Edited by: Bernardo Pohl, Sarah M. Straub, and Kevin Magill

Critical Discourse Analysis of iCivics'
Educating for American Democracy Roadmap
Sabryna A. Groves
ArCasia D. James-Gallaway

Abstract: In 2015, Banks, a foundational multicultural education theorist, articulated the concept of *failed citizenship* to describe the structural exclusion of Historically Marginalized populations perpetuated in U.S. civic education curriculum. His call for critical civic education reform has since been echoed repeatedly by other multicultural and critical education scholars. The *Educating for American Democracy* (EAD) initiative claims to support critically informed history and civic education. The goal of this critical discourse analysis is to determine the extent to which the EAD holds true to its expressed goal of mitigating *failed citizenship* by empowering historically marginalized individuals toward full, agential citizenship, or disempowers them by advocating concepts and practices that maintain white supremacist hegemony. Findings suggest that a majority of the EAD's content is tacitly hegemonic, leaving the supplement's criticality subject to implementation.

Communities of Color in the U.S., and across the world (Busey & Dowie-Chin, 2021), have historically had to contend with fewer historical narrative representations of their citizenship experience than white communities. These narratives often skew negative, marginalizing, tokenizing, or white washing the histories of People of Color (Utt, 2018). This narrative marginalization reflects and reproduces the social marginalization People of Color navigate under white supremacy (King, 2020). In 2015, Banks, a foundational multicultural education theorist, articulated the concept of failed citizenship to describe the structural exclusion of Historically Marginalized populations' histories perpetuated in U.S. civic education curriculum. Other scholars such as Gordon (1985), Helen Lopez and Bobroff (2019), Martinez (2017), and Vickery (2015) argue

Sabryna Groves: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0280-5086
Dr. ArCasia D. James-Gallaway: https://orcid.org/https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7372-8954
Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sabryna A. Groves, Email: sgroves@tamu.edu

for the inclusion of multicultural narratives and pedagogies in civics and history to disrupt the perpetuation of failed citizenship. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2023), 80% of all public educators in the United States for the 2020-21 academic year were white. While this is not inherently problematic, emerging research suggests that white practitioners are especially susceptible to perpetuating exclusionary narratives and engaging in pedagogical behaviors that uphold white interests (Haynes, 2023). Given curricular marginalization already limits whether Historically Marginalized communities are represented in social studies curricula, the overwhelming whiteness of the U.S. teaching force threatens to exacerbate this marginalization without intervention.

In March of 2021, iCivics, a non-profit American civic education resource provider, published the Educating for American Democracy Roadmap (EAD),a set of themes, pedagogical principles, and design challenges recommended by experts to guide history and civic education. In this critical discourse analysis, we analyze the EAD through the lenses of critical race theory of education (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Ladson Billings, 1995) and a critically informed, structural functionalist framework for hegemonic whiteness (Bell, 1980; Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Durkheim, 1893; Hughey, 2010). We also draw on a few relevant elements of EAD's Pedagogy Companion. Our analysis sought to determine the extent to which the EAD holds true to its expressed goal to, "…strengthen civic and history education for all young Americans," (Educating for American Democracy, 2021, pg. 8,

emphasis added), or disempowers some through the perpetuation of failed citizenship.

This article begins by reviewing the literature used to comprise the discursive lenses through which we reviewed the EAD Roadmap. Next, a summary of our methods details how discourse within the Roadmap was conceptualized and coded. Specifically, to evaluate the EAD's commitment to this principle, this critical discourse analysis employs culturally relevant pedagogical principles (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995) as well as a critically informed, structural functionalist framework for hegemonic whiteness (Durkheim, 1947; Bell, 1980; Hughey, 2010) as interpretive lenses. The language, content recommendations, and pedagogical principles of the EAD Roadmap are analyzed to determine the program's discursive slant, if one exists, as well if Historically Marginalized narratives are centered within. Next, we review our findings and discuss to what extent the suggested reforms in the Roadmap attend to the call for critically informed, multicultural civic and history education to address failed citizenship. Namely, discursive analysis of the Roadmap found significant reliance on tacitly hegemonic discourse, while pedagogical principles incorporated more critical themes. This finding suggests that the EAD relies more on practitioner beliefs and pedagogies than on curricular content to achieve its intended aims. Finally, we use our findings to discuss whether iCivics' commitment to civic education equity was upheld. Given how new the EAD is, our work marks some of the earliest literature analyzing

the program. Ultimately, we bring to the fore some of its strengths and weaknesses in the hopes of impacting both future iterations of the program and present implementation initiatives.

Literature Review

Banks (2015) coined the concept of failed citizenship to describe how educational institutions have systematically alienated historically underrepresented communities from full, agential participation in democratic society. This was accomplished by sidelining most accounts of their experiences in civic and history curricula. Without a multiplicity of representations, members of Marginalized communities are pushed out of civic discourse at large, leading them to identify with their Minoritized community identities more readily. For example, in interviews with two Black female social studies educators, Vickery (2015) found that neither practitioner strongly resonated with the notions of citizenship they were expected to teach. Each believed that American society did not recognize or treat Black people as citizens as such. Similarly, Ladson-Billings' research (2004) with Black youth showed that – despite learning about citizenship, civic ideals, and national values – eighth graders did not readily identify as American citizens. Instead, they formulated an understanding of citizenship primarily through their experiences as African Americans.

