did not infringe upon the rights of others, and was "enacted in a peaceful and orderly manner" (Ellis, 2005, p. 110–112). Certainly, at the highest level of the judicial system the machinations of patriotic groups such as the American Legion

had succeeded in developing a nation state in which conscientious and insightful decision-making had been usurped in the face of blind patriotism.

Some twenty years on, in the 1960s and early 1970s, the Vietnam War was the backdrop for renewed demonstrations of patriotism. Some citizens demonstrated a democratic patriotism by protesting the war. They were faced by fellow citizens who echoed the voice of the executive branch that was administering the American intervention in southeast Asia. As the anti-war voice gained momentum in the late 1960s and early 1970s, students became the voice and vision of protest. During a nationally coordinated strike on May 4, 1970, the National Guard opened fire at Kent State College on protesters after the ROTC building was set ablaze. The result was four dead students and nine injured (Teachout, 2009, p. 186). The response to this event, and evidence of popular support for the president, was seen in "demonstrations in favor of Richard Nixon and the Vietnam War. The most famous was the hard-hat riot of May 8, 1970, when Manhattan construction workers beat up hippies and demanded that city hall raise the American flag" (Walker, 2008, p. 46). Suggestions that the riot was catalyzed by the action of Nixon's CIA operatives are apparent. The hard-hat riot is a prime example of suppression of political dissent and democratic patriotism that ran counter to the administration's foreign policy (p. 192).

Post 9/11 World

The events of 9/11 saw a renewed use of the flag as a patriotic symbol for society to rally behind. The Pledge became a patriotic verse to recite, and to openly oppose war was deemed unpatriotic. In the immediate months following 9/11,

President George Bush enjoyed a staggering 90% approval rating (Gallup, 2001). It was a time for one to either be behind the president or to isolate himself from mainstream society. Being a "true" patriot meant supporting the nation-state on a path that shied away from questioning its leaders' decisions and actions, lest one be dubbed un-American. This blind patriotism served to dictate to the masses what it was to be American. Unlike the framers of the Constitution, the ideal for the American citizen after 2001 was to neither question nor critically consider any domestic or foreign-policy decisions made by the government (Ladson-Billings, 2006, p. 587).

This idea of collective reassurance through complicity with government policy was evident in the pro-war rallies of March 2003 after the invasion of Iraq. The participation by blue-collar workers in demonstrations in New York confirmed that patriotic attitudes have not altered with time. The same social groups that supported the Vietnam War and the Nixon administration voiced their approval for the Iraq War. The difference between the era of the Vietnam War, and Iraq and Afghanistan however, which demonstrated the changing use of patriotism in the United States, was the large domestic anti-war demonstrations that accompanied involvement in the conflicts and the media statements that followed. The major focal point for many of the pro-war demonstrations was the flag. In pro-war demonstrations the flag was ubiquitous, and in anti-war demonstrations those who carried the flag were assumed to be protesting the demonstration (Teachout, p. 210–211). The media responded with the voice of Bill Moyer being at the forefront when he stated, "the flag's been hijacked and turned into a logo – the trademark of a monopoly on patriotism" (Moyer, 2003).

The use of the flag as emblematic of pro-war patriotism and unyielding allegiance to government policy has at least to some extent been diminished. When Barack Obama announced the withdrawal of troops from combat operations in Iraq on August 31, 2010, he said:

> I'm mindful that the Iraq war has been a contentious issue at home. Here, too, it's time to turn the page. This afternoon, I spoke to former President George W. Bush. It's well known that he and I disagreed about the war from its outset. Yet no one can doubt President Bush's support for our troops, or his love of country and commitment to our security. As I've said, there were patriots who supported this war, and patriots who opposed it. And all of us are united in appreciation for our servicemen and women, and our hopes for Iraqis (Obama, 2010).

Role of Civic Education

Civic education is an obligation in education for the maintenance of the *patria* and the protection of the country. "Jefferson said the people themselves are the only "safe depositories" and the guardians of their liberty, but if the teachers are not adequately prepared "to inform the discretion of the people by education" one should fear for the future of the Republic" (Butts, 1989, p. 43). This Jeffersonian idea of patriotism seeks to question government in order to uphold the ideals of the Republic, and rather than accept the status quo of the government, seeks change in questioning the establishment for the maintenance of the Republic. Civic education is key to upholding the Republic. Torney-Purta (2002) identifies civic education as follows.

> An ideal civic education experience in a democracy should enable students to acquire meaningful knowledge about the political and economic system, to recognize the strengths and challenges of democracy and the attributes of good citizenship, to be comfortable in participating in respectful discussions of important and potentially controversial issues, and to be aware of civil society organizations." (p. 203).

Citizenship education is regularly seen in textbooks for social studies methods students such as Martorella (1996), which states "to function, even nominally, all societies must engage in some form of citizenship education. Those entrusted with the formal responsibilities for the maintenance, defense, and improvements of the society depend on some degree of citizen participation so that social, political, and economic institutions can operate" (p. 14). Indeed, the National Council for the Social Studies (http://www.socialstudies.org/about) promotes the notion that educators should "teach students the content knowledge, intellectual skills, and civic values necessary for fulfilling the duties of citizenship in a participatory democracy". This notion is as relevant for educators in 2013, as it was for those who helped found the nation.

> The principle of patriotism stands in need of the reinforcement of prejudices in favor of our country, and it is well known that our strongest prejudices are formed in the first twenty-one years of our lives (Rush, 1786).

As Benjamin Rush demonstrates, from its inception, in the United States there has been an illicit understanding of a relationship between patriotism and citizenship. The ability of the nation-state to explore the relationship has depended upon a comprehension that the early years of the Republic introduced concepts of patriotism

and citizenship. In order to be an American, the inhabitants of the former British colonies forged an identity that encapsulated both patriotism and citizenship and would become the bedrock of socialization in America (Marienstras, 2004). Patriotism for the establishment became tied up with a "civil religion" in "which every member of the nation was to be united in a common creed" (p. 682). This tenet was based in both the notion of liberty standing against tyranny and emerging emblems of national pride as "new symbols and rituals…The national flag, iconographic representations of Liberty, Fourth of July processions, festivals and celebrations…all involved the citizens in new, "invented" traditions which would become part of a common national culture" (p. 683).

Symbolic patriotic representations supported the overthrow of tyranny in favor of libertine values that despots stamp out. The residents of the United States sought faith in these symbols and rituals as they formed the soul of the new nation and absolved from tyranny anyone who happened to be a white male. A heightened awareness of allegiance developed alongside the new notion of citizenship. This allegiance was voluntary, and was "dependant upon a contract which provided for state protection to the citizens in return for their allegiance to the republican government" (p. 683). National loyalty was a new phenomenon and moved away from the traditional monarchical attachment that defined citizenship and daily life in England. John Jay, president of Congress in 1779, outlined a concept of U.S. citizenship in 1775–76 by "defining treason, requiring oaths of allegiance, and issuing passports and, implicitly, by the provisions in the Articles requiring interstate comity, a doctrine of national citizenship began to emerge" (Kaplanoff, 2004, p. 458). This political gesture by the

government provided a concrete framework to support the abstract notions of allegiance and citizenship.

With the national discussion founded on a framework of nationality and allegiance it was only a matter of time before the conversation of the founding fathers examined the nature of citizenship. Those in the U.S. might wish to be citizens voluntarily, but only white, and initially male landowners were allowed the full rights of citizenship. The discourse was necessary as non-white males pressured lawmakers for increased citizenship rights backed by historic extensions of full participation in society to various groups. The importance lies in who can be admitted to the "civil religion" of patriotism, and how their admittance serves as the root of citizenship. This resulted in the rise of citizenship education in the U.S. This education, as discussed by Rush, promoted the development of strong prejudices by students to their country during their school years. Citizenship has been inextricably tied to the success of the nation state, and patriotism served as the vehicle in which common ideals of the "civil religion" were venerated (Edwards & Stimpson, 2003, p. 92).

The new republic advocated education that would inculcate the fundamentals of patriotism and citizenship. Education, by shaping successive generations, would prepare Americans to govern themselves and aid in the transition of the nation into a collective mindset on the meaning of American citizenship (Yazawa, 2004, p. 428). In his "Report on the University of Virginia" of August 4, 1818, Thomas Jefferson said,

> As well might it be urged that the wild and uncultivated tree, hitherto yielding sour and bitter fruit only, can never be made to yield better; yet we know that the grafting art implants a new tree on the savage stock, producing what is most

> estimable both in kind and degree. Education, in like manner, engrafts a new man on the native stock, and improves what in his nature was vicious and perverse into qualities of virtue and social worth (Jefferson, 1818).

By "native stock," Jefferson was referring to those who had already adopted American ideals. Education, Jefferson was saying, was the means by which "a new man" could take on the virtuous characteristics of the native stock; in this case, the ideals of citizenship, patriotism, and self-governance. Yazawa (2004) identifies four reasons why education was a key ingredient in the daily life of the new republic, and why it would be so important for its future success. The first reason stems out of the enlightenment thought of the day, which focused on the interactions between the state, and the people primarily through the ideas of Locke (1690) and Montesquieu (1748). These relationships are based on the avoidance of tyranny, and education becomes a primary tool for the avoidance of despotism and the advancement of a self-governing citizenry. The second tool for an educated citizenry was the role of women in the home. Homemakers assumed the role of educators in the domestic sphere and were responsible for the instruction of their fledgling Americans in the way of the new Republic. As discussed earlier, the idea of Republican Motherhood (Kerber, 1976) served as a key link in the growth of the "civil religion" of patriotism and its ability to give birth to good citizens. The third reason for education lay in its ability to naturally allow the "best geniuses", as Jefferson termed those of superior intellect, to be separated from the rest in order to help govern the nation. The final reason, which cements the early understanding of the relationship between patriotism and citizenship, is the public

responsibility American citizens had in the maintenance and governance of the new nation (Yazawa, 2004, p. 428–430).

Education was essential to the success of the new republic, and women were critical components in patriotic instruction. The denial of equal rights for women is striking, given that the nation leaned on them to be vanguards in the instruction of patriotic virtues. The visibility and influence of women was particularly seen in religious institutions as churches abolished longstanding practices such as gender-segregated seating, and women were acknowledged for their "greater moral self discipline" and "virtue" (Henretta et al., 2002, p. 275). The role of women did not change overnight, nor—according to Brenda Wood (2004)—did women expect or wish such a drastic change. The notion that most women wished to overturn their traditional societal role to as a result of the political Revolution is untrue. As Abigail Adams wrote to her husband John on March 31, 1776:

> I long to hear that you have declared an independency. And, by the way, in the new code of laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make, I desire you would remember the ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors…Remember, all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice or representation (Adams, A., 1776)

Wood (2004) suggests that women did not want or desire immediate political equality but rather "an equality of status and esteem for the private sphere in which women operated" (p. 425). Women in the early Republic were recognized for their

political thoughts and ideas within the private sphere of the home, but not in public. In this way, the influence of women could temper and educate husbands and sons in the home so they could act appropriately in the construction of the new republic. The fate of the nation, and continued patriarchal success in society, was influenced by the patriotic role of women (p. 425).

The issue of race would also form a major issue in the development of citizenship. Within the early Republic, citizenship was granted only to free whites. After the passage of the first naturalization act in 1790, an avenue for citizenship was available "to any free white immigrant who lived in the United States for two years" (Sidbury, 2004, p. 612). Limiting citizenship was itself perceived as patriotic, given that many of the Framers thought only white Europeans could dutifully uphold the requisite patriotic ideals. Not only were people of African descent denied citizenship, but also American Indians, and women were denied full participation.

> The Federal Constitution, as well as the states, reserved citizenship to white freemen, implicitly excluding Blacks, even though they were free, and Amerindians who belonged to tribes, then considered as foreign nations. Citizenship was not extended to Blacks before 1868 or to Amerindians before 1924. White women also, while they could be treated as citizens in economic matters, were not entitled to all the privileges of citizenship until 1919 (Marienstras, 2004, p. 684).

This denial of citizenship restricted opportunity in a land founded on the ideals of equality, compassion and justice. The ideals of the early Republic placed those characteristics within the homogeneity of a white European ancestry. However, to

those who were not white and of European descent, full citizenship was an issue that clearly violated the stated goals of America (Westheimer, 2006, p. 614–616).

The Development of Citizenship Education in the United States and England

In this comparative study the focus is directed at gaining an understanding of how high school students in the United States and England perceive the concept of patriotism. The purpose in addressing their perceptions is to look deeper into the issue and address whether students can discern a difference between patriotism and nationalism, assess the role education has played in their understanding, and evaluate how their interpretation and education on the concept may affect the future Anglo-American relationship. To provide some context a very brief history citizenship education in both countries is necessary. The common link in both nations in this period is the rise of Conservative values seen in the ascendancy of Margaret Thatcher in England in 1979, and Ronald Reagan in the United States in 1980. A closer look at educational initiatives that coincided with the rise of Thatcher and Reagan in the late 1970's to the present day will give insight into patriotism's changing role in education.

Citizenship Education in England

The present concept of English patriotism is fundamentally related to the formation of a national identity in a nation that has become increasingly pluralist (Marsden, 2003, p. 27). The pluralist notion of England is a result of the immigration of people from Commonwealth nations to fill employment gaps left in the wake of World War II. During the immediate period from the end of the war until July 1, 1962, the

British Home office allowed 472,000 immigrants per year to migrate to England from Commonwealth nations without restriction (Migration Watch, 2001). Immigrants in search of work, primarily from India and Pakistan, altered the social fabric of the nation-state and what it means to be English. The response to this developing pluralist society was observable in multiple ways such as the increase of the use of the St. George's Cross and the communal singing of hymns such as "Abide With Me", emblematic of the rise of ceremony and ritual perceived to capture "English virtues" (Abell, Condor, Lowe, Gibson & Stevenson, 2007). To be English was to be part of a homogenous group that was Christian and white. The outcome of this homogenization produced a "new-racism" within the Conservative party of the late 1970's and ultimately the rise of Margaret Thatcher. For Carrington and Short (1995) new racism demonstrated that a

> national identity is defined in terms of cultural affiliation. The apparently unproblematic notion of a homogenous "British way of life" as English and Christian is central to such discourse that not only views ethnic minority groups as aliens, having different (and supposedly incompatible) traditions and values from the ethnic majority, but also depicts them as a potential threat to social cohesion (p. 183).

This underscored notion of either being in or out is evident in the British Nationality Act of 1981. This Act continued a removal of citizenship rights that had begun with the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of 1962 and created three classes of citizenship. The first class was "British citizenship" and conferred full rights, the second-class was "British Dependent Territories citizenship," and a third class, "British

Overseas citizenship," did not allow full citizenship (Figueroa, 2004, p. 220–221). According to Peter Figueroa (2004) the "act represented the culmination of the process of removing citizenship rights from some mainly 'non-White' people who had previously enjoyed such rights" while also allowing a secondary provision that allowed "white" people with an "ancestral" connection to acquire full British citizenship (p. 221).

This perception of what it is to be English therefore undermines those who are not white and Christian as they are unable to participate in the social fabric that is woven by a Caucasian and Christian thread. An evident and pervasive consequence of this myopic view is the consistent and ongoing rhetoric expressed in the tabloid newspaper culture of England through publications like "The Sun". "The Sun" has consistently been the most widely circulated newspaper in England with a daily print run in excess of 3 million copies and in a narrow nationalistic view, it furthers the trends for many of what it is to be English (Newspaper Marketing Agency, 2010). Primarily the notion of what it is to be patriotic in the eyes of many in England is tied to the English national football team. Every two years, or four, depending on qualification to World Cup and European Cup, the St. George Cross appears and nationalistic hymns like "Jerusalem" and songs like "Rule Britannia" inevitably follow. This produces responses such as the following in the June 2nd 2006 edition of the newspaper.

> TODAY The Sun goes into battle to defend the right of all English men and women to fly our national flag**.** Nothing unites the nation quite like sporting passion. And nothing gets small-minded killjoys on their high horses quite like signs of national pride. The sight of English flags proudly fluttering all around

> the country ahead of this month's World Cup has got the petty jobsworths up in arms. They brand anyone who dares to show their love for our country as racist and sneer at anyone who takes pride in being English. We have news for them. Patriotism is **NOT** a dirty word. The cross of St George no more belongs to the loony busybodies than it does to loathsome bigoted racists. It belongs to us, the English (Phillips. M., 2006).

Despite the changing times, and governments, there appears to be a consistent "monolithic" stance to what it is to be English. From the Conservative party of Margaret Thatcher of 1979–1991, to the Labour led Tony Blair government of 1997–2007, there has been an element that suggests that if there is not uniform social cohesion there is a lack of patriotism. Carrington and Short (1995) expand the discussion by suggesting that those who are English, and in the ethnic majority, have the need to be part of a homogenous group, and being outside of this homogenous collective in society is damaging to the potential greatness of the nation. Part of the response to by the government to promote a formal mandated curriculum was seen in the introduction of formal Citizenship Education in 2002 (Dept of Education, 2007).

This movement toward a nationally mandated Citizenship Education had been a century in the making. In 1902, with the passage of the Education Act, England was first organized into the series of Local Education Authorities that are still present in England. This represented the first "effective national school system" with resources allocated through local councils to most effectively serve the needs of students (Figueroa, 2004, p. 219). The Act contained patriotic elements that essentially gave citizens more access to the collective goods of the nation instead of channeling it into

the hands of the hereditary autocrats. The Act was in itself "predominantly patriotic in its concept and aims" (Readman, 2008, p. 84). However patriotic the act may have been in the development of English education, it served no more purpose than to provide a theoretical framework in which to demonstrate patriotism in the schools, but failed to practically apply it in the classroom (p. 85).

