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FROM THE EDITORS

This is the first issue to come out under our editorship. We would like to thank Cleo Cherryholmes and Jack Nelson for the work that they have done in setting a solid base for the journal. We hope to build from this base and to make the journal an even stronger communication link for educators interested in theory and research in social education.

The purposes of the journal will remain essentially the same. However, they will inevitably be shaped by our goals and new interests expressed by our contributors and readers. One of the primary purposes is for the journal to serve as a vehicle for distributing high quality articles on theory and research which are relevant to social studies educators. We also believe that the journal should be a forum for the exchange of ideas. In this sense, the journal serves to facilitate interaction between professionals who are interested in social studies education. Another major purpose of the journal is to stimulate new ideas. We hope that the articles contained in the journal over the next three years will spur people to think of old ideas in different ways and seek out new ideas based on what they read here. Should we accomplish these purposes, we feel that the journal will have proved to be successful.

We also have some practical ideas in mind for attaining our goals. This year we will be increasing the number of issues to two per year. We hope that by the end of a three year period, the journal will be published quarterly. We believe that there is quality research in the field and that, with an effort on our part and yours, we can accumulate high quality articles and produce many more volumes of the journal. This will depend on our initiative and yours in sending us manuscript copies and encouraging others to submit theirs.

We also hope to increase the readership of the journal by including material that will be informative for new audiences. We hope that more people will join CUFA and will find the journal useful. We intend to accept a wide range of articles in order to appeal to audiences who have diverse interests in social education. We would like to encourage your help in making the most out of the journal by encouraging your students, colleagues and libraries to subscribe. We have enclosed a one-sheet description of how to do this.

Probably most important, we would like to encourage you to write us concerning your ideas and advice about content and directions for the journal. Our plans will be as good as we can make them and much better if we receive ideas from interested readers.

Lee H. Ehman
Judith A. Gillespie
Indiana University
Social Studies teachers have a clear mandate to help students learn to think for themselves (NEA, 1962) (NAEP, 1969 & 1970). Whether this “thinking for themselves” has been called problem solving, reflective thinking, discovery, inquiry or critical thinking the goals and rationales have been the same. That is, the demands of citizenship in a democracy and the rapid pace of change which makes knowledge obsolete are grounds for arguing that students need to learn more than what to think; they need to learn how to think.

To say that students need to learn more than “...what to think; they need to learn how to think,” raises many important questions. What does it mean to say that someone learns “how to think” or learns “to think for oneself?” How are we to know if someone knows “how to think?” How can “learning how to think” be taught? These questions provide a backdrop against which the following discussion on critical thinking can be understood. Three major topics will be examined: (1) a definition, (2) a research paradigm, and (3) a research agenda for critical thinking.

The first part of the paper delineates several alternative definitions of critical thinking found in the social studies literature as well as several definitions found in the general literature on critical thinking. A modified definition is offered and arguments for its adoption are presented. In the second part of the paper two research and instructional paradigms, or models, of critical thinking are examined. Implications of the two paradigms for both research and instruction are set forth. In the third part of the paper four research approaches and a variety of research problems are suggested which are based upon the logical paradigm.

This paper builds upon the work of a host of educators, both within and without the field of social studies. It is not meant as an exhaustive review of all the literature on “thinking.” Such an effort would go well beyond the limits of a journal article. What it does seek to do is to carve out and clarify one part of this large literature.

DEFINITIONS

Studying critical thinking would be easier were there not such diversity in what has been considered critical thinking. An effort to find a single, correct definition of critical thinking is misdirected. It is misdirected because language is a social phenomenon and meaning is established in the
use of a term (Alston, 1964). What is possible and fruitful in defining a term such as critical thinking is to delineate alternative uses—i.e., meanings—and to be clear about which meaning is in use in any particular instance.

There are three meanings of critical thinking which can be observed in the social education literature. Critical thinking is sometimes defined as any mental activity which is "higher" on a taxonomy of objectives than "comprehension" (Sanders, 1966). This is a very broad definition. Another definition equates critical thinking with "reflective thinking" as it was defined by Dewey in his book How We Think (Provus, 1956). Again, given that Dewey's conception of "reflective thinking" encompassed a broad range of thinking activities, this definition includes a large range of activities. A third meaning of critical thinking is that of judging statements based upon a priori criteria (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). In this case, critical thinking is closest in meaning to the "evaluation" stage of Bloom's Taxonomy. It is this third meaning which is most akin to the way in which critical thinking will be defined here.

Critical thinking also has a history of usage and definition outside social education. In 1953 Smith wrote, "Now if we set about to find out what... a statement means and to determine whether to accept or reject it, we would be engaged in thinking which, for lack of a better term, we shall call critical thinking (p. 130). Enis (1967) abbreviated and altered Smith's definition by defining "critical thinking" as "the correct assessing of statements" (p. 115). The definition presented here borrows from Smith and Ennis. In this case critical thinking will be defined as "the evaluation of evidence of argument based on acceptable standards for the purpose of accepting or rejecting a statement." Although this definition retains essential features of both Smith and Ennis, it differs in the following ways and for the following reasons: First, unlike Smith's definition, the act of determining the meaning of a statement is not included. To do so needlessly enlarges the scope of critical thinking. In the interests of precision and parsimony, it makes more sense to consider comprehension as a necessary condition for critical thinking but not critical thinking, itself.

Second, unlike Smith's definition but similar to Ennis,' there is a qualitative standard for distinguishing critical thinking from other types of thinking. Critical thinking is defined here not simply as accepting or rejecting a statement, but includes the added notion that decisions to accept or reject statements be done "...on the basis of acceptable standards..." That is, there are criteria for determining whether critical thinking is taking place. Thus, not all decisions to accept or reject statements involve critical thinking. For example, the decision to accept one rather than the other of two contradictory statements might be based upon a conscious knowledge that the source of one statement is generally more reliable than the source of the other statement. Or, the decision might be based upon apparent whim. The former decision based upon an acknowledged criterion is an example of
critical thinking.

Third, Ennis defines critical thinking as the "correct" assessing of statements. The notion of correctness seems to imply that there is only one set of standards, or criteria, against which to judge statements and that the set of standards is known. It is more reasonable to recognize that there may be multiple sets of standards. For example, economics has its monetarist and fiscal schools of thought. Psychology has a wide variety of schools of thought as does each of the other social sciences. The implications of these varying schools of thought in this discussion is that thinking can be based upon any one of these frames of reference and be critical thinking.

The existence of multiple frames of reference and multiple sets of standards is compounded still further as we examine culturally dependent frames of reference. Within the United States there are culturally based frames of reference—e.g., fundamentalist religion and rationalist materialism—which are markedly different in their assumptions. On the world scene the complexity and diversity of frames of reference and their accompanying sets of standards render critical thinking defined as the "correct assessing of statements" unreasonable. A useful alternative to defining critical thinking as the "correct" judging of statements is simply to define critical thinking as it is here. Namely, it is judging of statements "...based on acceptable standards..." The acceptability of standards can, then, be decided within varying contexts. This provides for varying frames of reference and their accompanying standards for truth.

Definition takes us part way toward understanding the meaning of critical thinking. If we are to do research or instruction in critical thinking, a paradigm, or model needs to be delineated. That is, we need to know what kind of phenomenon critical thinking is. What are its constituent parts? Of what "stuff" is it made?

PARADIGMS

Answers to three questions will be sought in this discussion of critical thinking (CT) paradigms. First, what are the alternative paradigms of CT and what are the implications of each for research and instruction? Second, what evidence is there to support or reject alternative paradigms? And third, which paradigm is most reasonable for research and instruction in social education?

The literature of social education as well as the broader literature on CT indicates there are essentially two answers to the question "What is the CT paradigm?" I will call these the "mental" and "logical" paradigms. They represent fundamentally different ways of understanding CT with different implications for research and instruction.
Mental Paradigm

Unlike the logical paradigm which is set forth explicitly in the CT literature, the mental paradigm is implicit, unformulated. The mental paradigm must be sought in the implicit assumptions of educators as they talk and write about CT. It is important to identify and describe this implicit conception of CT for it has been influential in social education as a basis for both research and instruction. Uncovering this conception will enable us to examine it and thereby make more reasoned judgments about its strengths and weaknesses.

The central characteristic of the mental paradigm is the notion that critical thinking is a type of thought, or mental process. From the frame of reference of the mental paradigm, critical thinking is just what the term implies; it is "critical thinking." Although this "thinking," or type of mental process, cannot be observed directly, indicators of this process can be seen as persons engage in activities which call for more than simple recall or comprehension of information. Critical thinking tests are tools for eliciting and measuring this type of mental processing.

Research employing the mental paradigm typically involves experimental studies in which a treatment is designed to stimulate students to think critically. The dependent variable is a measure or measures of CT. An example of this can be seen in a study titled "Analysis and Evaluation Questions: Their Effects upon Critical Thinking" (Hunkins, 1970). The author writes, "...this study sought to determine whether a dominant use in social studies text-type materials of analysis and evaluation questions, as defined by Bloom's Taxonomy, would effectively stimulate the development of sixth-grade pupils' critical thinking" (p. 697). In the study students are randomly assigned to two treatment groups. One group received textual materials stressing analysis and evaluation questions. The other group received materials stressing recall questions. The content of the materials was otherwise the same. Critical thinking was the dependent variable as measured by the "Social Studies Inference Test" (Taba, 1964). Conclusions from the study indicate that the analysis and evaluation questions did not produce measurable differences of critical thinking between the two groups.

The telling characteristics of the mental paradigm should become more pronounced after we have described characteristics of the logical paradigm and can, then, make contrasts between the two.

Logical Paradigm

What I will call the "logical paradigm" is explicitly formulated and can be found in the work of Robert Ennis, Donald Oliver, James Shaver and A. Guy Larkins (Ennis, 1967) (Oliver & Shaver, 1966) (Shaver & Larkins, 1969) (Shaver & Larkins, 1973). The logical paradigm is not inconsistent with the
notion that CT involves a type of mental processing, it simply does not formulate CT in those terms.

The logical paradigm as found in the work of Ennis and others is based upon the assumption that it is possible to analyze and reduce complex judgments to a manageable list of sub-tasks and, then, to apply established criteria as a basis for making decisions. This reductionist process is explicitly noted in Shaver and Larkins *The Analysis of Public Issues Program* (Shaver and Larkins, 1973). They write, “We started from a basic concern with political-ethical issues and then selected those ideas which would best help a person come to a rational decision about such issues, ... We tried out different ideas on each other and on people outside the project, and observed other people discussing issues to determine what concepts were most helpful in clarifying and expediting the decision-making process (p. vi).

Since Ennis (1967) has dealt most explicitly with the logical paradigm we will turn, first, to his work. Ennis set forth what he called “aspects” of critical thinking. He explains the aspects in the following manner:

> “Since there are various kinds of statements, various relations between statements and their grounds, and various stages in the process of assessment, we can expect that there will be various ways of going wrong when one attempts to think critically. The list of aspects may be looked upon as a list of specific ways to avoid the pitfalls of assessment.”

Ennis listed twelve aspects.

1. Grasping the meaning of a statement
2. Judging whether there is ambiguity in a line of reasoning
3. Judging whether certain statements contradict each other
4. Judging whether a conclusion follows necessarily
5. Judging whether a statement is specific enough
6. Judging whether a statement is actually the application of a certain principle
7. Judging whether an observation statement is reliable
8. Judging whether an inductive conclusion is warranted
9. Judging whether the problem has been identified
10. Judging whether something is an assumption
11. Judging whether a statement made by an alleged authority is acceptable
12. Judging whether a definition is adequate

The logical paradigm is based on the notion that each of the potential pitfalls in making judgments can be dealt with to some degree by employing appropriate standards, or criteria, for making judgments. At the heart of
the logical paradigm, the "stuff" to be studied are two elements. The first
element is the critical task or problems which a person confronts. Examples
of these are tasks such as identifying unstated assumptions, determining the
relevance of evidence or judging the degree of certainty of a conclusion. The
second element is the criteria on which judgments are made. For example, if
one is confronted with the task of judging the degree of certainty of a
conclusion, one criterion would be to evaluate the consistency of the
conclusion with other known information.

In sharp contrast to the mental paradigm, a notable feature of the logical
paradigm is that the concept of critical thinking is conceptualized as simply
an umbrella term under which are subsumed a variety of activities. In
accordance with the logical paradigm, the term CT is understood as a
convenient rubric used to encompass a wide variety of activities. The
activities share the common feature that they all involve making judgments
about statements (or, phenomena which are rendered as statements), but
they do not necessarily share any further empirically discernible
relationships.

On the other hand, the essence of the mental paradigm is the notion that
there is a type of mental functioning which we can call "critical thinking." More
importantly, CT is not simply an umbrella concept, a handy way of
referring to a variety of diverse activities which share only a conventional
relationship to one another. According to the mental paradigm CT has a
basis in fact. It is a think and as such it should be possible to observe it, or,
at least, to observe indications of it. Shortly, the discussion will turn to
three studies which attempted to do just that, to examine evidence for a
unique construct. Before that, however, the discussion will turn to a prior
question. Namely, what difference does it make which, if any CT paradigm,
is our frame of reference?

Implications of the Paradigms

The difference between the mental paradigm and the logical paradigm
would be insignificant if it were not that they display markedly different
implications for both instruction and research.

The salient implication of the mental paradigm for instruction is the
notion that CT is not so much taught as it is stimulated and that this
stimulation of mental processing is effected through presenting students
with questions or problems which cannot be answered solely by factual
recall, but which require some "higher" mental processing. Questions,
problems and activities designed to "get students to think" provide the core
of a curriculum designed to enhance students' CT. In fact, a decade of
social studies research appears to have been based to varying degrees upon
this implicit paradigm.

In contrast, given the logical paradigm, instruction concentrates upon
teaching students to distinguish between different types of problems, or questions, and to employ appropriate criteria for resolving these problems. The logical paradigm points toward a curriculum which is oriented toward the teaching of concepts which can be employed for analysis and evaluation.

Whereas the mental paradigm appears to be based upon the plausible principle that the best way to teach someone how to think is to induce thinking, the logical paradigm is based upon the principle that "thinking" is not all of a single piece—that some "thinking" is reasonable and well grounded while other "thinking" may be groundless—and that a crucial element in teaching someone how to think is to first teach the grounds on which judgments can or should be made. Ennis makes this point very well in his discussion of Dewey's "reflective thinking." Ennis points out that within the framework of "reflective thinking" as Dewey described it, the criterion for solution of a problem is psychological. That is, a problem is solved when a person feels the problem is solved. Ennis points out that his conception of CT is "logical" in that there is a qualitative basis for determining problem resolution. Given this logical paradigm, determining when a problem is resolved is not based upon how one feels, but upon a priori standards, or criteria, for making judgments.

Similarities between characteristics of the mental paradigm and assumptions of faculty psychology are too close not to be noted. The basic assumption of faculty psychology was that there are faculties or mental "muscles" which can be exercised and strengthened by practice. The new faculty psychology of the mental paradigm differs somewhat in its apparent assumption that the ability to think critically can in a sense be awakened and enhanced by appropriate stimulation. The logical paradigm, in contrast, is similar to what some psychologists are calling "rule-governed" behavior (Segal and Stacy, 1975) and "information processing" behavior (Newell and Simon, 1972). A salient characteristic of these paradigms is the content specificity of thinking. That is, there are "rules" or "procedures" learned which apply within relatively specific contexts. This is in marked contrast to the highly generalized and undifferentiated conception of learning in faculty psychology.

The second major difference in implication between the two paradigms is the manner in which measures of CT should be treated. In practice, the most widely used measure of critical thinking, the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal is frequently reported as a total score even though it is comprised of five sub-sections each of which was constructed on the basis of a separate a priori criterion. The danger of combining scores on tests of critical thinking is that such combinations may be analogous to adding four bananas and six cadillacs and arriving at a sum of ten. In the case of the Watson-Glaser instrument, it is comprised of sub-sections which assess making of inferences, recognition of assumptions, making deductions,
making interpretations and evaluating arguments. Is it reasonable to combine scores on these sections and call it an index of CT? Or is such an index a fiction?

From the frame of reference of the logical paradigm, combining scores into an index is not reasonable and simply masks potentially useful information. The perspective of the mental paradigm, on the other hand, indicates that just such a combination of sub-scores is the most reasonable way to treat measures of CT. Which paradigm holds more empirical support? A way of answering this question is to examine the construct validity of critical thinking. Is there an empirically observable phenomenon we can call critical thinking which is separate and distinct from other constructs?

Evidence

Thus far the discussion on paradigms has identified two alternative paradigms of CT, a mental and a logical paradigm, and has examined some implications of the two for instruction and research. Confronting us at this point is the question of what evidence there is to support or reject either of the paradigms. Evidence for the construct validity of CT will be examined. If CT is a separate and distinct construct, it should be possible to establish this empirically.