To disrupt the ongoing alienation of Black and other Historically Marginalized narratives from civic and history education, Banks (2015) recommended incorporating transformative narratives and pedagogies. This would enable students to preserve their community identity while still feeling included and represented within broader citizenship discourse. It is a recommendation that's been persistently given by scholars of Color to revitalize social studies curricula for an increasingly diverse American polity. A few examples include Gordon (1985), Vickery (2015), and Martinez (2017) who all argued for the liberatory potential of counter-narration when discussing civics with Black and Latin@ youth. Helen Lopez and Bobroff (2019) championed the incorporation of Native American cultural knowledge and practices in civic education. This would give students a robust understanding of their identity, cultural heritage, and values, as well as knowledge of how each could be drawn upon to effect change. Finally, Banales et al. (2020) showed that a strong sense of ethno-racial identity can motivate youth toward civic engagement. This body of literature demonstrates the validity of Banks' argument for narrative diversity as a powerful force against failed citizenship.

With this consensus, it is imperative that social studies reforms are clear and strategic in their efforts to incorporate multicultural histories, as well as pedagogical resources that can make their incorporation more accessible. The iCivics EAD program (2021) cites equitable civic education for all students as one of their guiding principles, recognizing the ever-expanding body of scholarship arguing for the inclusion of historically underrepresented narratives and figures. The literature, however, has yet to clarify the role of the iCivics EAD program or its relationship to racial justice principles or

social studies education more broadly. This paper addresses those gaps.

Theoretical Framework

We combined culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) with a critically informed structural framework of white hegemony to examine the language and themes of the EAD Roadmap. Specifically, we evaluated how well it situated race to disrupt systemically reproduced education disparities among communities of Color, considering how these perspectives relate to failed citizenship (Banks, 2015). As we note, these lenses are consistent with many propositions that comprise critical race theory in education (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995), including the endemic nature of racism in U.S. society and the centrality of property rights in conferring social status, a dynamic that has perpetuated racial oppression across virtually all U.S. institutions, especially education.

Ladson-Billings (1995) went on to develop a framework for what she termed culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP), a theory of practice informed by pedagogical practices of effective educators of Black students, which she found affirmed their identities more holistically than traditional pedagogies. The practitioners she observed acted with alternative conceptions of themselves and their students, the social relations between them, and their relationship to knowledge and knowledge construction; that is, these educators worked to challenge the racial and social status quo. Thus, Ladson-Billings argued that educators seeking to employ CRP should cultivate similar mindsets, the core tenets of which include how all students

are capable of academic success, that teachers and students are equally important leaders in their classroom and local communities, and that knowledge creation is a critical and collaborative responsibility within those communities.

CRP enables students to critically examine the institutions while nurturing their capacity to collaboratively generate new paradigms. Employed within a civic education context, CRP (Ladson-Billings, 1995) forms a powerful remedy for failed citizenship and helped us to assess how well the EAD prioritized the academic success of all students, nurtured cultural competence, and encouraged critical perspectives. CRP was also used in our brief analysis of the Pedagogy Companion to determine whether it supported practitioners' cultivation of the skills mindsets necessary for culturally relevant pedagogy.

In addition, we used a critically informed structural framework for white hegemony to analyze the EAD. This framework conceptualizes whiteness as operating simultaneously as a social structure and racial category, members of which possess (or have historically and systemically withheld) access to venues of power that define, organize, and maintain that social structure. As a social structure, both white persons and persons of Color engage with hegemonic whiteness. However, only individuals granted access to identify with whiteness as a racial category are similarly afforded the capacity to exercise or withhold the social power(s) granted by hegemonic whiteness. This framework is informed by the works of Hughey (2010), Durkheim (1947), Bell (1980), and Bonilla-Silva (2006), discussed below.

Hughey (2010) used ethnographic data collected from self-identifying white nationalist and Antiracist white men to inform her framework for white hegemony (WH), which is defined by two key behavioral patterns; positioning the white race as superior to other racial categories and defining certain behaviors and values as 'ideally white.' Perceived adherence to these behavioral signifiers and values by other white people in each group – despite their radically different politics - resulted in the hierarchical classification of one another as either adequately conscious of their whiteness (good) or not adequately conscious (inferior.)

Note that Hughey's conception of whiteness is defined not by simply possessing 'white' skin, but instead attributed to a person by other white people based on adherence to a specific set of sanctioned values and behavioral practices; this attributive process represents whiteness in its structural form. Writing on the origins of social solidarity, Durkheim (1893) praises the hierarchical division of labor, arguing that through division, people become aware of their dependency on others. Seeking social solidarity, people act in accordance with the social expectations for their position. This adherence maintains and reproduces society, whereas deviance threatens solidarity and is thusly sanctioned. Hughey's observations regarding WH overlap significantly with Durkheim's structural framework, suggesting that whiteness functions as a mechanism for maintaining an ideal white supremacist social order.