The first state sponsored example of patriotic literature did not appear until 1949 with the issue of "a Ministry of Education Pamphlet". The booklet placed a "special emphasis on character training: the need to cultivate virtuous traits such as humility, restraint, service to others and the like" (Marsden, 2003, p. 27). Prior to this, the majority of education that defined traits of a good citizen was in the hands of writers of children's fiction like Enid Blyton, as well as through the guiding hand of patriotic organizations like the Boy Scouts, the Red Cross and the Girl Guides. Authors like Blyton passed on their impression of patriotic attitudes by demonstrating nationalistic pride through small actions like keeping the streets clean and never being cowardly. Such messages in the context of post World War I England were perceived necessary in the creation and maintenance of a country that could not internally disintegrate as had occurred in continental Europe. If children had an investment in the country then they would not run a way from those who threatened their way of life. Patriotic organizations "stressed the importance of the work ethic, thrift and saving, observing God's day, demonstrating patriotism by waving the flag, standing to the National Anthem, and learning and singing national songs" (p. 21). All of these patriotic citizenship centered developments were not mandated by the state and continued through to the 1980's.

It was evident in the 1980s that there was a need for the government to address issues of citizenship education in England. From the publication of the Ministry of Education pamphlet in 1949 through the 1980s there had been little formal action in English patriotic education. Kerr (1999) discusses the reason for this as it being perceived as "un-English". This education was too vulgar and overt in its prescription for it to be acceptable and was ignored or deemed unnecessary (p. 1–2). Figueroa (2004) however, argues that citizenship education was needed and should have contained a discussion of patriotism that was diverse in its interpretation and acceptance of a pluralist nation (p. 231).

In 1985 the Swann Report highlighted steps to understand citizenship education on pluralist terms. The Report was the first state sponsored attempt to address the needs of students in a pluralist society. "The Report makes it clear that the ideal society is a pluralist one where diversity is acknowledged and respected within a 'commonly accepted framework of values, practices and procedures'" (Edwards & Fogelman, 1995, p. 93). Although not explicit in its development of English patriotism and education, it did provide a framework that allowed a movement away from the homogeneity required as a precursor to being English. What is evident is the ironic nature of how elements of the Swann report were introduced into society. In areas that were predominantly white, citizenship education did not address issues of national identity and cultural pluralism but was focused on more mundane things like personal health and hygiene. It was in the already culturally plural areas like the inner cities of England where such initiatives were introduced. The interest on teaching in these areas had at its core a focus on increasing political participation in these diverse locations and possibly establishing a

foothold for equality in society (p. 94).

Despite these in-roads made by the Swann report it was eventually discarded as the focus shifted and education was redefined by the 1988 Educational Reform Act. The Educational Reform Act was the largest piece of legislation passed by the Thatcher government and it introduced for the first time a National Curriculum in English Schools. This curriculum, according to Phillips, Piper and Garratt (2003) "was an attempt to restore traditional curricular subjects and values through central government control and monitoring" and in "this context, any attempts by educationalists to promote citizenship education were almost doomed to failure" (p.171). The end of the Thatcher years of 1979–1991 saw the National Curriculum become a bastion of Anglo centrism. Academics and government advisors who sought to include measures that recognize the diversity of England and the need for recognition of a pluralist society were been met with vehement disapproval. The focus was on a curriculum that gave "prominence to the teachings of British history, Christianity, standard English and the English literary heritage (Carrington & Short, 1995, p. 184).

The National Curriculum was to receive a catalyst to include some mandated instruction in citizenship in the Cantle Report of 2001 (Figueroa, 2004). This report resulted from riots in the Northern towns of Oldham and Bradford, which featured large populations of residents from India and Pakistan. The series of riots began in June 2001 and initially were blamed on issues of loyalty, or lack of loyalty, to England. As a result of this, "the promotion of citizenship education in Britain was tied up with a more plural society and preoccupation with national identity" (Marsden, 2003, p. 27). A recommendation report under Labour Home Secretary David Blunkett set up to review

the Oldham riots exposed the reality when it stated, the riots were more to do with "social and economic deprivation, discrimination, Islamaphobia, resentment between the White and Asian communities, and political activity by the far right" (Figueroa, p. 222).

It was evident that concepts of what it was to be English in the new millennium were under question and in need of review. This focus had already been an interest of the David Blunkett as early as 1998, when he was Secretary of State for Education in the Labour government. In this position Blunkett employed Professor Bernard Crick to set out a framework under which citizenship education could be taught in England. The Crick committee argued that effective education contained three strands.

> Social and moral responsibility: children should learn self-confidence. As well as social and moral responsibility towards each other and others, including those in authority.
>
> Community involvement: children should learn about, and become involved in, the life of their community, for example through community involvement, service or action.
>
> Political literacy: pupils should learn how to be effective in public life, by being aware of the importance of the vote and other means of political participation. (Philips, Piper & Garrett, 2003, p. 172–173)

This report recommended that the teaching of citizenship and democracy should become part of the National Curriculum (Figueroa, 2004, p. 235). The inclusion of Citizenship Education would not enter the curriculum for another 4 years but what the Crick report did was open necessary debate. Much of the debate focused on how the

role of patriotism could be developed in such a pluralist nation where common values were disparate. Although the report gave methods for citizenship education, it did not address some of the key issues such as racism and tolerance, which would rear their heads in the riots in Oldham and Bradford in the summer of 2001 (Marsden, 2003, p. 28–29).

The Oldham and Bradford riots took some of these issues and brought them to the forefront of government policy as the Labour government saw the need for "a compulsory and tailored citizenship training as essential in order to avert such problems" (Marsden, 2003, p. 29). The idea of citizenship education, as discussed above, was certainly not a new idea in English education. The move from theory to practice was a deliberate step that had been avoided by a Conservative government that favored the Anglocentric content of the National Curriculum. The New Labour party led by Prime Minister Tony Blair, saw a need for citizenship education to be included and with this, it became for the first time in English history, a mandated part of the curriculum in August 2002. This mandatory curriculum in citizenship used the framework of the Crick Report and reworded it to identify what it called "three principal dimensions". These dimensions were "participation in democracy", "the responsibilities and rights of a citizen", and "the value of community activity" (Turner & Baker, 2000, p. 3). In summary for Key Stage 4 students the curriculum had in it the following under knowledge and understanding.

> Legal and human rights and responsibilities. Operation of the criminal and civil justice systems. The origins and implications of the diverse national, regional, religious and ethnic identities in the UK. The work of parliament, the

government and the courts in making law. The electoral system and democratic process. How individuals and voluntary groups can influence society. Media in society and the Internet. Global interdependence and sustainable development. The UK's relations in Europe and with the Commonwealth and UN. How the economy functions, the role of business and financial services. The rights and responsibilities of consumers, employers and employees (p. 9).

This returns to the point where the discussion of patriotism and the role of citizenship education in a pluralist culture began. The answer may lie in a relativistic approach to patriotism. What is repeatedly evidenced through the curriculum is the focus on relationships. It is about the acknowledgement of the role of the citizen in a pluralist nation, and the maintenance of liberty and democracy through recognition of different relationships at various levels of society from the classroom, to the community, the nation, and beyond (Department of Education, 2007).

Citizenship Education in the United States

Patriotic instruction through citizenship education has not been ignored in the United States. As a nation of immigrants it has always been in the interests of the government to promote the values and ideals of the nation. As Joseph Stoltman (2003) discusses, the inhabitants of the United States generally embody two groups, voluntary or involuntary migrants, or natives. As a result, the primary avenue through which the values of the establishment could be replicated in the populace was through public education. The schoolhouse became a citizenship induction center into "the roles, functions, and responsibilities of citizenship in the United States" (p. 238). The basic

understanding of these roles and functions are from the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution (p. 237). Citizenship education that teaches patriotism in the United States therefore had to have at its root the ability to uphold the concepts of liberty and freedom envisioned in the Declaration of Independence, and provide an understanding of the system of government discussed in the Constitution. In this patriotic learning experience students "may display devotion to the fundamental principles and values which the democratic system of government depends" (p. 239).

This patriotism is the source of "nearly all curriculum documents prepared by the States and local educational authorities in the United States" (Stoltman, 2003, p. 239). Although the government does not mandate patriotic education, voluntary frameworks are provided at the national level to the states, with students' generally receiving instruction on the key ideals needed to uphold the Constitution through the Social Studies curriculum.

Patriotic instruction in the U.S. is enforced by state mandates such as the Oklahoma PASS standards. Oklahoma law requires students to earn credits in U.S. History and Government, as do most high schools in the nation. In addition the role of patriotism in the U.S. is advanced through the work of educational corporations such as the Center for Civic Education, which promotes the understanding and acceptance of the ideals in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution (Pureifoy, 2005, p. 236).

Corcoran and Goertz (2005) discuss the emergence of the state standards movement. A year after the introduction of the National Curriculum in England in 1988 there was a federal move to support standards based reform by George H. W. Bush.

The federal government requested reform, but enforcement of the proposed reforms was beyond their sphere of influence as "federal law forbids its agencies from mandating, directing, or controlling the specific instructional content, curriculum, programs of instruction, or academic achievement standards" (p. 37–38). State standards based reform was then followed by legislation developed during the administration of President Bill Clinton with the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act". This act "which advocated rigorous state content standards and a corresponding alignment of curricula and assessments, provided a significant impetus to the promulgation of voluntary national civics standards" (Johanek & Puckett, 2005, p. 135). The key to assessing the effectiveness of these voluntary standards in the development of patriotic education is the impact they have had in the classroom, which appears to be limited as there is less instruction now than there was 50 years ago. Johanek and Puckett (2005) reference the 2003 Civic Mission in Schools which states that in the 60s it was not uncommon for students to take three courses in government, in comparison, current students enroll in a one semester class in government, and a two semester class in US History (p. 134).

States have assigned the responsibility for standards to their State Departments of Educations and therefore each state funded agency aligns their requirements with the specific needs of the students in their state. An example of the review and implementation of state standards can be seen in the Oklahoma Priority Academic Student Skills.

> Each area of subject matter curriculum, except for technology curriculum, adopted by the State Board of Education for implementation by the beginning of the 2003-04 school year shall be thoroughly reviewed by the State Board every six (6) years

> according to and in coordination with the existing subject area textbook adoption cycle, and the State Board shall implement any revisions in such curriculum deemed necessary to achieve further improvements in the quality of education for the students of this state (Oklahoma PASS Preface, 2010).

Blanket mandates such as the Oklahoma PASS fail to take into consideration the diverse needs of the population and whether or not the standards are content appropriate in a pluralist nation. This need to satisfy the requirements of all students presents a major issue with state standards, they can be "painfully vague in their approach" to patriotism and instruction in the ideals given to Americans in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution (Johanek & Puckett, p. 136). Using the Oklahoma PASS standards as an example, it is evident that the focus of the standards is in upholding the ideals set by the framers.

> social studies as a field of study incorporates many disciplines in an integrated fashion, and is designed to promote civic competence. Civic competence is the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required of students to be able to assume "the office of citizen," as Thomas Jefferson called it (Oklahoma PASS Preface, 2010).

The state standards suggest the knowledge necessary for students to embody patriotic citizenship. What is exceptionally important to recognize as Johanek and Puckett (2005) stated, is the vagueness of the standards (p. 136). Two standards in the Oklahoma PASS demonstrate this issue.

The first is from second grade Social Studies in Standard 3 objective 2. This standard says, "Provide examples of honesty, courage, patriotism, and other admirable character traits" (Oklahoma PASS 2nd Grade Social Studies, p. 222). The second

standard can be found in eighth grade Social Studies, which is US History 1760 to 1877. The requirements states:

> Interpret patriotic slogans and excerpts from notable quotations, speeches and documents (e.g., “Give me liberty or give me death,” “Don’t Tread On Me,” "One if by land and two if by sea," "The shot heard 'round the world," "E Pluribus Unum," the Declaration of Independence, the Preamble to the Constitution, “Fifty-four forty or Fight,” and the Gettysburg Address” (Oklahoma PASS 8th Grade Social Studies, p. 233).

The evidence suggests that patriotic instruction is present in second grade classrooms, and eighth graders regularly interpret patriotic statements. What is absent from the OK PASS is a framework for a consistent approach in the curriculum. The actual instruction is left up to the teacher who can create the content and the bias in accordance with their own personal feelings over the matter. Such a teacher specific approach to patriotism is clearly present in the fabric of most classrooms in the United States with at least 42 of the states requiring the study of American government between grades 9 and 12 (Johanek & Puckett, 2005, p. 134).

At the national level, the federal No Child Left Behind Act contained provisions to address civic education. In Section 2342, the act set out provisions for federal guidelines for what the government called the “Education for Democracy Act”. The act established as its purpose:

> (1). to improve the quality of civics and government education by educating students about the history and principles of the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights;

(2). to foster civic competence and responsibility; and

(3). to improve the quality of civic education and economic education through cooperative civic education and economic education exchange programs with emerging democracies (U.S. Dept of Education, 2001)

NCLB was designed to provide standards based testing across school districts. As Niemi and Niemi (2007) write, "While NCLB does not cover civic education, spillover effects have been felt in the form of revamped state specifications of standards for civics and government" (p. 35). In 2001, NCLB provided further structure to legislation like Goals 2000 in 1994. Both acts of legislation provide frameworks for the states to mandate standards based education.

Patriotic citizenship education, as directed by federal and state mandates, is present in diverse classrooms across the nation. Research indicates American children are far more aware of their ethnic heritage irrespective of their ethnic background. As a result, it is in the interest of both the national and state governments to understand the need to transmit values predicated by the state and national government through government and US History classes. While those values flow from the top down, a disconnect is apparent as the national government, as a result of the tenth amendment to the Constitution, does not provide specific content-based standards as it is left to the states (Carrington & Short, 1995).

National and state organizations such as the Center for Civic Education believe a civic education should not fail in addressing issues that uphold the Constitution. In 1991, the Center for Civic Education in cooperation with the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship contributed to CIVITAS: A FRAMEWORK FOR CIVIC

EDUCATION (Bahmueller, 1991). This framework proposed the following:

> Civic education in a democracy is education in self-government, which means active participation and not passive acquiescence in the actions of others. The health of the polity requires the widest possible participation of its citizens consistent with the common good and the protection of individual rights. No one's civic potential can be fulfilled without forming and maintaining an intention to pursue the common good; to protect individuals from unconstitutional abuses by government and from attacks on their rights from any source, public or private; to seek the broad knowledge and wisdom that informs judgment of public affairs; and to develop the skill to use that knowledge effectively. Such values, perspectives, knowledge, and skill in civic matters make responsible and effective civic participation possible (p. 2).

CIVITAS was followed by the development of voluntary core standards in the National Standards for Civics and Government in 1994, which were a part of the Goals 2000 Act (Stoltman, p. 240). These core standards for K-12 education covered various roles and aspects of civic life and have at their root the following intention

> The goal of education in civics and government is informed, responsible participation in political life by competent citizens committed to the fundamental values and principles of American constitutional democracy. Their effective and responsible participation requires the acquisition of a body of knowledge and of intellectual and participatory skill (Center for Civic Education, 2010).

However these standards were also voluntary and the actual content presented was the responsibility of educators and left to their discretion. The individual teacher

expresses the action in the classroom and that is where the responsibility therefore lies.

> Ultimately, the value of these standards will be determined in the classroom by knowledgeable, skilled, and dedicated teachers who have the capacity to make the study of civics and government the relevant, vital, and inspiring experience it should be. Teachers who foster students' natural, youthful idealism, and commitment to working together enhance the realization of the goals of American constitutional democracy (Center for Civic Education, 2010).

The ever-present understanding is that students do not perform well on assessments concerning the Constitution and the key principles of the United States (Stoltman, p. 240). This lack of performance is also echoed in the work of Niemi and Niemi (2007) who discussed the poor performance of students and placed the blame on teachers. In their qualitative study, teachers failed to address controversial issues or when they did approached discussion in a biased fashion. Teachers did not regard politics and government as full of debate and controversy, did not foster political participation, and were cynical about the role of politics and politicians in their daily lives (p. 53–56).

Patriotic instruction in the U.S. is focused through the social studies primarily in the disciplines of US Government and US History. Although there are no federally mandated instructions over material or content, there is legislation such as Goals 2000 and NCLB that support guidelines that are either recommended, or available, through non-profits that receive federal money like the Center for Civic Education. The success of these initiatives is measured at the local level primarily through the State Departments of Education who establish educational standards in social studies in K-12

education. Achievement of those standards are entrusted to school districts, individual schools, department heads, and ultimately, but most importantly, classroom educators.

Chapter Three: The Many Faces of Patriotism

This chapter will address the following types of patriotism that scholars have discussed in the last decade. These include "democratic" and "authoritarian patriotism" (Westheimer, 2006; 2007), "blind" and "constructive patriotism" (Kahne and Middaugh, 2006), "conservative" and "liberal patriotism" (Bader, 2006, and "humanitarian" and "nationalist patriotism" (Teachout, 2004).

Democratic and Authoritarian patriotism and Constructive and Blind patriotism

Alexis de Tocqueville (1835) in Volume I of Democracy in America first provides a discussion of two styles of patriotism. Many scholars would later describe these two types of patriotism in various terms as "blind" patriotism (Kahne and Middaugh, 2007) or "authoritarian" patriotism (Westheimer, 2006) on one side, and "democratic" patriotism (Westheimer, 2006: Lummis, 1996), or "constructive" patriotism (Kahne and Middaugh, 2006) on the other. Alexis de Tocqueville (1835) discussed the "blind" or "authoritarian" aspect of patriotism, prior to the use of such terms in the following way.

> It is in itself a kind of religion: it does not reason, but it acts from the impulse of faith and sentiment. In some nations the monarch is regarded as a personification of the country; and, the fervor of patriotism being converted into the fervor of loyalty, they take a sympathetic pride in his conquests…this kind of patriotism incites great transient exertions, but no continuity of effort. It may

save the state in critical circumstances, but often allows it to decline in times of peace (p. 242).

This sentiment focuses on a patriotism that allows for little discussion and reasonable thought about the role of authority and governance in one's nation, and relies heavily on unquestioning loyalty. As de Tocqueville states (1835), it requires "exertions" but "no continuity of effort" (p. 242). It is uncomplicated and requires very little investment from the individual to act in accordance with the intentions of the ruling power. Westheimer (2006) labels this idea of submission to the government and opposition to dissent as "authoritarian patriotism" (p. 615). This "authoritarian patriotism" has at its core the "belief that one's country is inherently superior to others", "primary allegiance to land, birthright, legal citizenship, and government cause", and a need to "follow leaders reflexively" and "support them unconditionally" (p. 610).