Evidence in this regard is scant, but what evidence there is does not support the notion that CT is a separate construct. There is evidence to show that CT tests measure roughly the same thing as I.Q. tests. Correlations between I.Q. tests and the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal are high. Hovland (1959, p. 797) reports a correlation of .70. A correlation of this magnitude is not in itself strong evidence against construct validity since I.Q. is a strong predictor of many verbally loaded tasks and since a correlation of .70 still leaves 50 percent of variance unaccounted. Other evidence is called for. In the following paragraphs three factor analytic studies which sought to empirically describe the structure of critical thinking will be described, analyzed and, then, their findings discussed in terms of the construct validity of "critical thinking."

One study (Rust, Jones and Kaiser, 1962) factor analyzed student performance on three critical thinking instruments, the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, Form BM; A Test of Critical Thinking, Form G prepared by the American Council on Education (The ACE test); and A Test on Principles of Critical Thinking, Form Fl 5 (apparently prepared by the Illinois Critical Thinking Project). The study involved 587 school students who had taken part in the Illinois study of critical thinking and who had attempted all items on each of the three tests. Twenty-one sub-test scores were computed—5 for the Watson-Glaser, 9 for the ACE and 7 for the Principles test. The principal axes method of analysis followed by Kaiser
varimax rotation was used. In terms of the construct validity of critical thinking, results of the study are ambiguous.

Three factors were identified accounting for 24, 13 and 5 percent of the total variance of the sub-tests. Although the authors interpret the first and largest factor as a “general reasoning factor” which they define as the “...ability to reorganize information,...” it is unclear whether the authors consider this the same thing as a critical thinking factor. Interpretation of the factors is further complicated by the pattern of loadings. The Watson-Glaser and the ACE tests load highly on the first factor with all but two of fourteen sub-tests loading .50 or higher, but the Principles test has only one of seven sub-tests loading .35 or higher on this “general reasoning factor.” Factor two is equally variable in its factor loadings with generally low loadings for the Watson-Glaser and ACE tests and generally high loadings for the Principles tests. They interpret the second factor as “logical discrimination” or “application of logical principles.” The third factor is highly loaded on only one sub-test of the Principles instrument and appears to have little significance.

The first factor with high loadings for the Watson-Glaser instrument and the ACE could reasonably be explained as a general intelligence factor. The Principles test does not relate to this same factor, and it is not immediately clear why this is the case. What is it which caused this pattern? Fortunately, the authors include two sample items from the Principles test, the test with low loading on the first factor and high loading on the second. Assuming that the two items are similar to remaining items on the test, it appears that they are highly dependent upon instruction. That is, a high score on the Principles test appears to have required specific instruction. In contrast to this, both the Watson-Glaser and ACE tests include brief instructions for each sub-section which are designed to be sufficient for performing each sub-section.

If this analysis is accurate, it would explain why this particular factor pattern emerged. Since some students received instruction and were part of an experimental group while others were part of a control group, performance of these two groups on a test (the Principles test) for which specific instruction had been provided some of the students would tend to suppress the first factor on that test and create a separate factor loading which emerges as the second factor. The test primarily measures whether they learned the principles or not.

But, what does this tell us about our original question concerning the construct validity of CT? Unfortunately, a clear answer does not emerge. The answer is clouded not only by the pattern of factor loadings but by a still more fundamental uncertainty. Namely, even if a single unambiguous factor were to have emerged from the study, would it be reasonable to interpret it as the CT factor? The answer is, I think, “No.” Running throughout all verbal task performances such as the Watson-Glaser and the
ACE including non-CT measures is what we can call a general intelligence, or general verbal ability factor. If a single dominant factor emerged for the CT tests, with no other factor running throughout the CT tests it would be much more reasonable to call it a general intelligence factor or a verbal ability factor than to call it the CT factor. A second factor running throughout the CT tests would need to emerge before we could reasonably say that there is a CT factor. Let's look at several other studies to see what pattern emerges.

Another study (Penfold & Abou-Hatab, 1967) designed to examine the structure of critical thinking differed from that of Rust, et al. in an important way. It did not conceptualize or operationalize critical thinking in terms of standard critical thinking tests such as the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, but employed Guilford's "structure of intellect" with focus upon his component of "evaluation." Penfold and Abou-Hatab administered thirty tests, twenty of which came from Guilford's work with the remaining ten selected from varying sources. A principal component factor analysis was done which was rotated. The tests were administered to 181 boys and girls seventeen years old in three British grammar schools. One strong finding emerges from the study. That is, a "general factor" emerges which the authors describe as follows:

"The nature of this general factor is not entirely clear. Apart from few discrepancies it runs through all the variables except those of low reliability. It could be interpreted as relational thinking, or as a compound of components connected with the general academic bias of all the testees in the sample."

Given the high correlation between I.Q. measures and measures of critical thinking—at least for the Watson-Glaser instrument—Penfold and Abou-Hatab's identification of a single general factor is probably more accurately described as an I.Q. factor than as a critical thinking factor. In short, it is questionable that this study supports the validity of a type of mental functioning separate from that measured by I.Q. tests that we might call "critical thinking."

A factor analytic study by Follman, Brown and Burg (1970) was done with 187 to 211 college juniors in an educational psychology course. Students were administered five tests, A Test of Critical Thinking, Form G (ACE), Cornell Critical Thinking Test, Form Z (Cornell Z), Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, Form ZM, (Watson-Glaser), The Logical Reasoning Test, Form A, Part II (Logical Reasoning) plus an English test, the Cooperative English Tests, English Expression, Form 1B (COOP). A principal component factor analysis followed by Kaiser varimax rotation was carried out. Two of the four analyses reported in the study are of most interest in the present context.

In one part of the study a factor analysis was done using only the three
critical thinking tests, *ACE, Cornell Z* and *Watson-Glaser.* Seven factors were identified accounting respectively for 11%, 8%, 6%, 6%, 9%, 8% and 7% of total variance. It is notable that no single general factor emerged nor did the factors break down neatly by tests. The authors conclude that

"It appears that the basic structure of the interrelationships of the critical thinking subtests is not a general ability but a com-posite of different group and specific factors each accounting for a relatively small percent of variance." (p. 16)

A second analysis included the *COOP* English tests. It was found that factors emerged which showed a "large communality of variance between critical thinking subtests and the English subtests" (p. 14). Both the finding of this analysis and the prior analysis support the conceptualization of critical thinking as a composite of task performances perhaps sharing a common factor with something we might call general verbal ability, but most notable is the lack of a CT factor.

To summarize briefly, the present discussion has examined evidence regarding the construct validity of the mental paradigm. Although the evidence is ambiguous, it does not tend to support the notion that there is a unitary mental process or closely related set of mental processes which form a construct we might call critical thinking. A confirmatory factor-analytic study designed to test specific hypotheses regarding the structure of CT measures is called for.

**WHICH PARADIGM?**

Thus far the discussion has examined several definitions of CT and two paradigms, or models, plus an examination of empirical evidence which tends not to support the "mental" paradigm. We, now, come to the question of what we should mean by CT; how should we understand its paradigm? Should we understand CT as essentially a mental process or as a set of logical operations?

What will be shown here is that the weight of both evidence and argument point toward the logical paradigm at this time as clearly the most reasonable for both research and instruction in social education. Evidence and argument will be grounded on six considerations.

First, as was seen in the previous discussion, empirical evidence to support the construct validity of CT is non-existent. What has been shown in the two empirical studies which appear to have had fewest methodological and conceptual problems—(Rust, Kaiser and Jones, 1962) and (Follman, Brown and Burg, 1970)—is that measures of CT tend to share variance with measures of general ability, but that no factor emerges which can be identified as CT.

Second, the logical paradigm helps us to answer the questions which
began this discussion. "What does it mean to say that someone learns 'how to think' or learns 'to think for oneself'?" Although it should not be construed that critical thinking involves the totality of all types of thinking, within the framework of the definition and paradigm discussed here it can be argued that one learns "how to think" as one learns to confront the various aspects of critical thinking and to make judgments about them on the basis of acceptable standards. The mental paradigm provides no such clearcut guidance.

"How can 'learning how to think' be taught?" Given the logical paradigm it is reasonable to conceive instruction in critical thinking as a multi-stage process: (1) teaching students the importance of judging statements, (2) instructing students in the types of difficulties facing one who would judge statements, (3) instructing in the grounds, or criteria, for judging statements, (4) providing practice in accepting or rejecting statements based upon criteria, and (5) providing for application in increasingly naturalistic settings. By comparison, the mental paradigm provides relatively little guidance, simply the notion that one stimulates CT by inducing students to deal with questions and problems which call for more than factual recall.

Third, the logical paradigm does not do violence to what social studies educators have ordinarily meant by critical thinking. For example, it corresponds very closely to the conception of critical thinking found in the Morse & McCune booklet on Critical Thinking and Study Skills (1964). As pointed out earlier, it is, also, closely related to the meaning of critical thinking as it was used in the Harvard Project Social Studies curriculum development and research effort (Oliver and Shaver, 1966) and in the Utah State curriculum development and research project (Shaver and Larkins, 1973). The logical paradigm is a clarification rather than a break with the past.

Fourth, the logical paradigm is a fertile source of questions, as will be seen in later sections of the paper. It facilitates generation of research problems.

Fifth, a research effort using the logical paradigm need not start from scratch. An examination of Ennis' aspects will reveal several which have already been the foci of investigation. Certainly his aspect of "judging whether a conclusion follows necessarily" has been given thorough investigation in some of the work emanating from Piaget's findings and theories. Examination of other aspects should reveal still other studies which are relevant.

And, finally, the logical paradigm should provide a focus for building a cumulative research effort. It, of course, will be possible for researchers to investigate the various "aspects," or "critical tasks" with little attention to the work of others; however, it is hoped that the "research agenda" outlined in the next section of this paper will provide a focus around which
otherwise apparently disparate investigations can be organized and interpreted.

In the next section, suggestions for research problems and approaches will be set forth.

RESEARCH AGENDA

The plea for building a body of cumulative research in social studies has been made frequently and in prestigious publications (Metcalf, 1963) (Shaver and Larkins, 1973). This paper should be seen as an effort to structure a joint research and instructional effort by focusing upon a problem in practice, by seeking to clarify the problem, understand the phenomena to be studied and by describing the range of research activities which can be targeted upon the problem. Hopefully, what will emerge from this effort will be an eclectic set of research activities, varying in the questions being asked and research approaches being taken, but sharing a common focus, paradigm and intent, namely the enhancement of critical thinking.

There are several fronts on which research into critical thinking (CT) can move. A variety of questions and a broad gambit of research methods are called for. In what follows, four types of research are suggested: (1) philosophical/conceptual, (2) empirical/descriptive, (3) content analysis and (4) empirical/experimental.

Philosophical/Conceptual Problems

1. To what extent is Ennis' list of 12 aspects of critical thinking in need of amplification?/clarification?/alteration?

Ennis does not claim exhaustiveness nor mutual exclusivity for the aspects. He, in fact, points out that the treatment of value issues is not part of his list. Aspects related to judging value issues should be added. In addition, it may prove possible to reorganize the list into clusters of aspects or even grouped hierarchies. Doing this would presumably render a service to both research and instruction by providing a theory of how the various aspects are related to one another. This static quality is the greatest weakness of the list of aspects. Aspects are treated as if they are unrelated to one another. Yet, the activity of judging whether to accept or reject a statement calls for a dynamic cluster of aspects. It may turn out that the static quality of the aspects is the price paid for their manageability.

The most significant effort to deal with the dynamics of critical thinking can be found in the works of Oliver and Shaver in their development of a "jurisprudential framework" for the analysis of public controversy and in the work of Shaver and Larkins (Oliver & Shaver, 1966) (Shaver & Larkins, 1969). Both sets of authors provide alternatives to the list of aspects.
provided by Ennis. See, also, Berlak’s (1965) comments on this topic. In addition, at least one additional list of critical thinking aspects (O’Neill, 1967, 22-25) has been completed since Ennis published his list.

2. What set of criteria, or standards as a basis for critical thinking are most justifiable? Should these be taught in public schools?

This is a very difficult question calling for rigorous investigation and judicious argument. The question is very sensitive since it asks, in effect, what grounds for truth should be taught in schools. Recent arguments over the content of the curriculum in Kanawha County, West Virginia may spread to other parts of the country. At least part of the controversy is based on just the question being asked here. What grounds for truth should be taught in schools?

3. Which aspects of critical thinking are most important?

This problem may be solved if hierarchical clusters of aspects are well conceptualized. At the present time there is no indication provided by Ennis nor in his list of aspects that one is more important or central to judging statements than any others. Answers to this problem should prove very helpful since it would stand to reason that research and instruction should be concentrated upon those items which are most important.

4. How can the various critical thinking skills identified throughout the social studies literature be related to Ennis’ aspects and the framework developed by Oliver and Shaver and by Shaver and Larkins?

The booklet published by The National Council for the Social Studies, *Critical Thinking Exercises and Study Skills* includes sections which focus upon such tasks as “distinguishing facts from opinions,” “identifying difficulty of proof” and “distinguishing between sources and secondary accounts” (Morse & McCune, 1964). Philosophical/conceptual research is called for to determine if and how these tasks relate to other aspects and conceptions of CT.

**Empirical/Descriptive Problems**

1. How do students vary in their performance of critical tasks? And how do teachers vary? Are there characteristics of students/teachers which predict performance?

At the present time there are large gaps in our knowledge of the incidence and quality of critical thinking in our population or about characteristics which distinguish successful from unsuccessful task performers. One notable exception to this would be research emanating from Piaget’s work; however, it represents only one part of the full range of critical tasks.

2. Given an aspect of critical thinking, what contextual and task variables influence performance on that aspect?

That is, it is reasonable to assume that the context within which subjects
are expected to perform will influence performance on an aspect of critical thinking. For example, paper and pencil tests confront subjects with a different context, or task, than an unstructured “natural” setting. Clearly, as educators we are interested in helping people to improve their critical thinking in “natural” settings. Yet, the cost of doing research in “natural” settings is high and for that reason more tightly structured and more easily researched contexts are used for research. The question is, what is the relationship between performance on highly structured tasks and performance in less structured settings? What is needed is a theory which predicts performance of an aspect of critical thinking as characteristics of the context vary.

3. What are the conditions for and incidence of CT in classrooms?
   Description of the incidence and nature of CT in classroom interactions should prove useful. Currently there are two instruments available for this (Smith, Meux, et al., 1970) (Slater, cited in Shaver & Larkins, 1969, pp. 233-239). Each of these instruments is based upon somewhat different models of CT. Research using these or similar instruments should help to answer questions about the relationship between the incidence of CT in classrooms and students’ performance of CT in both structured and unstructured contexts.

4. What are the conditions for and incidence of CT in non-school settings?
   Improved skill in critical thinking outside school settings is the payoff for instruction to both individuals and society. Knowledge of the incidence and conditions of CT in non-school settings might serve several useful purposes. First, it might alert schools to common weaknesses in CT. Second, such information might serve as a baseline against which to measure future levels of CT. An excellent vehicle for this research would be the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

5. Are there aptitude X task interactions?
   That is, are there characteristics (aptitudes) of task performers which display differential predictions across tasks?

6. What are the reasons subjects give for decisions as they engage in CT?
   In the case of CT where it is difficult to create items which are not differentially interpreted by subjects, the payoff for attending to subjects’ reasons for their decisions should be high. The general distaste of social science researchers to treat subjects’ reasons and explanations as *prima facie* data makes no sense when dealing with logical tasks.

**Content Analytic Problems**

Walker and Schaffarzick’s (1974) analysis of research comparing curricula provides strong evidence for the importance of curricular content for explaining patterns of achievement. Several questions might be asked:
1. What aspects of CT are treated and at what points in school curricula?
   Sub-questions include (a) What is the incidence of treatment of the various aspects? Are some provided more treatment than others? Are some aspects missing from curricula? (b) At what point are aspects introduced into curricula? At what grade level? In what subject matters?

2. How are CT aspects treated in curricula?
   For example, what implicit or explicit theories of how people learn to perform critical tasks are to be found? Or, to what extent are critical thinking aspects dealt with sequentially? To what extent is there provision for practice and application?

3. Are the CT aspects treated rigorously?
   It may be true that CT is treated in certain curriculum materials; however, such treatment may be so superficial or misleading that it is of questionable worth.

4. What is the impact of different curricula upon students?
   It should be possible to identify curriculum materials which should be expected to have differential impacts upon CT. Such materials could provide the basis for both quasi-experimental and experimental studies.

Empirical/Experimental Problems

1. What treatments enhance CT?
   Of particular interest are treatments which enhance application and long-term retention. It is clear that students can be taught to improve their performance in the short-term on critical thinking tasks which are similar to tasks on which they have had instruction and practice (Oliver and Shaver, 1966)(Shaver and Larkins, 1969). What is not known is how to facilitate application—i.e., uncued performance and, further, it is not known how to enhance long-term retention of CT performance.

2. Are there aptitude X treatment interactions?
   That is, are there characteristics of learners which cause them to respond differentially to instructional treatments?

