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FROM THE EDITORS

This issue is planned to be the first of three issues in Volume V, with the second and third to appear in August and December. We are very heartened by the sharp increase in quantity of manuscripts being submitted. The number, since we assumed editorship, now more than equals the number previously submitted in the first three years taken together. This might mean that more research is being conducted or that more researchers are aware of the journal and are willing to submit their work. Whatever the case, the increase seems to mean that our plans for increasing the publication frequency are not unrealistic in terms of the available manuscripts. Whether the goal of a quarterly journal in 1978 can be achieved is up to a continued growth in quality manuscript submissions, as well as the future decisions of the Executive Committee. At present publication costs are being subsidized with a grant of money from the N.C.S.S. budget. Future budget decisions will help to determine the future publication pattern.

In this issue we have begun a new feature, found after the last regular article, called "Research in Progress." We hope to have you readers contribute to this section, which we hope will help keep you up to date on research efforts under way but not yet reported in published or convention paper form. Another item of interest will begin to appear in the August issue—this will be a book review section.

You will note that in this issue Cleo Cherryholmes and Arthur Foshay exchange ideas about Foshay's recent article. Although we may invite critiques and rejoinders to appear in the same issue as the original article, as was the case in the past, this becomes increasingly difficult with an increased publications frequency. We encourage you to follow the lead of Cherryholmes on other articles that might appear. Contrary to what was said at the last C.U.F.A. annual business meeting, we will not depend on outside reviews of the critique letters, but will decide on the merits of the critiques ourselves. We will, of course, solicit rejoinders to be published with the letters which are deemed appropriate for publication.

We would like to point out the emergence of a new research publication in the field, the Journal of Social Studies Research, edited by John Napier of the University of Georgia. Information about this semi-annual journal can be obtained by writing him. Also of note is the Exemplary Dissertation Award competition sponsored by the N.C.S.S. Pertaining to doctoral inquiry in areas related to social studies education, this award will be given to one individual during the annual meeting in November, and will carry a cash award of $150 and an appropriate certificate of merit for research excellence. Entries must be submitted by June 1, in the form of an abstract of not more than three double-spaced pages, to Dr. Paul Williams, Division of Research, Henrico County School Board, Highland Springs, VA 23075.

If the range and number of dissertations in progress listed in the "Research in Progress" section are any indication of the extent of new inquiry in our field, then we judge these to be exciting times in our field. Many bemoan the lack of theoretical and empirical research in social studies; perhaps seeds planted earlier are now sprouting. What the harvest will yield remains to be seen, but there are signs of an increasing base of inquiry being developed in social education. We hope that this will prove to be the case; after our harsh winter a liberal dash of spring optimism is certainly called for.

Lee H. Ehman
Judith A. Gillespie
Indiana University
RESPONSE AND REJOINER
ON "CITIZENSHIP AS THE AIM OF SOCIAL STUDIES"

To the Editor:

In the December, 1976, issue of *Theory and Research in Social Education*, Arthur Foshay and William Burton argue that "the Social Studies needs a single governing concept—citizenship—to give it programmatic meaning, or coherence." (p. 2) They propose that citizenship be defined as "all those activities that seek just relations between individuals and social institutions." (p. 4) The work of John Rawls is invoked to support this definition—"Fortunately for us, John Rawls has put together the fruits of ten years' work in his *A Theory of Justice*, and we are in a position now to reconsider our term 'citizenship' because of his efforts." (p. 4) They go on to evaluate several sets of social studies materials against this notion of citizenship as social justice. The curriculum materials examined come off rather poorly on this test.

There are many points in this argument with which one might take exception. For example, neither the worth nor utility of the need for a single governing "concept" in the social studies is obvious by any means. Occasionally, pressures are exerted to create an orthodoxy of viewpoint about various goals and purposes. These have included, in addition to citizenship, teaching the structure of the disciplines, reflective inquiry, decision-making, career awareness, confluent education, and global education. Most social studies professionals would find some merit in each of these. But the press for orthodoxy has too often moved from one passing fancy to another, while many fundamental curricular problems related to each of these approaches to social studies instruction have remained unsolved and sometimes unaddressed. I object to this call for a consensual orthodoxy. A strong case can also be made for a pluralism of approaches supported by serious, sustained work that addresses the meaning of our various purposes and specifies the outcomes that derive from them. But this is a minor objection although it is more than simply a difference of opinion.

Another point with which one might disagree is the particular substantive focus of citizenship. One might just as easily choose some other approach, e.g., one of those listed above. This type of disagreement is a matter of values and commitment and is not susceptible to any final determination. I find citizenship neither a compelling commitment nor do I find it objectionable. The major problem with the Foshay and Burton position is not citizenship *per se* but some serious structural problems in their development of the meaning of citizenship that vitiate their argument, including their assessment of selected curriculum materials.

The first and most serious problem is the definition of citizenship as "just relations between individuals and social institutions." Now the substantive
meaning of citizenship derives from a description or prescription of a specific, usually desired, society. If it is desired that the society in question maximize individual freedom and liberty, then the good citizen will learn, be adept at doing, and be inclined to do certain things. If the desired society places the highest value on social, economic, or political equality, then the good citizen will learn, be able to do, and be inclined to do other kinds of things.

Foshay and Burton choose to treat citizenship in the context of the just society. This is not a new idea. Plato and Aristotle were near the beginning of a long line of thinkers who have dealt with this topic. Nor is this an idea with which many, if any, social studies educators would take exception. In some form there would no doubt be considerable consensus around the notion that social studies education should include a concern with citizenship in a just society. The problem is that Foshay and Burton never tell us what constitutes a just society. Rawls is quoted but only to assert the primary importance of justice in social institutions. But this tells us very little. Rawls never believed that the importance of justice in society required defending. This is where he started and then proceeded in the course of 587 pages to develop a specific theory of justice and suggest how it may apply in different situations. Foshay and Burton also assert the importance of justice but unlike Rawls they never tell us what they mean when they speak of justice. They assume that the meaning of justice is unproblematic.