An example of "authoritarian patriotism" was evident in the New York City Board of Education requirement for teachers to sign a statement saying they would demonstrate "unqualified allegiance" to the federal government" after 9/11. Actions such as those in New York fail to allow participation and systematic critique of policy for the good of all in society. "Authoritarian patriotism" (Westheimer, 2007) requires "non-questioning loyalty" and unconditional support of leaders. Consequently "dissent is seen as dangerous and destabilizing" and presents a problem for Social Studies teachers. In this context of "authoritarian patriotism", controversial issues of the day are not the concern of the teacher, and are therefore not passed on to the student (p. 178–181).

Kahne and Middaugh (2007) introduce this unyielding subservience to agreeing with the state as "blind patriotism". "Blind patriotism" as a "stance of unquestioning endorsement of their country represents a lack of awareness of reason and constructive dialogue. Discussion, focus, and understanding are abandoned in the face of an unquestioned understanding of one's own country as undeniably superior to all others" (p. 118). This is evident, according to the authors, in the "America, Love It or Leave It" mentality that has been particularly present after the events of 9/11. In the post 9/11 world, a world in which there should be more discussion about the domestic and foreign policy actions of government, there appears to be a curbing of criticism under the umbrella of "patriotism". Student's "patriotic commitments" according to Kahne and Middaugh (2006), have come at the "expense of critical analysis and an appreciation of the need to protect human rights and democratic principles" (p. 601).

Blind patriotism is present in the political structure. One only has to look at the rhetoric of former State Department of Education Lamar Alexander, who served under President George H. W. Bush between 1991 and 1993 and currently serves as U.S. Senator for the state of Tennessee. In the American History and Civics Education Act Senator Alexander encouraged educators to teach "the key persons, the key events, the key ideas, and the key documents that shape democratic heritage" (American History and Civics Education Act, 2003). The concerning addition to this statement (Westheimer, 2006) was that the government was to have the monopoly to be able to identify and define what constituted key persons, events, and ideas. Westheimer disagreed with the intention of Alexander and contended that to promote a single historical view leads down a path that promotes myopia and misunderstanding.

> Telling students that history has one interpretation (and that interpretation is that the U.S. is pretty much always right and moral and just in its actions) reflects an approach to teaching love of country that too easily succumbs to authoritarianism. Yet teaching this one unified creed in the wake of the September 11 attacks is rarely viewed as being political (p. 615).

This however is where the discussion gets even more complicated when making assumptions about blind patriotism. Schatz, Staub and Lavine (1999) used a mixed-method study to assess the relationship between blind and constructive patriotism in undergraduate students at University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Northern Illinois University, and Texas A & M University–Corpus Christi. The results raised some important questions, "in both studies, constructive patriotism was positively associated with political involvement, whereas blind patriotism was associated with political disengagement" (p. 169). As our discussion would suggest this "disengagement" is expected as action is traditionally associated with democratic and constructive patriotism. However Schatz et al (1999) discovered that in certain circumstances those that might be termed "blind patriots", now scored high on assessments of constructive patriotism due to their opposition to political situations they disagree with (p. 169–170). The article was written in 1999 and the situation they were discussing was the response of conservatives to the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal. Certainly in 2013, the presidency of Obama has resulted in conservative responses to issues such as health care and immigration that have resulted in active engagement by individuals who might traditionally be classed as "blind patriots" (Ladson-Billings, 2006), but due to their political engagement would now score high on assessments of constructive patriotism.

Alexis de Tocqueville (1835) not only provided a basis for what would be later called “authoritarian patriotism”, but also highlighted the form of patriotism that would later be referenced as “democratic patriotism” (Westheimer, 2006) in which there is a belief that there is a cumulative responsibility held by citizens to uphold the core ideals of the state in a Republic like the United States. Westheimer discusses the work of Howard Zinn to explain “democratic patriotism” as the requirement to not uphold the principles underlying government, but to the principles behind democracy, the most obvious of these in the United States being the Constitution (p. 614). In order to uphold democracy, discussion of government, aspects of citizenship, and recognition of controversial issues is necessary in education. Stevens (2002) discusses the practical application of this in the classroom stating that it is necessary to teach democratic values that enable patriotic fervor without silencing the rights of the minority. Democratic values, and “democratic patriotism”, require that people stand up and recognize that if tyranny exists, or if expression whether symbolic or spoken is suppressed, it is the duty of the citizen to rise up and act. This statement also demonstrates that “democratic patriotism” requires both action, and understanding of democracy and the Republic, in order to uphold the ideals of the Constitution (p. 18).

Kahne and Middaugh (2007) critique this requirement for activity in the patriotic process as “constructive patriotism”. “Constructive patriotism” has at its center the maintenance of democratic values. In an attempt to maintain “an effort to promote positive change and consistency with the nations ideals”, it is necessary to critique and question to ensure notions of equality and liberty are upheld (p. 118). Action by students should be taken even if they risk being vilified “because there can be no rights

without concomitant responsibilities, it is this juxtaposition we need to help students understand and incorporate in both their vision of active and responsible citizenship and personal behavior patterns" (Stevens, p. 19). In a study by Kahne and Middaugh (2006) that addressed the "patriotic commitments" 2366 high school seniors were surveyed from 12 diverse schools in California. This survey was not addressing their perceptions of patriotism, rather their "capacity and commitment" to "assume the full responsibilities of citizenship" in America. The study suggested that although the students were not blind patriots, it was "sentiment rather than analysis" that "guides assessments of the nations policies and practices" with only 16% expressing that they were "committed patriots, endorsed active and constructive patriotism, and rejected blind patriotism" (p. 603).

Conservative Patriotism and Liberal Patriotism

Psychologist Michael J. Bader (2006) discusses this need for belonging and attachment as a fundamental for conservative patriotism and liberal patriotism. Bader addresses the connection between patriotism and attachment when he says "patriotism is a container for a range of psychological needs that originally play themselves out in the family…patriotism establishes a "we" that satisfies the longings for connectedness and affiliation that are so often frustrated in our private lives" (p. 583). In a nation that, at least at the surface, appears bipartisan in its options for political parties, it is unsurprising that "we" turns into the "us and them", "right or wrong" basis that scholars characterize as "liberal patriotism" and "conservative patriotism" (p. 583).

This attachment, the need for belonging, that is being exploited "on both the Left and the Right seeks to link their partisan agendas to the evocation and satisfaction of these frustrated longings" (Bader, 2006, p. 583). Bader uses the work of George Lakoff, Professor in Linguistics at Berkeley, who analyzes this sense of a need for longing as the search for familial safety when he argued "that liberals speak to values arising from a conceptual paradigm that he calls the "nurturant parent" – including the values of empathy and responsibility for others – while conservatives appeal to a mental metaphor involving discipline and self reliance that he terms the "strict parent." Both models seek to address needs for connectedness and security albeit in radically different ways" (p. 583–584).

Under the Republican government of George Bush, Noguera and Cohen (2007) discuss the connection between support for government and maintenance of the status quo within the "strict parent" model of patriotism discussed above. Those who are complicit with the goals of the government will be given the support of the government providing they maintain the status quo. "Educators who support the war" in Iraq and Afghanistan, "the President, and the policies of the administration may experience little difficulty doing what they can to embrace the military effort and NCLB with patriotic enthusiasm" (p. 574). Failure to support the government, and the President at certain times, can result in ostracization as seen in the rhetoric of President George Bush prior to the initial incursion into Afghanistan after 9/11 with statements like "you are either with us or against us". Such rhetoric served to mobilize isolation not just for those who directly opposed the war, but also those who chose to enter into dialog concerning "patriotic" issues.

Gloria Ladson-Billings (2006) addresses one of these "patriotic" issues through the example of the Madison, WI school district and issue of the Pledge of Allegiance. After 9/11 the school district tried to pass legislation to enforce students, in particular international students, to say the Pledge of Allegiance. The board voted this down in line with previous court decisions allowing the option not to pledge and was faced with the vitriol of the national media proclaiming the board to be anti-American and Communists. At a school board meeting to address the issue over 2000 people were present, many from outside the school district to try and have the school officials recalled. Ladson-Billings points to the following statement from a school board member who held his ground in the face of "patriots" seeking to enforce the pledge, "patriotism is not what you say; patriotism is what you do" (p. 588). Ladson-Billings asserts that the "term "patriot" after 9/11 has been hijacked by an increasingly narrow and undemocratic sector of society" (p. 585). In this context what was once deemed patriotic, a rigorous and full debate in order to ensure the fundamentals of the Constitution are upheld in the face of potential tyranny has been overtaken by those seeking their own political goals by preying on a public in need of collective reassurance.

One of the major issues in understanding the role of conservative patriotism and liberal patriotism is the role of the media and the fact that often political discussion has been decided before it hits the various channels of communication. Ladson-Billings (2006) in reference to the media and in particular Ann Coulter wrote,

> I believe we are in a much worse place than simple lacking the ability to frame the debate. Indeed I argue there is no debate to frame. Instead there are

> shouting matches. Everything is already settled, and if you do not subscribe to the current dominant orthodoxy you are unpatriotic and godless. Your very presence is a threat to society. According to Ann Coulter you are a traitor (p. 13).

Fortunately, conservatives and liberals alike question such positions of neutrality or complicity by the media. Dan Rather on September 17th 2001 said, "George Bush is the president. He makes the decisions, and, you know, its just one American, wherever he wants me to line up, just tell me where, and he'll make the call" (Rather, 2001). Jensen (2007) writes about how this stance was widely criticized at the time by Bill Kovach, chairman of the Committee of Concerned Journalists, when he said,

> a journalist is never more true to democracy – is never more engaged as a citizen, is never more patriotic – than when aggressively doing the job of independently verifying the news of the day; questioning the actions of those in authority; disclosing information the public needs but others wish secret for self-interested purpose" (p. 389–390).

According to Bader, (2006) if conservative patriotism represents an unyielding allegiance to the status quo, then liberal patriotism is required to provide the tactile avenue in which patriotism can be felt through emotional attachment. A key issue when discussing liberal patriotism here is the apparent lack of academic criticism. The major criticism in print appears not to focus on content, but more the lack of ability of its supporters to counter the success that conservative patriotism has enjoyed since the beginning of the millennium. Bader suggests liberal patriotism has not been as successful as conservative patriotism because it has not used the psychological need for

attachment and union against an adversary, in this case common to "all forms of ethnocentrism, racism, sexism, and homophobia" (p. 42).

Patriotism, whether it is "liberal patriotism" or conservative patriotism" should not be used to divide along party lines, or be used as a political tool to isolate. As Dreier and Flacks (2003) said "loyalty to country is neither conservative nor liberal" (p. 397). Bader (2006) suggests in order to counter this success, supporters of liberal patriotism need to alter their focus. Instead of vilifying actions of the conservatives as wrong, which obviously maintains the problems, they need to address the problems of security and connection that both conservative and liberal patriotism fails to satisfy. The consequence in addressing the relationship or interaction, rather than addressing the result, is the need for an active conscious deliberation of multiple points of view, as interaction requires connections with other people and discussion.

This slate of consciousness requires at least a basic knowledge of fundamental values, and not only that it requires a basic knowledge of the positions of others to be most effective. Graff (2007) addresses multiple viewpoints when discussing the work of John Stuart Mill which presents the idea that the individual cannot understand how they feel if they do not understand how others feel about the same topic or subject, especially if their viewpoint is radically different. Patriotism, whether conservative or liberal, if it wishes to avoid being a redundant nationalism, therefore requires a conscious awareness of what their patriotism consists of and why it is important. The consequence of this is the dichotomies of patriotism discussed, blind or democratic, humanitarian or nationalist, conservative or liberal can potentially all be beneficial to society if there is conscious understanding and acceptance of more than one

perspective. The issue, as the scholars that have been discussed have highlighted, is the conscious thought and open discussion appears more prevalent in liberal and democratic patriotisms, and is often absent or missing in conservative and blind patriotisms (p. 68).

Humanitarian Patriotism and Nationalist Patriotism

Vermont historian Woden Teachout (2009) frames the concept of patriotism in America from a historical context through the introduction of humanitarian patriotism and nationalist patriotism. Nationalist patriotism shares some of the same characteristics as blind patriotism, a state where patriotism is characterized by the absence of critical dissent and with the authoritarian delivery of "patriotic" instructions to a homogenous group who share the same ideals (p. 69). Humanitarian patriotism has at its core the ability to focus on the "common good" of all individuals so that an inclusive patriotism can be achieved through ownership by its participants (p. 21). In this way patriotism is not owned by one of group of people, but is a process that can be invested in and systematically developed through dialogue and action.

The key developments in humanitarian patriotism can be viewed through the historical figure of Ebenezer McIntosh, and the 1765 Stamp Act Protests in Boston, MA. McIntosh, a Boston dockworker in pre revolution Boston sought to overthrow the Stamp Act of 1765 by mobilizing both the working class and the middle class of New England. This mobilization intended its followers live the Enlightenment ideals of the 18th century characterized by the pillars of "political liberty", and, if justified, "rejection of hierarchy" for the common good. These ideals were lived through the Loyal Nine, a group of working class Bostonians led by McIntosh who were given resources and

support from upper class politicians such as Samuel Adams (Teachout, 2009, p. 18–20). Teachout analyzes this event as being a unique point at which class boundaries were broken down through belief in the "emphasis on a common good and on improving the lives of the suffering (p. 21).

"Political liberty" for Teachout is based on the work of amongst others John Locke in the *Two Treatises of Government* (1690) and Jean Jacques Rousseau in *The Social Contract* (1763). This work is based on two key ideas, that of natural rights and the social contract. Natural rights are those rights that humans possessed prior to the formation of government, that of the right to life, right to liberty, and the right to property. Social contract is based on the idea that the government and its citizens enter into a symbiotic relationship where the ruling system has to recognize the natural rights of its citizens and should provide them protection, because in return the citizens have given up some of their liberties, such as taxation and agreeing to live by certain laws (Teachout, 2009, p. 22). If the social contract is upheld then political liberty exists because citizens are neither afraid of each other, nor the government. "Rejection of hierarchy" is not a prescription for overthrowing order and governance in an arbitrary fashion but is a requirement if the social contract is broken. If the social contract is broken then the various levels of the social hierarchy should work together for the common good, rather than working solely for personal gain and the benefit of the individual (p. 22–24).

Whereas the fundamentals of humanitarian patriotism have exhibited action to break down barriers and perceived governmental violations through inclusive, and largely non-violent protest, "nationalist patriotism" was born out of an early 19th

century nativism that sought to define America in terms of ethnic heritage and religion. Nationalism changed when new immigrants, primarily Catholic, came in numbers that were threatening to those who held the political reins in the 1820s and 1830s. According to Teachout (2009) the event that gave the formal birth to this new form of nationalist patriotism was the Philadelphia riots of 1844, a series of violent uprisings by white, primarily native-born Protestants, led by Lewis Levin against the city's Catholic community (p. 45). Levin used anti–Catholic sentiment to bring together 3000 men, initially with town hall meetings, to discuss and respond to increased immigration, perceived moral atrocities of the Catholic community, and the proposed introduction of the Catholic Douay Bible into Philadelphia classrooms at the expense of the Protestant King James Bible (p. 55–56).

Demonstrations against the Catholic residents of Philadelphia turned violent and the result was widespread violence against those that did not share the same ideology as the white native-born Protestants. During these demonstrations the flag of the United States became a point of focus and a symbol of white Protestant patriotism. This nationalist patriotism was "defined by loyalty – not to ideas but to a people or government – and by a sense of union or belonging" (p. 69). This need for belonging and attachment to the group led to actions that were carried out not for the good of all, as in humanitarian patriotism, but for a self-identified few who used their position in society to benefit them politically and economically.

Multiple Patriotisms

Conceptions of patriotism, such as those above, are some of the scholarly discussions that have developed in the post 9/11 world. Patriotism, as evidenced, is a malleable and fluid ideal that alters according to the individual and how they view the world. Kosterman and Feshbach (1989) wrote the following.

> Patriotism has appeared to "flow" at various periods in American history characterized by extroversion or national self-assertion, or in response to an outside threat. It has appeared to "ebb," however, a short time following some peak in this self-assertion in which "patriotic excesses" were perpetrated (p. 257–258).

This statement sets the stage for needing to recognize the concept of patriotism as a living concept to be experienced, rather than a redundant dichotomous descriptor. The concept of patriotism has multiple definitions. Patriotism is not a concept of right or wrong. Individuals require recognition of multiple patriotisms to ensure that in the "flow", where excesses tend to occur, the action of citizens through self-regulation citizens is tempered. The concept of patriotism is therefore concerned with the maintenance of a society in which citizens are neither afraid of themselves or the government. To understand patriotism in just one way, using definite concepts dilutes the ability of patriotism to achieve its true goal, which is the political liberty of all individuals.

The Need for Democratic Patriotism in the Classroom

The response to the terrorist attacks of 9/11 has not just changed the scholarly discussion about patriotism, the focus of history textbooks, and attitudes to American foreign policy, but it has fundamentally altered the fabric of the United States (Farragher, Buhle, Czitron & Armitage, 2002, p. 711–712). The immediate response to the events of 9/11 saw the curtailment of civil liberties as policy was pushed through for the pro war agenda. Those who supported legislation such as the PATRIOT Act were the patriots, and those who sought to discuss further for greater understanding were not (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

An extensive gap appeared between what the population required of its government to uphold the Constitution, and the actual actions of the government. If the political will of the few underscores the legislation of government, without taking into account its citizenry, then citizenship is removed as individuals are denied access to their full rights. What is patriotically being done in the name of the nation-state, and for the perceived continuation of the Constitution, hurt the nation. Dewey demonstrated the damaging nature of such a relationship.

> No government by experts in which the masses do not have the chance to inform the experts as to their needs can be anything but an oligarchy managed in the interests of the few. And the enlightenment must proceed in ways which force the administrative specialists to take account of the needs. The world has suffered more from leaders and authorities than from the masses (Dewey, 1916/1994, p. 251).

If, under the facade of patriotic action, individuals have their options removed, then there is no voluntary allegiance to the state. The state, rather than the individual becomes the one that chooses and the patriotic notion of "civil religion" becomes redundant as the tools and methods through which to understand the country are discarded if the individual is not given access to citizenship. In addition to this, as Dewey examines, if there is no relationship between the state and the citizen, and there is no patriotic instruction, there can be little or no accountability for ones actions. In other words, if the citizen is not given the tools to develop their citizenship through instruction, and through a "democratic patriotism", then the future of the nation is restricted as there will be no-one educated enough to take responsibility for upholding the Constitution. If "authoritarian patriotism" removes citizenship and its associated benefits from society, then the individual opportunity for growth and the collective development of that nation is stunted.