In his 1980 publication on the persistence of racialized school segregation after Brown v. Board of Education, critical race theorist Derrick Bell coined the term interest convergence, proposing that the,

> "...interest of blacks in achieving racial equality will be accommodated only when it converges with the interests of whites. [and that] ...Racial remedies may instead be the outward manifestations of unspoken and perhaps subconscious judicial conclusions that the remedies, if granted, will secure, advance, or at least not harm societal interests deemed important by middle and upper class whites." (Bell, 1980)

After Brown, the Supreme Court repeatedly upheld court decisions that promoted the value of 'local autonomy' for school management (Milliken v. Bradley, 1974; Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 1971; Dayton Board of Education v. Brinkman, 1977). Each written to uphold the 'valuable national tradition' of 'local autonomy.' Here, both of Hughey's (2010) principles for white hegemony are observed; the positioning of white interests as superior to those of other racial groups, and the defining of ideal values around which social order is maintained to support white interests. Bonilla-Silva's (2006) work helps amplify the pervasiveness of this maintenance by articulating ways white people have historically employed silence, race-evasive, or colorblind discourses to avoid interrogating their own racial privilege, thereby perpetuating white hegemony. A robust set of scholarship demonstrates how silence and race-evasiveness emerge in classrooms and teacher education programs (Haynes, 2017; Haynes, 2023;

James-Gallaway, Hudock, & Franklin, 2023; Stoll, 2015), and even in spaces specifically designed to challenge these forces in social studies education (Haviland, 2008; Hawkman, 2020; Urrieta & Riedel, 2008).

The capacity to define, organize, and maintain social order to protect the interests of the white race despite competing values between white populations is imperative to this analysis of the EAD Roadmap. To evaluate the EAD for the perpetuation of WH, this analysis identifies if and where these resources appeal to specific ideal value sets or behavioral patterns without an explicit attribution to how these values or behaviors empower people of Color or challenge WH. Knowing that white folks have historically manipulated the definition of abstract values to serve their own interests, as Bell observed, this analysis will also review if and where practitioners are left to their own devices to interpret, define, or otherwise engage their students with concepts in the abstract.

Methods

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) examines how language and behaviors are deployed to construct, (re)produce, and otherwise engage with social systems (Catalano & Waugh, 2020; van Dijk, 2001). As van Dijk (2001) writes, "CDA does not deny but explicitly defines and defends its own socio-political position," (pg. 96). CDA has been used previously to examine the role whiteness plays in preservice teacher education programs (Rogers & Moseley, 2008) as well as the discourses present in educational

documentation like curricula or other core texts (Busey, 2017; Utt, 2018; Dozono, 2020). Building on this literature, this critical discourse analysis focuses on linguistic choices in the EAD curriculum supplement with an understanding that practitioners, and specifically white practitioners, may interpret the language within these resources in service to the maintenance and (re)production of white hegemony (Bell, 1980; Haynes, 2023). Three a priori discursive codes were selected prior to cursory analysis based on the researcher's chosen critical, theoretical stance; discourse could be critical, hegemonic, or tacitly-hegemonic.

Critical perspectives of race, specifically whiteness, support the positioning of race at the forefront of critical social analysis, and CRP advocates for the positioning of students as capable of academic success and agential in their journey toward it. On second read through, language within the Roadmap and Pedagogy Companion was coded as critical (C) if it did one or more of the following:

- engaged with race directly as it was historically and systematically used to disenfranchise people of color
- provided specific examples or references to historic figures of color and or historical narratives centering people of color
- encouraged the challenging or interrogation of social systems
- prioritized student voice and agency in the educational process

WH discourse involves itself in identifying values and behavioral practices as ideal and prioritizes their value and

preservation. Additionally, WH discourse notably lacks critical engagement with individual narratives or stories, instead prioritizing more general ideal values and behaviors. Language within the Roadmap and Pedagogy Companion that identified and or prioritized values (especially in the abstract) and behavioral practices, social systems, or traditions without any supplementary interrogation of how they may perpetuate racialized social inequity was therefore coded as hegemonic (H). Language that could be interpreted as either C or H was coded as tacitly-hegemonic (Th), as this analysis takes for granted how well intentioned paradigms that don't explicitly engage in critical, counter analyses are at risk of being misconstrued to maintain a white supremacist status quo (Bell, 1980; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

Discursive units (DUs) can heretofore be understood as complete sentences or paragraphs from which a prescribed action or value can be clearly interpreted; words and phrases alone were not coded, but were granted the context of the sentences, paragraphs, and thematic sections they belonged to until a clear intention and interpretation could be deciphered. This aligns with guidelines by Wodak and Meyer (2009) for discourse analysis to, "...focus on larger units than isolated words and sentences, and therefore new basic units of analysis (p. 3)." Initially, the Roadmap was read to gain familiarity with the structural and thematic format of the document. Although three a priori codes had already been selected, no explicit coding took place during this initial read through. After the initial read through, three thematic organizing principles were

clearly articulated by the EAD and therefore became central discursive contexts for the further discourse analysis. These were the Seven Themes, the Five Design Challenges, and the Six Pedagogical Principles. These organizational themes were coded prior to critically coding the entire document, since these themes set intentions for how each supplementary element of content was to be interpreted. Tables 1-3 detail each organizational theme and how it was coded.