For Rawls the meaning of justice is very problematic, it needs elaborate development and extensive clarification. He goes to great length to state and explicate his two principles of justice (Rawls, p. 60, for the first statement of these principles). Now even if Foshay and Burton uncritically accept Rawls’ argument it is still incumbent upon them to tell us what his argument is and, possibly, provide us some examples. We are provided neither. Parenthetically, it should be noted that many areas of contention are thereby avoided.

Not only are we not told what “just relations between individuals and society” means, it is implied that Rawls has provided a final and definitive treatment of justice. The implication comes from their failure to question, in any sense, Rawls’ position. But his is not the only position concerning the meaning of justice. The critical literature that A Theory of Justice has spawned is voluminous. There are serious objections to many parts of Rawls’ argument, e.g., the notion of the original position (Barber, 1975), the choice of the maximin decision rule (Rae, 1975); and the difference principle (Nozick, 1974) have all been attacked to name but three. The important issues raised by Rawls have not been settled by any means nor are the applications of his principles unambiguous, e.g., the amount to be saved for future societies. So even if social studies materials were to be based on Rawls’ theory of justice as a guide to citizenship, many issues remain to be addressed and clarified, even though they will certainly not all be solved,
before evaluating existing materials against these standards. Thus we are not told any of the substance of Rawls' theory of justice nor that criticisms exist or what they say. Also we are not told that alternative theories of justice exist.

Although the meaning of justice continues to be an open issue, Foshay and Burton are not alone among social studies educators in treating the meaning of justice as unproblematic. For example, Kohlberg's stage six probably encompasses some notions about justice or applications of just principles although what stage six means is not entirely clear. According to Fenton (1976, p. 58), Rawls has given a moral interview that has been identified as stage six thinking. What some social studies educators and psychologists seem unaware or not fully appreciative of is that Rawls has attempted to develop a theory of justice based on a form of the social contract and that there are other theories of justice developed from alternative positions. Nozick (1974) presents a devastating critique of some of Rawls' key arguments in the process of arguing an entitlement theory of justice which comes from a libertarian view of society. Harsanyi (1975) takes issue with Rawls while arguing a view of justice from the standpoint of utilitarianism. As for Kohlberg and other moral thought advocates, if Rawls, Nozick and Harsanyi can all be identified as being at stage six, then stage six, while not exactly being all things to all people, would include such a multitude of philosophical positions and contradictions that the meaning of stage six would be indeterminate. On the other hand, if Rawls is identified as a stage six thinker but not Nozick or Harsanyi, then there would be good reason to believe that the Kohlberg scheme is methodologically flawed by the promotion of one philosophical and ideological position to the exclusion of others.

Not only do Foshay and Burton fail to mention criticisms of Rawls' theory of justice, they also do not acknowledge any competing views of justice. Given all of this, it is not surprising that they fail to operationalize the meaning of justice that they purport to hold up as a standard for evaluating social studies materials. This being the case, the evaluation is little more than an impressionistic assessment of the chosen texts. Insofar as their evaluation rests on arguments which are incomplete at the crucial points and leaves key terms undefined, e.g., what is justice? how is the term justice operationalized in order to evaluate materials?, their research claims have the status of mere assertions.

Finally, I am in agreement with Foshay and Burton on the importance of citizenship and justice in the social studies. There are serious and complex issues. Our treatment of them should match their seriousness and complexity.
REFERENCES


Cleo H. Cherryholmes
Department of Political Science
Michigan State University

To the Editor:

Mr. Cherryholmes' response to the article by Burton and me illustrates a difficulty that has arisen in Education because of the development of specialties, and sub-specialties, in the field. The advantage of these specialties is that they allow for some penetration of the various aspects of Education. The disadvantage is that they sometimes leave the specialist forgetting that he does not know it all. The specialty I inhabit is called curriculum design. As a member of this group, I am called upon to look across the fields of study and activity that go on in schools, asking certain consistent questions of each of them. For this reason, I have been involved in curriculum projects in Aesthetics and Science, each time as chairman of the advisory committee; I have been drawn into English and literature; I had a hand in the establishment of the High School Geography project. How dare people like me touch these disparate fields? Because of the consistency of the questions we raise.
One of these is the question of aim vs. 'aimlessness. This question Mr. Cherryholmes chooses to lay aside as a "minor objection." But it is the main point of our article. As James P. Shaver says in his 1976 presidential address to NCSS, "It is a rare instance when one comes across a K-12 curriculum . . . that is carefully structured with interrelated courses based consciously on some common 'social studies' orientation, such as citizenship, rather than the old redundancy of U. S. History recycled and a scattering of social science courses taught largely independently of one another." The Social Studies, as a field, is in trouble because of this incoherence. Witness the proliferation of scattered mini-courses in the high schools, and the disposition at the elementary level to take method, rather than substance, as the aim. When no coherent set of ideas activates a field, it becomes prey to anyone with an idea, or a fad, or a style. Silberman's (and other journalists') accusation of "mindlessness" becomes pertinent.

Mr. Cherryholmes' plea for pluralism ignores this hazard. To call for a single organizing idea is not to call for a doctrinaire, or limited, program. Indeed, in the absence of an idea that has the necessary scope and idealistic appeal, doctrinaire proposals erupt, as those social studies people who have confronted the patrioteers in various parts of the country know very well.

The notion that a single organizing concept should activate a program has a long history in curriculum thinking. One can deduce such an idea in the education of the guardians, in The Republic, as also in classic essays on education—Montaigne, Milton, Ascham—each of which pursues an organizing idea appropriate to its times. More recently, and more pointedly, curricularists would refer to the various statements of the aims of education since 1890, and in particular to Ralph Tyler's formulation of the requirements for planning a curriculum in his Basic Principles. If Burton and I seemed to take the need for a single, organizing idea for granted, it is because the consensus on the point is so ancient and widespread.

Mr. Cherryholmes is obviously not a specialist in curriculum design in the sense indicated here. If he were, he could not possibly have listed, as if they were of the same order, "teaching the structure of the disciplines, reflective inquiry, decision-making, career awareness, confluent education (!) and Global Education." This list is confused, from my point of view, and Mr. Cherryholmes sounds like a layman.