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The first two sections of this paper seek to clarify what we mean when we use the term “critical thinking” and, further what phenomena would be of interest if one were to investigate “critical thinking.” The third section of this paper—“Research Agenda”—presents a variety of research questions and approaches focusing upon critical thinking. Philosophical/conceptual, empirical/descriptive, content analytic and empirical/experimental problems are raised and discussed briefly. The purpose of this final section is to set forth a set of interrelated problems on which a cumulative body of knowledge about a significant educational goal can be built through use of a
wide range of research tools and disciplines.

On the basis of the evidence and arguments presented here, the following conclusions appear warranted: There are alternative ways of defining and conceptualizing critical thinking. The alternatives have implications for both research and instruction. One way of understanding critical thinking, the “mental paradigm,” displays several weaknesses. Most notable is the lack of evidence supporting its construct validity. A second weakness is its lack of clear implications for instruction and research other than the neo-faculty notion that critical thinking is best taught by stimulating students to think. Another way of conceptualizing critical thinking, the “logical paradigm,” displays few of the weaknesses and many strengths not found in the mental paradigm. Most notable are the specificity with which this conception can be described, its clear implications for instruction and the ease with which research problems can be generated.

Given the relatively long period during which teaching students “how to think” has been advocated in social studies education and given the difficulties encountered in fostering this goal, social studies educators might wish to give careful consideration to the logical paradigm conception of critical thinking as a potentially useful way of building a cumulative body of highly relevant insights and findings.
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**FOOTNOTES**

1I am indebted to the following colleagues for their thoughtful comments on drafts of this work: Val Arnsdorf, Joseph DeCaroli, Rita Fillos and A. Jon Magoon.

2Messick writes, "Construct validation is the process of marshaling evidence in the form of theoretically relevant empirical relations to support the inference that an observed response consistency has a particular meaning." He goes on to write, "... a construct is defined by a network of relations that are tied to observables and hence are empirically testable." (955) Samuel Messick, "The Standard Problem: Meaning and Values in Measurement and Evaluation," *American Psychologist*, October 1975, pp. 955-966.
“Ah, so you shall be sure to be misunderstood. Is it so bad then to be misunderstood? Pythagoras was misunderstood, and Socrates, and Jesus, and Luther, and Copernicus, and Galileo, and Newton, and every pure and wise spirit that ever took flesh. To be great is to be misunderstood!  

“EXPANDING COMMUNITIES” CONCEPT

In the late 1930s and early 40s Paul R. Hanna developed and later refined the “expanding communities” concept as an approach to the teaching of social studies. Hanna advocated, for the elementary and junior high school student, a multidisciplinary, wholistic, and coordinated study of people living in societies which he referred to as communities. See FIGURE 1. With the learner placed at the center, or core, of his/her environments, it was maintained that every one of us lives simultaneously in all communities: the family, the school, the neighborhood, the local, the state, the regional, and the national community. Beyond the borders of the national community multi-national regional communities were identified: Inter-American, Atlantic, and the Pacific.

Hanna proposed that the “action” involved within the “Expanding Communities” model moved from the smaller and more intimate communities to the larger and more inclusive communities as the child progressed through the elementary school and expanded his/her activities geographically and culturally. In reference to the model Hanna stated:

“We believe that by careful programming we can introduce the pupil, through inquiry, to economic, geographic, historic, social,

*This manuscript was accepted for publication by the previous editor, Cleo Cherryholms, before Lee Ehman assumed editorship.
anthropological, and political science generalizations underlying each of these enlarging communities of which he is a member."

In later years Hanna's conceptualization of social studies as an "expanding" and "environmental" systems approach has been indirectly documented by the work of Jacob Getzels, Egon Guba and Herbert Thelen. It has been their contention that dimensions similar to those cited by Hanna play important roles in the progression of an individual towards an "observed behavior." (Note: The writers have defined "observed behavior" as that behavior exhibited by students and observed by teachers following any learning processes. Examples may be increased cognitive and affective skills, psychomotor development, the attainment of a teacher-directed goal, etc.) Of special significance are the organizational or institutional dimension (nomothetic), and the personal or individual dimension, (idiographic). In Getzels-Guba-Thelen's "Dimensions of the School as a Social System" these two dimensions, (nomothetic and idiographic), guide the "school as a social system" in a fashion similar to the factors which guide a child through the "expanding" social studies curriculum. (It is assumed that the student/students are influenced by both institutional expectations and individual needs/goals.) Both models, (Hanna and Getzels-Guba-Thelen) profess movement in pluralistic fashion from originating cores. This action and interaction is observed readily in Getzels-Guba-Thelen since the individual student is free to move between the linear and parallel nomothetic and idiographic dimensions. That is, the student acts and learns due to the press of institutional expectations and individual need dispositions. The same is, or should be, true of Hanna's model. Both employ a systems approach which makes it virtually impossible to become "locked" into one dimension and/or "community" level. More importantly, Hanna's model need not be sequential in directional focus, as is Getzels-Guba-Thelen. (Hanna's model is a concentric design as opposed to the linear design of "Dimensions of the School as a Social System.") However, the idea that Hanna's model is a sequential, locked-in, or multidisciplinary approach to social studies curricula has been one of the recent criticisms leveled at the "Expanding Communities" concept.

CRITICISMS OF THE "EXPANDING COMMUNITIES" MODEL

Chapin and Gross in *Teaching Social Studies Skills* have divided "new social studies projects" into three major groupings: (1) Those which emphasize the concepts or methodology of one separate social science discipline; (2) the multidisciplinary approach, which insists that each discipline be taught according to its own independent structure while combining in some way the various social sciences; and (3) those projects which employed a more interdisciplinary, unified, or integrative curriculum.
approach toward the many disciplines. Accordingly, it has been the multidisciplinary approach, advocated by Hanna and others which has received the brunt of criticism in recent years. Chapin and Gross continued by stating that

"Though the multidisciplinary approach would consider how the economist, the social psychologist, or the political scientist would look at a given problem like juvenile delinquency and still respect the integrity of each discipline, the interdisciplinary approach refuted the usefulness of the unique, separate social science structure.

Instead, the interdisciplinary approach projects shifted from formal considerations of structure to a more pragmatic consideration of what particular concepts from the many disciplines would be most useful for a given topic... Perhaps more new social studies projects used the interdisciplinary approach than any other organizational structure."4

In essence, Chapin and Gross contend that the practical aspect of social studies curricula is enhanced by interdisciplinary pragmatism, while multidisciplinary approaches remained separate and formal in structure.

This concept of "separateness" or "formalization" in the multidisciplinary curricula most often refers to the "linear" or "sequential" pattern of social studies instruction. That is, most critics refute the multidisciplinary approach on the basis that it is a traditional pattern and consequently locks the learner into a "step-by-step" process, rather than developing the curricula on a repetitive or experiential basis. This criticism has been advanced by five authors of two separate social studies texts. Clements, Fielder, and Tabachnick, in Social Studies—Inquiry in Elementary classrooms, have stated the following:

"There is a sense of progression or movement in every administrative scheme for the social studies. Sometimes that movement appears to be linear in nature. The Expanding Communities design, for example, seems to move in a direct line from the communities composed of family and neighborhood outward to the communities composed of nations. Linear schemes characteristically do not repeat or return to particular topics. Instead, they progress step by step from what is believed to be close at hand and relatively simple to what is regarded as rather remote and complex. Other designs do repeat topics or ideas. These curricular schemes are pulsating, in the sense that the progression of topics includes a systematic return to earlier themes, persistent themes, and recurring issues."5
Clements _et al._ continued by stating that older school children, with an absence of linear curricula influence, could re-examine social studies topics introduced in earlier years. In contrast to the "Expanding Communities" approach, this "new" instruction was governed by more subtle distinctions, more refined generalizations, and wider sources of information.6

Rooze and Foerster, co-authors of _Teaching Elementary Social Studies—A New Perspective_, have also commented on the previously identified and so-called "linear" approach to the social studies:

"The traditional pattern of sequencing instruction in social studies has used the expanding environment principle. This was based upon the premise that children could comprehend only that environment nearest in time and space to their experiences. The child studied the home, school, neighborhood, community, state, region, and then the nation, in that order. Such a pattern ignored the impact of mass media to which children are exposed and which vastly increased their experiential base."7

Perhaps the best summary of criticisms of the "Expanding Communities" model comes from Ord's _Elementary School Social Studies for Today's Children_. According to Ord, "The expanding-environment approach to designing the social studies curriculum has recently come under severe attack."8 In order to substantiate his assertion, the following divisional outline of criticisms was presented:

1. The grade-level themes or sequence has been criticized by some for becoming too inflexible and restrictive for modern-day youth. That is, among other things, it is reasoned that because children today watch television and travel more widely than ever before, they can move out of the small circle of the home, school, and neighborhood to a study of people and places more remote from them earlier in their school experience. In many cases young children spend valuable school time studying things they already know a great deal about, such as the work of firemen and policemen. Maximum learning cannot take place where children are so restricted.

2. Defining scope according to the basic human activities of mankind discourages the utilization of current issues and problems important for today's world and for future survival.

3. Since the first three grades all deal with aspects of the community, there is a considerable amount of repetition of content in these early years.

4. Under this framework, content to be learned is often set out far in advance. Topics become outdated rapidly and therefore, in many cases, are unsuitable to meet the emerging needs of society.
Part of the danger in this framework lies in the temptation to accept it as the only thread and to ignore the fact that this particular approach is often too age-grade oriented. For example, the family has value as a focus of study for more than the first years a child is in school. It is a false notion that once family content has been looked at in the first grade it need never be reviewed again.

Bruce R. Joyce, although admitting that Hanna's work in the field of social studies was honest and offered much to the scholar, contended that he was "amazed at the lack of attention given the monumental series of social sciences by Hanna and his students." In essence, the traditional, sequential, multidisciplinary approach to the teaching of social studies has been criticized. Similarly, the "new" social studies have been criticized. The writers chose not to criticize the "new" social studies curricula and/or approaches. The measured intent, rather, was to support the concept of the "Expanding Communities" model through a re-clarification or re-juxtapositioning of Hanna's original conceptualization.

"EXPANDING COMMUNITIES" REVISITED AND MODIFIED

FIGURE 1 depicted Hanna's conceptualization of the "Expanding Communities." FIGURE 2 is a concentric, graphic representation of Hanna's concept with two additional dimensions: (1) Facilitators surrounding the child in the model's core, and (2) pathways leading from the child and his/her facilitation through the expanding communities and then back again; (illustrated by the double-headed arrows). In order to facilitate the explanation of the model, only five of Hanna's eleven "Expanding Communities" have been included: (1) Family, (2) school, (3) neighborhood, (4) local, and (5) state. It should be understood that the remaining "Communities," i.e. "region-of-states, national, interamerican, atlantic, pacific and world" can be added to the model represented by FIGURE 2 if so desired.

Before progressing further in explanatory fashion, it becomes necessary to assert two clear-cut, definitive assumptions concerning FIGURE 2: (1) The learner, placed in the center or core of Hanna's "Expanding Communities," does not stand alone. Rather, he/she is the chief beneficiary of facilitators, social and physical environments, his/her formal and informal educational experiences, and (2) this is made possible through the open "pathways" which are accessible to the child in his/her "journey," so to speak, through the "world" of social studies.
FACILITATORS

As displayed in FIGURE 2 the child is surrounded by facilitators. No longer should the child be assumed as standing alone at the center of "Communities." As the chief learner in an environment organized for learning, the child relies on more than teachers to guide him/her through the "Communities." For example, the child is not "facilitated" in his/her learning experience by what we refer to as "learning facilitators:" (1) Social environments, (2) physical environments, (3) formal educational experiences, and (4) informal educational experiences. These "learning facilitators" are assumed to exist simply because the child's world involves more than a classroom or a textbook.

Depending on individual circumstances the learner encounters a variety of physical and social environments as well as formal and informal educational experiences throughout life. Schools are probably one of the most common formal educational experiences and environments of individuals in our society. The degree to which teachers recognize and coordinate with other environments and learning experiences will determine the validity of criticisms launched at Hanna's model. It is recognized that school age learners are encountering a variety of environments, other than the "Community" being studied in school, as well as having formal and informal learning experiences which involved different community levels. However, the formal study of a single community level does not and should not imply that other community levels cannot be related.

PATHWAYS

The pathways leading from the learner, or core, of FIGURE 2 allow for freedom of movement by the child through his/her surrounding communities. The double-headed arrows at either end of the pathways allow for the return to a previously studied community.

As the center, or core, of his/her own learning environment, children consequently find themselves in a unique situation. In the past it was naturally assumed by instructors or teachers of the social studies that the child progressed, sequentially outward, through "communities." As previously mentioned, proponents of the "new" social studies argued that this sequence "locked" the child into a "community" regardless of the child's natural intelligence or readiness to pursue other "communities" in the course of studies. Supporters of the interdisciplinary approach to social studies felt that multidisciplinary techniques prevented the child from returning to a previously inhabited "community." With the adaptation and refinement of the "Expanded Communities" model, FIGURE 2, it appears as if this criticism is not necessarily valid.

The pathways have been designated as exploration, acquisition,
development, and application. Through the learner’s many environments and formal/informal educational experiences, he or she will be introduced and reintroduced to knowledge, skills and values. Through formal educational experiences in a school environment the learner is given the opportunity to explore, acquire, develop and apply his or her knowledge, skills and values.

Today’s vast expanse of available media propels the child into many “Communities” which can be “explored” en masse, or singularly. The “community” of “family” is traditionally explored first. This “family” concept can now be moved, vis-a-vis, through the pathways to any “Expanding Community” level shown in Hanna’s model. In essence, the “family” is not only studied as an independent unit in a singular “community,” but rather as a “family” on any or all community levels. The model traditionally thought of as multidisciplinary now shows signs of interdisciplinary movement or action when the pathways are viewed as “open” to all “Expanding Communities” on any concentric level. Therefore, the “family” is easily studied or viewed, in terms of “school,” “neighborhood,” “local” or “state” communities. This interdisciplinary movement within a traditionally multidisciplinary model is possible if the model is viewed as an “open” system; not “locked” in or “sequential” as predominantly criticized.

Hanna has never insisted that his “Communities” exist. Instead, he has raised questions as to the existence of “Expanding Communities.”

“If the set of expanding communities is demonstrable, can the set be used as sequential emphases for progression from school level to level: starting with the child’s family and moving systematically outward to the larger communities?”

Similarly, the writers pose the question, do “pathways” aid the learning situation through a natural existence; i.e., the child explores surrounding environments and “Communities,” acquires knowledge, skills, values, consequently develops and ultimately applies knowledge, skills and values? Also, are these pathways sequential in a step-by-step, “community-by-community” process, or is there interdisciplinary movement within a multidisciplinary model? In other words, is it possible to teach social studies in a sequential pattern with interdisciplinary emphases by combining the best of two “worlds?”

THE EXPANDING COMMUNITIES AS AN OPEN SYSTEMS MODEL WITH “INPUT” AND “OUTPUT”

In adapting Hanna’s “Expanding Communities” model to function structurally as represented in FIGURE 2, the following assumptions must be made:
(1) The child as a learner, is the product of a formal (institutional) education, as well as the product of a self-imposed (personal) education in his/her day-to-day existence.

(2) It becomes possible to penetrate or “join” the “institutional” and “personal” dimensions.

(3) The double-headed arrows, symbolic of the “pathways” in FIGURE 2, allow for “input” from the communities as well as “output” in the traditional, sequential pattern.

(4) Hanna’s “Expanding Communities” model is an “open” systems model as opposed to “closed.”

As previously mentioned, Getzels, Guba and Thelen have conceptualized a model which displays linear movement, (i.e., nomothetic and idiographic), towards “observed behavior.” More importantly, Getzels, Guba and Thelen view this “observed behavior” as originating from a “social system.” Therefore, if the child is viewed as the core within the “social system,” and “observed behavior” is depicted as one of the resultant products of social studies instruction per se, then is it not possible for the child’s facilitators, as depicted in FIGURE 2, to originate from two sources: Nomothetic and idiographic? Is it possible for the institution (social studies curriculum) and the child (personal dimension) to be facilitated by sequential and individual exploration, acquisition, development and application of knowledge, skills and values?

Sweitzer has stated that the two dimensions, nomothetic and idiographic, interpenetrate one another. Since the two dimensions are interpenetrable a third dimension, referred to as transactional, becomes a blend of the other two dimensions. In FIGURE 2 this transactional dimension is represented by the “pathways.” Sweitzer continued by adding that the two dimensions, together with the transactional dimension, operate within and interact with a larger environment. In reference to FIGURE 2 this conclusion by Sweitzer provides support for the writers’ previous assertion that a sequential approach (movement to a larger environment) does not necessarily mean that interdisciplinary action (“interaction”) cannot occur within the “Expanding Communities” model.