Table 1
The Five Design Challenges

The Five Design Challenges		
1) Motivating Agency, Sustaining the Republic	1.1 How can we help students understand the full context for their role as citizens and civic participants without creating paralysis or a sense of the insignificance of their own agency in relation to the magnitude of our own society, the globe, and shared challenges?	Th
	1.2 How can we help students become engaged citizens who also sustain civil disagreement, civic friendship, and thus American constitutional democracy?	H
	1.3 How can we help students pursue civic action that is authentic, responsible, and informed?	Th
2) America's Plural Yet Shared Story	2.1 How can we integrate the perspectives of Americans from all different backgrounds when narrating a history of the United States and explicating the content of the philosophical foundations of American constitutional democracy?	C
	2.2 How can we do so consistently across all of America's historical periods and conceptual content?	C
	2.3 How do we help students make sense of the paradox that Americans continuously disagree about the ideal shape of self-government but also agree to preserve shared institutions?	Th
3) Simultaneously Celebrating and Critiquing Compromise	3.1 How do we simultaneously teach the value and the danger of compromise for a free, diverse, and self-governing people?	C
	3.2 How do we help students make sense of the paradox that Americans continuously disagree about the ideal shape of self-government but also agree to preserve shared institutions?	Th
4) Civic Honesty, Reflective Patriotism	4.1 How can we offer an account of U.S. constitutional democracy that is simultaneously honest about the past without falling into cynicism and appreciative of the founding without tipping into adulation?	Th
5) Balancing the Concrete and the Abstract	5.1 How can we support instructors in helping students move between concrete, narrative, and chronological learning and thematic and abstract or conceptual learning?	A

Table 2
The Six Pedagogical Principles

The Six Pedagogical Principles		
1) Excellence for All	EAD teachers commit to learn about and teach full and multifaceted history and civic narratives. They appreciate student diversity and assume all students' capacity for learning complex and rigorous content. EAD teachers focus on inclusion and equity in both content and approach as they spiral instruction across grade bands, increasing complexity and depth about relevant history and contemporary issues	S/C
2) Self-Reflection and Growth Mindset	EAD teachers have a growth mindset for themselves and their students, meaning they engage in continuous self-reflection and cultivate self-knowledge. They learn and adopt content as well as practices that help all learners of diverse backgrounds reach excellence. EAD teachers need continuous and rigorous professional development (PD) and access to professional learning communities (PLCs) that offer peer support and mentoring opportunities, especially about content, pedagogical approaches, and instruction-embedded assessments	S/F
3) Building an EAD Ready Classroom and School	EAD teachers cultivate and sustain a learning environment by partnering with administrators, students, and families to conduct deep inquiry about the multifaceted stories of American constitutional democracy. They set expectations that all students know they belong and contribute to the classroom community. Students establish ownership and responsibility for their learning through mutual respect and an inclusive culture that enables students to engage courageously in rigorous discussion	S
4) Inquiry as the Primary Mode of Learning	EAD teachers not only use the EAD Roadmap inquiry prompts as entry points to teaching full and complex content, but also cultivate students' capacity to develop their own deep and critical inquiries about American history and civic life, and their identities and communities. EAD teachers embrace these rigorous inquiries as a way to advance students' historical and civic knowledge and connect that knowledge to students and their communities. EAD teachers also help students cultivate empathy across differences and inquisitiveness to ask difficult questions, which are core to historical understanding and constructive civic participation	F/C
5) Practice of Constitutional Democracy and Student Agency	EAD teachers use their content knowledge and classroom leadership to model our constitutional principle of "We the People" through democratic practices and promoting civic responsibilities, civil rights, and civic friendship in their classrooms. EAD teachers deepen students' grasp of content and concepts by creating student opportunities to engage with real-world events and problem-solving about issues in their communities by taking informed action to create a more perfect union	F/Th
6) Assess, Reflect, and Improve	EAD teachers use assessments as a tool to ensure all students understand civics content and concepts and apply civic skills and agency. Students have the opportunity to reflect on their learning and give feedback to their teachers in higher-order thinking exercises that enhance as well as measure learning. EAD teachers analyze and utilize feedback and assessment for self-reflection and improving instruction	F

Table 3

The Seven Themes

The Seven Themes		
1) **Civic Participation**	This theme explores the relationship between self-government and civic participation, drawing on history to explore how citizens' active engagement has mattered for American society, and on civics to explore the principles, values, habits, and skills that support productive engagement in a healthy, resilient constitutional democracy. This theme focuses attention on the overarching goal of engaging young people as civic participants and preparing them to assume that role successfully.	H
2) **Our Changing Landscape**	This theme begins with the recognition that American civic experience is tied to a particular place, and explores the history of how the United States developed the geographic and demographic shape it has, as well as the complex experiences of harm and benefit that history has delivered to different portions of the American population; and the civic questions of how political communities form in the first place, become connected to specific places, and develop membership rules. The theme also takes up the question of our interaction with and responsibility to the natural world	C
3) **We The People**	This theme explores the idea of "the people" as a political concept—not just communities who share a landscape but members of a nation who share political ideals and institutions while also regularly disagreeing about their meaning and efficacy. The theme explores the history of how the contemporary American people has taken shape as a political body and builds civic understanding about how political institutions and shared ideals can work to connect a diverse population to shared processes of societal decision-making. The theme also explores the challenge of e pluribus unum: forging one political people out of diverse experiences.	H
4) **A New Government and Constitution**	This theme explores the social, political, and institutional history of the United States in its founding era, as well as the theoretical underpinnings of our constitutional design. The state constitutions and the federal 1787 Constitution, as amended, form diverse peoples and places into an American people: one overarching political community. The Constitution deliberately creates a complex layering and counterbalancing of institutions, powers, and spaces for debate and opposition. The document and its revisions by amendment strive to secure and protect the ideals of equal rights for all proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence.	H
5) **Institutional and Social Transformation – A Series of Refoundings?**	This theme explores how cultural practices, social movements, and conflicts have combined with political institutions to shape American life from the earliest colonial period to the present, investigates which moments of change have most defined the country, and builds understanding of how we, the people, working in concert, have changed American society and political institutions.	Th
6) **A People in the World**	This theme explores the place of the United States and the American people in a global context, investigating key historical events in international affairs, and building understanding of the principles, values, and laws at stake in debates about America's role in the world, and the world's role in shaping the United States.	Th
7) **A People with Contemporary Debates and Possibilities**	This theme explores the contemporary terrain of civic participation and civic agency, investigating how historical narratives shape current political, social, and economic arguments, how values and information shape policy arguments, and how the American people continues to renew or remake itself in pursuing fulfillment of the promise of our constitutional democracy.	Th