We sound like laymen to Mr. Cherryholmes, too, when in the article we uncritically accept Rawls, and do not spell out what we take "justice" to mean. I do not think the criticism of the texts is vitiated by this lack, however, since the criticism was not that the texts had a mistaken view of justice or citizenship, but that most of them ignore these terms, or almost ignore them. Burton's and my function, with respect to the Social Studies, is to call attention to what we take to be a weakness, and to propose a promising candidate for remedying it. If the Social Studies community
would consider citizenship as an organizing idea, or would propose some alternative idea of equal power and attractiveness, we would be content. It is not our function, since we are not in the field, to enter into the disputes over the concept "justice." This we leave to people like Mr. Cherryholmes, who obviously has the scholarly knowledge that would make such an analysis possible. I do not doubt for a moment his commitment to the importance of justice and citizenship. I only ask that he and his colleagues get on with it.

Arthur W. Foshay
Professor Emeritus
Teachers College, Columbia University
Rowe, Massachusetts 01367
A PHILOSOPHY FOR INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

Angene H. Wilson
University of Kentucky

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There are at least two possible philosophies which could undergird intercultural education. One, pragmatism, has been the usual and taken for granted philosophy. Another, phenomenology, has rarely been considered and is at least equally appropriate.

This article will first describe both pragmatism and phenomenology and then hypothesize the advantages and disadvantages of each in relation to intercultural learning. Second, the article will show how each philosophy is or could be applied in intercultural curricula in schools. Finally, the author will make a case for allowing phenomenology to be a competing and complementary philosophy for intercultural education.

DEFINITION OF PRAGMATISM

Pragmatism is a peculiarly American philosophy whose major exponents have been William James, Charles Peirce, and John Dewey. Its thesis is that an idea should be judged by how it works, that meaning is in consequences. John Dewey stated that reflective thinking is the "active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends." (Dewey, 1933, p. 9)

Dewey's influence on education, and especially social studies education, was profound. He wrote about the essential relationships between education and experience, activity, interest, democracy. In a day when rote memorization was the usual method of teaching, Dewey argued that teachers ought to build education on intelligently directed experience and be catalysts for reflective thinking in the classroom. Later Griffin (1942) gave the job of improving and refining the reflective capacities specifically to history teachers.

Dewey's two phases of reflective thinking—a state of doubt and an act of searching to resolve the doubt—are very close to a description of the scientific method. They are also precursors to the steps of problem solving used by social studies educators Hunt and Metcalf (1955) and to the process of inquiry described by Beyer (1971). Hunt and Metcalf urged teachers and students to study closed areas such as race, sex, and economics by using the following steps: recognition and definition of a problem, formulation of hypotheses, elaboration of logical implications of hypotheses, testing of hypotheses, and drawing of a conclusion. Beyer's process includes: defining
To illustrate the pragmatic problem-solving approach, Maxine Greene in *Teacher as Stranger* shows how Hamlet might be viewed through that philosophic lens. Hamlet, confronted by his father's ghost, transforms a vaguely troubling situation into a problematic one. The problem is that something is rotten in Denmark. He hypothesizes that his uncle murdered his father and that therefore his uncle will stop Hamlet's play within a play about the murder of another king. Hamlet tests his hypothesis. Claudius does indeed stop the play. Hamlet concludes his uncle murdered his father. So Hamlet has learned something. Through inquiry, he has had what Dewey would call a meaningful experience.

**DEFINITION OF PHENOMENOLOGY**

Phenomenology has German roots and is far less widely known, at least in the United States and by educators, than is pragmatism. Edmund Husserl and Alfred Schutz are among the major exponents.

Basic to phenomenology are the refusal to take for granted (Husserl wanted to create a presuppositionless philosophy) and bracketing (defined by Schutz as the setting aside of judgments about the nature and essence of things).

A second important aspect of phenomenology is its emphasis on perspective. Husserl wrote that the world is a "communalized set of perspectives. We are all conscious that there is only one world, but we are also quite sure we all see it differently, we all interpret it differently, and we all attribute different meanings to it at various times." (Poole, 1972, p. 90) Phenomenologists also believe a person must take one's own biography and perspective into account as one attempts to know.

A third aspect of phenomenology is its urging that persons concentrate on the subject experience and see before they think. (Psathas, 1973) Schutz (1970) writes about "wide-awakeness" as a consciousness originating in an attitude of full attention to life. It is an alert, wide-ranging seeing of the whole. As Denton writes: "Seeing is thus the perception of that experience as opposed to that observed." (1974, p. 105)

Finally, phenomenology demands that a person reflectively make meaning. In this case, reflection may be subjective rather than objective. It may operate, as Poole suggests, by describing and comparing a body of materials, by considering perspectives, by using sympathy, empathy, and antipathy, and by integrating all aspects into a totality. Rice (1975), interpreting Denton, states reflection comes through hermeneutical dialogue which leads to a feeling and pattern-filled understanding rather than to abstract explanation.
Again, Greene's description of Hamlet, this time from a phenomenologi-
cal point of view, illustrates. Phenomenologically, Hamlet is a person living
in a particular common sense world, the court at Elsinore. He takes for
granted the rituals, customs and social hierarchies of the Danish state. He
also has his own peculiar biography; he is a part of the same culture as
Horatio and even Claudius, but he also son of the dead king. When he is
confronted by the ghost, he is shocked. He cannot fit that occurrence into
his common-sense world. So he begins to reflect on what he is doing,
thinking. In reflecting, he excludes or brackets out the ordinary
interpretation. Writes Greene:

He can only discover the meaning of what is happening if he engages
in the kind of self-interpretation that will enable him to interpret the
significance of the Other, who is Claudius, and the Other's actions in
the World. He can only discover what is rotten in Denmark if he
refuses to take for granted any longer the rituals that apparently
legitimate the court. (p. 134)

DEFINITION OF INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

Intercultural education is the study of cultural, racial, religious, ethnic,
and national groups and the meeting, discussing and working with members
of those various groups for the purpose of "learning empathy for a
multiplicity of human horizons." (Novak, 1971, p. 84) In shorthand, it is
the study of and experience with other people. It is not a substitute term for
global education, but is a major part of global education. It is not a
substitute term for multiethnic education either, because multiethnic
education concentrates on our own society and thus can be part of
intercultural education.