As previously assumed, Hanna’s model is an “open” systems conceptualization. The adaptation of Hanna’s “Expanding Communities,” FIGURE 2 necessitates that assumption. According to Hearn, “open systems exchange energy and information with their environments; that is, they have inputs and outputs.” Stogdill regarded organized groups (similar to the sequential approach to social studies or the previously cited nomothetic dimension) as an input-output “open system which exchanged members or values with its environment.” This may be associated with the assertion that interdisciplinary “action” can occur in a multidisciplinary approach to social studies. More succinctly stated in Griffiths’ comment: “An open system is related to and exchanges matter with its environment,
while a closed system is not and does not." 16

SUMMARY

In summation, the writers have presented a defense of the "Expanding Communities" approach to social studies. It has been noted that the "newer" techniques of social studies instruction may be incorporated into Hanna's original conceptualization of the sequential and/or multidisciplinary method. An attempt has been made to justify the adaptation of Hanna's model, FIGURE 2, by assumption and documentation.

Additionally, the writers have asked the question, is this the answer to the criticism of the "Expanding Communities" model? Perhaps there is no one set answer. We feel that Hanna has provided the best answer to our query as well as a summary for his own defense when he stated:

"It must be made crystal clear that there is no "one royal road" to developing the appropriate values and concepts and behavior in man-to-man relations; rather, there are currently several designs from which to select, and there will be still more sequential programs developed in the years to come." 17
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INTRODUCTION

Is there a logical inconsistency between traditional pressures for schools to produce uncritical national patriots and the educational needs of an emergent global society?

Schools periodically reassess their goals and set new directions and ideals. The very nature of the relationship between schools and the societies in which they operate virtually precludes the setting of school goals which are radically different from those of the society. Though there are some who argue that the schools have the capacity to reconstruct society, the weight of evidence indicates that schools are essentially reflective of their societies. Where there are conflicts between the newly developing goals of the school and the societal forces that influence school regulation and practice, a variety of dilemmas results. Social education is often the curricular focus of such conflicts and the dilemmas fall upon those who work in the field.

One area of potential conflict appears in the recent movement toward global education. There is little doubt that we live in a global society. Extensive transnational transportation, communication and trade provide considerable evidence of this, though the most public display of the notion of globality may have been the dramatic photographs of earth taken from space. Global education in the schools draws from the increasingly obvious concept of interdependence and those human issues which are supranational. Issues like worldwide pollution, food supply, population, nuclear warfare, discrimination, multinational corporate business and energy call for study and teaching at a level beyond national interest viewpoints.

Schools, however, exist within the legal and political boundaries of nations. They are usually perceived as major institutions for conveying national values and loyalties to the young citizen. With the burgeoning of nationalism over the past two centuries schools have been given a large share of the responsibility for strengthening the sense of nationhood in the minds of a people. Nationalistic education is a term that fits this process of instructing people in the virtues of their own country and the evils of those deemed enemies.

An examination of some of the backgrounds for nationalistic education,
examples of it in several countries, and a focus on selected requirements related to it in the United States illustrates the conflict between intentions to move toward global education and the traditional nationalistic concerns of the schools. There is a relatively long history of nation-based international education in American schools that has typically been composed of world (separate national) history, political geography, area studies and comparative government. Education which emphasizes narrow nationalism may need to be modified to account for worldwide human interests. Global education has not been a common activity in American schools.

This paper concentrates on the expressed intention of those who control or desire to control the schools' efforts at producing the "good citizen." The primary concern is nationalistic education, which is defined as those educational activities designed to develop a belief in national values. Nationalistic education usually incorporates three dimensions: (1) development of positive feelings toward those rituals, ceremonies, symbols and persons that express or incorporate those national values; (2) development of competency in operating as a national citizen; and (3) development of negative feelings toward countries, ideologies, symbols and persons considered contra-national. This paper examines a body of literature about and official documents related to the practice of nationalistic education in the schools.

NATIONALISM AND THE SCHOOLS

Nationalism, as an eighteenth century phenomenon, has spread throughout the world in a variety of manifestations and results. It is one of the most important factors in everyday political life. Hans Kohn suggested in 1956 that nationalism had become the dominant emotional force all over the globe. Although he notes that

"Nationalism is in itself neither good or bad... peoples newly awakened to nationalism have begun to stress and overstress their self-hood and independence, their cultural particularities and self-sufficiency... collective passions and utopian expectations have centered around the newly awakened nationalism to such a degree that ever new barriers disrupt the international community." 2

Some two decades after Kohn's article it appears that nationalism is still the dominant emotional force. The United Nations, less united than nations, continues as a forum for national interests and conflict. U.N. worldwide conferences on population, food and women result in vague statements of principle that ensure the rights of national sovereignty in any decisions. The Viet Nam war was turned into a battle for American national honor. African countries battle internally and externally to establish their nationalism.
The large literature available on nationalism includes numerous definitions of the term nationalism:

"a fusion of patriotism with a consciousness of nationality."3

"a state of mind, in which the supreme loyalty of the individual is felt to be due the nation-state."4

The following characteristics of nationalism were among ten hypothesized by Shafer:

"...2. Some common cultural characteristics such as language (or widely understood languages), customs, manners and literature...
3. Some common dominant social (as Christian) and economic (as capitalistic or recently communistic) institutions.
4. A common independent or sovereign government...
5. A belief in a common history (it can be invented)...
7. A devotion to the entity (however little comprehended) called the nation...
8. A common pride in the achievements (often the military more than the cultural) of this nation and a common sorrow in its tragedies (particularly its defeats).
9. A disregard for or hostility to other (not necessarily all) like groups, especially if these prevent or seem to threaten the separate national existence..."5

Arguments over the definition, history, nature and extent of nationalism are well treated in our sources. There is little debate, though, on the contention that nationalism is a strong force in human affairs. As such it is an important concern for those interested in the study of social phenomena. Nationalism, as a state of mind fusing patriotism with nationality and consisting of a set of beliefs and conditions, is learned.

Schools, as a major socialization agent in a society, share in that society's goals, ambitions, morality and constraints. There is a long-standing argument in educational literature over the purposes and practices of the schools with respect to their role in reflecting or reforming society.6 Viewed from one end of the continuum, the schools are, and necessarily continue to be, reflective institutions whose primary purpose is to inculcate values, ideas and behaviors deemed suitable by the dominant society. The school as an instrument of the society exists to provide uncritical training in those skills and knowledges which continue the cultural heritage as perceived by those in power. This form applied to nationalistic education is intended to
produce obedient patriots.

At an opposing end of the spectrum is the idea that schools should, and must, assist in the reconstruction of society. Schools have an intellectual and moral obligation to criticize the existing society in an effort to improve it. As centers of knowledge devoted to the search for truth and intended to prepare new generations for new societies, schools offer an unparalleled opportunity for social reconstruction. Knowledge, skills and cultural values merely transmitted to youth serve the society poorly and comprise the basic nature of education. If one reviews the history of schooling it is possible to find evidence of school-borne social reconstruction. The very notion of mass, public, free education is an example. Nationalistic education in this manner sees the patriot as a free and critical person, responsive to change.7

The battle between educational conservators, who see the school as an agency of transmittal of pre-determined cultural baggage, and the reconstructionists, who dream of utopias through constant change, is played out in cycles—or spasms—of rhetoric. For good or ill, the actual practices of the school seem to change only slightly. Schools have come to be the subject of great debate, fads and fancies, but they continue to be very resilient in continuing to do whatever they were doing. Most schools carry a mixed bag of essentialist content, traditionalist view, high-minded moral pretext, progressive ideology and reconstructionist intentions. One of the reasons schooling is a difficult field for research is that there is little purity and limited opportunity for precise experimental design. An examination of the literature—those statements of purpose, intention, requirement and recommendation—can provide one perspective for viewing nationalistic teaching, though it has the limitation that it may not fully relate to what is actually taking place in schools. It does, at the least, offer a sense of the educational intentions of those in power.

Within the context of schools as both reflective and reconstructive institutions, pushed and pulled by a variety of forces, the framework for producing national citizens can be examined. As V. O. Key noted, all national systems of education indoctrinate the younger generations with the values of the political order.8

A larger number of studies over the past decade have focused on the area identified as political socialization in which the major questions related to what children seem to know about or value in the political system. These studies provide interesting insights about parts of the content and process of political education. They say more, perhaps, about what is learned outside of schools than within.

Sir Charles Waldstein, in a spirited book on patriotism published in 1917, differentiates between patriotism and chauvinism. He describes patriotism as love of country and chauvinism as hate of all others. Further, he suggests a differentiation between true patriotism and false patriotism, with the true form incorporating ethical justifications that necessarily predispose
a person to international patriotism. Waldstein proposes a true patriotism that involves "love and loyalty to a League of Civilized and Free Nations." His true patriotism assumes unselfish love and loyalty for country as the basis for "the most effective higher moral idealism, ending in the love of mankind." Waldstein advocated a schooling in social and political education with emphasis on civics and modern ethics.9

Although Waldstein's idealism of international patriotism was unrealized, his point about the duality of patriotism and chauvinism as positive and negative components is reflected in much of the effort in nationalistic education.

The defining characteristics of nationalism suggested by Boyd Shafer and excerpted earlier in this paper involve similar bi-valence in pride of national achievement and disregard or hostility to other national groups. This combination occurs often in official documents governing schools.10

NATIONALISTIC EDUCATION IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Schools have been seen as effective tools for nationalistic teaching. Carlton Hayes suggests that schooling was a prominent factor in the development of German, French, Japanese and other nationalism as well as assisting in the movement toward World War I through nationalistic propaganda utilized in classrooms.11

Jean-Jacques Rousseau published his Considerations sur le gouvernement de Pologne in 1772 in response to a request by a Polish nobleman for ways to intensify nationalism. Rousseau's essay is considered the first systematic theory of conscious and organized nationalism. In it he argues that national institutions can produce an inspiration for the people to have a love for and loyalty to the nation by instilling habits that cannot be erased. He saw the teaching of patriotism through schooling as an absolute necessity, stating:

"Education ought to give national form to the soul of the people, and guide their opinions and tastes in such a way that they will become patriots through inclination, through passion, through necessity. A child, upon opening his eyes, must see the nation, and to the day of his death must see only that....At 20 years of age, a Pole must not be anything else: he must be only a Pole...when he learns to read, he will read only about his native land. When he is ten years old, he should know all the products of his country; at twelve years all the provinces, its roads, its towns, at fifteen he should know its entire history; at sixteen all its laws;...Only Poles should be his teachers, all married, if possible, all distinguished by their good morals, honesty, good sense and wisdom...Gymnastics should be
established in all the schools so that the children will have the benefit of physical exercise. . . .''12

Rousseau's prescriptions for Polish education sound strangely familiar to those who have examined American, and other countries', social education programs. Carlton J. H. Hayes presented excerpts from French schoolbooks used in the 1920s. They included the following along with his comments:

''The Great War (World War I) is briefly commented upon as follows: 'France wished to live at peace with all nations. But in 1914 Germany provoked a general war. With the Allies, England, Russia and the United States, France fought valiantly for right and justice. Victorious in 1918, she imposed on Germany, in 1919, the Treaty of Versailles, which returned Alsace-Lorraine to us.'

''The book concludes with a 'Moral of History' in these words:

'Children, you have read the history of your country, the recital of its victories and defeats,... As citizens you will fulfill all your duties and remain attached to the institutions which the Republic has founded. As soldiers you will perform with zeal your military service and, if the fatherland appeal to your devotion, you will be ready to shed your blood for it....

[in another text] ''In a section on modern science lauding Pasteur, appear the following:

'It was likewise a French scientist who contributed to the invention of wireless telegraphy; another who, after fifty years of tireless toil, conferred upon our country the marvellous discovery of refrigeration....The first submarine was also due to a Frenchman....it is to France that aviation owes most.'

No mention of any scientific achievements elsewhere.'''13

German nationalistic education has its own heroes. During the reign of William II, efforts at nationalism in school teaching produced a number of works. One of the books on historical methodology was written by Carl Reim for history teachers and had a chapter titled 'History Instruction as a Means of Developing a Patriotic and Monarchial Spirit.' In the introductory pages Reim notes, 'More national consciousness, much more than we now possess! That is the end to which we history teachers must help our youth.'''14

The Nazis recognized the role of education in nationalistic development. Control of the schools was an early thrust under Hitler. Abolition of contra-national ideas and infusion of strong nationalistic sentiments were basic elements in the Nazi school program. Textbooks of the period praise
obedience, discipline, Hitler, and the regime. One of the books, following a passionate story of Hitler's rise to power titled "Adolf Hilter, the Savior from all Troubles," identifies a symbol of nationalism in the following manner: "The swastika banner symbolized the program of the party: in red the socialistic, in white, the national idea, and in the swastika the struggles for the victory of Aryans over racially alien powers."\textsuperscript{15}

This use of symbol in school-developed nationalistic education is common. The swastika statement also illustrates the dual character of much nationalistic education: positive view of own nation and negative view of others. Mark Krug analyzed textbooks used in post-World War II East and West Germany and discovered differences according to which government was in power. Thus, one East German text speaks only of Polish Jews as having been killed under Hitler. Other studies make a similar point.\textsuperscript{16}

Other countries use the schools as instruments for developing patriotism and chauvinism in younger generations. Russia, in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, harbored little national pride. During the reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855), nationalism emerged and Russians of the Orthodox Creed were touted as the perfect citizens of the earth. Europe was portrayed as pagan, while Russia was considered holy.

Marx held that nationalism was a bourgeois manipulation, and Marxist historians did not engage in patriotic glorification in their writings. In the 1930s, however, there was a return to nationalism, and this was evidenced in school programs. A Russian government commission gave a 75,000 ruble prize for the most satisfactory textbook on the history of the U.S.S.R. to Professor A. V. Shestakov, who wrote:

"In no other country in the world is there such friendship among the various peoples as in the U.S.S.R.... there are no parasites, capitalists and landlords... there is no exploitation of man by man.... In the past our country was a backward country; now it has become the most advanced and mighty country in the world."\textsuperscript{17}

A 1938 presentation by M. I. Kalinin to a conference of teachers dealt with the teacher's task in the socialist society. He noted that the new socialist man must be educated as a comradely spirit because "we are surrounded by capitalist countries, because our Union is being systematically slandered and every bourgeois is longing for a suitable moment to crush the Soviet Union."\textsuperscript{18}

China can be used as an Asian example of nationalistic education. Chang Chih-tung, a government official, published an essay in 1898 that argued that saving China from revolution involved three things: maintaining the reigning dynasty; conserving the holy religion; and protecting the Chinese race. These are to be done through education, "But unless Chinese learning is made the basis of education, and a Chinese direction given to thought, the
strong will become anarchists, and the weak slaves.'

Cyrus Peake, in a 1932 publication, states that the "motive and aim of these Chinese who have been responsible for the introduction of modern education into China in the course of the past 70 years was to build a strong nation resting on military power and capable of existing in a world of warring nations." Peake's studies show how this was accomplished over a period of time resulting, after 1925, in an education system permeated with a "dogmatic and intolerant" spirit of modern nationalism.

A more recent study of texts used in Chinese schools was reported by Ridley, Godwin and Doolin. They conducted a content analysis of ten school readers used in mainland China for teaching the Chinese language. Ridley, et al. found that stories used in these readers fell into one of three categories: primarily informational, aimed at specific political attitudes, and designed for behavior modelling. Heading the list of those things that should be known by a three to four year old child was the "picture of Chairman Mao and the national flag." In the fourth year the child should "know a few stories about how the Liberation Army fought the reactionaries." Fifth year is for intensification of the "Five Loves" which include love of motherland. During the sixth year emphasis is on "hating reactionaries and American imperialism...loving peace-loving friendly nations...loving the New China."

Japanese nationalistic education is well documented in P. A. Narasimha Murthy's historical study. Government selection of textbooks resulted in increased emphasis on Japanese patriotism in schools. Nationalized textbooks covered morals, history, geography, copy-books, Japanese language readers, arithmetic, drawing, and science. Physical education, incorporating military exercises, was made compulsory and, at one point, even included appropriate military songs to accompany the gymnastics.

**NATIONALISTIC EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES**

Similar studies of texts, teaching guides, position statements and the influence of patriotic organizations on nationalistic education in the United States have shown that there is no lack of the patriotic and chauvinistic spirit in American schools. Billington's study group of American and British historians concluded that the treatment of historical material in both countries is nationally biased, but American texts are much more biased than British. Commager notes that, "Schools were not only an expression of American philosophy; they were the most effective agent in its formulation and dissemination." Gellerman, Raup, Pierce and others found extensive involvement of patriotic organizations in school affairs. More recent studies have shown the impact of nationalistic views on the operation of schools and the perceptions of teachers and other school personnel.
In the United States there is a strong sense of nationalistic education. Documents exemplified here indicate only some of the written state-level requirements and guidelines. At the local district, school and individual classroom level such instruction is commonplace. Every public school in the United States, and probably every classroom, displays an American flag. Allegiance pledges are daily routine in most schools, often required by law. American history is the most commonly taught subject in the social studies. For a very simply comparison, the British schools display no flags, have no school pledges to the nation, do not engage in other patriotic exercises, and take British history only upon student election. British school officials, upon interview, expressed surprise at the thought of flag display and related rituals. British students interviewed could not easily comprehend such activities, and said that they learned patriotic songs from watching sports events on television, but certainly not in school.25 There are obvious nationalistic biases in the content of British school courses in geography and history, but nothing as widespread as that found in American schools. One set of explanations easily suggested for the differences in nationalistic education is that America is trying to melt a mixture of immigrants, is younger, is physically larger and in less common geographic contact than England and, thus, needs more direct teaching of nationalism.