In addition to the three a priori codes, three emergent codes were generated during the first read through to better encapsulate the full range of discourses employed within the EAD. These three new codes were systemic (S), referring to language in the EAD that implied a necessary value, structure, or other resource be present within the classroom, school, or district for successful implementation and outcomes; faculty development (F), referring to explicit pedagogical language or recommendations for faculty professional development; and aesthetic language (A), referring to purely explanatory language with no discernable discursive slant. After the first read through, the official coding process began. Thus, the second read through sought to code all language in the EAD within these six code groups. Each formatted section of text (e.g., Executive Summary, Introduction, etc.) was coded independently, and then incidents of each code were totaled for that section, with an overall code for the section being determined by which code made up a majority of the DUs within the section. There were no incidences wherein a majority did not emerge.

Repetitions of DUs, when they occurred, were coded, viewed as reinforcing the discourse of the DUs being repeated. Headings, quotes in the margin, references, and other language included for aesthetics or formatting were coded under aesthetic language. Explicitly education focused language (assessment strategies, pedagogical models, etc.) were coded under faculty development unless they were contextualized as a means to achieve a differently coded end (e.g., inquiry-based pedagogy as a means to increase student agency is coded as C). Incidents of each kind of discursive unit were then counted to determine the overall discursive slant of each EAD resource. Examples of discursive units and how they were coded can be found in Table 4.

Table 4

Examples of Discursive Units and their Codes

Examples of Discursive Units and their Codes		
Code	**DU Example from Theme 1, K-2 Grade Band**	**Rationale**
Critical	Analyze strategies and examples of civic participation, including instances of participation by those without full political rights	Clear and explicit reference to a historic withholding of political rights from some citizens
Tacitly Hegemonic	Define components of a healthy community and the rights and responsibilities of community members	Vague reference to community standards and rules of membership that leaves definitions open to interpretation
Hegemonic	What are the responsibilities and opportunities of citizenship and civic agency in America's constitutional democracy?	Centers 'American constitutional democracy' without problematizing how that institution has and still limits opportunities for citizenship and civic agency

Findings

Our findings are organized as the EAD is; we first discuss how the EAD is thematically structured, and how all its structural elements were coded. Next, we discuss the content of the Roadmap itself, how its content was coded, and how relevant structural elements influenced our interpretation of the Roadmap. Finally, we touch briefly on elements of the Pedagogy Companion as they pertain to our analysis of the Roadmap.

Themes, Design Challenges, and Pedagogical Principles

Due to the organization of both the Roadmap and Pedagogy Companion, it was critical to code and fully understand the three structural elements of the EAD that informed both documents. The first and most defining structural element were its seven themes, displayed in Table 1, each of which was defined and supplemented by history and civic thematic questions, key concepts, and design challenges for practitioners, as well as grade-appropriate driving history and civic inquiries. Like the seven themes, the five design challenges were defined and supplemented by additional questions that EAD authors contended with while creating the program. Recognizing that civics and history are complex subjects, the design challenges bring out multiple, conflicting perspectives teachers may contend with in their classroom. EAD authors rationalized the challenges, saying:

> Despite knowing that some of the enduring tensions at the heart of a republican form of government — tensions between liberty and equality, for example, or between the few and the many — can at times be uncomfortable for teachers and students alike, we believe that deep and critical exploration of these questions will ultimately serve all of our students (and our educators) better than avoiding them." (EAD, 2021)

This is an interesting component of the program, since it intends to anticipate questions that may arise as students and teachers are engaging with the content.

This gives practitioners insight into what content EAD authors deemed controversial or polarizing enough to mark as a design challenge. That said, merely demarcating where controversies may emerge is no substitute for intentionally building inquiry around said controversies into the curriculum. Finally, six pedagogical principles are presented that authors believe are necessary for the successful implementation of the Roadmap. These principles are largely dispositional and value laden, suggesting that an EAD teacher must hold and enact a specific set of values if they are to cultivate the student outcomes they and the EAD seek. As was necessary, the Pedagogy Companion was referenced to better understand the meaning and context for each pedagogical principle. However, a full, coded analysis of the Pedagogy Companion exceeds the scope of this analysis.

Roadmap to Education for American Democracy

As mentioned earlier, DUs were nested within seven content themes. Supplementary design challenges were connected to each theme, providing another layer of discursive context to interpret the DUs in. Finally, the six pedagogical principles acted as a broad discursive umbrella housing each the seven themes, five design challenges, and the discursive units themselves. Figure A (end of article) visualizes this relationship and designates the codes for each thematic element to demonstrate the discursive contexts DUs were nested within. Analysis of the Roadmap's content found and coded 605 DUs; 10.9% of the units were coded as

H (66), 55.5% as Th (336), and 33.6% as C (203). The combined total of H and Th codes accounted for 66.4% of the language used, meaning that the Roadmap relied on hegemonic and tacitly hegemonic discourse for most of its content.