Persons are educated about other cultures in three major ways: mass
media, personal experience, and schooling. Mass media is the major source.
One study, for example, found that high school students say newspapers
and magazines are their sources of information about the world 38 percent
of the time and television 35 percent of the time. (Remy, 1973) Personal
experiences, the second source, are more positively exemplified by
person-to-person exchange programs. Schooling, the third source, is the
usual focus for educators, but it is clear that schooling ought also to include
ways of teaching students to process mass media information critically and
ways of providing opportunities for students to meet, discuss and work with
members of many cultural groups. It is a measure of how far intercultural
schooling has to go in promoting personal experience that in 1975 it was
news that American schools in Germany were beginning a regular exchange
program with German schools.
PRAGMATISM AND INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

The following advantages and disadvantages of pragmatism as a philosophy underlying intercultural education are hypothesized.

Advantages:

1. The steps of reflective thinking *a la* problem solving *a la* inquiry are natural ones for dealing with new and strange persons and cultures and especially with the global problems that affect us and them. Overpopulation and ethnically and religiously motivated civil war are but two problematic situations which call for acts of searching (hypothesizing and testing) and coming to conclusions. The criterion of "what works" seems important here in the judgment of consequences.

2. The pragmatic process assures that hypotheses are tested. Students and teacher have to test their brainstorming about China, for example, against a variety of data. The learners will not, if they are pragmatists, be tempted to take one source's statements at face value, but will test them against other data.

Disadvantages:

1. A pragmatic approach to intercultural education is inappropriate if person-to-person contact and experience are the educational methods and if the objectives are awareness and understanding rather than problem-solving. Persons are not problems to be solved but human beings to know and care about.

2. Pragmatism, as an American child and as the philosophical relative of the scientific method, is associated with what Denton calls the sociological-nomothetic bias of our culture which studies and explains in terms of concepts and principles. It is associated with what Valery's Chinese philosopher calls the Western mind's "raging science." (Reston, 1976) Donald Johnson has a similar concern which he connects directly with intercultural education. He wonders if social sciences are adequate tools for exploring other cultures and peoples.

Perhaps we forget that social sciences are all western inventions and therefore accept many western values as norms of culture. The comparative approach of the new social studies comes close to operating from a universal culture model which owes much to thinkers like Morgan at the turn of the century. The tacit belief is that the Non-West is at the evolutionary stage of prerenaissance Europe and what happened to us during the last five hundred years will happen in Asia. Only the names have been changed, the locations shifted. Only one
real question need haunt us here. What if cultures don’t evolve at all and there are no universal models. (p. 14)

PHENOMENOLOGY AND INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

The advantages and disadvantages of phenomenology as a philosophy to undergird intercultural education are hypothesized as the following:

Advantages:

1. Phenomenology encourages teachers and students to look at other persons and other cultures and their places within global issues without presuppositions. Not only stereotypes, but also conceptual presuppositions such as “civilized” and “tribe” are bracketed. Learners look before labeling, describe before explaining and analyzing.

2. Phenomenology takes the individual perspective of the person experiencing life seriously. The perspectives and life experiences of both learner-persons and learned-about persons are considered.

Disadvantages:

1. Phenomenology is not congruent with the global issue approach or the comparative social science approach to intercultural studies. While it demands learners make meanings, it does not demand that conclusions be reached about problems or that data be classified and compared according to certain conceptual schemes.

2. Phenomenology may not be a very satisfactory philosophy for the part of intercultural education which now takes place in school. Perhaps a problematic situation is necessary to arouse interest. Then, too, hypothesizing and generalizing and concluding are easier in the classroom than in the middle of adult life.

PRAGMATISM AND INTERCULTURAL CURRICULA

Curricula abound whose underlying and unexamined philosophy is pragmatism. An excellent example is the sample plan for inquiry teaching about an ethnic group in Africa which is part of Beyer’s previously mentioned text. Beyer begins with a problematic or doubtful situation—What are the Asante like? Students study a vocabulary list and hypothesize, then look at some pictures, test their hypotheses and conclude, and finally go on to apply their conclusions to new data. The Human Experience (Weitzman and Gross, 1974), an inquiry-oriented text, asks students to reconstruct Sumerian life from some Cuneiform script and to use a map to
construct hypotheses about appearance and movement of early peoples.

Curricula which stress current events and ask students to understand problem areas of the world and global issues are also pragmatic in approach. For example, a second-year American history teacher, unprepared to teach a world history class suddenly thrust upon him, very naturally begins his course with an emphasis on areas and peoples of the world which are in the news. He may order materials from the African-American Institute to give his students more background on South Africa or use a high school or adult magazine as regular, general source. He may use Intercom, a quarterly magazine which offers a wealth of resources and teaching ideas from a global perspective on topics such as environment and male and female roles.

Curricula which study societies, ours and others, in terms of concepts and with what might be called the comparative social science approach, are a third type in the pragmatic tradition. The guide to Interculture’s Changing Africa multi-media kit, for example, uses concepts such as modernization, conflict resolution, division of labor, roles, and change. The high school text Exploring World Cultures (Newhill and LaPaglia, 1974) uses a quotation from Kenneth Kaunda, Zambia’s president, to encourage thinking about the concept of modernization.

Many questions or problems raised in intercultural curricular are comparative in nature. The text People and Cultures (Garbarino and Sady, 1975) asks students to compare Tahitian and Hawaiian tools and language, and part of the Villagers of India unit in that book is a comparison of three Indian villages. The Praeger series Through African Eyes asks: “How are the problems of young Africans similar to those faced by young Americans?” The Allegheny Intercultural Understanding Project (1972) asks students to compare institutions found in different cultures, as in the question “Contrast Japanese religious attitudes and dependency with American religious attitudes and independency.”