> Our thoughts of our own actions are saturated with the ideas that others entertain about them, ideas which have been expressed not only in explicit instruction but still more effectively in reaction to our acts…The individual is held accountable for what he has done in order that he may be responsive in what he is going to do. Gradually persons learn by dramatic imitation to hold themselves accountable, and liability becomes a voluntary deliberate acknowledgement that deeds are our own, that their consequences come form us" (Dewey, 1916/1994, p. 182–183).

The plurality of the nation has presented issues for patriotism and the concept of citizenship since the founding fathers (Parker. W, 2003, p. 14). The issues that have

developed out of the "melting pot" nature of the nation have led to problems in a "narrow" discussion of the relationship between patriotism and citizenship (p. 16). A primary reason for this stunted citizenship education is evident in books from the early twentieth century that present citizenship solely on Western European ideals (Newman, 1928: Diemer & Mullen, 1930). Newman provides an example of this bias, which places any idea of citizenship in the hands of Western Europe, and so becomes the possession of Americans, the French and the British.

For it was in fact circumstance rather than philosophy which moved the

> whole center of gravity away from the Greeks…The circumstance was the emergence of three events of world import. In Britain there was the Industrial Revolution, which began the factory system and the Industrial Age, in which we now live, and which opened for the whole of mankind a new chapter; in America there was the Declaration of Independence, which reiterated the ancient claim of national freedom and introduced into the world polity the governing practice of federation of States, a principle which in theory was centuries old; and in France there was the Declaration of the Rights of Man, which had as its battle cry Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, the reign of democracy (Newman, p. 23).

Such claims and insistence of the possession of the political system being held by, rather than developed out of these nations, served to present a patriotism in the first half of the twentieth century that limited recognition of the role others might play in the life of the Constitution. Newman later goes on to say that these "three chief nations of the world" face the burden for "a higher form and practice of citizenship than any

hitherto claimed by the State in the history of man" (p. 24). When such statements are made it is unsurprising that a foundation for citizenship has often been based in an "authoritarian" form of patriotism. This, in the present, has led to the constant deficit for the potential for citizenship in the United States, as multiple groups have been unable to share in patriotism or develop constructs for their citizenship due to their displacement from society.

Anzaldua (1987) discusses the alienation of those on the Mexican-American border. Physically, these inhabitants of the United States, whether they be U.S. citizens or not, operate in the "Borderlands". This creates a tension and vacuum in the lives of those who reside their as

> Gringos in the U.S. Southwest consider the inhabitants of the borderlands transgressors, aliens – whether they possess documents or not, whether they're Chicanos, Indians or Blacks. Do not enter, trespassers will be raped, maimed, strangled, gassed, shot. The only "legitimate" inhabitants are those in power, the whites and those who align themselves with whites (Anzaldua, p. 1–2).

The issue of patriotism and citizenship are redundant as issues of race and ethnicity govern control. Access to the full benefits of citizenship for some in the United States, is removed as a result of the fear felt in occupying these "Borderlands". The "Borderlands" are not just concerned with geographical location. "In fact, the Borderlands are physically present wherever two or more cultures edge each other, where people of different races occupy the same territory, where under, lower, middle and upper classes touch, where the space between individuals shrinks with intimacy" (Anzaldua, Preface).

Education can transcend this "space". "Democratic patriotism" allows a citizenship rooted in upholding the goals of the Republic. Instruction in schools need to focus on the human dignity of the student, rather than the characteristics of a citizenship rooted in the white European male dominated world of the 18th century. It is in the schools that much of the instruction over the "strengths and challenges of democracy and attributes of good citizenship" are located (Torney-Purta, 2002, p. 203). In the classroom it is evident there is an ability for citizenship education to foster a democratic patriotism in the classroom that is inclusive. Research (Torney-Purta, 2002) has demonstrated that students in the United States are well adapted in the twenty first century to discuss the differences and challenges faced due to issues of gender, race, and immigrant status. The "Borderlands" can be navigated and difference recognized as part of citizenship that does not conflict with patriotism.

The problem, as presented by Torney-Purta, (2002) is that the teachers are unable to "deal with diverse identities in their classrooms, especially at the same time they are attempting to hold students to rigorous expectations about knowledge and develop a sense of citizen identity as commonly defined" (p. 210). To promote an education, that can combine a patriotism that fosters an inclusive patriotism, requires teachers to adapt to a new model of citizenship education.

Westheimer and Kahne (2002) recognize that a citizenship education that focuses less on the individual student and their role on society, and more on traditional conservative understandings of citizenship, will replicate the issues of "authoritarian patriotism" and limited citizenship seen in society (and in education). What is proposed instead of an "often ideologically conservative conception of citizenship" (p. 4) is a

framework that addresses three visions of "citizenship", "the personally responsible citizen; the participatory citizen; and the justice oriented citizen" (p. 9).

The personally responsible citizen "acts responsibly in his/her community…works and pays taxes, obeys laws, and helps those in need" (p. 10). According to Westheimer this would also fall under the guise of character education as well, offering teachers an opportunity to advocate action for the general good of all citizens. As Lockwood (2009) emphasizes "character education advocates want their programs to promote positive ethical behavior among young people and reduce or eliminate socially and personally destructive behavior" with the goal of producing productive citizens that behave in accordance with the goals of the Constitution and Declaration of Independence (p. 2).

The participatory citizen has been given an education that has enlightened them on "how government and other institutions (e.g. community based organizations, churches) work and about the importance of planning and participating in organized efforts to care for those in need" (Westheimer & Kahne, 2002, p. 11). The participatory citizen is aware of the structure of the government and would understand the limitations and rights that could be exercised under the Constitution and Republican government.

The justice-oriented citizen has the ability, through education, to call "explicit attention to matters of injustice and to the importance of pursuing social justice" (Westheimer & Kahne, 2002, p. 12). Instruction on the how to uphold human dignity, regardless of race, ethnicity or any other pre-existing condition that may have resulted in residence in the "Borderlands", or even outside of citizenship, enables the student to

achieve this self-reflective condition. An understanding of a constructive or democratic patriotism is key to this three-pronged framework of citizenship education.

Summary

To conclude the chapter, this author concurs with the need for the classroom to foster a "democratic patriotism" or "constructive patriotism" in citizenship education. This style of citizenship education favors the maintenance of civil liberties and dialogue conducive to the understanding and respect of differences both in the classroom, and for future dialogue at the domestic and international level.

Chapter four will discuss the methodology used in this study. Chapter five will address the results of the research. Chapter six will be concerned with the implications of the findings and how they can be applied in the schools alongside propositions for further research.

Chapter Four: Methodology

Rationale for using a mixed method study

The purpose of this study is to address what differences exist in student perceptions of patriotism in the United States and England. The rationale for utilizing a mixed method is it allows for both quantitative comparisons of opinions held by high school students, while qualitatively examining emotional aspects of their patriotic understanding that is more difficult to quantify. According to Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004)

> researchers should collect multiple data using different strategies, approaches and methods in such a way that the resulting mixture or combination is likely to result in complementary strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses. Effective use of this principle is a major source of justification for mixed method research because the product will be superior to monomethod studies (p. 18).

In this mixed method study the quantitative study employed a Likert scale survey that asked various questions concerning patriotism to high school students in both nations. The questions covered ten topics. The topics, and the reasons why they were selected for inclusion on the scale will be discussed later in this chapter. Likert scale assessment was best suited for the survey as it allows for "fairly accurate assessments of beliefs or opinions…because many of our beliefs and opinions are thought of in terms of graduations" (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, p. 260). The qualitative section was conducted using a semi-structured interview process with high school students in both nations. Following the administration of the Likert scale

surveys, co-operating teachers at participating school sites selected students for follow-up interviews. The interviews were then examined using a narrative analysis approach which allowed further investigation of the student's story and allowed the respondent to order their thoughts and perceptions over the concept of patriotism (Riessman, 2002, p.218).

Description of the Primary Investigator

At this point it is necessary to discuss some of the researcher's experiences and interests so that the reader is aware of the critical perspective influencing this study. I am a British citizen who attended a state boys grammar school in England. I completed a Bachelors degree in Theology in England and following a few years working I moved to the United States where I completed a Masters degree in Education and am currently enrolled in a Ph. D program in Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum. I teach high school Social Studies and adjunct classes at the university level for pre-service teachers in Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum.

My interest in the issue of student perceptions of patriotism between the United States and England is borne out of my educational and social experiences during student teaching. This was the first time that I had been exposed to the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance within U.S. high schools. I came to understand that there was very little instruction in the curriculum to explain the meaning or history of the Pledge, which led me to consider questions of patriotism. These questions of patriotism were initially primarily concerned with differences between my nation of citizenship, England, and nation of residence, the United States, and how the high school students in both countries understood and interpreted the concept.

During my doctoral studies it was evident through discussion in the high school classes I taught, and my first qualitative research class that although high schools throughout the nation allowed opportunity for students to recite the pledge, there was little instruction beyond elementary school memorization. Indeed there are only fleeting references to patriotism in state standards and, as discussed earlier, open recommendations from national groups that carry no mandate. England and the United States are two nations that possess many shared characteristics in history, culture and philosophy. My subjective experience drove the belief that there is a necessity for further comprehension of the perceptions of patriotism for high school students in both nations. This comprehension is required in order to understand not only how patriotism is discussed in high schools, but also how citizenship is approached in both nations domestically. Such an understanding over perception of patriotism might provide a glimpse of how today's students may interact with their fellow citizens, and also those in other nations in the increasingly interdependent globalized world of the future.

Study sample selection

As this was a comparison study between the United States and England multiple sites were necessary. According to Creswell (1998) it is exceptionally important that participants "must be individuals who have experienced the phenomenon being explored and can articulate their conscious experiences" (p. 111). As such students were selected who have had mandated Social Studies classes in both nations in which there has been a level of citizenship education. In the United States these were seniors and sophomores, in England the corresponding age group were those in year 13 and

year 11. Administrators were contacted at schools in both nations with the primary consideration for them to be able to identify students in those grades who had experienced the phenomenon, which in this instance was some citizenship education (de Marrais & Lappan, 2004, p. 259).

By approaching schools, institutions where the required populations for study were located in one place and so cluster sampling were adopted. Denscombe (2003) says of cluster sampling "it is possible to get a good enough sample by focusing on naturally occurring clusters of the particular thing that the researcher wishes to study…The researcher does not need to organize the grouping of all the young people on one site – they are there anyway – and it is in this sense that the school offers a naturally occurring cluster" (p. 14).

For the research study the following schools were approached to be part of the study. One school from both England and the United States whose administration self identified as being an inner-city school. One school from both England and the United States whose administration self-identified as being an urban school. One school from both England and the United States whose administration self identified as being suburban. The schools chosen were identified through personal relationships with either faculty or members of the administration and were approached through a formal letter to enquire as to their willingness to participate in the study.

Description of the sites

United States School #1 – Inner City

Information provided by the administration stated that the school is a co-educational private preparatory school in the Roman Catholic tradition under the values of the

sisters of Mercy who founded the school. The school has a population of 359 and has a minority enrollment of 43%. It is evident from conversations with teachers at the school that the majority of the non-white population was Hispanic. The school has a student to teacher ration of 12:1. The school is located 2 miles to the south of the downtown area of a major metropolitan city in the Southwest, which according to the census bureau has a population 591,967.

United States School #2 - Urban

Information provided by the administration stated that the school is a co-educational private preparatory school in the Roman Catholic tradition under the local Archdiocese. The school has a population of 716 students and has a minority enrollment of 24%. The school employs the author and the majority of the non-white students are Hispanic. The school has a student to teacher ration of 18:1. The school is located 5 miles to the north of the downtown area of a major metropolitan city in the Southwest, which according to the U. S. census bureau has a population of 591,967.

United States School #3 - Suburban

Information provided by the administration describes the institution as a publically funded high school. The school has a population of 1743 students and states it has a minority enrollment of 27%. The majority of students who are non-white are either American Indian or African American which both makeup 9% of the student body. The school has a student to teacher ration of 15:1. The school is located in a university town with a population, according to the U.S. census bureau of 113,273. The town is located

20 miles to the south of the downtown area of a major metropolitan city in the Southwest, which according to the U. S. census bureau has a population of 591,967.

English School #1 – Inner City

Information provided by the administration stated that the school is a single sex girl's grammar school that is voluntary aided. The school is run by a foundation and as such the buildings and maintenance of the facility are their responsibility. The school has a population of 748 and has a minority enrollment of 75%. The majority of the students are of Afro-Caribbean descent. The school has a student to teacher ration of 14:1. The school is located in the borough of Southwark, which has a population of 287000. The borough is located in London, which has a population of 7.8 million people.

English School #2 - Urban

Information provided by the administration stated that the school is a single sex selective boy's grammar school that is voluntary aided. The school is run by a foundation and as such the buildings and maintenance of the facility are their responsibility. The school has a population of 731 and has a minority enrollment of 66%. The majority of the students are of South Asian descent. The school has a student to teacher ration of 17:1. The school is located in the borough of Walsall, which has a population of 287000. The borough is located in the West Midlands, which has a population of 2.63 million people.

English School #3 - Suburban

Information provided by the administration stated that the school is a co-educational comprehensive school. The school has a population of 1481 and has a minority enrollment of 12%. The majority of the minority students are of South Asian descent. The school has a student to teacher ration of 15:1. The school is located in the borough of Birmingham, which has a population of 1.36 million. The borough is located in the West Midlands, which has a population of 2.63 million people.

Description of the co-op teachers

The co-operative teachers who participated in this study were either known to the researcher, or referred by teachers who were known to the researcher. Principals from the schools where the teachers were employed were sent an email requesting access to the schools. The principals responded and gave permission to research at their school and work with the co-operating teacher who allocated classes to survey and interview. The co-operating teacher's in England allocated a class period in which to survey the student's and identified students for follow-up interviews. The co-operating teacher's in the United States prior to my arrival had already administered the surveys and then identified students for follow-up interviews. Each co-operating teachers distributed parental consent forms and received parent approval prior to arrival.

Description of the students

Students identified for the research study in the United States were comprised of seniors and sophomores. English students were selected from Years 13 and 11. Seniors in the United States and Year 13 students in England were predominantly born between

September 1992 and August 1993 and are in their final year of high school. Sophomores in the United States and Year 11 students in England were predominantly born between September 1994 and August 1995.

Data collection

The first phase of the study was the quantitative element. This section employed the administration of a Likert scale survey to high school students. The high school students (n=240) selected for the survey, were identified by administrators at the participating schools. The purpose of the Likert scale survey is to provide ordinal data for the purpose of comparing data in other categories (Denscombe, 1998, p. 237). In this study, the data comparison is focused on the perceptions high school students have of the concept of patriotism in the United States and England.

The second phase applied the qualitative process, which consisted of semi-structured interviews. The interviews allowed subjects to expand on their perception of patriotism, which in turn permitted the researcher an opportunity to understand their interaction with the concept (de Marrais et al., 2004). During this phase students were chosen by the administration of the participating school. These interviews had a clear set of questions that were addressed, however there was flexibility in the interview in order to allow the interviewee to expand upon their experience (Denscombe, 1998). The interview procedure followed the Narrative Analysis method suggested by Riessman (2002). A discussion of the procedure will follow.

Survey development

Researchers such as Kosterman and Feschbach (1989) and Schatz, Staub and Levine (1999) have developed patriotic themed surveys. Kosterman and Feschbach directed their survey toward identifying "the multidimensionality of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes and dispositions" and used a 120 item survey that was taken by 239 university students and 24 high school students of which 21 were under the age of 21 and 3 between the ages of 21 and 30 (p. 260). The final sample used by Kosterman and Feschbach were building contractors whose age's ranges from 21 to over 50 (p. 261). The survey was then analyzed using exploratory factor analysis. This survey was not used as an instrument for a number of reasons. First the items being asked did not concern patriotism specifically, second it was determined that a 120 item questionnaire for high school students was too intensive for young adults in high school, and third it did not offer items that were specific to themes that were addressed in citizenship education in both nations being studied.

Schatz, Staub and Levine did address constructive and blind patriotism and was specifically taken by 544 students from 3 universities (p. 156–165). A 20-item scale was developed. However this was not used as it specifically related to issues that were unique to the United States and included references to concepts like being "un-American" and references to Vietnam, which a high school student in England would be unlikely to have a frame of reference to answer (p. 159).

The Citizenship Education component of the National Curriculum (Department of Education, 2007) was reviewed to ascertain themes shared with CIVITAS (Center for

Civic Education, 1991). Following consultation with co-operating teachers in both nations the themes below were identified in both nations' citizenship education.

1. Political Affiliation
2. International Concerns
3. Government Policy
4. Questioning Authority
5. Understanding History
6. National Pride
7. National Welfare
8. Emotional Attachment
9. Attitude to War
10. Civil Rights

In developing these themes particular attention is drawn in the English curriculum for Citizenship Education to the "Range and Content" section, which includes a list of "key concepts and processes" including "political, legal and human rights, and responsibilities of citizens…the roles of the law and the justice system…freedom of speech and diversity of views…and the diversity of ideas, beliefs, cultures, identities, traditions" (Department of Education, 2007). Likewise attention is directed to the CIVITAS (1991) document, which includes in its introductory section "Civic Virtue", a comprehensive list of civic commitments (pp. 11–16). These fundamental principles were compared with the English curriculum and out of this the above themes emerged for the survey instrument.

In the development of the survey instrument the process outlined by Crano and Brewer (2002) was implemented. Initially a series of potential items were developed around the themes that were common to both the Citizenship Education component of the National Curriculum in England, and the 1991 CIVITAS recommendations, which serves as the foundation for most instruction of this kind in the United States. In discussion with university researchers "those that are obviously double-barreled, ambiguous, or confusing" were either written or discarded (p. 287). After the series of items was reduced down the surveys were sent out to the principals of the participating schools for observation and comment. Those items that were determined to be inappropriate or in the eyes of the administrator not addressing the understanding of the student's regarding patriotism were removed or reworded. In following this procedure the goal was to retain those items that discriminated the understanding of high school students and patriotism, and remove those that failed to distinguish attitudes to student understanding of patriotism. Twenty items were retained over the ten themes discussed above. Half of the items presented the themes in a blindly patriotic manner, half of the items presented the themes in a constructively patriotic manner. The items were then randomized on the scale (see Appendix C).