Table 5 provides an overview of how many DUs were present in each of the seven themes, as well as how they were coded.

Table 5
EAD Roadmap Code Counts by Theme

Theme	Critical	Tacitly Hegemonic	Hegemonic	Composite
1) Civic Participation	34	48	10	Th
2) Our Changing Landscape	18	49	0	Th
3) We the People	39	50	7	Th
4) A New Government and Constitution	31	55	24	Th
5) Institutional and Social Transformation	29	55	8	Th
6) A People in the World	13	48	15	Th
7) Contemporary Debates and Possibilities	39	31	2	C
Roadmap Totals	203	336	66	Th

Within the Roadmap, H coded content tended to speak or explicitly refer to specific American historic events, traditions, governing processes, or institutions, and founding documents with no prompting for critical student analysis. These units tended to be informative in nature, laying out civic and historical facts to be learned. H content also usually prompted students to factually compare the past with the present, and to flatly discuss with evidence the value and consequences of certain policies, events, processes, or phenomena. DUs coded as H did not tend to promote deeper inquiry, as they were largely factual and informative. Interestingly, for each theme as grade bands became more advanced, more H content tended to emerge. While one strength of the Roadmap is its small percentage of H coded content overall, knowing that adolescence is a formative time for civic identity development (Youniss, McLellan, & Yates, 1997), it

seems imperative that more critical content be introduced at this stage. This is especially true if we are to take to heart the alienating effect of failed citizenship on youth of Color. At such a crucial stage for identity formation, multicultural representation and opportunities for critical, reflective inquiry should be central to social studies instruction.

C coded content very specifically engaged students in reflections on their own beliefs and beliefs of others, on how their actions and the actions of others impacted one another, on their agency and how it can be enacted, in critical perspective taking exercises, in critical discussions of historically marginalized individuals and communities and their resistance to oppressive phenomena, and finally on the merits and pitfalls of social systems, organizing principles, and institutions for specific groups of people through history and in present day American society. These trends directly align with Ladson-Billings' (1995) culturally relevant pedagogical recommendations. C coded content is further amplified and enhanced by the Roadmap's intentional centering of inquiry as its preferred pedagogical method, although there is little to no guarantee that practitioners will implement the Roadmap under this preferred method. This point is reinforced by the longitudinal work of Martell (2020) who found that even if practitioners firmly believed in inquiry as a method, support and resources from their schools proved to be the determining factor regarding whether they could actually facilitate it in their classrooms regularly.

Lastly, Th content typically sat somewhere

between factual and inquiring. One such example comes from the 9-12 grade band under the theme, "Institutional and Social Transformation – A Series of Refoundings?" asking students to engage with the question, "How do social practices, religious beliefs, or culture interact with laws?" This question could, in the right practitioner's hands, stimulate critical inquiry into the relationship between communities and the laws that govern them, or the tensions that might emerge when specific cultural traditions conflict with those laws. However, if a practitioner does not have the cultural competence or desire to facilitate such a critical discussion, students instead may end up factually investigating how concepts like religion and cultural practices have been historically litigated. This was the overwhelming trend with Th content; most had potential to be critical if and only if they were facilitated by a critically minded practitioner.

Pedagogy Companion to the EAD Roadmap

> "Shifting classroom instruction to align with the EAD Roadmap and the EAD Pedagogy Companion's core pedagogical principles requires broader systemic change that establishes conditions for success within our educational systems in order to develop a sustainable model that cultivates civic capacity." (EAD, 2021)

As stated, a full, coded analysis of the EAD Pedagogy Companion exceeds the scope of the present analysis. However, because the Pedagogy Companion's pedagogical principles are intended to

ground the Roadmap's implementation, a brief discussion of these themes is necessary for properly and meaningfully understanding the EAD Roadmap. In the Companion, each of the six principles are unpacked in detail and supplemented with pedagogical strategies to enact them; teacher, student, and administrative moves to support their institutionalization; and ideal teacher, student, and administrative outcomes to exemplify what meaningful implementation of the Roadmap should look like and produce. An overview of the six principles and how they were coded is presented in Table 1.12. One strength of the principles is their consistent invoking of CRP principles prioritizing the civic educational success of all students, increasing student agency, and recognizing students as agential leaders and knowledge creators in their classroom and external communities. The philosophical underpinnings of the Companion, therefore, appear to be more critically leaning than the Roadmap. Based on the tacitly hegemonic slant of the Roadmap, the invocation of CRP within the principles seems to once again offload the responsibility of critically transforming history and civic education onto practitioners rather than curriculum developers. This dynamic risks perpetuating the same curricular tropes that alienate historically underrepresented communities in the Roadmap that scholars like Banks have already problematized, masking this oversight with a surface level appeal to critically and culturally relevant discourses in the Companion.

Additionally, within the Companion and throughout its principles, EAD authors have included notes on actions that could

be taken at the school and district level, giving some attention to institutional changes that must be made for effective implementation. To call the document a mere pedagogical companion is an understatement, as so many of the principles focus on the structure and nature of the school and classroom community, as well as how the school should position itself within the broader community.