Finally, the pragmatic process of reflective thinking is evident in the objectives of intercultural curricula as well as in the activities. The American University Field Service Intercultural Social Studies Project (1974) wants students to “consume discriminately and process critically.” The Allegheny Intercultural Understanding Project lists as its objective 4: “Students will develop skills in using techniques of the social scientist—data collection, analysis and evaluation of data, formulation of hypotheses, projecting solutions, validating hypotheses, supporting conclusions.”

PHENOMENOLOGY AND INTERCULTURAL CURRICULA

It is more difficult to find curricula which take a phenomenological approach. Bracketing, the first aspect listed under definition, is sometimes
encouraged in dealing with stereotypes, but rarely with concepts which are
simply taken for granted and often used as categories for organizing
hypotheses. Bracketing can be done, however. In essence, it is encouraged
by the following statement in the introduction to Praeger's *Through Indian
Eyes*: "If we are willing to look beyond the statistics on gross national
product and life expectancy, India may have something to say to us about
the quality of life." (Johnson, 1974)

Use as visual evidence of the new and outstanding American University
Field Service films of Bolivia, Afghanistan, Kenya Boran, Taiwan and the
China Coast also encourages bracketing. Norman Miller, director of the
project, urges that students first simply see (while bracketing presupposi-
tions about the culture being viewed) and then describe. He suggests waiting
to go to printed data until after the describing and perhaps categorizing
from the visual evidence. That this way of learning about other cultures is
difficult was evident in a recent workshop on strategies for the films. The
mostly professorial crowd had a very hard time not beginning with
generalizations.

The second mentioned aspect of phenomenology, the emphasis on
perspective, shows up occasionally in intercultural materials, especially in
the guise of concern about ethnocentrism. The AUFS Intercultural Social
Studies Project criticizes contemporary curricula for presenting the world as
fragmented units perceived through an ethnocentric lens. One of that
project's strengths is that its field staff associates have lived and
participated in the cultures they write about and film. One of the project's
exercises, entitled "Perceptions and Perspectives," asks students to view
Singapore as an American living there might and to view the United States
as a Malaysian not living here might.

Perspective is also considered in the Southeast Asia book of the
Scholastic World Cultures Program (1974) when Mesarovic reminds his
readers: "In any discussion of standards of living the first step should be to
determine whose standard of living is being talked about." He quotes a
proverb from Bali: "Other fields, other locusts; other pools, other fish."
The special virtue of the various Praeger series, which now cover Africa,
India, China, Japan, and the Middle East, is that, for the most part, they
allow persons of the culture to speak for themselves.

Concern about the perspective of the learner in relation to other peoples
and cultures is obvious in Fersh's *Learning about Peoples and Cultures*
(1974). In one section entitled "Seeing Each Other as Outsiders and
Insiders," he offers two short readings "The Nacirema" and "The Rac." In
these readings, the American is forced to look at himself as an outsider
might. The wide eyes and "ohs" that appear as students discover the
Nacirema is an American and the rac a car are evidence that this is a new
experience—to, in phenomenological terms, consider one's own biography.
Besides appeals to rise above ethnocentrism, the use of "inside perspective" readings, and the challenging of learners' perspectives, there is another way to examine perspective in the classroom: dialogue between persons of different cultures. Following is a transcript of such a dialogue between a Nigerian graduate student and a group of American high school students.

Oke: Let me ask this question, too, since you brought up the question of many wives. How is it possible that here a boy or girl has more than one date at the same time? Like it is almost opposite our own. When you are going with a girl you are going with just that one girl, but here today a girl may go with a boy, tomorrow you may see her with another guy. You change boys just like that. How do you manage to do it?

Student: I guess we don't commit ourselves up to a certain point.

Oke: One point here is that you've been told you can go with as many boys as possible, at least until you're engaged, whereas in our own country, once you go with a girl, you go with that girl. You are almost sure you are going to get married.

Student: But what happens if you start taking her out and find it's a big mistake and yuk?

Oke: Well, you don't take a girl out until you're almost sure.

The third aspect of phenomenology mentioned in this article is wide-awakeness. Such an attitude of full attention to life seems an appropriate one for persons approaching the experience of a new culture and new persons. It is often the normal attitude of someone confronting an alien place, someone in the midst of a new cultural experience. At the Ibadan, Nigeria market, for example, an American is wide-awake to the deep blues of the tie-dyed cloth, the woven basket cages of chickens, the rows of glistening machetes, the stacks of enamelware bowls decorated with red flowers. Beyond sight—smell and sound and taste and touch are challenged.

How can that attitude be cultivated in a classroom? An Amish experience, outside the classroom yet as part of schooling, might be ideal and possible in some parts of the United States. But in the ordinary classroom, what is a student to be awake to? Again, the AUFS films mentioned earlier can be exciting vicarious field experiences. The Changing Africa multimedia kit has more than 60 authentic artifacts of the Kpelle culture for hands-on experience. Indigenous newspapers, magazines, vocabulary, music, poetry, folk tales, proverbs, clothing, and food can be the raw materials to see, experience, describe.
The chance to make personal meaning, the fourth aspect of phenomenology described in this article, rarely appears in intercultural curricula. The text *The Human Experience*, which includes intercultural material, does ask students to write their own personal political philosophies, and to design a new constitution, a new city, and a perfect economy. To make personal meaning from intercultural education inside the classroom may seem almost impossible. Yet students did gain personal meaning from a two-week Yoruba Nigerian experience in which the author of this article was involved. Central to the experience were three class periods of small-group dialogue between Nigerians and students. The experience also included role-playing a naming ceremony, eating African chop, reading newspapers, plays, novels, listening to music, and playing ayo. Wrote one student in concluding her essay about her experience:

Everything that I learned I could not possibly write on paper, for the pure facts about a culture are not all that one learns. What may be most important of all is the image that one obtains from his fellow man.

**PRAGMATISM AND PHENOMENOLOGY**

Reflective thinking, problem solving, and inquiry in the tradition of John Dewey's pragmatism are a vital part of social studies education. Some would contend that reflective thinking, particularly about controversial issues, has hardly been tried by teachers. Yet many good social studies teachers do attempt to encourage their students to think about experience. What very few teachers do is allow students to "experience experience." Therein lies a crucial difference.