Interview guide development

The research study used a semi-structured approach to the interview process. The purpose of the semi-structured interview, as discussed earlier, is to provide a series of questions that need to be addressed but allows for flexibility and opportunity to move beyond the interview guide should the opportunity to present itself for the purpose of

depth of information. The interview guide (see Appendix D) was developed with the input of administrators at the participating schools. Initially questions were developed and sent to the schools for comment and approval. When comments were returned alterations were made to the interview guide until all the questions were acceptable to all the administrators in the co-operating schools. As indicated by Riessman (2002) in a Narrative Analysis format the interview guide should have "5 to 7 broad questions about the topic of inquiry, supplemented by probe questions" (p. 247).

Research study

The research was carried out in the United States and England in the months of March and April 2011. The research in England was done in March of 2011. The research in the United States was done in the April of 2011. Throughout the development of the survey instrument and interview guide a relationship had been developed with the administration in the schools in both nations. At each site, three sites in England, three sites in the United States, co-operating teachers and administrators in the schools had identified 20 sophomores in the United States/Year 11's in England and 20 seniors in the United States/Year 13's in England for study at each school. Prior to my arrival at the sites parental consent (see Appendix B) was gathered where required. Prior to taking the survey student consent (see Appendix A) was also obtained. In total there were 240 students who were administered surveys and 36 students who selected for further interview.

Survey procedure

The research was conducted on assigned day agreed upon with the administration at the co-operating school. Prior to this day parental consent forms had already been completed where required. Prior to taking the survey students also completed the student consent form required. The survey was then circulated to the students and completed. Students were told that they did not have to finish the survey instrument if they did not wish to and they were under no obligation to take it. In addition the co-operating teacher explained that this was not for any form of grade and they were taking the assessment for the purpose of research at the university. At no point at any of the six sites where research was conducted did a student choose not to complete the survey instrument.

Interview procedure

The interviews were conducted immediately following the administration of the surveys. Students who had the required consent and were selected by the co-operating teacher were interviewed. Students were then interviewed in a classroom chosen by the co-operating teacher and the interview took place. The interview guide assisted with the direction of the interview as well as notes being taken in the space provided in the interview guide. The discussion was also recorded using a Snowflake microphone that was integrated into Garage Band software on a Mac Book. Each interview lasted between 5 and 7 minutes. When appropriate, as dictated by semi-structured interviews, additional questions were asked to gain a depth of understanding of the student's perception of patriotism.

Data analysis

Data analysis followed the stages adopted by Creswell (1998). The first step in the analysis was addressing the surveys. As recommended by university supervisors Principal Axis Factor analysis was used to explore the number of factors underlying the responses to the scale on both the American high school student sample and the English high school student sample. Factor retention was determined through examination of the scree plot and also parallel analysis (see http://ires.ku.edu/~smishra/parallelengine.htm). Following Varimax rotation factors were interpreted using a loading criterion of |.30| with the dominant factors named. Following the factor analysis the internal consistency reliability of the subscales comprising my measure using Cronbach's alpha (1951) were assessed.

The second step was the narrative analysis. Using the model set by Riessman (2002) there are five levels in addressing a narrative such as an interview experience. These levels are 1). Attending. 2). Telling. 3) Transcribing. 4). Analyzing. 5). Reading. These five levels were addressed as follows:

Attending–Attending is the stage in which "discrete certain features" are addressed in the environment in which the interview was being conducted. As the interviews were taking place in six different schools in two nations, and the rooms for interview were chosen by the administrators at the schools, it was necessary to make note by "reflecting, remembering, recollecting them into observations" that could be later used (Riessman, 2002, p. 222). These notes were later used in order to provide context for discussion concerning the interview.

Telling–Telling is the stage in which the interview takes place. The interview guide was developed using 5 broad questions with the opportunity to probe further when appropriate (Riessman, 2002, p. 247). In doing this "investigators can give up control over the research process and approach interviews as conversations, almost any question can generate a narrative" (p. 248). The students were interviewed using the guide and the interviews were recorded.

Transcribing– "Transcribing" is "absolutely essential to the narrative analysis" (Riessman, 2002, p. 251). In this process I transcribed the interviews and also addressed any features of the conversation that were not part of the conversation such as long pauses, laughing etc.

Analyzing–During the transcription process insights were gained over and above the ten themes intimated by the questions on the survey scale. Additional insights such as this "shape how we choose to represent an interview narrative in our text" (Riessman, 2002, p. 253). The challenge in the analysis is to "identify the similarities across the moments into an aggregate" (p. 226). At this point the research of Creswell (1998) was adopted. After the initial reading the process of horizontalization of the data began. This horizontalization consisted of listening to and reading the transcribed interviews and identifying "significant statements" made by those being researched. These significant statements were then placed into clusters of meaning, identifying statements that shared common themes and grouping them together based on their commonalities to discover

emerging themes. (Creswell, 1998). By repeating this process with the research from the interviews core themes in the perceptions the high school students have about patriotism began to emerge.

Reading– "The fifth and final level of representation comes as the reader encounters the written report" (Riessman, 2002, p. 227). In this instance the themes and descriptions were shared with a university supervisor to gain additional comments and input.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of the study are numerous and need to be identified. This section will address four significant limitations to the study: regional, institutional, the survey, and the interview.

The first limitation is a regional issue and concerns the use of three schools in Oklahoma to represent the United States. As a predominantly Republican leaning state with all 77 counties going Republican in the 2012 general election in which the presidency went to a Democrat, it is certain that the state is not representative of the United States as a whole. In the same vein the use of three schools in England that came from boroughs in the nation's two largest metropolitan areas, London and Birmingham, is not representative of England as a whole. It is important to state that those students surveyed do not represent all regions in either nation, and do not represent all racial or ethnic groups contained within either nation.

The second limitation concerns the type of schools that were studied. In Oklahoma studies were conducted in one public 6A high school, a private Catholic 5A high school, and a private Catholic 4A high school. Consequently the study does not reflect the opinions of students in general in the United States as two of the schools chosen for study were religious schools. In England there was a more balanced approach in the selection of types of schools with one being a large suburban public school, a small urban public school, and a medium sized suburban selective school. However the limitation that needs to be addressed here is that the large suburban school was co-ed where the two other schools, as is common in England, were single sex institutions, which could impact the study.

The third limitation is the actual survey instrument itself. The survey was approved and tested in accordance with the advice of Crano and Brewer (2002) to make the instrument as effective as possible for the participants. The survey was being taken by high school students and participants may have hurried through the survey just to get it finished. Participants may also have lacked the vocabulary in certain circumstances to fully understand the questions that were being asked of them. In addition the participating schools selected the students that would take the survey and it is possible that the participating schools chose students who they thought would give the "right answer" so to better reflect their institution. In addition the teachers chose the students to be interviewed and could have been prejudiced by choosing a specific set of students who they thought would answer the questions in a manner they thought appropriate.

The final limitation is the interviews that were conducted. In total 36 students were interviewed of the 240 students who took the survey. The issue here concerns the

generalizations from these interviews to the wider populations in both nations. It is certain that these students, and their perceptions of patriotism, do not represent the attitudes of all students within the United States or England. A further issue with the interview procedure concerns the responses that were given by the participants. In one-on-one interviews of this nature with high school students, it is possible that they may not have been wholly truthful in their responses for fear of giving information that may not be politically correct for example. In addition the students chosen for interview were selected by the participating schools, and consequently may have been chosen for their perceived intellectual ability, which may have reflected well on the school in the eyes of the co-operating teachers. In both the survey administration and the interview procedure, the participants were continually reminded that the responses would be kept confidential and there was no way of linking their name to the response. In addition, as there was not a grade associated with the survey or interview there was no extrinsic motivation for them to not be truthful in their responses.

Summary

Chapter four discussed the methodology used in this study. This included a rationale for using a mixed method study. In addition to this, information concerning the sample selection, research sites, co-operating teachers and a description of the students was included. Finally information concerning the development of the survey, interview guide and the procedures followed in the administration of the surveys and interviews alongside the data analysis process were explained. Chapter five will address the results of the research. Chapter six will be concerned with the implications of the

findings and how they can be applied in the schools alongside propositions for further research.

Chapter 5: Results

Introduction

In this chapter the quantitative and qualitative results will be presented. The quantitative results will be presented with the exploratory factor analysis of the survey research for England followed by the factor analysis for the United States. Independent t-tests will then be included comparing the nations. Following the quantitative results, the qualitative results will be presented which consists of identifying emergent themes from the interview data that were common to high school students in both nations followed by themes that were apparent but unique to students in either nation. The factor analysis identified that students in both nations understood patriotism in similar ways. As a result, the qualitative results were combined to highlight shared perceptions between the students, and identify unique differences.

Exploratory factor analysis: English sample

English high school students in three schools were surveyed. Principal Axis Factor analysis was used to explore the number of factors underlying the responses to the scale in the English sample. Factor retention was determined through examination of the scree plot and also parallel analysis (see http://ires.ku.edu/~smishra/parallelengine.htm). Both the scree plot and parallel analysis results suggested the presence of three dominant factors that explained the variation in the items. Following Varimax rotation there were three factors interpreted using a loading criterion of |.30| or above. Eight items met the inclusion criterion on the first factor, four on the second factor, and seven on the third factor. Based on the pattern of

loadings, the first factor was named "Constructive patriotism". The second and third factors were named "Importance of emotional attachment" and "Blind allegiance", respectively. Prior to rotation, the first, second, and third factors explained 14.418%, 10.5%, and 6.034% of the variation. Following rotation, they explained 10.486%, 10.293%, and 10.182% of the variation, respectively. Table 1 contains the Varimax rotated factor loadings for my analysis.

Following the factor analysis, I also assessed the internal consistency reliability of the subscales comprising my measure using Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951). Co-efficient alphas for the three subscales were modest. Cronbach's alpha for Constructive Patriotism was 0.687. Co-efficient alpha for Importance of Emotional Attachment was at 0.731. Co-efficient alpha for blind allegiance was 0.700.

Table 1

Varimax Rotated Factor Loadings for English High School Students

Item – Each item is preceded with "To be a patriotic citizen"	Constructive patriotism	Importance of emotional attachment	Blind allegiance
6. It is important to understand the historical failures of the nation as it helps identify the challenges that may face the country in the present	0.673	0.190	-0.006
4. It is important to me to be informed on the political situation in other nations as it helps me to understand more about my own country	0.528	-0.003	0.033
10. It is important to understand and educate myself on the shortcomings of the government of my country	0.504	0.047	-0.056
12. It is necessary to me as a citizen to feel free to support minority political views in my country	0.500	-0.069	0.034
7. It is important I support the candidate whose political platform most reflects my ideals and goals for society, even if it means supporting the political party I or my family do not usually align myself with	0.422	-0.019	-0.165

20. It is important to be proud of the country of which I am a citizen and still recognize its limitations	0.417	0.315	0.160
15. It is important to feel free to question your country's policies in times of war	0.377	-0.284	-0.085
13. It is important to disagree with the government if it is in the interest of the welfare of the nation and its people	0.360	-0.202	-0.126
18. It is necessary to be emotionally attached to the country of which I am a citizen	0.014	0.824	0.108
9. It is important to understand the great accomplishments in the history of the nation as it helps me appreciate why the country is great	0.217	0.622	0.255
11. It is important to be proud of the country of which I am a citizen in all circumstances	-0.110	0.595	0.437
14. It is necessary to restrict my emotional attachment to the country of which I am a citizen	0.231	-0.446	0.249
19. It is important to me as a citizen to support the majority political viewpoint in my country	-0.033	-0.010	0.705
16. It is important to agree with the government as it always acts in my best interests	-0.062	0.092	0.541
17. It is important to support your country's policies to the fullest in times of war	-0.006	0.384	0.512
8. It is necessary to support without question the political leaders of the country	-0.105	0.069	0.475
3. It is important to accept that my government generally makes the correct decisions for the good of the country	-0.069	-0.020	0.380
5. It is important that I support the candidate of the political party I normally support, or my parents support	-0.118	-0.098	0.324
2. It is necessary for me to be solely concerned with the well being of my country	0.079	0.074	0.323
1. It is necessary to critically question the political leaders of the country	0.289	-0.025	-0.106

Exploratory factor analysis: American sample

American high school students in three schools were surveyed. Principal Axis Factor analysis was used to explore the number of factors underlying the responses to the scale in the English sample. Factor retention was determined through examination

of the scree plot and also parallel analysis (see http://ires.ku.edu/~smishra/parallelengine.htm). Both the scree plot and parallel analysis results suggested the presence of three dominant factors that explained the variation in the items. Following Varimax rotation, three factors were interpreted using a loading criterion of |.30| or above. Seven items met the inclusion criterion on the first factor, five on the second factor, and seven on the third factor. Based on the pattern of loadings, the first factor was named "Blind allegiance". The second and third factors were named "Importance of emotional attachment" and "Constructive patriotism" respectively. Prior to rotation, the first, second, and third factors explained 16.687%, 10.794%, and 6.097% of the variation. Following rotation, they explained 12.634%, 11.005%, and 9.938% of the variation, respectively. Table 2 contains the Varimax rotated factor loadings for my analysis.

Following the factor analysis, I also assessed the internal consistency reliability of the subscales comprising my measure using Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951). Co-efficient alphas for the three subscales were modest. Cronbach's alpha for Blind allegiance was 0.750. Co-efficient alpha for Importance of Emotional Attachment was at 0.714. Co-efficient alpha for Constructive patriotism was 0.614.

Table 2

Varimax Rotated Factor Loadings for American High School Students

Item – Each item is preceded with "To be a patriotic citizen"	Blind allegiance	Importance of emotional attachment	Constructive patriotism
16. It is important to agree with the government as it always acts in my best interests	0.634	0.132	-0.190

19. It is important to me as a citizen to support the majority political viewpoint in my country	0.629	-0.033	-0.065
5. It is important that I support the candidate of the political party I normally support, or my parents support	0.617	-0.123	-0.182
8. It is necessary to support without question the political leaders of the country	0.553	0.090	-0.240
20. It is important to be proud of the country of which I am a citizen in all circumstances	0.462	0.531	-0.110
7. It is important that I support the candidate whose political platform most reflects my ideals and goals for society, even if it means supporting the political party I or my family do not usually align myself with	-0.436	0.320	0.362
3. It is important to accept that my government generally makes the correct decisions for the good of the country	0.435	0.237	-0.181
18. It is necessary to be emotionally attached to the country of which I am a citizen	0.045	0.657	-0.087
14. It is necessary to restrict my emotional attachment to the country of which I am a citizen	0.343	-0.584	0.169
11. It is important to be proud of the country of which I am a citizen and still recognize its limitations	0.034	0.517	0.220
17. It is important to support your country's policies to the fullest in times of war	0.274	0.499	-0.386
9. It is important to understand the great accomplishments in the history of the nation as it helps me to appreciate why the country is great	0.224	0.495	0.299
6. It is important to understand the historical failures of the nation as it helps identify the challenges that may face the country in the present	-0.079	0.227	0.568
10. It is important to understand and educate myself on the shortcomings of the government of my country	-0.116	0.029	0.473
15. It is important to feel free to question your country's policies in times of war	0.046	-0.180	0.445
1. It is necessary to critically question the political leaders of the country	-0.156	-0.169	0.435
13. It is important to disagree with the government if it is in the interest of the welfare of the nation and its people	-0.246	0.018	0.397
12. It is important to me as a citizen to feel free to support minority political views in my country	-0.075	-0.014	0.380

4. It is important for me to be informed on the political situation in other nations as it helps me to understand more about my own country	-0.117	0.174	0.336
2. It is necessary for me to be solely concerned with the well being of my country	0.281	0.206	0.094

Comparison between American and English High School students

Given the similarity in factor structure between the English and American samples, it appeared that students in both countries were interpreting the items similarly. As such, several independent samples t-tests were carried out in order to compare mean levels of Constructive Patriotism, Blind Allegiance, and Importance of Emotional Attachment between students in England and America. Prior to carrying out my tests, the items that loaded the same across the three subscales were averaged within person to form composite indices of Constructive Patriotism, Blind Allegiance, and Importance of Emotional Attachment.

The first comparison involved a comparison of the English and American students on Constructive Patriotism. Results from the independent samples t-test indicated a statistically significant difference in means between the English and American high school students on Constructive Patriotism, $t(238) = -3.656$, $p < 0.001$. The mean (Mean = 4.0625, SD = 0.4822) of the American student sample was greater than the mean (Mean = 3.8208, SD = 0.5402) of the English student sample.

The second independent samples t-test compared the two student groups on Blind Allegiance. On this factor there was no significant difference between American High School students (Mean = 2.5777, SD = 0.7907) and English High School students (Mean = 2.4861, SD = 0.6185), $t(238) = -1.067$, $p = 0.287$.

The final independent samples t-test compared the two student samples on Importance of Emotional Attachment. Results from the independent samples t-test indicated a statistically significant difference in means between the English and American High School students on Importance of Emotional Attachment, t (238) = -2.732, p = 0.007. The mean of the American student sample (Mean = 3.5316, SD = 0.6546) was greater than the mean (Mean = 3.2850, SD = 0.6546) and English High School students.

Differences in Factor Loadings on Items Between Samples

When looking at the Varimax rotation there were three factors interpreted using a loading criterion of |.30| or above. Within those factor loadings there were some differences of interest. First was the change in the dominant factor. In England the dominant factor was Constructive patriotism, followed by Importance of emotional attachment and Blind allegiance. In the American sample the dominant factor was Blind allegiance, followed by Importance of emotional attachment and Constructive patriotism.