Discussion and Conclusion

The EAD Roadmap has a clear discursive slant toward hegemonic whiteness as a result of a heavy reliance on tacitly hegemonic language. Additionally, within the introduction to the roadmap, the authors state that it is not a prescriptive tool but is intended instead to be interpreted and best aligned with existing standards and methods (EAD, 2021). From the outset, then, it can be argued that there is a neutral hegemonic orientation guiding the framework, since it leaves its content and direction up to local interpretation. Since it is content driven, this use of neutral hegemonic language offloads the responsibility of incorporating critical perspectives and counter narratives onto the practitioner. Stated differently, with barriers to critical social studies inquiry emerging both as a product of limited supports for inquiry in schools (Martell, 2020) and an overwhelmingly white practitioner base (National Center for Education Statistics, 2023; Haynes, 2023), the seeming reliance of the Roadmap on practitioner's pedagogical principles must be problematized, something we have attempted in this project.

The level of institutional, administrative,

and community cooperation put forth by the Pedagogy Companion would require a well-resourced district with the capacity to honor student voice at an institutional level, implement nontraditional assessment strategies, and leverage community and local partnerships for project-based learning opportunities. To reference Martell (2020) once more, these institutional factors - not practitioner beliefs - are a leading determinant of whether inquiry is facilitated in history classrooms. Though careful consideration has been made by the authors to outline the ideal environment where EAD civic and history education should occur, to put it simply, this is not an accessible place. This critically leaning idealism couches the tacitly hegemonic Roadmap in critical rhetoric without addressing the gaps in representation perpetuated by the curriculum supplement itself.

It was found that the principles underlying the Pedagogy Companion were more critical than the Roadmap, repeatedly invoking principles aligned with Ladson-Billings' (1995) culturally responsive pedagogy. In an ideal circumstance wherein the practitioner buys into the critical tone of the Pedagogy Companion, there is a slightly better chance that they will facilitate the Roadmap in such a way that presents its tacitly hegemonic content to students with a more critical slant. As evidenced by the work of Bell (1980) and Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), though, this 'open to interpretation' neutrality has historically been manipulated to serve the reproduction of hegemonic whiteness. Further, the work of Haynes (2023) elucidates that, if the teacher is white, as roughly 80% of the public teaching force

is, that risk becomes all the more likely. Facing the threat of failed citizenship (Banks, 2015), critical civic and history education simply cannot be left to chance. The Pedagogy Companion does provide some recommendations to practitioners and administrators that encourage the development and advocacy for professional development that align with the EAD framework's critically informed mission to secure civic education success for all students (EAD, 2021). This kind of institutionalization, both at the school and teacher education level, is imperative, as it better ensures that practitioners are engaging with these materials in a critically informed and culturally relevant way. The ideals laid out in the Pedagogy Companion must therefore be a simultaneous call to action for all educational stakeholders, as the success of their framework hinges on making this ideal a reality.

One limitation of our analysis is that we did not separately code CDUs that prioritized student voice and agency in the educational process from CDUs that engaged with whiteness or race directly as it was historically and systematically used to disenfranchise people of color; provided specific examples or references to historic figures of color and or historical narratives centering on people of color; and or encouraged the challenging or interrogation of social systems. Future research should pursue this delineation, as it would grant us greater insight into the actual amount of critical history and civic education narratives that have been integrated into the Roadmap per the recommendations of scholars like Banks (2015) versus how much of the C content

merely promotes student agency through inquiry. While both are features of CRP, truly adhering to Ladson-Billings' (1995) framework entails that both occur together.

While there is a significant amount of critical language used to engage students and practitioners throughout both the EAD Roadmap for Educating American Democracy and its Pedagogy Companion, more must be done to ensure that its heavy reliance on tacitly hegemonic language is not exploited to render this culturally relevant discourse moot. It is important to recognize the level to which the EAD has succeeded in incorporating language that both aligns with and is informed by critical perspectives on race, especially whiteness, and culturally relevant pedagogical principles. The EAD framework represents a significant step forward for American history and civic education, and especially for students of historically marginalized communities. As it stands, however, the extensive use of tacitly hegemonic content threatens to alienate those students from classroom opportunities to critically reconceptualize paradigms of citizenship and governance in ways that better serve themselves and their communities. This would perpetuate Banks' failed citizenship and oppressive structures of hegemonic whiteness, contrasting the Educating for American Democracy framework's expressed goal to provide equitable civic education for all.

References

Banks, J. (2015). Failed citizenship, civic engagement, and education. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 51, 151-4.

Bell, D. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest convergence dilemma. Harvard Law Review, 93:3, 518-533

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Busey, C. (2017). This who believes? A critical race discourse analysis of the Association for Middle Level Education's This We Believe. Paper presented at the 2017 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Retrieved in 2022 from the AERA Online Paper Repository. Christopher L.

Busey, C. L. & Dowie-Chin, T. (2021) The making of global Black anti-citizen/citizenship: Situating BlackCrit in global citizenship research and theory, Theory & Research in Social Education, 49:2, 153-175, DOI: 10.1080/00933104.2020.1869632

Catalano, T., & Waugh, L. R. (2020). Critical discourse analysis, critical discourse studies and beyond: Perspectives in pragmatics, philosophy & psychology. Springer.

Crenshaw, K. et. al. (1995) Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement. New Press.

Dayton Board of Education v. Brinkman, 433 U.S. 406, 420 (1977). Retrieved from https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/433/406.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2001). Critical Race Theory: An introduction. New York University Press.

Dozono, T. (2020). The passive voice of white supremacy: Tracing epistemic and discursive violence in world history curriculum. Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 42:1, 1-26. DOI: 10.1080/10714413.2020.1721261

DDurkheim, E. (1893). The Division of Labour in Society. New York: The Free Press.