One of the ways to examine the politics of nationalistic education in the United States is to investigate official documents which govern the operation of the schools. From a survey of state laws and state board of education regulations the following examples indicate the types of nationalistic education promulgated in the United States:


"...4. The principal emphasis in teaching about communism should be consistent with the ideal of developing well-informed American citizens; and while such study should be objective and scholarly in its approach, it should develop clearly the threat of communism to the free world....

6. A principal outcome of this study should be an understanding of and strengthened belief in the governmental system of the United States.... 26

Also Education Code Section 9031.

"No teacher giving instruction in any school, or on any property belonging to any agencies included in the public school system, shall advocate or teach communism with the intent to indoctrinate or to inculcate in the mind of any pupil a preference for communism.

In prohibiting the advocacy or teaching of communism with the
intent of indoctrinating or inculcating a preference in the mind of any pupil for such doctrine, the Legislature does not intend to prevent the teaching of the facts about communism. Rather the Legislature intends to prevent the advocacy of, or inculcation and indoctrination into, communism as is hereinafter defined, for the purpose of undermining patriotism for, and the belief in, the government of the United States and of this state.

For the purposes of this section, communism is a political theory that the presently existing form of government of the United States or of this state should be changed, by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means, to a totalitarian dictatorship which is based on the principles of communism as expounded by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin."27

Florida.

"...2. The public high schools shall each teach a complete course of not less than thirty hours, to all students enrolled in said public high schools entitled 'Americanism versus Communism.'

3. The course shall provide adequate instruction in the history, doctrines, objectives and techniques of communism and shall be for the primary purpose of instilling in the minds of the students a greater appreciation of democratic process, freedom under law, and the will to preserve that freedom.

4. The course shall be one of orientation in comparative governments and shall emphasize the free-enterprise-competitive economy of the United States as the one which produces higher wages, high standards of living, greater personal freedom and liberty than any other system of economics on earth.

5. The course shall lay particular emphasis upon the dangers of communism, the ways to fight communism, the evils of communism, the fallacies of communism, and the false doctrines of communism.

6. The state textbook committee and the state board of education shall take such action as may be necessary and appropriate to prescribe suitable textbook and instructional material as provided by state law, using as one of its guides the official reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee of the United States Congress.

7. No teacher or textual material assigned to this course shall present communism as preferable to the system of constitutional government and the free-enterprise-competitive economy indigenous to the United States."28
Hawaii.

"...The history of the United States and its backgrounds shall be thoroughly taught to get the fullest possible understanding of the long struggle for human liberty, of how our democratic ideals and practices began and grew, and the whole picture of what our people have done in making our life better.

This instruction shall be given with the vital purpose of developing an informed devotion to our American way of life. The difference between the ruthless aims and practices of totalitarianism of whatever form and the great democratic ideas of justice, equality, freedom and the work of each person, shall be sharply drawn. Special emphasis shall be given to communism as a major totalitarian threat in the world at this time...

Nebraska.

"...4. In at least two grades of every high school, at least three periods per week shall be devoted to the teaching of civics during which courses specific attention shall be given to the following matters: (a) The Constitution of the United States and of the State of Nebraska. (b) The benefits and advantages of our form of government and the dangers and fallacies of Nazism, Communism, and similar ideologies. (c) The duties of citizenship...."

New York.

"...3. The courses of study beyond the first eight years of time public day schools may provide a program for a course in ‘communism and its methods and its destructive effects.’"

The common threat among these state policies is the same dualism of patriotism and chauvinism suggested by Waldstein, Shafer and others. There are differences among the policies in terms of detail and degree of vehemence, but a basic tenet is producing loyalty to the United States while making anti-communists. There is a stress on national symbols and rituals in the operation of schools under these kinds of policies.

CALIFORNIA AS AN ILLUSTRATION

For example, California, whose prohibitive enactment in this area is shown previously, includes segments of the Education Code and State Board of Education Regulations in the State School Register, which is the official registry of student attendance maintained by teachers in the public schools. Included in the Education Code provisions printed at the front of
the Register are the following:

"...13556.5 Instruction shall be given in the principles of morality, truth, justice, patriotism, and the rights, duties, and dignity of American citizenship. Pupils shall be taught to be mannerly and kind to animals and to avoid idleness and profanity.

16517. The governing board of each school district throughout the State shall provide for each schoolhouse under its control, a suitable Flag of the United States, which shall be hoisted above each schoolhouse during all school sessions and on school holidays, weather permitting.

"The governing board of each school district shall provide smaller and suitable United States Flags to be displayed in each schoolroom at all times during the school sessions.

"The governing board of each school district shall enforce this section." 32

and the first paragraph of Section 9031, which appears earlier.

Taken from the California Administrative Code, regulations enacted by the State Board of Education, are the following flag requirements:

"...20. Flag Shall Have Proper Care. ‘The governing board of each school district shall provide a suitable flagstaff for the hoisting of the Flag and a locker in which the Flag can be kept when not being flown. The Flag shall be raised before the opening of school and taken down at its close every day, weather permitting. Principals and teachers shall teach pupils to honor and care for the Flag to the end that it may be treated with respect and handled with reverence at all times.’

21. Activities With Respect to Flag. ‘The governing board of each school district shall require, and provide for, the giving of appropriate instruction throughout the school term and the holding of appropriate exercises or other activities in each school under its jurisdiction during the last week of the annual school term of the school which shall emphasize to the pupils of the school the meaning of the Flag of the United States and the purpose, ideals, and freedoms for which it stands. There shall be a daily pledge of allegiance to the Flag of the United States in each public school, conducted in accordance with regulations which shall be adopted by each governing board.’" 33

California, about 15 years ago, was the scene of much activity in increasing amount of nationalistic education. The Los Angeles City Board
of Education had passed a regulation which prohibited instruction about UNESCO because that agency was considered too heavily communist-influenced. A suburban Los Angeles school district board of education passed a regulation that any materials on which appeared the word "Russia" or which dealt with Russia had to be screened by the board before they could be used in the schools. Orange County, notable for its patriotic organizations, had a large number of school districts which refused federal aid to education because it was considered too socialistic. "Freedom Centers," containing framed documents from U.S. history and a collection of books extolling American virtues and often including books sponsored or advocated by the John Birch Society, were established in many California public school libraries with the financial support of local businessmen's groups.

The election of Max Rafferty to become California State Superintendent of Public Instruction was partly the result of his well publicized concern for teaching American values and patriotism. Rafferty became nationally known for his views against "progressive education" and his support for basics and morality stressing American virtues and religion.

By 1976 California had elected Wilson Riles as State Superintendent, and had become much more moderate in its stress on nationalistic education. During a 1975 interview with Douglas Campbell, Assistant Director of the Office of Curriculum Services of the California State Department of Education, he said that he saw no movement among groups now to develop more patriotic education. Though he agreed that the schools are heavily engaged in Bicentennial activities, he saw such events as distinctly different from the kinds of nationalistic education fomented by patriotic organizations in the past.

In response to a question about the changes in patriotic school work over the past 15 years, Campbell said:

"That period 15 years ago was accentuated by repeated efforts to push the schools and the state toward patriotism....I suspect that [the McCarthy Period] had something to do with it....of course school boards received a lot of heat from people. What has happened in my judgment is that the whole thing has been cooled. There is very little activity, very little ultra-conservatism....When Max [Rafferty] left a lot of that kind of concern also left.

I think what's happening in the Bicentennial year is really exciting because it is a grass roots feeling. It's people just wanting to participate in the celebration. What has died down is the kind of movement which has a strong nationalistic bias. A lot of what was done before was because of fear."34

The California Education Code still contains the requirements noted above for daily "appropriate patriotic exercises," school celebration of
national holidays in honor of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Luther Burbank, Susan B. Anthony, and Crispus Attucks. There also still remains the prohibition against a teacher, on any school property, advocating or teaching "communism with the intent to indoctrinate or inculcate in the mind of any pupil a preference for communism." There are two paragraphs of this section of the Code prohibiting a form of comministic instruction which are not reprinted in the State School Register, but which appear earlier in this paper.35

While there are some serious logical and definitional questions in these last two paragraphs of this law, there is an obvious attempt in them to modify the first blindly prohibitive paragraph. The law does permit teaching the "facts about communism," though the teacher must not have "intent to indoctrinate or inculcate in the mind..." That is a difficult enough assignment for a teacher without the convolusion in the definition of communism, and the more recent determination that membership in the party is not illegal. The legislative intent is rather clearly expressed: "to prevent the advocacy of...communism...for the purpose of undermining patriotism..."

There is in this prohibitive section an obvious hostility toward communism, totalitarian dictatorships, changing the existing form of United States government by force, violence or other unconstitutional means, and teaching which undermines patriotism.

To implement Code-required instruction (Section 13556.5 cited previously) in the principles of patriotism, the California State Board of Education adopted January 8, 1970, a set of guidelines that incorporates a "salient feature" of the American approach to patriotism: "Love of country does not necessarily mean hostility to others." Even the relatively moderate statement on patriotism includes the comment, "Our nation, perhaps more than any other, is built upon love and loyalty freely given."36

California shifted in nationalistic education from high-minded rhetoric to legal requirements that included vague generalities for combatting evil, and patriotic exercises, then to internal inconsistencies in intention, form and practice. The use of the schools to produce a morality—or patriotism—greater than that of the society as a whole is a common practice in America. The effectiveness of this approach is questionable, though it is a nearly impossible subject to adequately measure.

CONCLUSION

Nationalistic education appears to be a significant fixture in the schools of many, if not all, countries. It uses the schools as instruments to produce love and loyalty for the nation unthinkingly. It usually involves teaching national pride in history, government, language, heroes and symbols, but also includes negative portrayals of ideas and peoples considered
contra-national. In this, the schools act as reflective agents, uncritically transmitting myths and images deemed proper to the younger generations.

Among the implications of strong emphasis on nationalistic education in the schools is the conflict inherent in the disparities between national pride and a global society. Schooling toward national patriotism, with its implied and expressed notions of national superiority and inferiority of others, may impede education toward global unity and/or transnational interdependence. In the present world there is enough friction caused by narrow perceptions of national interest. Calling upon the schools to educate the young for some improvement in the global situation is inconsistent with demands for uncritical patriotism and chauvinism.

The spirit of free inquiry into national values has not been a strong point in nationalistic education here or elsewhere. Limited by requirement or political pressure, schools have engaged in the production of loyal citizens who often love their own country but harbor hostilities toward others. To the extent that narrow nationalistic education is successful in producing uncritical patriots with hostility, pride of state will frustrate a sense of global identity.

In a global society such nationalistic education appears to be dysfunctional. There are virtues in love of country and in patriotism. Primary among these is the quality of drawing people together in a common bond of friendship and service. Evidence provided herein, and in a large body of literature on the subject, suggests that the virtues of patriotism are severely diminished by the corollary education in collective hatred that has been included. Waldstein’s concept of a true patriotism that leads to global unity may be an ideal worth pursuing, but sixty years after his book appeared and eighty years after he first presented a series of lectures on the idea schools are still engaged in a nationalistic education that incorporates hostility or ignorance toward those considered potential enemies.

The dilemma for social educators who care about critical thinking in a global society is apparent. Traditional patterns of nationalistic schooling may be politically acceptable but professionally frustrating. Attempting to change the laws and regulations may result in an educator’s own patriotism being called into question or general charges of unAmericanism being levelled against the schools.

Those who advocate global education should be prepared to assist social educators in the transition. The period of the American bicentennial is an appropriate time to reconsider nationalistic education and to propose avenues for making it more consistent. One way would be to accept the traditional forms of patriotic exercise, biased history and inherent hostility but not set goals for global education. Another would be to educate directly for world citizenship as though nation-states were insignificant. A third approach would make it clear that national interests are served by global
conditions of peace, economic development, environmental protection, human justice and the opportunity for free participation in political decisions. This third approach calls for a different form of national education—one which fosters knowledge of global affairs without necessary hate of others or false national bias; one which provides for critical examination of national and global issues; and one that inspires a sense of global community.

Documentary evidence examined here shows a long term and widely practiced nationalistic education that contains the dual characteristics of positive self-image and negative views of those deemed contra-national. If one argued from this evidence, it would appear unrealistic to presume drastic change toward global education. Still, there is continuing change in society and education and a periodic reassessment of goals. There is also a need for more studies of different evidence related to nationalistic and global education.
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DEMYTHOLOGIZING THE TEXTBOOK PRESIDENT:
TEACHING ABOUT THE PRESIDENT AFTER WATERGATE

Harold M. Barger
Trinity University

Political scientists for a long time were unable to consider the American presidency without extolling the virtues of its rapidly expanding powers and broadening scope. Students of the office saw the strong presidency as an inevitable and desirable trend in the political system. In recent years, however, this intoxication with executive power turned into a hangover for many observers of the Oval Office as they discovered there were dangers to the political system from exercises of unrestrained power and authority.

A particularly relevant criticism of presidential power with potent ramifications for educators has focused on what is appropriately called the “textbook presidency.” The textbook presidency describes and values a chief executive who is generally benevolent, omnipotent, omniscient, and highly moral (Cronin, 1972). Not too long ago, such an image dominated textbooks from the elementary school through the university, although during the past five years a far less positive and benevolent image appears to be projected in newer college texts (Cronin, 1972). There has also been an about-face by professional students of the presidency. Former advocates of strong chief executive now believe the office has grown so powerful and isolated it no longer functions responsibly in a system of checks and balances. Our traditional view of this high office is now seen as being unrealistic (Hughes, 1974; Reedy, 1970; Schlesinger, 1973).

Watergate unquestionably has dealt the White House its most devastating damage. However, reevaluation of the office had begun before Watergate, which brought humiliation and resignation to the administration of Richard M. Nixon. Criticism of presidential abuse of power and lack of credibility haunted Lyndon B. Johnson during most of his elected term and served as the catalyst for the revisionist textbook presidency at the college level. By the early 1970's, most academic analyses of the Viet-Nam War had begun to seriously question the desirability of the omnipotent president.

How and what will educators teach students about the president in the aftermath of the presidential office’s worst scandal? It remains to be seen to what extent elementary and high school social studies authors and publishers will restructure their homogeneously positive and uncritical image of the presidency. If the conflict of the past decade is any guide to the content, there probably will not be much critical analysis of the post-Watergate presidency. In fact, the nation’s leading high school government textbook in terms of sales and longevity includes two brief references to Watergate in its 1974 edition. Neither reference directly
involves any discussion of the role of president in the scandal, or the possible ramifications of Watergate on the presidency (McClenaghan, 1974).

Whether textbooks deal with the present problems of the presidency or not, pre-collegiate social studies teachers will not be able to avoid it. One might logically expect students to greet with skepticism or out-right indifference any attempt to present any contemporary president as the saintly prince of civics past.

It is not surprising that government texts view the president in imperial tones, given the strong endorsement of the activist, purposeful, progressive and powerful president found in college textbooks of the 1950s and 1960s. Further support for the strong presidency came from general works on the office written after World War II by political scientists and historians who took as their model the presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The bulk of the content in these books is focused on institutional descriptions and constitutional arrangements. The formal is emphasized to the exclusion of any discussion about behavioral and policy aspects of the office. A set of generalizations can be derived from these books that either imply or directly assert:

1. The president is the embodiment of all that is good in America: honesty, integrity, courage and kindness.
2. He leads the free world in its fight against world communism.
3. He is the most knowledgeable and competent person in the nation to make decisions. His decisions are invariably made formally and in Constitutionally prescribed ways.
4. He leads legislatively because Congress fails to do so.
5. He wears many hats. ("A Day in the Life of the President.")
6. The president is infallible because he is the president.
7. He is a personality who symbolizes our past great presidents.
8. He is a thoughtful, benign leader who cares for all the people.
9. He deserves the support of all Americans because he is always acting in the interests of all Americans.

Two textbooks vary from these generalizations more than the others, discussing presidential policy-making with a more substantive policy focus. They are Woll and Binstock's *American Political System* and Mehlinger and Patrick's *American Political Behavior*. By contrast, the book that most faithfully follows these generalizations is the nation's oldest and best-selling high school government text, *Magruder's American Government*.

The tone of *Magruder's* is set by a quote that begins the book's two chapters on the presidency:
The presidency is more than executive responsibility. It is an inspiring symbol of all that is highest in America's purposes and ideas. . . . No one could think of it except in terms of solemn consecration. (McClenaghan, p. 283).

The remaining assessments of the office in Magruder reflect this Homeric vision. For example, it is written of the president:

He is a symbol of the people and the nation as a whole.
He is the personal embodiment and representative of their dignity and majesty.
(He) both reigns and rules.
(He) insists that Congress enact most of the major legislation that it does.
He is the leader of the free world in its struggle against the forces and designs of world communism. (p. 283).