Troutner, in an essay "John Dewey and the Existential Phenomenologist" (Denton, 1974), focuses on Dewey as pragmatist and Heidigger as phenomenologist to show what philosophy has to do with that difference. Dewey, he says, sees man and the world as a natural scientist does, as reality objectified and out there. Heidigger, on the other hand, as a phenomenologist, sees the world from the perspective of human consciousness. Dewey focuses on the process of experiencing, while a phenomenologist focuses on the person who is experiencing. Although Dewey shines through in biographies as a fascinating and real man, he did not in his writings use "I" or "my" to precede experience. He asked in third person "How does an individual live in the world?" While Dewey was interested in the objective mind resolving problematic situations, for a phenomenologist "to map a village means less than to visit its people." (Rozak, p. 377)

Since intercultural education involves persons—others, a diversity of others, and a me—it is important that persons are part of the curricula,
and that they are aware of and understand each other. Bracketing, considering perspective, seeing, and making personal meaning are roads to awareness and understanding. Gouldner writes about the awareness which depends on the attitudes of persons toward information and which is more than a depersonalized pursuit of knowledge, the awareness which includes self and which sees "truth as growing out of the knower's encounter with the world and his effort to order his experience with it." (Gouldner, 1970, p. 493) Denton writes about an understanding which includes intentions, commitments, feeling the experiencing body, encounters, projections, thinking through new materials, sharing frames of reference, perceiving body English (language). (Rice, 1975)

Still, the individual lived experience does confront another's lived experience, in fact many others' lived experiences. There is a social world and it does have problems. Thinking about, reflecting on those problems is also a part of intercultural education. The ethnic fairs Louisville schools are putting on this year should be experiences leading to awareness and understanding. But reflective thinking about busing and equal education is also necessary in Louisville. However, it is probably true that if lived experiences with people come first, the process of thinking about problems with people will be clearer.

A-ha! That sounds like Dewey—experience and education. "My," the personal element, does have to be added.

So, after all, the two competing philosophies of pragmatism and phenomenology can be complementary, encompassing problems and persons, society and the individual, thinking and experiencing. The two can join to make a holistic philosophy to undergird intercultural education.

A PHENOMENOLOGICAL POSTSCRIPT

This article was written in the reflective mode: the problem was stated and terms defined; hypotheses were suggested and tested as they applied to intercultural curricula; a conclusion was reached.

The person—I—am behind that process, however. My personal biography, especially the experiences I lived in West Africa for four years and in the South Pacific for two years, have contributed to my thinking. An anthropologist has written about his realization that he was seeing his anthropological subjects as objects when he began to write his field report and found he could not fit into it the individuals he had known. (Jay, 1969) My thinking about Liberia and Sierra Leone and Fiji revolves around individual persons and places and experiences more than around problems and conclusions. That thinking is a plate of rice—whole and yet separate. But it is definitely my human consciousness and full of feeling and caring. It is my conviction (and existential leap of faith) that in intercultural
education, with both the fear of blowing ourselves up and the hope of a shared future pushing us on, caring is as important as thinking. Finally, my children keep me honest.
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ATTRIBUTES AND ADOPTION
OF NEW SOCIAL STUDIES MATERIALS
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THE PROBLEM

In the 1960's, major curriculum revision was undertaken in pre-collegiate social science education. History and social science associations, private foundations, the National Science Foundation and the United States Office of Education committed large sums of money to projects to develop instructional materials which would reflect new trends popularly known as "the new social studies." Although a substantial investment had been made in the development projects, at the time of this study, in 1973 and 1974, little was known about the diffusion of the new materials into the nation's classrooms.

There were a few case studies on the diffusion of particular sets of "new social studies" materials. Richburg (1969) investigated factors which led early adopters to purchase materials from the University of Georgia Anthropology Curriculum Project. Switzer (1973) studied variables related to the retention and discontinuance of Sociological Resources in the Social Studies (SRSS) Project materials by pilot teachers. Hering (1973) wrote case studies of four teams trained to disseminate SRSS materials. Kinney (1975) studied awareness and use of the High School Geography Project materials by college geography professors. The American Institutes for Research (AIR) prepared case studies on the development and diffusion of materials from the Developmental Economic Education Project (Kim, et al, 1972), the Carnegie-Mellon Social Studies Curriculum Project (Sanderson and Kratochvil, 1972), the Materials and Activities for Teachers and Children (Sanderson and Kratochvil, 1972) and the Taba Social Studies Curriculum Project (Sanderson and Crawford, 1972; Crawford, Kratochvil and Wright, 1972). The AIR case studies hypothesized about the effects of cost, complexity, marketing techniques and other factors on the diffusion of the new materials. The case studies of single programs, however, did not yield comparative data on the diffusion of different programs.

A few descriptive studies using survey data compared the diffusion of new secondary social studies project materials. Switzer, et al (1974) noted the extent of awareness and use of new materials in five midwestern states. They were interested also in the channels of communication through which teachers learned of the innovative materials. Turner and Haley (1975) studied the extent of use of the same materials in four other states. They also looked at the characteristics of teacher adopters and their degree of
satisfaction with the materials.

Studies of the extent of use of new secondary social studies materials were also conducted by Walker (1974) in Nebraska, Wells (1973) in Oklahoma, Weidner (1972) in Alabama, Robeson (1974) in Prince George's County, Maryland, and Britton (1976) in Santa Clara County, California. While these studies yielded descriptive information about the comparative diffusion of new secondary social studies project materials, there remained little knowledge as to why some materials were adopted by more schools than were others.

If we are to understand the process of innovation diffusion in social studies, we need to test explanatory hypotheses to supplement the existing descriptive research base. In studying the adoption phenomena of innovative curricular materials in social studies, it is appropriate to draw upon the more general knowledge base of innovation diffusion. Generalizations about the adoption of new ideas, practices and products in agriculture, business and medicine suggest variables to consider in studying the adoption of new social studies materials.

In their major work on innovation diffusion, Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) suggested that an individual's perception of the attributes or characteristics of an innovation is related to the adoption of the innovation. In surveying the existing literature, Rogers and Shoemaker identified as important the following five attributes: relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability and observability. They emphasized that it is the individuals' perceptions of the attributes of innovations, not the attributes as classified as experts or change agents, which affect the innovation's rate of adoption (p. 138).