Educating for American Democracy. (2021). Roadmap to educating for American democracy: Excellence in history and civics for all learners. iCivics. Sourced from: https://www.educatingforamericandemocracy.org/the-roadmap/

Educating for American Democracy. (2021). Pedagogy companion to the EAD roadmap. iCivics. Sourced from: https://www.educatingforamericandemocracy.org/pedagogy-companion/

Gordon, B. (1985). Toward emancipation in citizenship education: The case of African-American cultural knowledge. Theory & Research in Social Education, 12:4, 1-23. DOI: 10.1080/00933104.1985.10505485

Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as Property. Harvard Law Review, 106:8, 1707–1791. https://doi.org/10.2307/1341787

Haviland, V. (2008). "Things get glossed over" Rearticulating the silencing power of whiteness in education. Journal of Teacher Education, 59:1, 40-54.

Hawkman, A. (2020). Swimming in and through whiteness: Antiracism in social studies teacher education. Theory & Research in Social Education, 48:3, 403-430, DOI: 10.1080/00933104.2020.1724578

Haynes, C. (2017). Dismantling the White supremacy embedded in our classrooms: White faculty in pursuit of more equitable educational outcomes for racially minoritized students. International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 29:1, 87-107.

Haynes, C. (2023). The susceptibility of teaching to White interests: A theoretical explanation of the influence of racial consciousness on the behaviors of White faculty in the classroom. Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 16(1), 97–108. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000256

Helen Lopez. J., & Bobroff K. (2019). Rooted Indigenous core values: Culturally appropriate curriculum and methods for civic education reflective of Native American culture and learning styles. Multicultural Perspectives, 21:2, 119-126. DOI: 10.1080/15210960.2019.1606640.

Hughey, M. (2010). The (dis)similarities of white racial identities: The conceptual framework of "hegemonic whiteness." Ethnic & Racial Studies, 33:8, 1289–1309. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870903125069

James-Gallaway, C., Hudock, M., & Franklin, C. (2023). "They didn't really have key experiences that they thought they could bring to the table." Perceptions of white racial absolution during cross-racial intergroup dialogues. Human Communication Research. 00, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqad008

King, L. (2020) Black history is not American history: Toward a framework of Black historical consciousness. Social Education, Vol 84(6), pp. 335-341.

Ladson Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32:3, 465-49

Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). Culture versus citizenship: The challenge of racialized citizenship in the United States. In J.A. Banks (Ed.), Diversity in citizenship education. pp. 99-126.

Ladson-Billings, G., Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. Teachers College Record, 97:1, 47–68.

Martell, C. C. (2020). Barriers to inquiry-based instruction: A longitudinal study of history teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 71:3. 279-291.

Martínez, R. (2017). 'Are you gonna show this to white people?': Chicana/o and Latina/o students' counter-narratives on race, place, and representation. Race, Ethnicity and Education, 20:1, 101-16.

Milliken v. Bradley, 418 U.S. 717 (1974). Retrieved from https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/418/717.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2023). Characteristics of Public School Teachers: Condition of Education. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved in 2023 from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/clr.

Rogers, R. & Mosely, M. (2008). A critical discourse analysis of racial literacy in teacher education. Linguistics and Education, 19, 107-131.

Stoll, L. (2015). Teachers' perspectives on race and racial inequality: Strategic intersectionality and the countervailing effects of privilege. In Davis, D. J. (Ed.) Intersectionality in Educational Research. Stylus.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 402 U.S. 1, 14 (1971). Retrieved from https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/402/1.

Urrieta, L. & Reidel, M. (2008). Citizenship normalizing and white preservice social studies teachers. Social Justice, 35:1, 91-108.

Utt, J. (2018). A case for decentering Whiteness in education: How Eurocentric social studies curriculum acts as a form of white/western studies. Ethnic Studies Review, 41(1-2), 19-34.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001), Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (Ed.) Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. Sage Publications.

Vickery, A. E. (2015). It was never meant for us: Towards a black feminist construct of citizenship in social studies. The Journal of Social Studies Research. 39:3, 163-172.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009b). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.) Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage.

Youniss, J., McLellan, J. A., & Yates, M. (1997). What we know about engendering civic identity. American Behavioral Scientist, 40:5, 620–631. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764297040005008

Appendix A

Six Pedagogical Principles: Composite Codes - S/F/C	
Excellence for All (S/C) Self-Reflection and Growth Mindset (S/F) Building an EAD Ready Classroom and School (S)	Inquiry as the Primary Mode of Learning (F/C) Practice of Constitutional Democracy and Student Agency (F/Th) Assess, Reflect, and Improve (F)

1) Civic Participation (H)

   - **EAD Identified Relevant Design Challenges:** 1.1 (Th), 1.2 (H), 1.3 (Th)

2) Our Changing Landscape (C)

   - **DCs:** 2.1 (C), 2.2 (C), 2.3 (Th)

3) We the People (H)

   - **DCs**: 2.1 (C), 2.2 (C), 2.3 (Th)

4) A New Government and Constitution (H)

   - **DCs:** 3.1 (C), 3.2 (Th)

5) Institutional and Social Transformation - A Series of Refoundings? (Th)

   - **DCs:** 4.1 (Th)

6) A People in the World (Th)

   - **DCs:** 5.1(A)

7) A People with Contemporary Debates and Possibilities (Th)

   - **DCs:** 5.1 (A)