Nowhere in Magruder is there any substantive discussion about presidential performance in foreign or domestic policy areas, nor is there any discussion of personal qualifications of various incumbents. There is no indication that there is often conflict between the chief executive and other branches and political role holders in our government.

Descriptions beyond the value statements tend toward dry recitations of the powers, duties and structural characteristics of the office, again submerging specific role holders in the institution. Actual incumbents are mentioned only twice, and past presidents do not appear by name other than in accounts of assassinations, inaugurations, or in patriotic contexts.

Brown and Peltier's Government in Our Republic (1964) offers more discussion of former incumbents and their policies, but wholly in a positive and non-critical way. It does, however, observe that the office has become so powerful and complex that it is "literally impossible for any man to fill it well (p. 167)." This does not prevent them from admiringly comparing the president to a "king in a monarchy."

"When he makes an appearance anywhere in the United States, all other present remain standing until he is seated or gives a sign to be seated. That goes for ladies too" (p. 157).

Examples of the unquestioning loyalty owed by citizens to the office are common in all but the Woll-Binstock and Mehlinger-Patrick texts. There is an implication that the president is personally responsible for and capable of fulfilling most citizen demands and needs, particularly if he gets their loyal support.

Hartley and Vincent (1971) in American Civics argue "the man who holds this highest position in our nation's government bears a great burden and great responsibility. He must have the support and help of his fellow
citizens (p. 88).” Nowhere is there any suggestion citizens might have an equally vital obligation to occasionally disagree with or question presidential decisions.

In fact, much of the discussion in secondary school textbooks emphasizes a passive, subject-oriented relationship between the citizen and his president, a kind of child-powerful father exchange. The authors of Our Living Government (Haefner, Bruce and Carr, 1970) for example write:

“The president is more than a glorified national sheriff. He must protect our Constitutional form of government...against attack from within or without. He must make sure that individual citizens enjoy the personal rights guaranteed by the Constitution” (p. 226).

The textbook president thus is to be readily trusted, with little consideration of who he is or what his ideologies might be. American Political Behavior (Mehlinger and Patrick, 1972) alone among the texts reviewed here raises some important questions about how citizens come to know about presidential personality traits and how they act upon this knowledge. For example, a discussion on presidential honesty in the book suggests students list ten character traits desirable in a president.

“Since honesty is a trait that nearly all Americans expect of a president, you might begin your list with ‘honesty’.”

But all the other textbooks appear to present as given rule that the president, because he is president, must be a man of extraordinary character and integrity. Little or no effort is made to encourage students to assess characteristics of different presidents, or aspects of character they might value in presidents past, present and future. Hartley and Vincent (1971) even find it significant to mention that the president “usually attends church on Sunday” (p. 86).

As in the college texts of the 1950s and early 1960s, the growth in presidential power is seen by all of the high school textbook authors as a generally beneficial and irreversible trend. Our Living Government (Haefner, Bruce and Carr, 1970) presents a particularly biased argument, suggesting a number of measures to make the president even more independent of Congress and the bureaucracy. “It is not a question of power, for the president has that, but a matter of authority to carry out his powers” (p. 240).

The omnipotent president upon whom the rest of the world depends is prominently featured in Hartley and Vincent (1971):

“From the four corners of the world, the leaders of foreign governments come to Washington, D.C. to talk to the President of the United States.”
"Many nations look to the U.S. for leadership and help in their struggle against communism. The president must furnish leadership not only to the American people, but also to the governments and people of every nation in the free world" (p. 86).

The modern presidency is a role of much greater diversity and complexity, and it is much more dependent upon the personality filling the office. High school textbooks fail to present the drama of this majestic and yet human institution. Men of vastly different styles, abilities, beliefs, and values give shape to its functioning. The role has been invested with history, respect, patriotism, and monarchical trappings. But for all this, it is still a peculiarly American institution, occupied by a popularly elected man who can never live up to the grandiose textbook description.

When such a role is found to be occupied by a man who is fallible and untrustworthy, much less an occasionally inadequate decision-maker, the structure crumbles. The textbook presidency is incapable of absorbing and dealing with a Watergate any more than with a much-criticized and unpopular presidential war in Southeast Asia. The perennial debate topic "Is the presidency too much for one man?" will probably continue to be implicitly answered in the negative in high school textbooks, even though most scholars of the presidency and former advocates of the imperial presidency by now are answering "yes."

No one relishes destroying the greatness of a presidential office which over the long history of our nation has served us well. Nor would anyone suggest weakening a power that is needed to act quickly and decisively in times of international and domestic crises. But if the classroom and textbook presidency is going to even remotely resemble the presidency of the mid-1970s, we need to deal with it more realistically and critically.

The question confronting educators and curriculum developers is to what extent is the incumbent separated from the office? In the textbook presidency, this distinction is blurred. The man is the role, and the role is the man.

What follows is a brief review of some findings of student images of the presidency immediately before the Watergate scandal broke and one year later, when the Nixon Administration had reached its lowest point of public credibility and support. The ramifications of the data will then be applied to some suggestions about how we might approach the presidency in the aftermath of its worst hour.

STUDENTS AND WATERGATE

The American president as a "benevolent leader" has dominated a considerable body of research and theory in political socialization. In their
seminal study of the relationship between children and political authority, Easton and Dennis (1968) noted:

"From the earliest grade, the child sees the president as on a commanding height, far above adults and children. The President flies in on angel's wings, smiling, beneficent, powerful, almost beyond the realm of mere mortals" (Easton and Dennis 1968, p. 171).

These early positive images become important in creating respect and esteem for the president in later adult life, enabling most Americans to have respect and to offer basic support for the president even if they disagree with him, belong to the opposition political party, or dislike the particular incumbent holding the office.

One theory that has enjoyed widespread acceptance suggests the early affection toward the president occurs because the president appears as a powerful father-like figure for the young child learning to relate to national authority. The child is so dependent upon family authority for satisfaction of his basic needs that he comes to attribute positive and benign attributes to authority first in the family, then beyond.

There can be no question that a considerable amount of political education in the elementary through secondary school years reinforces this benevolent model, although there is evidence that the high school age student is generally more critical of the role and the incumbent than he was at an earlier age. Consequently, the traditional textbook presidency is redundant in one sense: his benevolent qualities reflect earlier basic socialization expectations. And in another aspect, the image appears increasingly incongruent for a young adult who has become more partisan, more issue-oriented, and more questioning of authority in general.

It is among the earlier age grades that the textbook image of the benevolent and all-powerful leader is more congruent with the child's images. At least up to the sixth grade, children were found to view the president as the dominant political authority in the nation. In fact, the typical child is able to express an opinion about the president even before he is exposed to formal classroom materials about the role and institution, or before there is much understanding or cognitive knowledge about the role.

This perception is so pervasively positive that Easton and Dennis were unable to find in all their testing a "child who did not express the highest esteem for the president." Children viewed the president "through rose-colored glasses, with no taint of criticism, mistrust, or indifference creeping into the picture," (1968, p. 177).

Recent research, however, has found a less than universal image of the benevolent leader. Considerable variations have been found among ethnic minority populations, and there is some evidence that both President Johnson and President Nixon were viewed much less enthusiastically by
children from the early elementary school years into the high school grades (Weissberg, 1974).

Several recent studies have found that Watergate has affected children’s orientations toward the presidency more than any other variable since testing for this relationship began. Furthermore, the data suggest that its impact was much the same at the elementary school level as at the normally more critical high school level.

In early 1974, Arterton studied a sample of elementary school children in a prosperous Boston suburb and found students generally thought the president undependable and untrustworthy (Arterton, 1974). A study of children in grades three through eleven in Memphis, Tennessee also noted some deterioration in the normally positive images white, middle class had of President Nixon (Lupfer and Kenny, 1974).

A study conducted by the author in April of 1973 and one year later of fifth through twelfth grade students in San Antonio, Texas, revealed a significant loss of trust and affect in the president’s honesty, trustworthiness, dedication to job, and responsiveness to people.2

**THE MALEVOLENT PRESIDENT: DATA CONFIRMATION**

The loss of affection, respect and esteem for the President of the United States among children and adolescents is so widespread and profound that even if it is indeed focused on the individual, the impact on the institution of the presidency could be long-lasting and significant.

Our data indicate so strongly a massive disenchantment with the President that even if it were possible theoretically to separate the man from the office for children and adolescents, the residue of cynicism and confusion might well affect their perceptions of subsequent men in the office for some time to come. Regardless of ethnicity or age, children in the San Antonio data reflect views that are not only negative, they exceed even the unprecedented low ratings and cynical responses of adults, sampled at approximately the same period in time and or relatively equivalent measures of the President (Gallup, 1974).

Perhaps the single most important variable that shows the disenchantment with the President is found in responses to the statement “The President is very honest,” a direct indicator of trust. Item A on Table I below reveals sharp erosion of trust by elementary school children from 1973 to 1974.

Perhaps most surprising of all the data show that elementary age children are nearly as negative as their adolescent peers. The “valleys” of youthful regard for the President appear much earlier than socialization theory previously posited.
Table I: Responses to Statements about the President, by School Grade Level and Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary Sample</th>
<th>Senior High Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. &quot;The President is honest.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. &quot;The President is a nice person.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Rating the President by how much he is liked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or not at all</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. &quot;The President works hard.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. &quot;The President knows a lot.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Rating the President on &quot;how much he helps my family.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or not at all</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not only is his integrity seriously questioned, the President's image as a "nice person" and his likeability have also diminished sharply across ethnic lines and age sets. Reponse B on Table I shows the decline is particularly sharp in the pre-post test samples of elementary children. Again, elementary school children nearly parallel their secondary counterparts.

Ranking the president on the question how well the child likes him compared to other political leadership roles provides a more direct indication of personal affect. Item C on Table I reinforces the strong negative image projected by the questions testing perception of trust and personality. Again, a strongly negative image is consistent from elementary to high school age.

Traditional "textbook" accounts assert the President has an impossibly difficult job. Item D shows even this assumption demolished by the Watergate presidency. One sixth grade girl wrote on her survey instrument:

"He doesn't work hard enough. That is at being an honest, good President. He works hard at evading questions about Watergate, and at not paying his taxes, and at bugging and wiretapping Democratic headquarters, Democrats' homes, and doctors' offices."

The decline in job appraisal continues on Item E: "The President knows a lot." Interestingly, elementary age children show an even sharper decline in evaluating presidential intelligence. Secondary school students apparently are able to separate moral behavior from ability in assessing presidential performance.

Item F rates the President on how much he helps one's family. Previous socialization research always found a majority of younger children in agreement with this highly personalized perception of presidential decision-making. By high school, this belief usually disappears. Item F shows the same marked decline in the elementary age child's confidence in the President. Realism appears to have come early to this sample of elementary school children.

The data in Table I reveal a much diminished presidency as a result of Watergate. A significant decline in all six measures relating to trust, personableness, benevolence, knowledge and performance is indicated for both elementary and secondary students, suggesting that younger students are far more capable of distinguishing the man from the office than textbooks or theory have previously implied. Table I shows elementary students have become just as critical—perhaps even as cynical—as their older peers. The loss of affection between 1973 and 1974 is surprisingly steep for the sample of fifth and sixth grade students.

Earlier research into ethnic minority group children and adolescents' attitudes toward the presidency likewise found less than benevolent attitudes among many children toward the president. Ethnic minority
studies have generally led to the suspicion that images of the president and other political authority figures may be generationally determined and issue-specific. Abramson (1972), for example contrasts what he calls the social-deprivation theory that posits attitudes are the function of societally-shaped personalities, and a political-reality theory which suggests they are generally shaped by actual political conditions. Political attitudes not only change, but they change differentially for different groups under varying conditions.

This leads to speculation that issues, crises, and personalities are more important in determining legitimacy and receptivity to authority than early political socialization research implies. Assessments of the feelings of minority groups show relatively rational policy and personality assessments that retard or encourage development of feelings of benevolence and trust in particular leaders. The benevolent leader theory consequently appears to be related to stable, less controversial epochs. Easton and Dennis (1968) acknowledge the possibility that the United States might be entering a period of political instability that might restructure basic attitudes toward political authority. But are perceptions of the president as benevolent, infallible, protective and omnipotent part and parcel of the child’s developmental process, or are they dependent upon a state of “politics as usual?”

It has been argued that the child relates himself not to the occupant of the White House as a man, but to the role itself: “This is of vital importance for the input of diffuse support for a political system. It may be a singular mainstay of the presidential structure...” (Easton and Dennis, 201).

If the child fixed his attention on the president as a man and revered the specific qualities of the incumbent, he would learn that the legitimacy of authority is dependent upon individual qualities. This, however, would cause the child to have to virtually reorient himself to each successive president based upon a consideration of whether or not the man had the qualities admired in his predecessors.

“To command acceptance, each president would have to stimulate a belief in his personal adequacy. Leadership succession would be a source of constant political strain. The routinization of charisma would have difficulty in developing” (Easton and Dennis, 202).

Obviously, the alternative to this perspective is to make the president a symbol rather than a role performer. Younger children accept him because he is the president, and they possess a set of idealized expectations about him regardless of who he may be. By personalizing the office, one is able to accept any and all incumbents, and the system is maintained in a relatively stable manner.

Weissberg (1974) has argued that depersonalization of the presidency is
the most important feature of the maturing student’s orientation to national political authority. The older child begins to perceive the incumbent as part of an aura that is the American presidency, even as he begins to understand the president is not a divine monarch. But more important, the child of twelve years or older is increasingly capable of separating the man from the office, a process that would enable one to hold a low evaluation of an incumbent without necessarily condemning the office. Dissatisfaction can be channelled into replacing the man, not the institution.

INTRODUCING THE “NEW” PRESIDENT

What is needed now is for teachers and curricula developers to reconsider the president in four basic conceptual ways:

1. As an institution in the context of a more dynamic and conflict-ridden political system than has been suggested heretofore.
2. As a role of some historical and symbolic importance to our political culture.
3. As a unique personality occupying the various roles a President plays at any given time.
4. As a political actor who has specific strengths and weaknesses in his role performances, and who has successes and failures in his policy efforts.

To a considerable extent, the problem is a theoretical one of distinguishing what Easton (1965) has described as the three levels of support found in any political system: the community, the regime, and the governing authorities. The political community refers to those aspects of a political system that identify a collection of people as members in a shared effort. Community involves feelings of patriotism, traditionalism, and even familism. It is those unique aspects of our system that bind most of us together as “Americans.” The almost royal regard with which Americans traditionally held their presidents is a characteristic of the political community. Indeed, the death of presidents while in office has occasioned grief for many citizens similar to the loss of a family member or parent (Sigel, 1965).

The regime describes the actual constitutional processes and structures of the political system, in this sense the presidency and the institutional system of checks and balances. Our examination of high school textbooks indicates the regime receives a disproportionate amount of attention. Considerable space is devoted to duties, powers, privileges and activities of presidents.

The third level, the governing authorities, includes those specific individuals who hold office and perform the regime roles at any given time. Here, for example, we might be referring to Richard M. Nixon or Gerald R. Ford as president.
Traditionally, textbooks and curricula indiscriminantly tied these three levels of governmental support together in the belief such an approach would inculcate system-supporting political values. As a result, the charismatic aspects of the presidential role are overemphasized in tandem with institutional characteristics and patriotic symbolism. Particularly is the case for the important early school years, when children receive their first classroom introduction to the presidency with strong doses of legend, myth and personality. Rarely are children taught to consider the important distinctions between a complex institution, an incumbent, policy issues, and the American conception of limited and responsible political authority. Little discussion is encountered showing how much the president is dependent upon other decision-makers in our federal system.

So strongly are the three supportive levels intertwined formally and informally for elementary school age children, Easton and Dennis (1968) have argued it may be logically impossible for the child to see the president in a position of power and responsibility and yet not think well of him.

"If children see a person in an elevated status, they very probably also will believe he is a wonderful person, especially if the status is approved by adults and remains so distant that little capacity exists for the child to test his evaluations through direct experience" (p. 177).

The American Political Science Association's Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education (1971) has criticized this tendency to overemphasize charismatic qualities of political authority while giving at the same time a disproportionate attention to historical events, legal structures and formal aspects of decision-making. Such an undifferentiated approach encourages a subject-oriented relationship to authority rather than a participatory one.

Obviously there are countervailing attitudes about the value of our traditional approach to learning about the president. At least 45 states have laws requiring and regulating the teaching of government in schools. Implicitly and sometimes explicitly defined in most state requirements is the intention to produce not just an understanding of American political institutions, but a sense of respect and devotion as well.

The problem with this goal is whether respect, devotion and substantive information and theories about government can be taught when inconsistencies are impossible to avoid. In the case of the presidency, the textbook image of a benevolent and omniscient leader may be pedagogically possible and intellectually reasonable when the leader is in fact widely perceived as benevolent and possessing of leadership abilities. This may, however, be more likely during periods when specific issues and role behaviors are not as important as the personality of the man in office. It may be no accident of history that many presidents who were most popular while in office were men who later were regarded by students of the office as
weak presidents. And some of the so-called “great” presidents were men who sparked considerable public debate, criticism and reaction while serving their terms in office.