Within those factors some differences were exhibited between the English and American samples on the same items. Item 20, "It is important to be proud of the country of which I am a citizen and still recognize its limitations", loaded on Constructive patriotism for the English sample at 0.417 and on the American sample at -0.110. On item 5, "It is important that I support the candidate of the political party I normally support, or my parents support", although both samples loaded on Blind patriotism above |.30| the American sample loaded at 0.617 whereas the English sample

loaded at 0.324. Finally of interest is item 1, "It is necessary to critically question the political leaders of the country", which loaded at 0.435 on Constructive patriotism for the American sample but loaded at 0.289 on the English sample.

Qualitative Analysis of English and American High School Students

As the factor analysis demonstrated English and American High School students interpreted the terms of the survey in similar manners. The dominant factors that presented themselves in the quantitative analysis: Blind Allegiance, Importance of Emotional Attachment, and Constructive Patriotism act as umbrellas under which themes emerged that are consistent with students' perceptions in both countries.

The themes that were common to students in both nations and would fall under Constructive patriotism were:

1). Constructive definitions

2). National welfare

3). Active citizenship

4). Challenging the government

5). Role of history in defining identity

The themes that were common to students in both nations and would fall under Importance of Emotional Attachment were:

1). National pride

2). Emotional bond

The themes that were common to students in both nations and would fall under Blind allegiance were:

1). Blind definitions

2). Nationalism

3). Safeguarding government

4). Manipulations of history

There were however three themes that were not common and only evident in the English classrooms, and one theme that was only evident in the classrooms in the United States. The themes unique to England were:

1). Class

2). Multinational backgrounds

3). "Local/community" patriotism

The theme unique to the United States was:

1). Questioning nationalism

The qualitative discussion will first address the similarities that exist in the qualitative data. The similarities will then be followed by those elements unique to England and the United States.

Similarities regarding the comments between students in England and the U.S.

There are similar themes that emerged for the qualitative data that can be discussed. Under the dominant factor termed Constructive Patriotism five themes emerged. Each of these themes was addressed by students in all of the schools in England and the United States. The first theme named "Constructive definitions"

demonstrated that in both nations students do have an awareness of a patriotism that requires participation in a democracy and upholding ideals that "promote positive change and consistency with the nations ideals" (Kahne & Middaugh, 2007). In the inner-city school in England a response from a female Year 13 student, which was reflective of other responses in the English schools, discussed patriotism in saying, "because if the government isn't doing something right for the country you have to help them and make sure a change is made in line with what the nation historically stands for". This statement, which identifies the two core fundamentals of the definition of constructive patriotism offered by Kahne and Middaugh, positive change, and being representative of the ideals of the nation, was also represented in the school classed as inner city in the United States. In this situation a male Hispanic senior student defined patriotism as

> Patriotism is probably like how dedicated you are to your country. I mean you have people that all go out for USA, America, you have your military. People normally think it's just the military, but I'm sure there are patriotic- they're in the military- but I mean, some view of patriotism is more your government. You know you have to step in as a person. I remember one of the questions on the survey was do you support your government kind of thing but if you support your government, they have to support you like you can't just have a government that is pulling off whatever they want, you know, you have to have some involvement for change.

Both students in both situations, and this was repeated at every location by at least one student were able to present an understanding of a constructive form of patriotism.

A second theme that emerged and would fall under Constructive Patriotism is "National welfare". These responses were all concerned with themes of well-being and sustenance of the nation. A student in the urban school in England said "I think you should care for your country…the well-being of it like if you believe in the country you should stand up for it". This notion was replicated in the United States, in the urban school with a sophomore girl discussing patriotism as "I love my country and I respect it, and I respect the government even if I don't usually agree with all of the decisions they have made I care about what is happening to the country". Narrative in all the schools reflected some recognition of this idea.

A third theme that emerged was named "Active citizenship". In both nations it was evident throughout the narrative that students understood an idea of the citizen as being an active role rather a passive one. The active citizen was specific in that it was a personal statement that they, as individuals, would be personally willing to do something for the good of the nation. The Year 13 male student in the suburban school in England stated,

> Well I'm really interested in law and looking at the House of Commons and seeing what goes through. I feel by doing law it's opened my eyes a bit more to the political side of it. But when I was little I didn't really take much notice. But when you start to vote, you have to start thinking I'm actually going to be part of

it and making that decision. You have to start realizing you have to start doing things yourself

This personal action of actively involving oneself in politics is demonstrative of a constructive approach to patriotism and is not unique to students in England. This approach, though not as specific to an active involvement in politics, was also evident in a senior girl in the suburban school in the United States. When asked about standing up to the government if it was doing something bad she said "…nothings perfect because it is still run by human beings, so there is going to be corruption, so if it is for the general good then yeah I would stand up against it."

The fourth theme that emerged under the factor Constructive Patriotism was themed "Challenging the government". When discussing the role of the individual students were aware that it might be necessary to challenge the position of the government if it violated the ideals of the nation. In the inner-city English school a Year 13 girl said the following:

> a majority of the time if people don't agree with certain things introduced by the government or if they do agree, then you definitely get the views of the people. For example, free protest, if they don't agree with certain things or through complaints or suggestions or stuff like that...most of the time people feel free to air their views if they don't agree, and that's kind of an essential part to being a patriotic citizen.

This theme was also reiterated in the inner city American when a sophomore boy when asked whether patriotism was an important part of society he responded, "I think it really is. I think things don't get run right if nobody cares. Sometime to care is

to ask questions I think". The idea of government question was a theme that ran deep in both samples of students. Students were very aware that part of maintaining the ideals of the nation might require citizens to act and question the establishment if there appeared to be a violation of the nations ideals.

The final theme that emerged was called the "Role of history in defining identity". In this theme the identity concerned how the student perceived themselves as either American, or English, and how this influenced their perception of patriotism. In the suburban school in England a Year 11 boy said the following when asked about how he perceived patriotism.

> Being proud of where you come from and who you are, not being afraid if someone is deriding you country not being afraid to just go we know who we are…you have to have everything in moderations. You have to be proud of your country, but if you were proud of the bad things we did like the massacre when we had the empire or something like cheering that on or the Nazi side of patriotism would be bad.

What is evident in this situation is that students were aware that it might be important to understand the negative aspects of national history in order to recognize the limits of patriotism. This recognition was raised by a Sophomore girl in the urban school in the United States when she introduced the idea of America having "deficiencies" and stated "I mean recognize the errors, the mistakes made in history, or the mistakes being currently made that would cause harm to the people or the welfare, not only of the country, but of the rest of the world".

Under the dominant factor termed Importance of Emotional Attachment two themes emerged. Each of these themes were addressed by students in all of the schools in England and the United States. The first theme was called "National pride" and was structured with comments concerning the feelings associated with importance of the nation. These were not necessarily nationalist statements, rather individual statements that represented pride in their respective country. When responding to how they defined patriotism a Year 13 girl in the suburban school stated, "being proud of where you come from and who you are, not being afraid if someone is deriding you country, not being afraid to just to know who we are." This comment when it was said was not a confrontational statement but it was an example of a young lady who was aware that she was proud of her country and was willing to state it in discussion. This sense of national pride was also evident in the remarks of the sophomore boy at the urban school who interestingly gave an analogy to patriotism as being the same as school spirit in supporting the country. This statement of pride did not state the United States was better than other nations, but it was presented as follows, "It's kind of like school spirit at school. If we didn't have school spirit, our sports teams would not be as good, we would not have fans in the stands to cheer on our players." The reason why this was interesting was for this student throughout his entire interview the focus was not on the superiority of the nation, but on the need for sentiment in order for the individual to have an investment that brings dividends for everyone else.

The second theme that emerged and was common to students in both nations was termed "Emotional attachment " and was something present in a least one student from all the schools. The emotional attachment was specifically recognized by a Year

12 girl in the inner-city school when she stated, "isn't it how a person feels about their country and identity from that country and basically their feelings toward it like feeling proud of where you are from and the country you are in and yeah just things like that, your emotions towards the country really." When pushed further about whether the emotion was necessarily positive or negative she said, "I'm not sure. I don't know. It sounds like being a patriot of your country is a positive thing, but I'm not exactly sure." This is an interesting statement as it demonstrates that despite a focus on citizenship education in England, and also interestingly the girl stated she was an Army Cadet, there was no specific recognition whether patriotism was positive or negative. What was stated however was that she said "I love this country" and that joining the Army Cadets was her way of giving something back. A similar idea was presented but in a far more direct way in the urban school in America. A sophomore boy said "I think patriotism is an emotional response which people feel within a particular country when they feel a very strong tie to a particular country, a particular society, a particular culture." What stood out in this instance was that the student said after that this emotional response should not be "recognized as inherently noble or dignified."

Under the dominant factor Blind Allegiance four themes emerged. The first theme was termed "Blind definitions" and consisted of multiple constructions of patriotism that demonstrated an understanding that patriotism was concerned with unquestioned allegiance to the nation. This theme was replete with examples from students such as the Year 13 boy from the urban school who stated in discussion about patriotism, "I think it is about having a passion for your country and doing the right thing for your country and supporting what the government does." Responses in this

theme ranged from those that just stated support for the nation "most of the time" such as the senior boy in the inner city school in the United States who said, "I think patriotism is like supporting your country, and like the military, and like the government even though the government, you might not always agree with it, but you support it most of the time." To statements that offered an unequivocal statement that you need to trust the government in all situations like this from a sophomore boy at the urban school

> I think that we should be behind our country in all matters and be emotionally on our countries side and have all of our will into helping our country perform to the best of our abilities instead of being kind of in the middle instead of being and not being behind our country; that's what patriotic means as a citizen is to support our country.

Certainly it was refreshing to note however, that in this discussion the student was discussing a patriotic action that was for the purpose of, in his words, "helping our country perform to the best of our abilities." It was not from his perspective about helping the government but rather aiding in the good of the nation as a whole.

The second theme was named "Nationalism". Although it was present, even if not explicitly named, in at least one of the interviews at each site it was theme that was more prevalent in the American schools. In the English schools there were references such as this from a Year 13 boy in the suburban school,

> If you use patriotism in like something in what you really want to say, Communist can say they are patriotic because they want to share everything for everyone in the country but then nationalist could say they are patriotic because

they get rid of people who aren't actually English. It's like a buzzword to make it seem more acceptable.

This reference to nationalism was concerned more with how patriotism and nationalism become intertwined as political statements in the eyes of the students, whereas the statements from the American students were often far more explicit and demonstrated a greater acknowledgement about what nationalism, in there eyes, may entail. This statement was from a Year 13 boy in the inner-city school

> I believe if you have patriotism, you can relate to the nationalism as well. I believe it is showing loyalty and true meaning for your country. And by meaning I mean showing that you understand the values of the country and how to exploit them into the world and into the society of your country as well.

This concept of nationalism related to using subjective concepts of what American values are and then interestingly those values become a vehicle through which exploitation can occur on both a domestic and an international level. A sophomore boy at the same inner city school said

> Nationalism is pride in your country from my understanding; its pride that your country is the best, and that other countries aren't necessarily the best. So patriotism is, I mean they kind of coincide, but I mean at the same time they are different in the fact that they don't always, like if you are going to be nationalistic and patriotic is two different things, and that I mean, sometimes doing what's doing what's patriotic isn't always what's nationalistic because it may not be what the country itself is putting out.

What was very interesting following this was that he stated that "being patriotic is only required on the fourth of July" and the rest of the time "the country is more centered around ourselves." This focus more on the idea, for this student, that nationalism is required on a day-to-day basis to support the country, and patriotism is potentially more associated with symbols and key holidays throughout the year.

The third theme that emerged was called "safeguarding government". This theme contained essential characteristics where the students appeared to defend government action even if they were aware that the government might potentially be involved in actions that negative to the well being of the nation. This focus was mainly concerned with war situations. When asked a question about how you can support your country a Year 13 girl from the inner-city school in England said, "by like not questioning it and stuff like if the government makes decisions to say go to war, you'd be like yeah and support it and understand they're doing it for the good of the people." When asked whether it was good not to question the government she responded, "yes". In an interview with a sophomore girl at the suburban school there was a focus on supporting the government regardless as being patriotic, and further suggested disagreement was unpatriotic. When asked whether it was possible to not support the government and still be patriotic she said, "I don't think so. I don't think it is. You kind of have to support the government…I don't think it means the government is doing anything bad, but it kind of means you are unpatriotic because you are disagreeing."

The fourth theme that emerged was called "Manipulations of history." This theme contained references in which students discussed situations in which they were either choosing to actively ignore historical events, or they felt history had been

manipulated therefore situations that would mean they would not question their nation. In this situation in the suburban school in England a Year 13 boy said when asked about whether British history had been manipulated in school,

> Some bits have been glossed over like what we did when we had the empire, like using machine guns on people or army spears have been glossed over. Well, let people know but just tell them about it don't say oh we did that so we are bad. Just say that's what we did. It was at the time the right thing, possibly

This idea that history can be ignored, or that massacres can be "glossed over" in order to not interrupt ones understanding of patriotism is interesting. In the inner city school in America a sophomore boy said the following:

> I think patriotism is standing up for what's right because that's what our country was founded on in the first place, America. America was founded, and the patriots were the people who stood up for what they believed in because they realized that King George and the people oppressing them were not giving them the rights that they deserved.

Clearly this statement represents a belief of the student, or an opinion fostered by instruction through his U. S. History classes. What it serves as an example of how history may have been reduced to an easily digestible idea that all colonists were oppressed and universally supported a revolution against a tyrannical British government who actively sought to remove their liberties. This reading of history is false, it helps feed patriotic ideals, but it is far more complex which is often inconvenient for many US history teachers to instruct.

Differences between students in England and the United States

When addressing the qualitative data three themes emerged that were unique to the schools in England and one theme emerged that was unique to the schools in the United States.

The first theme was termed "Class". This theme was prevalent at all three schools and concerned the idea that patriotism was a class issue and those who were either better educated, or of a higher social class, or both, might be more patriotic. When addressing the focus on class the majority of the students who discussed this were either in the very diverse inner-city school located in a relatively low income borough of London, or in the majority white suburban school located in a fairly affluent suburb of Birmingham. In the inner city school a Year 13 girl discussed her idea that the government are biased toward the middle class and her intimation appeared to be that this results in the middle class being more patriotic,

> Like if the government does something wrong and you don't believe they are picking like the biased towards something….like people's backgrounds at times and how much they earn like their service background and stuff whether they are like professional or working classes…someone that who can afford to send their child to private school without struggling and they more like patriotic

In the suburban school another approach to class and patriotism was perceived. Whereas the young lady in the discussion above appeared to suggest that the government favored those who might "send their child to a private school", a young man in Year 11 said it was working professionals who agree with what the government

want and conform to appear patriotic, "a lot of business men and stuff like that I find agree with what the country does a lot."

The second theme was termed "Multinational backgrounds" and was concerned really with impact of being an immigrant, or being from a family where parents were immigrants, had on perceptions of race and patriotism. Students in all three schools were very aware that patriotism for some observers could easily be manipulated into racism. Others were struggling with their position in society as both English and belonging to another nation. In the urban school which is 66% minority students predominantly of Indian or Pakistan descent a white student appeared to play down the idea of there being an English patriotism.

> I would say now a days Britain's a very multiculturalist society, so it has a lot of traditions from other countries as well now that you could define as now being British traditions like from either St. George's day of St. Patrick's day, I think it's all just mingled….I don't think it's important to be patriotic, if you want to be considered British.

A white student in the suburban school, which had a minority enrollment of 12%, approached the multinational background from a different perspective addressing issues of race in terms of what can and cannot be discussed in society without being labeled a racist. This interaction was very interesting, as it appeared to demonstrate a perceived threat felt by the student.

Interviewer: What do you think patriotism is?

> Student: Like everyone says sticking up for your country, but its having your opinion at a certain time but I think it's very different now due to the different

cultures and due to the fact we are all brought up not to out our opinions now. Like, I've been brought up to have an opinion, but you can't voice it as much in our society.

Why do you think we can't voice that opinion?

Because of being called racists if that different cultures, like within Birmingham there are so many different cultures, you can't voice because you get into trouble and what not. It has to be quite close now to yourself; you can't say much.

Do you think that's a good or a bad thing to be so guarded, maybe?

I think it's a bad thing, but that's the way I've been brought up because my dad's very. I've been brought up by my dad and he's like you got to voice your opinion against different people, but society don't let you, so it's quite difficult.

So do you think you should be able to say something?

Yeah but it's very difficult to do now. You don't mean nastily. Sometimes you say stuff that you don't actually mean, but due to the different cultures, people take it so many different ways, so there's things that you can't do.

Do you think that's an unpatriotic thing to not be able to express your opinion?

Yeah, I think you should be able too. Because obviously if you were born like here, you've been brought up to be patriotic you should be able too. You can be like yourself, but you've got to be able to show it as well to prove your family to your country, sort of thing.

This interaction was very interesting as the student, though never raising his voice, consistently fidgeted in his seat, and looked around the room as if he was expecting to get in trouble about his ideas. This focus certainly was not present in the

inner-city school, which had a 75% minority enrolment. Unlike the urban school, where the majority of students were descended from family in Pakistan and India, the students in the inner-city school were from multiple locations throughout the world including Nigeria, India, Pakistan, Jamaica, Ghana and many more. The focus on the multinational background at this school was concerned more with the opportunity that England and its society potentially present. As a Year 13 girl discussed,

> like a lot of friends who come from different backgrounds, and they do appreciate everyone where they come from. Deep down they actually appreciate it, but other people they act like they do. We are lucky to live where we do and have this school and different things like that. We're lucky to have it, but some people don't show it. Deep down they've got to care somewhere, I think maybe.

The final theme that emerged was what I termed "Local/community" patriotism. This theme is based around the school in which there was a great deal of diversity, and particularly with the inner-city students in London. At this school, with a minority enrolment of 75%, a recurring theme that presented itself was that students stated their patriotism was to "London" or to one of the boroughs within the city. It appeared that where there was more diversity, the patriotic focus came closer to where they actually lived and the communities that helped support them. Comments included "I love living in London; I don't think I'd like living anywhere else", "it's more of a diverse community rather than just one community…I don't know I am just used to this environment, and I have never lived outside of London so what I know is only here in London" and references to London boroughs "Lewisham", "Catford", "Peckham" and "Bermondsey" as holding specific value rather than being English were present.

Although there were mentions to the value of the community in both of the other schools in the English sample, it was in the school in London that there was specific and repeated mentions of the local community in the discussion of patriotism.