Several investigators used the five concepts of relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability and observability to describe characteristics of educational innovations (Carlson, 1971; Littleton, 1970; and Brennen, 1971). Educational change agents have also used those concepts to plan diffusion strategies (Jwaideh and Marker, 1973).

However, it had not been demonstrated empirically that the five a priori concepts were delimited by the characteristics Rogers and Shoemaker used in their definitions for the concepts. For example, there was no evidence that compatibility contained the elements or subdimensions attributed to it in the literature. One purpose of the study described in this article was to determine empirically whether attributes of innovations are perceived by potential adopters in constructs similar to Rogers and Shoemaker's definitions of innovation attributes. A second purpose was to determine if the attributes are related to potential adopters' willingness to adopt new social studies materials and to the actual adoption of those innovative materials. The study sought answers to the following questions:

1. Do the definitions for relative advantage, compatibility, complexity,
trialability and observability adequately describe attributes of new social studies materials as they are perceived by potential adopters of the materials?

2. Are potential adopters’ perceptions of the attributes of new social studies materials related to their stated willingness to try those materials?

3. Are potential adopters’ perceptions of the attributes of new social studies materials related to adoption of those materials?

4. Do potential adopters’ attitudes toward new social studies materials correlate with adoption of those materials in their schools?

5. What attributes of new social studies materials have the strongest and weakest correlations with positive and negative attitudes toward new social studies materials?

6. What attributes of new social studies materials have the strongest and weakest correlations with actual adoption of those materials?

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In reviewing the literature on innovation diffusion, studies were identified which related each of Rogers and Shoemaker’s five categories to the adoption of educational innovations (Cameren, 1966; Christensen and Taylor, 1966; Kohl, 1967; Hull and Wells, 1972; Littleton, 1970; Carlson, 1965; and Brennan, 1971).

“Relative advantage is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as being better than the idea it supersedes,” explained Rogers and Shoemaker (1971, p. 138). Further, they said:

Relative advantage, in one sense, indicates the intensity of the reward or punishment resulting from adoption of an innovation. There are undoubtedly a number of subdimensions of relative advantage: the degree of economic profitability, low initial cost, lower perceived risk, a decrease in discomfort, a savings in time and effort, and the immediacy of the reward (p. 139).

Studies of the diffusion of educational innovations concluded that initial cost, continuing cost, rewards, time needed, student interest, student learning, effectiveness, and a general perception of the innovation being better than existing materials was related to the adoption or rejection of education materials (Lamar, 1967; Reynolds, 1970; Brennan, 1971; Franklin, 1972; Mongerson, 1969; Haber, 1963; and Dohmann, 1970).

Several studies of the diffusion of social studies materials in particular hypothesized a relationship between perceptions of innovative materials being better than those used previously and the adoption of materials. Several studies suggested that student interest, student learning and cost were related to the adoption of new social studies methods and materials.

The second innovation attribute found related to adoption was *compatibility*. Compatibility is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with the values, past experiences, and needs of the receivers (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971, p. 145). Several studies in education emphasized that innovations are more likely to be adopted if they are compatible with the existing curriculum—courses and school practices (Cameren, 1966; Miles, 1964; Reynolds, 1970). Other studies in education concluded that compatibility with the values of the adopters was important (Lamar, 1967; Brennan, 1971). Compatibility with needs was found also to correlate with the adoption of educational innovations (Ross, 1958). In his study of the Georgia Anthropology Curriculum Project, Richburg (1969) noted the importance of compatibility with needs, values, and previous experience.

*Trialability*, the third attribute, is the degree to which an innovation may be tried on a limited basis (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971, p. 155). Studies on the diffusion of a physics curriculum, of language laboratories, and of agricultural educational innovations noted the importance of first trying the innovation on a small scale or pilot basis (Cameren, 1966; Haber, 1963; Christensen and Taylor, 1966). In social studies, Richburg (1969) found that schools which adopted the Georgia Anthropology Project materials had usually tried them out on a small scale before actually adopting them.

*Observability* was the fourth innovation attribute found to be related to diffusion. Observability is the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971, p. 155). Haber (1963) found that an important influence in the adoption of language laboratories was that adopters had seen and heard about the labs’ success in other schools. It was possible that observability also contributes to the diffusion of new social studies materials.

*Complexity*, “the degree to which an innovation is perceived as relatively difficult to understand and use” (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971, p. 154), was the fifth attribute found related to innovation diffusion. With regard to educational innovations, complexity referred to teacher difficulty in understanding or using an innovation and to beliefs about students using or understanding the innovation. Several studies noted that teacher adopters found an innovation easy to use, whereas rejectors thought it was difficult to use and that it required additional teacher training (Brennan, 1971; Christensen and Taylor, 1966). Richburg (1969) noted that adopters of the Georgia Anthropology Curriculum Project reported that in reviewing the materials initially, they were concerned with the level of difficulty of the vocabulary, with whether students could read the material adequately and with whether the material overall was too advanced for their students. They
were concerned also with whether untrained teachers could use the material. It was possible, then, that complexity, which involved difficulty for teachers or students, readability, and the need for special skills, would be related to the adoption of other new social studies materials.

Earlier studies on the adoption of non-social studies educational innovations found that relative advantage, compatibility, trialability, and observability correlated positively with adoption while complexity correlated negatively with innovation adoption. There were a few indications that the same relationships exist in the case of adoption of new social studies materials.