If this is the case, then textbooks that are adulatory of presidential leadership are redundant during times of benevolent leadership, but contradictory during times of presidential stress and challenge, or at best misleading or irrelevant.

According to a political-reality theory, which the data from Watergate studies tend to support, students will be exposed to contradictory and critical messages during times of conflict and stress and these messages quite likely will overcome or at least influence traditional socialization learning patterns. Events such as Watergate occur regardless of the fact they are inconsistent with tightly constructed and tested theories or positivistic educational goals.

If our curricula and textbooks fail to differentiate the presidency in terms of regime, incumbent and our political community, we may be doing infinitely more harm than good to the system. Students should be made aware that an individual can admire or not admire the presidency as a role and an institution, respect and hold patriotic feelings for certain occupants of the office in the past, and yet not like a particular president. Too often, nonsupport of a president has been interpreted by many sectors of our society as “un-American” or “unpatriotic” or “destructive of the presidency.” The British have no comparable dilemma when their political leadership loses support from various sectors of the population. An Englishman may support the Queen yet hold a highly critical view of the Prime Minister and the party in Parliament. There is no equivalent accusation in England that suggests one is “un-English.”

Both recent incumbents who found their bases of support eroding attempted to forestall popular sentiments against them by using the textbook presidency as a rallying flag. Nixon asserted on numerous occasions during Watergate that those who sought to unravel Watergate were attacking him, and by attacking him as president, they were attacking the office and by implication weakening the nation. The late President Johnson likewise tried to accuse critics of his Vietnam policy of trying to damage the presidency and the nation. The textbook presidency encourages this kind of analogy, despite the fact that it refutes our democratic creed that we are a nation of laws and not of men.

Much like the Hollywood myth of love and marriage, Americans traditionally viewed the president with such unrealistic expectations and through such rose-colored glasses that the real man became a fairy prince instead of a man with one of the world’s most powerful and impossible jobs. We have found too many times that the relationship between a president and the electorate was not made in heaven. But like the ever hopeful suitor, we continued to chase after the idealized and romanticized
version which our textbooks, teachers and culture provided.

In the aftermath of Watergate, a more critical and substantive approach to the presidency would not only benefit our young by preparing them for a more realistic political vision, it could contribute to a more balanced presidency.

Former Johnson press secretary George Reedy (1970, p. 27) has observed:

"The atmosphere of the White House is calculated to instill in any man a sense of destiny. He literally walks in the footsteps of hallowed figures—of Jefferson, of Jackson, of Lincoln... (T)he White House is a heady atmosphere. The most sanctified relics of a distant, semimythical past surround (the president). From the moment he enters the halls he is made aware that he has become enshrined in a pantheon of semidivine mortals who have shaken the world, and that he has taken from their hands the heritage of American dreams and aspirations.

Unfortunately for him, divinity is a better basis of inspiration than it is for government."
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2A pre-Watergate sample of 792 fifth and sixth grade students was surveyed in April, 1973. A sample of 512 fifth and sixth grade students were sampled in approximately the same schools one year later, but from different populations. In addition, some 484 senior high school students
were sampled in the 1974 survey. Students were asked to respond "agree, disagree or no opinion" to statements about the president. The statements are displayed here as the titles to the subtables. President Richard M. Nixon was not mentioned by name in any items.
Teachers and parents have one major common characteristic: they share responsibility for shaping the quality and character of the same children. To some extent modern society has created a division of labor whereby teachers are charged with instilling knowledge, fostering information gathering skills, and developing good citizens. Parents, as the legal and morally-sanctioned custodians, have a multiplicity of functions, including at least some aspects of those vested in teachers. Moreover, parents often take a proprietary interest in how well teachers are performing their functions. One area of parental interest is that of citizenship training, broadly defined. It is this intersection of family and school functions which frequently gives rise to friction between parents and teachers, for it is an area in which both are performing socialization functions.

Working with interrelated data from a 1965 national sample of high school seniors and their parents, social studies teachers, and principals we previously illustrated several dimensions of parental and teacher roles in the political socialization process. We showed that much of the parental discontent with schools centered on classroom content lying in the religious, moral, and political realms (Jennings, 1968). Other work assessed the impact of social studies teachers and courses. Even though we found exposure to civics courses to be generally of low import, there were sub-populations (Blacks) where the courses had considerable impact (Langton & Jennings, 1968). Working with aggregate data, we usually found home "effects" to be more consequential than school effects, but it was apparent that much of the variance was shared in common by the two sources (Jennings, 1974). More germane for present purposes, we have—through correlational analysis—assessed the relative impact of social studies teachers versus parents as socialization agents (Jennings, Ehman, & Neimi, 1974). Although parents emerged as clearly more powerful agents, we did find that the success of parents was bolstered or undercut depending upon whether teachers agreed or disagreed with the parents on the orientations in question. A related finding was that teacher emphasis on political participation had scant impact on student views of participation (Levenson, 1972).

One key link in these various approaches has been only marginally
addressed, and that is the level of congruency in political outlooks between teachers and parents. Although there are a variety of case studies and spectacular reports in the media pointing out the respective (usually divergent) perspectives of parents and teachers, we know relatively little on a broad scale about the political consonance between these two sets of socialization agents. What that terrain looks like will have much to do with the nature and results of the political socialization process as well as the character of school-community political relationships.

We approach this topic in two ways. First, and foremost, we compare teachers and parents at the national, aggregate level. For general purposes it seems worthwhile to know the political qualities of these teachers because that will tell us something about them as socialization agents as well as political actors (citizens) in their own right. Another virtue of the aggregate presentation is that immediate comparisons can be made between teachers and the very relevant counterpart group of parents. In this sense we will have national estimates of whatever gulfs exist between the political climates fostered by parents versus those of teachers.

While it is useful to compare teachers with all parents for purposes of detecting grand patterns, it is also instructive to compare them with similarly situated parents. The most distinguishing characteristic of teachers versus parents is the former's college degree status. All have at least a baccalaureate degree and one-half have a masters. It is also well known that education is significantly related to a number of political orientations. If it turns out that teachers depart from parents on given orientations, this may be due to teachers' being better educated rather than being a unique function of their occupational roles.

On the other hand, it is possible that teachers may deviate from parents precisely as a result of their occupational roles. Many occupations develop ideologies; and persons who are part of an occupational structure become, to a greater or lesser extent, committed to a pattern of thought and behavior. Certain occupations undoubtedly recruit particular types of people, but occupations also socialize their members with acceptable attitudes and behaviors (Cottrell, 1940; Rosenberg, 1957).

We have, then, two alternatives to keep in mind when comparing teachers with parents. To explore these two possibilities it is necessary to separate out those parents with comparably high educational attainments. Only one-tenth of the parents have at least a college degree, with about three-tenths of that total having a degree beyond the bachelor level. Another reason could be advanced for making aggregate comparisons. If one observes reasonable similarity between teachers and parents, it is tempting to infer that similarity also prevails within particular school communities and that the similarity stems from selective recruitment, teacher conformity to community norms, or both. By the same token, if wide divergencies are revealed, it is tempting to conclude that
teacher-parent dissimilarity prevails at the local level and that the teachers are deviating from the norms of the school community as represented by parents. It is, of course, fallacious to make such inferences—although more than one investigator has committed this sort of fallacy. In the last portion of this paper we take advantage of the sample design by constructing multiple series of teacher-parent pairs at the local school level. By doing so we can assess the direction and strength of the linkage between these two agents of socialization.

Details of the overall study design and execution are presented elsewhere (Jennings & Neimi, 1974). For present purposes it is sufficient to note that the sample of teachers was chosen to maximize the number of teachers to whom the high school seniors had been exposed from grades ten through twelve. A concise definition of the teacher sample is that it represents those social studies teachers bearing the heaviest load of social studies teaching during grades ten through twelve for a national sample of twelfth graders in 1965. A total of 317 out of 321 designated teachers were interviewed. In the analysis sampling weights are employed, with a resultant N of 384. For the aggregate analysis these teachers will be compared with the parental sample, raw N = 1992, weighted N = 1927; the weighted N for college educated parents is 192.

Table 1: Political Trust Among Teachers and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(385)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1887)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(192)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRUST, EFFICACY, AND COSMOPOLITANISM

Trust in the political system is one of the more global kinds of political orientations and is usually acquired during pre-adulthood (Easton & Dennis, 1969). Minimal levels of support are held to be necessary for the persistence of democratic regimes. Trying to cultivate trust in the system has clearly been one of the trademarks of the American school system. Using the responses to individual statements to form a political trust scale, we may compare teachers and parents (Table 1). Teachers are found throughout the range on the political trust continuum, but there are nearly twice as many on the high side of the middle position as on the low side, whereas with parents there are over twice as many on the low side as the high side.

These distributions suggest, if nothing else, that the sum total of the parent culture is more cynical in its socialization cues than that of the teacher culture. But is this a function of the teacher role or properties associated with educational status? Comparing teachers with college degree parents provides rather clear evidence that occupational placement is the decisive factor. Since highly educated parents are no different than parents as a whole, the original disparity between teachers and parents remains.

How might the parent-teacher discrepancy be accounted for? A pair of alternative though not mutually contradictory answers come to mind. First, the recruitment process for high school social studies teachers might operate to select from the beginning those persons with relatively high trust. Second, through the process of teacher training, occupational socialization, and subject matter exposure these people may undergo a retardation of the normal growth of cynicism from adolescence to adulthood.

The first alternative is not directly testable from our data. Some studies do show that teachers, even future and young ones, have tended to be relatively complaint, noncompetitive, and deferential (Caplow, 1957; Guba, Jackson & Bidwell, 1963; Kilpatrick, Cunnings & Jennings, 1964; Mason, 1961; Rosenberg, 1957). They need to trust in other powerful figures and institutions. Thus there is some suggestion that occupational self selection helps account for the relatively high levels of political trust among teachers.

We can test the second hypothesis with data from this study. If the retardation hypothesis is correct it follows that there will be little or no association between teaching experience (or age) and political trust; as teaching experience and age increase, trust should remain at a fairly uniform level. This explanation has plausibility since there is but a slight association between number of years teaching and trust, \( r = -.09 \). It can be argued that the constant reinforcement of subject matter materials—most of which are far from cynical—helps keep the trust levels on a smooth plane. Teachers have traditionally inundated themselves and their students with messages glorifying the American system and its history. Repetition
may act to curb the normal growth of political distrust. To this process may be added school and community pressures acting to discourage teachers from expressing aberrant, "anti-American" interpretations of the past and present.

As with political trust, political efficacy is one of the fundamental components of an individual's political portfolio. At the adult level the importance of political efficacy and civic competence for individuals and political systems has been demonstrated repeatedly. Two items from the standard Survey Research Center efficacy scale were presented to the respondents, with these results:

"Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things."

"Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>College graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent giving efficacious response</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent giving efficacious response</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas the proportion of efficacious answers drops from the first to second statements for parents the exact opposite is the case for teachers. Scrutiny of the two statements reveals that the first one deals more with one's felt capacity to influence government by non-electoral means. In contrast to this action-oriented theme is the second statement, which refers more to one's comprehension of what politics is all about. Given the teachers' presumed expertise, knowledge, and understanding about that which they expound in their occupational roles it is not at all surprising that their absolute levels of efficacious replies are high; nor is it surprising that they exceed those for parents.

Not so transparent is why the belief in other methods of influencing government decisions is no different than that for parents as a whole? After all, American political history is replete with examples of how collective efforts have affected outcomes, to say nothing of contemporary examples in the realm of protest movements. What we may be witnessing is not so much a reflection of what teachers think about the system in general, but rather their own place in it. That is, they may believe that other people—especially the upper-socio-political stata—have other methods but that they, as particular role-incumbents, are more constrained. There is some modest, indirect support for this proposition in terms of the relationship between reactions to this statement and support for the propriety of teachers' expressing themselves politically in the community. Without exception, the more efficacious teachers are more supportive of a variety of community political actions by teachers. Assuming that propriety
and/or a fear of sanctions are debilitating factors for sizeable numbers of teachers, the relatively low sense of being able to affect governmental decisions outside the electoral arena acquires more plausibility.

Taking into account the response of college educated parents to this proposition simply strengthens the foregoing argument. These parents have no hesitation in asserting that they can affect outcomes in other ways. Since education is a firm predictor of efficacy, and since these parents and teachers have roughly the same quantitative amounts of education, one can make a strong case that the difference in efficacious responses stems from the particular occupational roles of teachers. Supporting evidence comes from examining the second statement. Even though highly educated parents score well above parents in general, they still fall short of the teachers in terms of efficacious responses. Here the occupational role of expertise and cognitive competence stands over and above the propensity of well educated strata to profess relatively great understanding of the workings of government.

Another general orientation to the political world is represented by one's level of political cosmopolitanism, a concern with larger, more encompassing geo-political domains rather than smaller, more restrictive ones. Teachers and parents are assigned positions on the localism-cosmopolitanism scale by using an unfolding algorithm for preference order data (Jennings, 1967). Not surprisingly, teachers are more cosmopolitan than parents, an advantage that stems in part from their high education rather than their occupational roles alone (Table 2). In contrast to political trust, highly educated parents are more like teachers than are the parents as a whole; indeed they are more like teachers than other parents. A general function of higher education is to expand one's sphere of concern, and both teachers and non-teachers respond to that force.

Table 2: Cosmopolitanism Among Teachers and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cosmopolitanism</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.53 (253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.64 (1540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.14 (166)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For high school social studies teachers, however, the perception-expanding effects of higher education are particularly pronounced because of their continuous teaching of subject matter which is itself cosmopolitan in nature. Teachers were asked during the interviews what kind of topics they discussed when dealing with current affairs in the classroom. Out of all responses 40 percent dealt with international politics, and another 20 percent with national matters. Only 8 percent could be clearly classified as state and local in character. To this may be added some reluctance to attend to local politics because of professional norms having to do with neutrality in and out of the classroom.

**THE CONCEPT OF THE GOOD CITIZEN**

Because of the importance placed on high school social studies as a means for developing good citizenship, it is of more than passing interest to examine differences between parents and teachers in their conceptions of what constitutes the ideal citizen. Each respondent was asked to characterize the good American citizen; up to four different responses were coded. One way of categorizing the responses is according to whether they were couched in political or non-political terms. Examples of political response categories are: loyalty to the government; obeying laws; serving and helping the government; taking part and being active in public affairs; and voting. Non-political responses include: helping other people; being a good neighbor; getting along with others; being honest, moral, and clean; and being concerned about home and family. From these responses an index was constructed ranging from 1, non-political, to 4, very political.3

Parents have more extreme non-political scores and a lower mean score compared with teachers (top panel, Table 3). What is surprising about these figures is not that teachers surpass parents, but rather the thinness of the margin. Given the subject matter with which they deal one might have expected them to impute a greater political component to the idealized citizen role. Even history teachers spend most of their time talking about political history. We have argued elsewhere that the good citizen image varies over the life span, with a less politicized conception appearing at the early and late stages (Jennings & Niemi, 1974). Teachers, being well into adulthood, exhibit some elements of this decay in political emphasis. At the same time they keep more political emphasis than do parents because of their intimate connection with an inherently political subject matter.

Another aspect of the good citizen concept is the extent to which the "political" responses given by an individual are loaded toward an activist position. To construct a measure for this we first excluded all non-political interpretations of the good citizen idea and then dichotomized the political responses into two categories: active and non-active. By politically active we mean responses indicating participation and goal-directed behavior rather
than passive, compliant qualities. The dichotomized responses were then used to derive an active-passive good citizen index score for each respondent, again with no penalty being assessed for lack of verbosity. A 1 indicates the passive end and a 4 the active end of the variable.4

Table 3: Idealized Good Citizen as Seen by Teachers and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Dimension of Good Citizen</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Activism Dimension of Good Citizen</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN's are reduced in this portion of the table because all respondents who gave descriptions with no political content have been deleted.

Overall, teachers give more active descriptions than do parents, although the differences are not large (bottom panel, Table 3). College educated parents stress the political activist attributes of the ideal citizen more so than parents as a whole and are nearly indistinguishable from teachers. If anything, teachers lag behind highly educated parents on the political activism dimension, a striking commentary on the degree to which social studies teachers are still caught up in obedience, loyalty, and fealty as
hallmarks of citizenship virtues.

In strong contrast to political trust and moderate contrast to cosmopolitanism the findings for citizenship prescriptions indicate that teachers are scarcely different from comparably educated adults. By inference, the occupational role does little by way of sharpening the essentially political and activist nature of good citizenship. We are not suggesting that good citizenship should be normatively restricted to the explicitly political, or that obedience and loyalty are superfluous qualities in modern society. Nevertheless, the whole tone of secondary education guidelines in citizenship training has been geared toward preparing students for active political roles in society. To find social studies teachers no more imbued with this vision than comparable parents is ironic, indeed.

**POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP**

Of all the specific political preferences teachers are most wary of expressing in the classroom, none is probably more *verboten* than personal partisanship. Pressing the Democratic or Republican line in front of students is clearly outside the pale of acceptable behavior. Nevertheless, it seems likely that partisan preferences might occasionally color the teacher’s presentations. Although there are minor differences along the seven-point party identification spectrum, the signal feature of inter-sample comparisons is the overwhelming similarity of party preferences (Table 4). Taken as a whole, primary group and secular forces seem to have affected the two samples similarly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Party Identification among Teachers and Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 100% 3.42 (382)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% 17 14 9 8 18 8 100% 3.42 (382)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24% 25 9 10 5 15 12 100% 3.40 (1876)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% 14 11 7 9 16 24 100% 4.17 (191)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is, however, a Democratic bias among the teachers above and beyond the prevalent Democratic tendencies in the nation. Matching teachers with comparably educated parents reveals that the latter are considerably more Republican. What may account for this difference is the fact that teachers more often come from working class backgrounds and Democratic homes than is true of college degree parents.

Another aspect of partisanship is the intensity with which a preference is held. The seven-way measure was “folded” at the middle so that a three-way intensity measure was constructed (and “pure” Independents eliminated). Parents in general are only slightly more intense than teachers but college educated parents are noticeably more so. Thus the image of relatively weak party ties among teachers is borne out. Teachers also stress voting for the individual (64 percent) or both individual and party (21 percent) rather than the party (15 percent). The classroom appears to be a teacher-contrived sanctuary from the reality of partisan loyalties.

PUBLIC POLICY OPINIONS AND GROUP EVALUATIONS

One of the perennial fears of organizations and parents who monitor the schools is that teachers will run against the community grain with respect to current controversial issues. What usually precipitates a pronounced grievance against the teacher is a parental claim that teachers were expressing themselves in an area of choice best reserved for individual or family determination. In its more extreme form the watchdog function assumes a virtual censorship process and, ultimately, results in demands that offending teachers either desist in their “wrong” behavior or be relieved of their duties.

How real is the imagined difference between teachers and parents on a nationwide basis? To answer that question we compare reactions to five separate issues. These issues include a pair specifically related to education: the role of the federal government in achieving integration, and the desirability of having prayers in public schools. A third issue is the now-moot question of the eighteen year old vote. The two other issues are whether a locally-elected communist should be allowed to hold office, and whether a person in the community should be allowed to make speeches against churches and religion. Responses to each of the five questions have been scored along a liberal-conservative dimension (see footnote to Table 5).

Those expecting social studies teachers to be torch bearers of civil liberties will be justified only in part. Teachers do take the less conservative stance on all issues, but the difference in two cases is trivial. Moreover, even though teachers are most liberal on each issue than all parents, that is not true of two of the issues when comparisons are made with college degree parents.
Table 5: Opinions on Five Issues Among Teachers and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Conservative position</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal position</td>
<td>Depends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Speeches against Churches</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Role in School Integration</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighteen Year Old Vote</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Communist Can Hold Office</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayers in Public Schools</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a A conservative position means being against anti-church speeches, against federal role in promoting school integration, against the eighteen year old vote, against allowing communists to hold office, and for prayers in school.
b The higher the score, the more conservative the answer.
* Less than \( \frac{1}{2} \) of 1 percent.
Significantly, these two issues pose classic tests of subscription to the freedom of speech and to the legitimacy of free elections. That many adults fail to recognize the paradox of being for the abstract principles but against a (painful) application of them is a well-established empirical finding (Prothro & Grigg, 1960; McClosky, 1964). Similarly, the ability of better-educated individuals to recognize the paradox and resolve it in favor of the abstract principle is generally recognized, and is reflected in the more liberal position of highly educated parents in the present study.

Combining their high education with a presumed awareness of the constraints imposed by subscribing to two fundamental democratic norms, social studies teachers should, if anything, be more tolerant than counterpart parents. Such is patently not the case. Especially striking is the distribution of responses on the speeches against church issue. One can only conclude that many teachers fail to grasp unyielding nature of a commitment to free speech and election legitimacy. Corroborative evidence comes from other studies of teachers in which a gross inability to distinguish between matters of fact and opinion has been noted (Zeigler, 1966; Massialas, 1969).

Collectivities of people which are distinguished by certain physical, locational, social, religious, and membership characteristics (the list is obviously not exhaustive) often come to serve as significant political reference groups for individuals. The intersection of group evaluations and the political process comes when claims or demands are made by or upon significant portions of such groupings.

To what extent do teachers and parents hold different evaluations of socio-political groupings and thus—at a further remove—the interpretation of questions of public policy? A partial answer can be gained by comparing ratings applied to eight separate groupings on a "feeling thermometer," an instrument designed to capture a person's feelings toward a group on a scale ranging from a negative, cold 0° to a positive, warm 100°. Mean ratings are presented in Table 6.

Three points stand out. First, the general drift is similar and on the positive side for both samples. The largest inter-sample difference is 7 points, with teachers being more favorable than parents toward Jews. Second, what differences there are point toward the teachers as being more favorable toward traditional minority groupings. Thus they have higher evaluations of Catholics, Negroes, Jews, and Labor Unions. At the same time they are somewhat less positive about majority or stereotypically anti-minority groupings (Southerners). The higher rating applied to Big Business is the only exception to this pattern. Other studies have found social studies teachers to be more tolerant and civil libertarian than most other categories of teachers (Zeigler, 1966; Massialas, 1969). Our findings suggest that this difference also applies to their position vis-a-vis parents.
A third observation reinforces this point. Comparison of teacher attitudes with those held by highly educated parents shows that the posture of the teachers is not simply a function of educational status. College-degree parents join teachers in assigning slightly lower scores to Whites, but in every other instance (save the tie on Big Business) the teachers emerge as more minority supportive and majority non-supportive. Feelings about labor unions provide the best example, yielding a net difference of 13 points, with teachers on the high side. Occupational roles would seem to account for the persistent differences, particularly in the case of labor union sentiments, where most of the teachers belong to collective bargaining organizations.

**TEACHER-PARENT LINKAGES**

We now have a view of how teachers and parents compare in the aggregate and of the apparent role of self-selection, socialization, and occupational demands which sometimes set teachers off from comparably-

---

Table 6: Evaluations of Socio-Political Groups by Teachers and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Evaluated</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>College Graduate Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Unions</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southerners</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The higher the figure the more favorable the rating on the "feeling thermometer" which runs from 0° to 100°.*
educated parents. This information is useful for many purposes, but it begs the question of teacher-parent congruence at the local school level. It is at that level, after all, that parents and teachers intersect, with the adolescent offspring lying at the center of that union. Because of the sample design slightly over nine of every ten parents interviewed could be paired with at least one social studies teacher to whom their child had been exposed. Within that total about one-fourth were paired with the teacher from one course, two-fifths with the teacher from two courses, and one-third with the teacher from three or more courses. The average number of course teachers per parent is 2.2.

Table 7 presents the results of the paired correlations. None of the signs are negative, suggesting that severe tensions do not exist at the local level. Considering the ordinarily large gap in educational achievements between teachers and parents, plus whatever peculiarities accompany the occupational role of teaching, the lack of antipathies is not to be downplayed. Surely the heat of the political socialization process, to say nothing of school-community politics, would be raised appreciably if teachers found themselves consistently at odds with the parents of their charges.

On the other hand, it is perfectly obvious that while dissonance is not the rule, neither is harmony—the correlations range from .00 to only .22. The highest congruence is found in the relatively controversial areas of integration, prayers in the school, partisanship, and the evaluations of salient, visible population groups. For the sake of peace in the community, if nothing else, it is fortunate that congruence is highest in these emotion-laden areas. Still, even these levels of agreement do not denote high political agreement between these two socializers acting on the same socializees.

From a methodological standpoint, it is apparent that making inferences from the aggregate profiles down to the immediate school level pairings would have been misleading in a number of instances. Clearly, it would be appropriate to reexamine these relationships, controlling for relevant community, parental, and teacher characteristics. It is not at all inconceivable that these modest correlations vary considerably, depending upon the other features. In some instances the signs would undoubtedly be reversed, and in other instances the positive association would be exaggerated. Due to lack of space we cannot pursue that line of analysis.

Contenting ourselves only with the overall correlations, we must still address a major question. Why, in view of the weak patterns of agreement, are there not more instances of conflict initiated by parents who find their political orientations not faithfully echoed by their adolescent's teachers? There are several possible explanations but two have particular appeal. Simply because teachers do not agree with parents does not guarantee that these differences will be manifested in either classroom or community
behavior. For example, Democratic teachers in a Republican school community will not only keep their loyalties undisclosed in the classroom but may be “closet” Democrats in the community as well. Thus parents, as monitors, will not perceive a discrepancy. Indeed, the more controversial the area the less likely will differences be exposed. As demonstrated elsewhere, there are norms against excessive classroom and community political expressivism, especially in smaller communities and among teachers with more provincial backgrounds (Jennings & Zeigler, 1970).

A second explanation is that even when parents perceive a difference, they may not be at all upset about it. Intensity of feeling ordinarily runs high among only a minority of parents, even on controversial issues. Parents have also been conditioned not to interfere excessively in school affairs. Moreover, many political orientations are viewed as matters of taste

---

Table 7: Teacher-Parent Pair Correlations (r) Across a Range of Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Orientations</th>
<th>Issue Positions</th>
<th>Group Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitanism</td>
<td>School integration</td>
<td>Southerners .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School prayers</td>
<td>Whites .14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good citizen</td>
<td>Party identification</td>
<td>Negroes .11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(activism)</td>
<td>Communist holding office</td>
<td>Labor unions .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political trust</td>
<td>18-year old vote</td>
<td>Protestants .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good citizen</td>
<td>Speeches against church</td>
<td>Jews .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(politicalness)</td>
<td>Partisan intensity</td>
<td>Big business .04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The efficacy index for the parent sample utilizes four statements; that for the teacher sample uses two of the four items.
and as non-threatening. For example, parents are unlikely to be upset simply because they discover that their adolescent's teachers are more cosmopolitan than they are or that they emphasize active rather than passive citizenship roles.

From a socialization perspective, however, our findings illustrate very nicely the varied political cues to which the growing child and adolescent are exposed. Contrary to simpler times and societies when the set of socialization forces were perhaps more uniform, contemporary youth are molded by a host of forces, many of which may not be complementary to each other. The very modest parent-teacher similarity reported here fits into this pattern of complexity and heterogeneity. It is not surprising, then, that both the parental and teacher transmission processes are far from perfect.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The major problem that these findings present is one involving the role high school social studies teachers play in citizenship training. Teachers have been shown to be less efficacious in terms of non-voting political action than parents with similar educational backgrounds. Teachers are more trusting, and less skeptical, about government than highly educated parents. Similarly, teachers' conception of the "good citizen" is a slightly less politically active one than their well-educated parental counterparts. Teachers' intensity of partisanship is lower than similarly educated parents. The picture of social studies teachers, as compared with parents with equal education, is one of subscription to obedience, loyalty and passivity in the political arena. There is some reason to suspect that this situation is partly due to selection and socialization into the teaching occupation.

Compared with parents in general, social studies teachers reflect somewhat higher trust, greater cosmopolitanism, a slightly more activist picture of the "good citizen" and about the same degree of partisanship intensity. Teachers' positions on controversial social issues tend to be more liberal than parents'.

But in general the differences between teachers and parents are not large. It is doubtful that the citizenship training function is being carried out by a group of teachers which is radically different from the parents of high school students. Although some educators believe that "social reconstructionism" ought to be carried out through the curriculum, it is difficult to imagine this happening with the teachers sampled in this study, given the picture of their political attitudes and beliefs derived here. Rather, if citizenship training is effective, and if teacher beliefs and attitudes are reflected in student outcomes of this training, then the process is basically a conservative one, in which the political culture is handed down to the next generation in school. Of course, this may not be the case. But if the citizenship outcomes are substantially different, it is not likely that
differences in teacher beliefs and attitudes are the cause.
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**FOOTNOTES**

1Support for the research on which this paper is based came from the Danforth Foundation and the National Science Foundation. It was accepted for publication by the previous editor, Cleo Cherryholms, before Lee Ehman assumed editorship.

2Five items were used for the parent scale, and four for the teacher scale. The upper tail of the parent scale (values 5 and 6) was collapsed for purposes of comparison. The items used are found in Jennings and Niemi (1974).

3The index, which imposed no penalties for lack of verbosity, was constructed in the following manner: each of the four possible responses was dichotomized as political or non-political. Values were then assigned according to the following rule, where the numerator represents the number of political responses and the denominator represents the non-political responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index value</th>
<th>Ratio of Political to Non-political Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2; 1/3; 0/1; 0/2; 0/3; 0/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/2; 1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/1; 2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/0; 3/0; 2/0; 1/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4This index was scored in exactly the same way as the political-non-political index described in the previous footnote, except that the ratio is now active/non-active, rather than political/non-political.

This paper describes conceptual structures for research and instruction in critical thinking. The paper is comprised of three interrelated parts. The opening pages describe alternative definitions of critical thinking. A modification of the definitions used by B. Othanel Smith and Robert Ennis is offered in which critical thinking is defined as the "evaluation of evidence or argument based on acceptable standards for the purpose of accepting or rejecting statements." The second part of the paper examines two critical thinking paradigms—a "mental" and a "logical" paradigm, and implications of each are set forth. Empirical evidence for the construct validity of the mental paradigm is examined, and is generally found lacking. Finally, arguments for accepting the logical paradigm are set forth. The third part of the paper makes use of the logical paradigm as a basis for generating research problems. These are organized into four groups (1) philosophical/conceptual, (2) empirical/descriptive, (3) content analytic and (4) empirical/experimental problems. It is the purpose of this third section to provide a set of research problems, interrelated by virtue of their focus upon critical thinking, on which a cumulative body of knowledge concerning critical thinking can be built.


In the late 1930s and early 40s Paul R. Hanna developed, and later refined, the "Expanding Communities of Men" concept as an approach to the teaching of social studies. Hanna advocated a multidisciplinary, wholistic, and coordinated study of people living in societies which he referred to as "communities."

Since the advent of the "new" social studies in the 60s, Hanna's multidisciplinary approach has received considerable criticism. Most proponents of the "newer" social studies have refuted the "Expanding Communities" model, or the multidisciplinary approach, on the basis that it is a traditional pattern and consequently locks the learner into a "step-by-step" process rather than an "interdisciplinary" approach to learning.

The writers of "In Defense of Hanna..." chose to support the "Expanding Communities" concept through clarification and modification.
of the original model. By adding "facilitators" which surround the child at the core of his learning environments, and by providing "pathways" through which the child as a learner may move at will, Hanna's criticized multidisciplinary model now becomes an interdisciplinary method of teaching the "new" social studies through the modified application and re-adaptation of an "old" model.


This paper concentrates on the expressed intention of those who control or desire to control the schools' efforts at producing the "good citizen." The primary concern is nationalistic education, which is defined as those educational activities designed to develop a belief in national values. Nationalistic education usually incorporates three dimensions: (1) development of positive feelings toward those rituals, ceremonies, symbols and persons that express or incorporate those national values; (2) development of competency in operating as a national citizen; and (3) development of negative feelings towards countries, ideologies, symbols and persons considered contra-national. This paper examines a body of literature about and official documents such as state laws related to the practice of nationalistic education in the schools of the United States and other nations. The evidence suggests that nationalistic education appears to be a significant fixture in the schools of many, if not all, countries. It uses the schools as instruments to produce unthinking love and loyalty for the nation. It usually involves teaching national pride in history, government, language, heroes and symbols, but also includes negative portrayals of ideas and peoples considered contra-national. In this process, the schools act as reflective agents, uncritically transmitting myths and images deemed proper to the younger generations.


The President of the United States is the focal point of American government for most Americans. The role traditionally has been portrayed for Americans as one filled by an omniscient, omnipotent, highly moralistic
figure who personally carries the weight of the world on his shoulders. The Vietnam war and Watergate have considerably altered this "textbook" ideal. Teachers are now challenged by the need to examine the office and its capabilities as distinct factors shaped by the incumbent who holds the office.

Policy-making may now be more critical in assessing the presidency. Continuing mythologizing of the role will probably be rejected or considered a distortion of reality.


This paper presents data from the high school teachers and parents of a randomly selected national sample of 1965 high school seniors. Congruency in political outlooks between teachers and parents is examined. To provide an educationally controlled teacher-parent comparison, only those parents with a college degree are treated as a separate group. As groups, teachers are less cynical and more cosmopolitan than parents, although the latter difference is partly a function of educational level. Teachers believe that they understand politics better than parents, but also subscribe more to voting as the only way that people can influence government. Teachers see good citizenship as more political and activist than parents in general, but not differently than college educated parents. Teachers are more Democratic but less intensely partisan than parents and are generally more tolerant and civil libertarian toward social groups and issues. Correlations between teacher-parent pairs shows very modest strength or direct agreement between the two socialization agents, although there are no negative relationships on any measure. The findings show that some teacher-parent political differences are occupational, and are as complex as the overall political socialization network within which these two agents work.