The theme that was unique in America was termed "Questioning nationalism". Within this theme in America students made references to doubting the role of nationalism in society. In the urban school a sophomore boy the discussion went as follows.

Interviewer: What do you think the difference is between nationalism and patriotism?

> Student: I think nationalism is an extreme form of patriotism which reaches the point where every single element of a country- its culture, every single element of a country is celebrated and said to be superior to all other countries. Patriotism, I would say, is a softer form of nationalism. I would say that patriotism under the right conditions can become nationalistic.

Do you think that patriotism is an important part of society today in America?

> I would say that it is highly valued by many people in America. I would say that it is not necessarily an important element of American society; however, I feel that American society over values patriotism.

Okay why do you say over values?

> Well I mean you look at the American political system, in order to get elected you practically have to say the American government is infallible in everything it does, almost. You get criticized for criticizing the US. You get criticized almost alienated for criticizing the United States government or many of its allies overseas.

This insightful position from the student demonstrated a highly critical position in understanding the role of government in his life. His position may have been the most articulate, but it was not the sole statement that questioned nationalism in this manner. A sophomore girl at the suburban American school discussed this element of patriotism as being "like learned behavior, like something they make students do in school, like the Pledge of Allegiance and stuff." This questioning of nationalism and the role the government has in potentially training people to think in a certain way was never addressed in any of the English schools in which interviews took place.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

This study investigated the perceptions of patriotism held by high school students in the United States and high school students in England. In order to obtain this information the study incorporated a Likert scale survey that asked various questions concerning patriotism to high school students in both nations. The Likert scale surveys were put through exploratory factor analysis in order to understand the multi-dimensionality of the students' perceptions of patriotism. Survey information was complemented by follow-up interviews, which were transcribed and analyzed for emergent themes.

The purpose of the study was to address the potential for students in both nations to maintain the "special relationship" between the United State and England by addressing their perception of patriotism. Through addressing their perceptions of patriotism in both countries it is possible to view both the current nature of student's understanding of citizenship in both countries, while simultaneously looking to the future potential for them to mature into adults who can successfully negotiate and protect their nation's economic, political and social ideals in a globalized and interdependent world. This research is specifically intended to help identify opportunities to promote education on democratic patriotism for students, as this form of patriotism is more likely to maintain self-governance and the preservation of civil liberties, not just in the United States or England, but also in those nations that share the fundamental characteristics of democratic governments.

The study attempted to address the following:

1. Are students able to discern between patriotism and nationalism?
2. How does education on patriotism, whether it be mandated as in the UK with the national curriculum, or non-mandated but recommended as in the United States, influence student's interpretation of the concept?

In answering these questions, a perspective can be obtained that may begin to address the following questions.

3. How can two nations with an "enduring special relationship", foster continued ties despite their differences in citizenship education?
4. How will students' interpretations of patriotism impact international relations between the two nations in the future?

Types of patriotism and questions of nationalism

Through the comparison of quantitative and qualitative data it was evident that students in both nations favored a constructive form of patriotism over a blind form of patriotism. This was specifically seen in the comparison of means between England and the United States where independent samples t-test indicated a statistically significant difference in means between the English and American high school students on Constructive Patriotism, $t(238) = -3.656$, $p < 0.001$. The mean (Mean = 4.0625, SD = 0.4822) of the American student sample was greater than the mean (Mean = 3.8208, SD = 0.5402) of the English student sample. As both of the nations demonstrated an understanding of constructive patriotism it is suggested that students have the ability to consider multiple viewpoints in their decision-making processes that maintain the ideals

of their respective government structures. This ability points to the potential for citizens of both nations to be able to continue discussion based on the democratic principles in the international arena in the future.

From the qualitative data it was also suggested that students, especially those in America, were able to distinguish between nationalism and patriotism. Despite what may be perceived in the media, where talking heads appear to occupy opposite ends of the political spectrum, the reality is that students, at least in the samples addressed, may be able to discern the complex nature of patriotism. Their focus on constructive patriotism, in lieu of a blind patriotism, may indicate that students are potentially presented with the critical tools to look beyond the media and partisanship in understanding their role as citizens. This discernment indicates that students recognize that loving one's country can be expressed in many different forms of patriotism.

Role of mandated education in both nations

When considering the lack of mandated citizenship education in the United States this ability to distinguish between types of patriotism raises some interesting points. Evidently, at least for the sample of students that was addressed in the study, the influence of education either in the classroom, or in other developmental situations such as the home, church, or other environments has superseded the lack of formal guidelines at the federal level. Concepts of patriotism are important to society in the United States, and even if presented by the media in partisan or nationalistic forms, education has may provide students with the critical ability to exercise personal judgment when it comes to issues of citizenship. What may be an issue to consider with this finding is the role of

patriotic ritual in the school experience may play in the lives of students in the United States. When means were compared on the Importance to Emotional Attachment factor, results from the independent samples t-test indicated a statistically significant difference in means between the English and American High School students on Importance of Emotional Attachment, t (238) = -2.732, p = 0.007. The mean of the American student sample (Mean = 3.5316, SD = 0.6546) was greater than the mean (Mean = 3.2850, SD = 0.6546) and English High School students. There is no patriotic ritual similar to the Pledge of Allegiance in English schools, and also national anthems prior to high school sporting events in England are also absent. American high school students from an early age are introduced to these rituals and this repetition may potentially result in American high school students having a greater emotional attachment to the country.

What has more importance in England, according to the Citizenship section of the National Curriculum in England, is the fluid nature of relationships. The introductory paragraph to the Citizenship section of the curriculum discusses engagement in "topical and controversial issues", "rights responsibilities, duties and freedoms", "laws, justice and democracy" and "decision-making and forms of action" (Dept. of Education, 2007). The next paragraph is solely concerned with respect, relationships and understanding a changing world.

> Citizenship encourages respect for different national, religious, ethnic identities. It equips students to engage critically with and explore diverse ideas, beliefs, cultures and identities and values we share as citizens in the UK. Students begin

to understand how society has changed and is changing in the U.K, Europe and the wider world (p. 41).

This recognition of an ever-changing world in which the students are going to need to demonstrate an understanding of multiple viewpoints is essential in a country like England, especially so in major cities like London and Birmingham with large minority populations. By that account when addressing the qualitative data it was evident from the three emergent themes that were unique to England—class, multinational backgrounds and "local/community" patriotism, that an awareness of the need to respect the rights of others is evident in the students. Particularly in the school in London where minority enrolment was 75%, there was a movement to more of a focus on what was termed "local/community" patriotism. Banks (2008) recognizes this lack of citizenship education directed at the local community as being a key issue in American education. Identity and protection was prescribed to the local area primarily, and then to the nation as a whole secondarily. Whether this awareness is a result of citizenship education in the schools, or a product of general socialization would vary from student to student. The schools in the United States were from a far more homogenous location in terms of ethnic makeup, and indeed political affiliation, and it is interesting to note that was very little reference to finding attachment to the local community rather than the nation as a whole.

In the suburban school in England, which had the lowest minority population of all the schools studied at 12%, it was very interesting that in discussion the school actively promoted an event called "Unity and Diversity", which gave students the opportunity to present various religious and ethnic positions to local primary school

students. This was part of the citizenship curriculum, which they are mandated to have once a week. The teacher said the "students embraced the event", which in her words was to address, "what it is to live in diversity, what your rights are as a citizen, what everyone's rights are in the country, even if they aren't citizens." The traditional definition of patriotism introduced at the beginning of Chapter 2 concerned "having love and protection of one's country at its foundation." Students in England, under the formal guidance of the government through the schools, or informal education outside traditional learning environments, appear to include the protection of others as a constituent part of their patriotism. When looking at both the mandated education in England, and the non-mandated education in the United States it appears that both systems are having the potential effect of producing citizens who, at least in the schools studied, favor a constructive patriotism over a blind patriotism and therefore are protecting democratic ideals and civil liberties suggesting common values on which the future relationships can be established.

Within the factor loadings there were some differences between the English and American samples. On item 20, "It is important to be proud of the country of which I am a citizen and still recognize its limitations", loaded on Constructive patriotism for the English sample at 0.417 and on the American sample at -0.110. This raises interesting issues, as it is evident that students from the two countries understood the question differently. The difference in interpretation may be partly due to the socioeconomics involved as the three schools in the United States were either private schools, or a large public school located in a university town. It is possible that students in the American schools may not have been exposed to histories or multicultural

education that presented alternate viewpoints due to the relatively homogenous nature of the schools studied not promoting such initiatives. As Banks (2008) suggests there are issues concerning "how to recognize and legitimize difference and yet construct an overarching national identity that incorporates the voices, experiences, and hopes of the diverse group that compose it" (p. 133). In a relatively homogenous environment in a state in which all 77 counties voted Republican in the 2012 election, students may not have an idea that limitations exist in the political structure. On item 5, "It is important that I support the candidate of the political party I normally support, or my parents support", although both samples loaded on Blind patriotism above |.30|, the American sample loaded at 0.617 whereas the English sample loaded at 0.324. As discussed above, the surveys were administered in a state in which there is a heavy Republican leaning, certainly when presented with very little political discussion and few options this style of Blind allegiance may be more evident.

This study adds to the literature in specifically addressing the multidimensional perspectives of patriotism specifically held by high school students. Studies have specifically addressed university students and their perceptions of patriotism (Schatz, Staub and Levine, 1999), or mixed 24 high school student's understanding with a larger sample of 239 university students (Kosterman and Feschbach, 1989), so the specific study of 240 students in a cross-cultural comparison is unique and supplements the research that has been already published. In particular it adds weight to the study by Kahne and Middaugh (2006) and supports their outcome that students, in their study in "diverse" schools in California, also favor constructive patriotism over blind patriotism (p. 603).

In addition, the research also provides justification for the current path of a nationally mandated approach to citizenship education that focuses on issues of pluralism in England. The results demonstrated that, at least in the sample of students studied, children were potentially being given the tools to interact with diverse populations, whilst maintaining and understanding their own unique character.

Finally, when addressing the students studied, there appears to be justification for allowing the state and local government to determine citizenship education requirements in the United States of America so that patriotic education adapts to the needs of the local community. The unique situation of each school requires specific curriculum that can go beyond symbols like the flag, and into patriotic education that aligns itself with democratic ideals.

The "Enduring Special Relationship"

To conclude, it is evident that the students were studied share a similar understanding of the terms used to discuss patriotism. Even though students may not use terms like constructive and blind patriotism, they are able to explain characteristics of the concepts. As the factor analysis demonstrated their understanding of the key constituents of patriotism share similar fundamental characteristics between nations, alongside some unique elements that are specific to the local environments in which the schools were situated. Such shared language, which also maintains distinct national identities, is essential in our increasingly interdependent existence. In this world, in which critical infrastructures can be compromised through terrorist attacks, catastrophic natural disasters, and systems failures that compromise national security and public

safety, it is important that nations maintain their alliances with sovereign nations that share the same ideals. For this reason a continued relationship between the United States and England is fundamental not just to those two nations, but also to the stability of all states who share the same democratic ideals. This research would suggest, at least in the small sample of students studied, that the next generation of adults has the tools to critically consider their patriotic action for the protection of their political state, and others that seek the democratic ideals.

References

Abell, J., Condor, S., Lowe, R., Gibson, S. & Stevenson, C. (2007) Who ate all the pride? Patriotic sentiment and English national football. *Nations and Nationalism,13* (1), 97–116.

Adams, A. (1776). *Letters between Abigail Adams and her husband John Adams.* Retrieved from http://www.thelizlibrary.org/suffrage/abigail.htm

American History and Civics Education Act, H. R. 1078, 108d Cong. (2003).

Anzaldua, G. (1987). *Borderlands: the new mestiza = La frontera*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute.

Bader, M. (2006). The psychology of patriotism. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(8), 582–584.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, Group Identity, and Citizenship Education in a Global Age. *Educational Researcher,* 37(3), 129-139.

Bahmueller, C (Ed.), (1991). *CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education*. Calabasa, CA: Center for Civic Education.

Barrow, L. (1989). White solidarity in 1914. In R. Samuel (Ed.), *Patriotism volume I: History and politics* (pp. 275–287). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bell, A. (2008). *London was ours. Diaries and memoirs of the London Blitz.* New York, NY: I. B. Tauris.

Bell, J., Frazier, T., Godfrey, M., McPherson. J. & Moore, M. (Eds). (1991). *Eyewitness and others: Readings and American history, Volume 1: Beginnings to 1865.* Orlando, FL: Holt Rhinehart & Winston.

Bellamy, F. (1953). *The Story of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, Volume VIII. Number 2,* University of Rochester Library Archives.

Bennett, L. (2004). Classroom recitation of the pledge of allegiance and its educational value: Analysis, review and proposal. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 20 (Fall 2004), 56 – 75

Billingsley, H., & Dee, J. (1570). *The elements of geometrie.* London: Daye.

Black, J. (1994). *British foreign policies in an age of revolutions, 1783–1793.* New York, NY: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Black, J. (2012). The war of 1812. *History Today, 62*(10), 10–12.

Brennan, G. (2003). *Patriotism, power and print.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press

Butts, R. (1989). T*he civic mission in educational reform*. Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press.

Cafaro, P. (2009). Patriotism as an environmental virtue. *Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Ethics*. 23,185-206. Doi: 10.1007/s10806-009-9189-y

Calhoun, C. (Ed). (2002). *The human tradition in America from the colonial era through Reconstruction*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources.

Camicia, S. & Zhu, J. (2011). Citizenship education under discourses of nationalism, globalization, and cosmopolitanism: Illustrations from China and the United States. *Frontiers of Education in China*. 6 (4), 602-619. Doi: 10.1007/s11516-011-0147-x

Carrington, B. & Short, G. (1995). Citizenship and nationhood. in Leicester, M., Modgil, C. & Modgil, S. (Eds.), *Education, culture and values volume VI. Politics, education and citizenship* (pp. 183 – 193). New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Center for Civic Education (1991). *CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education.* Calabsas, CA: Center for Civic Education.

Center for Civic Education. (2010). *National standards for civics and government.* Retrieved from http://www.civiced.org/index.php?page=stds_toc_intro

Chiodo. J., Martin. L. & Worthington. A. Does it mean to die for your country? Preservice teachers' views regarding the pledge of allegiance. *The Educational Forum, 75*(1), 38–51.

Coby, J. (2009). *Thomas Cromwell: Machiavellian statecraft and the English Reformation*. Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.

Coram, R. (1791) Political inquiries, to which is added a plan for the establishment of schools throughout the United States. In C. Hyneman & D. Lutz (Eds.) *American Political Writing During the Founding Era: 1760-1805* (1983). Retrieved from http://oll.libertyfund.org/title/2068/188771

Corcoran, T. & Goertz, M. (2005). The governance of public education. In Fuhrman, S. & Lazerson, M (Eds.), The public schools (p. 25 – 56). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Crano, W. & Brewer, M. (2002). *Principles and methods of social research*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publisher.

Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Cronbach, L. (1951). Co-efficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16,* 297–334.

Cruickshanks, E. (2000). *The Glorious Revolution.* New York, NY: St Martin's Press.

Cunningham, H. (1989). The language of patriotism. In R. Samuel (Ed.), *Patriotism volume I: History and politics* (pp. 57–89). New York, NY: Routledge.

Davis, J. (2006). Albert and the Great Exhibition of 1851. In C. Litzenberger & E. Groth Lyon (Eds.), *The human tradition in modern Britain* (pp. 95–110). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

de Marrais, K. & Lappan, S. (2004). *Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

de Tocqueville, A. (1835/1994). *Democracy in America.* London, UK: Random House.

Department of Education (2007). Citizenship 2007 Programme of Study for Key St 3. *Department of Education.* Retrieved from http://www.education.gov.uk/schoolsteachingandlearning/curriculum/secondary/b00199157/citizenship/ks3/programme

Department of Education (2011). Review of the National Curriculum. *Department of Education.* Retrieved from http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/curriculum/nationalcurriculum

Department of Education (2012). Guide: The National Curriculum. *Department of Education.* Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/national-curriculum/key-stage-3-4

Denscombe, M. (2003). *The good research guide for small scale research projects.* Glasgow, Scotland: Bell & Bain Publishing Company.

Dewey, J. (1916). In J. Gouinlock (Ed.), (1994). *The Moral Writings of John Dewey.* Amherst, NY: Prometheus.

Diemer, G. & Mullen, B. (1930). *Pupil citizenship.* Yonders-on-Hudson, NY: World Book Company.

Dinwiddy, J. (1991). Interpretations of anti-Jacobinism. In M. Philp (Ed.), *The French Revolution and British popular politics.* New York, NY: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Dreier, P. & Flack, D. (2003). Patriotism and progressivism. *Peace Review*, *15*(4). 397–404

Duiker, W. & Spielvogel, J. (2004). *World History*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Eastwood, D. (1991). Patriotism and the English state in the 1790's. In M. Philp (Ed.), *The French Revolution and British popular politics.* New York, NY: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Edwards, J. & Fogelman, K. (1995), Citizenship education and cultural diversity. In Leicester, M., Modgil, C. & Modgil, S (Eds.), *Education, culture and values Volume VI. Politics, education and citizenship* (pp. 93–103). New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Edwards, G. & Stimpson, P. (2003). Environmental citizenship education. In Williams, M. & Humphreys, G (Eds.), *Citizenship education and lifelong learning* (p. 89 - 99). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Ellis, R. (2005). *To the flag: The unlikely history of the pledge of allegiance.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Emsley, C. (1991). Revolution war and the nation state. In M. Philp (Ed.), *The French Revolution and British popular politics.* New York, NY: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Evans, E. (2011). *The shaping of modern Britain.* Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Farragher, J., Buhle, M., Czitron, D. & Armitage. S. (2002). *Out of many*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

Ferguson, N. (2004). *Empire: The Rise and demise of the British world order and the lessons for global power.* New York. NY: Perseus.

Figueroa, P. (2004). Diversity and citizenship education in England. In Banks, J (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education* (pp. 219–244). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gallup. (2001). *Presidential approval ratings – George. W. Bush.* Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/116500/presidential-approval-ratings-george-bush.aspx

Gentles, I. (2011). *Oliver Cromwell.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmilan.

Graff, G. (2007). Another way to teach politically without P.C.: Teaching the debate about patriotism. In Westheimer, J. (Ed.), (2007). *Pledging allegiance. The politics of patriotism in American schools* (pp. 65–70). New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

Goldie, M. (1998). The Bill of Rights, 1689 and 1998. *History Today*, *48*(9), 10.

Greene, J. P., & Pole, J. R. (Eds.)., (2004). *A companion to the American Revolution.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Hanssen, S. (2006). G. K. Chesterton and British national identity in World War I. In C. Litzenberger & E. Groth Lyon (Eds.), *The human tradition in modern Britain* (pp. 187–199). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hegel, G. (1821). The Philosophy of Right. In Porter, J. (Ed.) (1989). *Classics in Political Philosophy* (pp. 418–433). Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall Canada.

Henretta, J., Brody, D., & Dumenil, L. (2002). *America a concise history: Second edition.* Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martins.

Jefferys, K. (1991). *The Churchill coalition and wartime politics, 1940 – 1945*. New York, NY: Manchester University Press.

Jefferson, T. (1818). *Report on (the) University of Virginia*. Retrieved from http://www.thejeffersonproject.org/history.html

Jensen, B. (2003). Patriotism's a bad idea at a dangerous time. *Peace Review*, *15*(4). 389–396.

Johanek, M. & Puckett. (2005). The state of civic education: Preparing citizens in an era of accountability. In Fuhrman, S. & Lazerson, M (Eds.), *The public schools* (pp. 130–159). University of Pennsylvania: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, R. & Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14–26.

Kahne, J. & Middaugh, E. (2006). Is patriotism good for democracy? A study of high school seniors' patriotic commitments. *Phi Delta Kappan,* Vol. 87 (Issue 8), pp. 600–607.

Kahne, J. & Middaugh, E. (2007). Is patriotism good for democracy? In Westheimer, J. (Ed.), *Pledging allegiance. The politics of patriotism in America's schools* (pp. 115–126). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kaplanoff, M. (2004). Confederation: movement for a stronger union. In Greene, J. P., & Pole, J. R. (Eds.), *A companion to the American Revolution*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Kerber, L. (1976). The Republican mother: Women and the Enlightenment—An American perspective, *American Quarterly, 28*(2), 187–205.

Kerr, D. (1999). *Re-examining citizenship education: the case of England.* Slough: NFER.

Kodelja, Z. (2011). Is education for patriotism morally required, permitted, or unacceptable. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30, 127-140. Doi:10.1007/s11217-011-9233-z

Kosterman, R. & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political psychology, 10*(10), 257–274.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). Once upon a time when patriotism was what you did. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *87*(8), 585–588.

Leepson, M. (2005). *Flag: An American perspective*. New York, NY: St Martins Press.

Locke, J. (1690). *The two treatises of government.* Retrieved from http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1690locke-sel.html

Lockwood, A. (2009). *The Case For Character Education: A Developmental Approach*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lummis, C. (1996). *Radical democracy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Machiavelli, N. (1517). The Discourses. In Porter, J. (Ed.) (1989). *Classics in Political Philosophy* (pp. 201–229). Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall Canada.

Marienstras, E. (2004). Nationality and citizenship. In Greene, J. P., & Pole, J. R. (Eds). *A companion to the American Revolution* (pp. 680–686). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Marsden, B. (2003). Hope springs eternal: Some historical reflections on citizenship education. In Williams, M. & Humphreys, G. (Eds.), *Citizenship Education and Lifelong Learning* (pp. 19–31). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Martorella, P. (1996). *Teaching social studies in secondary and middle schools.* Eaglewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Simon & Schuster.

McMillan, J. & Schumacher, S. (1989). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foreman and Company.

Migration Watch UK. (2001, August 10th). *The history of migration to the UK.* Retrieved from http://www.migrationwatchuk.com/pdfs/6_1_History_of_immigration.pdf

Mill, J (1859). On Liberty. In Porter, J. (Ed.) (1989). *Classics in Political Philosophy* (pp. 436–458). Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall Canada.

Miller, M. (2002). Rebecca Dickinson. A life alone in the early Republic. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *The human tradition in America from the colonial era through Reconstruction* (pp. 143–162). Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources.

Montesquieu, C. (1748). *The spirit of laws.* Retrieved from http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/montesquieu-spirit.html

Morris, W. (Ed). (1982). *American heritage dictionary of the English language*. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin.

Moyer, B. (2003, February 28th). *Bill Moyers on patriotism and the flag.* PBS. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/now/commentary/moyers19.html

National Council for the Studies (2012). Executive Summary. Retrieved http://www.socialstudies.org/standards/execsummary

Newspaper Marketing Agency. (2010, October 31st). *The Sun facts and figures.* Retrieved from http://www.nmauk.co.uk/nma/do/live/factsAndFigures?newspaperID=17

Newman, G. (1928). *Citizenship and the survival of civilization.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Niemi, N. & Niemi, R. (2007). Partisanship, participation, and political trust as taught (or not) in high school history and government classes. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 35*(1), 32–61.

Noguera, P. & Cohen, R. (2006). Patriotism and accountability: The role of educators in the war on terrorism. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(8), p. 573–578.

Nussbaum, M. Toward a globally sensitive patriotism. *Daedalus, 137*(3), 78–93.

Obama, B. (2010, August 31st). *Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on the End of Combat Operations in Iraq*. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/08/31/remarks-president-address-nation-end-combat-operations-iraq

Obama, B. (2012, March 14th). *Obama welcomes 'rock-solid' ally to White House.* Retrieved from http://www.defense.gov/News/NewsArticle.aspx?ID=67545.

Oklahoma PASS Preface (Accessed 2010, October 31st) Retrieved from http://www.sde.state.ok.us/Curriculum/PASS/default.html

Oklahoma PASS Social Studies (Accessed 2010, October 31st) Retrieved from http://sde.state.ok.us/Curriculum/PASS/Subject/socstud.pdf

Oklahoma Secondary Schools Activities Association (2012). *ADM list*. Retrieved from http://www.ossaaonline.com/docs/classifications/2012_13_ADM_08062012.pdf

Oklahoma Secondary Schools Activities Association (2012). *Rules.* Retrieved from http://www.ossaaonline.com/docs/2012-13/PoliciesRules/1213_Rules.pdf

O' Leary, C. (2007). Patriot acts. In Westheimer, J. (Ed.), *Pledging allegiance. The politics of patriotism in America's schools* (pp. 153–163). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Newman, G. (1928*). Citizenship and the survival of civilization.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Parker, R. (2003). *Free speech on trial*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

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

Parry, J. (2006). *The politics of patriotism: English liberalism, national identity and Europe 1830–1886*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Phillips, M. (2006, June 2nd). England expects flags. *The Sun*. Retrieved from http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/article50503.ece

Phillips, R,. Piper, H. & Garratt, D. (2003). Citizenship education in the United Kingdom: A "home international" analysis. In Williams, M. & Humphreys, G. (Eds.), *Citizenship education and lifelong learning* (pp. 167–184). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Philp, M. (1991). Introduction. In M. Philp (Ed.), *The French Revolution and British popular politics.* New York, NY: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Pincus, S. (1996). *Protestantism and patriotism.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Porter, J. (Ed.) (1989). *Classics in Political Philosophy*. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall Canada.

Pureifoy, W. (2005). The education of democratic citizens: Citizen mobilization and public education. In Fuhrman, S. & Lazerson, M (Eds.), *The public schools* (pp. 235–251). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rather, D. (2001, September 17th). *The Late Show with David Letterman.* Retrieved from http://www.nyjtimes.com/cover/terror/DaveandDan.htm

Readman, P. (2008). *Land and nation in England. Patriotism, national identity and the politics of land, 1880 – 1914*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press.

Rickman, M. L. (2011). *Making the "herball": John Gerard and the fashioning of an Elizabethan herbarist*. The University of Oklahoma). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 201. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/893648779?accountid=12964. (893648779).

Riessman, C. (2002). Narrative analysis. In Huberman, A. & Miles, M. (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion* (pp. 217–270). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rousseau, J. J. (1762). On the social contract. In Porter, J. (Ed.) (1989). *Classics in Political Philosophy* (p. 357–384). Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall Canada.

Rush, B. (1786). *Of the mode of education proper in a republic*. Retrieved from http://chronicles.dickinson.edu/resources/Rush/mode_of_education.html

Salisbury, N. (2002). Sqaunto last of the Patuxet. A life alone in the early Republic. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *The human tradition in America from the colonial era through Reconstruction* (pp. 1–15). Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources.

Schama, S. (2000). *A history of Britain: The wars of the British 1603-1776.* New York, NY: Hyperion.

Schama, S. (Writer), & Muir, J. (2002). Forces of Nature [Television series episode]. In Martin Davidson (Executive Producer), *A History of Britain.* London, UK: BBC.

Schatz, R., Staub, E. & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political psychology, 20*(1). 151–174.

Sica, M. (1990). The school flag movement: Origin and influence. *Social Education, 54*(6), 380–384.

Sidbury, J. (2004). Construction of race in Republican America. In Greene, J. P., & Pole, J. R. (Eds.), *A companion to the American Revolution* (pp. 610–617). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Stevens, R. (2002). A Thoughtful Patriotism. *Social Education, 66*(1), 18–24.

Stoltman, J. (2003). From sea to shining sea: Citizenship and civic education in the United States. In Williams, M. & Humphreys, G (Eds.), *Citizenship education and lifelong learning* (pp. 235–251). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (Eds). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Teachout, W. (2009). *Capture the flag*. New York, NY: Perseus.

Tibor, F. (1980). Hegel in England: Victorian Thought Reconsidered. *Hungarian Studies in English , 13*, 49–58.

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

Traupman, J. (1994). *Latin Dictionary*. New York, New York: Bantam Publications.

Turner, D. & Baker, P. (2000). *Developing citizenship in secondary schools*. London, UK: Kogan Page.

University of Oklahoma (2007). The Internship/Student Teaching Experience: Addendum to the Student Handbook.

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *Education for democracy act*. Retrieved from (http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg31.html)

Walker, J. (2008). The age of Nixon. *Reason, 40*(3), 46–55.

Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (August 2002). *Educating the "good" citizen. The politics of school-based civic education programs*. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. Boston, MA.

Westheimer, J. (2006). Politics and patriotism in education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(8), 608–620.

Westheimer, J. (Ed.), (2007). *Pledging allegiance: the politics of patriotism in America's schools.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Wood, B. (2004). The impact of the revolution on women. In Greene, J. P., & Pole, J. R. (Eds.) *A companion to the American Revolution*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Woodward, D. (1980). The Background of the Statute of Artificers: The Genesis of Labour Policy, 1558-63. *Economic History Review, 33*(1), 32–44.

Yazawa, M. (2004). The impact of the revolution on education. In Greene, J. P., & Pole, J. R. (Eds). *A companion to the American Revolution.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Appendix A

University of Oklahoma

Institutional Review Board

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Project Title:	Students Perceptions of Patriotism in the United States and England
Principal Investigator:	Andrew Worthington
Department:	Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum

You are being asked to volunteer for this research study. This study is being conducted with high school students at a few select schools in England and the United States. You were selected as a possible participant because you are currently taking a humanities/social studies course in high school.

Please read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to take part in this study.

Purpose of the Research Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the understanding that high school students have concerning patriotism in the United States and England

Number of Participants

Up to 300 people will take part in this study.

Procedures

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to do the following: Sign this informed consent form, complete the survey that should take no more than ten minutes, and return the survey to your teacher. Your participation may involve follow-up interview. The student's chosen for interview will be selected at random and will be interviewed in a classroom selected by the principal/headteacher of your school. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate, or to stop at any time. The results of the research study may be published, but your name will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only. Your identity will not be associated with your responses in any published format.

Length of Participation

10 minutes for survey. 10 minutes for follow-up discussion section if chosen

This study has the following risks:

The study has no risks

Benefits of being in the study are

The findings from this project will provide information for social studies educators on how students understand the concept of patriotism.

Confidentiality

In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify you without your permission. Research records will be stored securely and only approved researchers will have access to the records.

The records will be retained in my home, in a locked safe for 1 year and at that point in time will be destroyed by erasing all identifiers from my computer, recording device and shredding any paper copies.

There are organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis. These organizations include Dr. John J. Chiodo and the OU Institutional Review Board.

Compensation

You will not be reimbursed for you time and participation in this study.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you withdraw or decline participation, you will not be penalized or lose benefits or services unrelated to the study. If you decide to participate, you may decline to answer any question and may choose to withdraw at any time.

Audio Recording of Study Activities

To assist with accurate recording of participant responses, interviews may be recorded on an audio recording device. You have the right to refuse to allow such recording without penalty. Please select one of the following options.

I consent to audio recording. ___ Yes ___ No.

Contacts and Questions

If you have concerns or complaints about the research, the researcher conducting this study can be contacted at Aworthington@ou.edu (phone 001-405-201-3370) or Dr. John J. Chiodo at jjchiodo@ou.edu (phone 001-405-325-1498).

Contact the researcher(s) if you have questions or if you have experienced a research-related injury.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than individuals on the research team or if you cannot reach the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records. If you are not given a copy of this consent form, please request one.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received satisfactory answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature Date

Appendix B

University of Oklahoma

Institutional Review Board

Parent/Guardian Consent to for Child to Participate in a Research Study

Project Title: Students Perceptions of Patriotism in the United States and England

Principal Investigator: Andrew Worthington

Department: Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum

You are being asked to grant permission for your child to volunteer for this research study. This study is being conducted with high school students at a few select schools in England and the United States. Your child has been selected as a possible participant because they are currently taking a humanities/social studies course in high school.

Please read this form. If you have any questions please call Andrew Worthington on 001-405-201-3370 or email at aworthington@bmchs.org.

Purpose of the Research Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the understanding that high school students have concerning patriotism in the United States and England

Number of Participants

Up to 300 people will take part in this study.

Procedures

If you agree for your child to be in this study, they will be asked to do the following:

Sign an informed consent form, complete a survey that should take no more than ten minutes, and return the survey to their teacher. Their participation may involve a follow-up interview. The student's chosen for this interview will be selected at random and will be interviewed in a classroom selected by the principal/headteacher at your child's school. Their involvement in the study is voluntary, and they may choose not to participate, or to stop at any time. The results of the research study may be published, but their name will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in

summary form only. Their identity will not be associated with your responses in any published format.

Length of Participation

10 minutes for survey. 10 minutes for follow-up discussion section if chosen

This study has the following risks:

The study has no risks

Benefits of being in the study are

The findings from this project will provide information for social studies educators on how students understand the concept of patriotism.

Confidentiality

In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify your child. Research records will be stored securely and only approved researchers will have access to the records.

The records will be retained in my home, in a locked safe for 1 year and at that point in time will be destroyed by erasing all identifiers from my computer, recording device and shredding any paper copies.

There are organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis. These organizations include Dr. John J. Chiodo and the OU Institutional Review Board.

Compensation

There will not be reimbursement their time and participation in this study.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

Participation by your child in this study is voluntary. If they withdraw or decline participation, they will not be penalized or lose benefits or services unrelated to the study. If you allow them to participate, they may decline to answer any question and may choose to withdraw at any time.

Audio Recording of Study Activities

To assist with accurate recording of participant responses, interviews may be recorded on an audio recording device. You have the right to refuse to allow such recording without penalty. Please select one of the following options.

I consent to audio recording. ___ Yes ___ No.

Contacts and Questions

If you have concerns or complaints about the research, the researcher conducting this study can be contacted at Aworthington@ou.edu (phone 001-405-201-3370) or Dr. John J. Chiodo at jjchiodo@ou.edu (phone 001-405-325-1498).

Contact the researcher(s) if you have questions or if you have experienced a research-related injury.

If you have any questions about your rights, or your child's rights as a research participant, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than individuals on the research team, or if you cannot reach the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records. If you are not given a copy of this consent form, please request one.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received satisfactory answers. I consent for my child to participate in the study.

Parent/Guardian Signature Date

Appendix C

Students Perceptions of Patriotism Survey

Please respond by circling the answer you most agree with on a 1 – 5 scale.

If you strongly disagree with the statement you should circle 1.

If you disagree with the statement you should circle 2.

If you neither agree nor disagree with the statement you should circle 3.

If you agree with the statement you should circle 4.

If you strongly agree with the statement you should circle 5.

1). To be a patriotic citizen it is necessary to critically question the political leaders of the country

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

2). To be a patriotic citizen it is necessary for me to be solely concerned with the well being of my country

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

3). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to accept that my government generally makes the correct decisions for the good of the country

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

4). To be a patriotic citizen it is important for me to be informed on the political situation in other nations as it helps me to understand more about my own country

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

5). To be a patriotic citizen it is important that I support the candidate of the political party I normally support, or my parents support

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

6). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to understand the historical failures of the nation as it helps identify the challenges that may face the country in the present

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

7). To be a patriotic citizen it is important that I support the candidate whose political platform most reflects my ideals and goals for society, even if it means supporting the political party I or my family do not usually align myself with

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

8). To be a patriotic citizen it is necessary to support without question the political leaders of the country

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

9). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to understand the great accomplishments in the history of the nation as it helps me to appreciate why the country is great

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

10). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to understand and educate myself on the shortcomings of the government of my country

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

11). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to be proud of the country of which I am a citizen and still recognize its limitations

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

12). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to me as a citizen to feel free to support minority political views in my country

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

13). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to disagree with the government if it is in the interest of the welfare of the nation and its people

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

14). To be a patriotic citizen it is necessary to restrict my emotional attachment to the country of which I am a citizen

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

15). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to feel free to question your country's policies in times of war

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

16). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to agree with the government as it always acts in my best interests

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

17). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to support your country's policies to the fullest in times of war

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

18). To be a patriotic citizen it is necessary to be emotionally attached to the country of which I am a citizen

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

19). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to me as a citizen to support the majority political viewpoint in my country

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

20). To be a patriotic citizen it is important to be proud of the country of which I am a citizen in all circumstances

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree

Appendix D

Interview Guide–Semi Structured

1. How did you feel about the survey?
2. Did you understand the survey?
3. Do you have any questions about it or would you like to address anything on the survey?
4. What do you think patriotism is?
5. Do you think you are patriotic? Why or why not?
6. Is patriotism an important part of society?
7. What element of patriotism is most important to you?