**HYPOTHESES**

The purpose of this study was to determine if the five attributes were related to the adoption of new social studies materials. Within that framework, this study tested the following hypotheses:

1. The concepts relative advantage, compatibility, trialability, observability and complexity are valid descriptions of potential adopters' perceptions of the attributes of new social studies materials.
2. Relative advantage (subdimensions: low initial cost, low continuing cost, low risk, savings in time and effort, increased student interest, and increased student learning) would correlate positively with potential adopters' attitudes toward new social studies materials and with the adoption of those materials.
3. Compatibility (subdimensions: with felt need, with previous experience, and with values) would correlate positively with potential adopters' attitudes toward new social studies materials and with the adoption of the materials.
4. Trialability would correlate positively with potential adopters' attitudes toward new social studies materials and with the materials' adoption.
5. Observability would correlate positively with potential adopters' attitudes toward new social studies materials and with the adoption of the materials.
6. Complexity (subdimensions: difficult for teachers to understand and use, difficult for students to understand and use, and dependence on teachers having particular skills) would have a negative correlation with potential adopters' attitudes toward new social studies materials and with the adoption of the materials.
7. Favorable attitudes toward new social studies materials would have a positive correlation with the adoption of these materials.
PROCEDURES

The innovations considered in this study were the 19 sets of materials for grades 9-12 which were listed in a special feature of Social Education on the new social studies project materials (Haley, 1972, pp. 718-719). Five other comparable sets of materials which were available from commercial publishers at the time of the study were also considered innovations for this study. The titles, authors, and publishers of the 24 sets of materials were listed on The New Social Studies Materials List, which was sent to potential adopters (Hahn, 1974).

To measure potential adopters' perceptions of the attributes of new social studies materials which were hypothesized to be related to adoption, the Materials Information Questionnaire (see Appendix) was developed (Hahn, 1974). Items were written to measure relative advantage, compatibility, trialability, observability, and complexity, as they had been defined in the literature. To estimate content validity, a panel of four professors of social science education and/or educational diffusion were asked to assess the validity of the items in terms of the construct definitions in the literature. Items which received less than 100 percent agreement among panel members as to their content validity were revised to attain unanimity.

The revised instrument was pilot tested to establish test-retest reliability. Social studies educators completed the questionnaire twice, within a three week interval. Items which yielded low test-retest correlations were revised. The instrument twice revised was then field tested with a three week interval between responses. The test-retest reliability coefficient for the questionnaire was .87. The final version of the Materials Information Questionnaire was then sent to a sample of potential adopters of new social studies materials. The responses were factor analyzed to establish construct validity. Those data will be discussed later.

A two-stage process was used to identify potential adopters of new social studies materials. From the schools listed in the Indiana, Ohio, Florida and Georgia school directors as having grades 9, 10, 11 or 12, 250 schools were identified in each state using a table of random numbers (Glass and Stanley, 1970, pp. 510-512). Letters were sent to the principals of 1,000 schools in the four states explaining the study and asking each principal to name the person or persons who had the most influence in the selection of social studies materials for that school. An accompanying questionnaire requested selected demographic data on the school. An accompanying questionnaire requested selected demographic data on the school. An accompanying questionnaire requested selected demographic data on the school. An accompanying questionnaire requested selected demographic data on the school. An accompanying questionnaire requested selected demographic data on the school.

Of the 1,000 principals in the four states, 225 (90 percent) of the Indiana principals, 185 (74 percent) of the Ohio principals, 193 (77 percent) of the Florida principals, and 201 (80 percent) of the Georgia principals returned questionnaires for use. In all, 804 responses (80 percent) were received from principals.
Indiana principals named 216 individuals, Ohio principals named 257, Florida principals named 216, and Georgia principals named 222 individuals as influential in selecting new social studies materials. Letters, directions, and questionnaires were sent to the 473 people identified by Indiana and Ohio principals in the Spring of 1973, and to the 438 individuals named by Florida and Georgia principals in the Spring of 1974. The potential adopters of secondary social studies materials were asked to identify familiar materials on The New Social Studies Materials List. Secondly, respondents completed up to three Materials Information Questionnaires in terms of the familiar materials.

Fifty-four percent of the Indiana subjects, 38 percent of the Ohio subjects, 66 percent of the Florida subjects and 64 percent of the Georgia subjects returned questionnaires. The resulting sample of potential adopters in Indiana and Ohio in the Spring of 1973 contained 209 individuals. The Southern sample contained 286 potential adopters from Georgia and Florida in the Spring of 1974. Of those, 83 respondents, or 40 percent, in the midwestern sample, and 138 respondents, or 49 percent, in the southern sample, said they were not familiar with any of the materials on The New Social Studies Materials List and, therefore, they could not fill out any Materials Information Questionnaires. Because potential adopters could complete up to three questionnaires, a total of 231 questionnaires were returned from 126 different potential adopters in Indiana and Ohio, and 304 questionnaires were returned from 286 different potential adopters in Florida and Georgia.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Responses to the Materials Information Questionnaires were factor analyzed using a varimax rotation method to determine if the concepts previously used in the diffusion literature were appropriate in classifying potential adopters' perceptions of new social studies materials. Responses from both samples loaded on four distinct factors.

In both samples, Factor I contained items which related to whether materials would be better than what they superceded. These data can be seen in Table 1 and 2.

Factor I is similar to the original definition of relative advantage. It contains the subdimensions which potential adopters use to determine if materials are better than what they were using previously. However, Factor I does not contain the subdimensions of profitability and efficiency associated with relative advantage. Further, Factor I contains the additional items related to compatibility with one's needs and values, and with observability. Factor I is, therefore, labeled "observable benefits."
Table 1: Factor Loadings for Factor I—“Observable Benefits”
Indiana and Ohio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Descriptor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Original Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better than previous material</td>
<td>.8090</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased student interest</td>
<td>.7609</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning greater</td>
<td>.7796</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not risky-lessons succeed</td>
<td>.5399</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach or methods needed</td>
<td>.7019</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content needed</td>
<td>.6834</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches valued things</td>
<td>.6141</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package needed</td>
<td>.5511</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning observable to teacher</td>
<td>.7063</td>
<td>Observability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results observable to others (teachers and administrators)</td>
<td>.4099</td>
<td>Observability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results observable to parents</td>
<td>.5174</td>
<td>Observability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Factor Loadings for Factor I—“Observable Benefits”
Florida and Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Descriptor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Original Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better than previous material</td>
<td>.7642</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased learning greater</td>
<td>.7316</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning greater</td>
<td>.6958</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach or methods used</td>
<td>.4763</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content needed</td>
<td>.6518</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches valued things</td>
<td>.5704</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package needed</td>
<td>.4973</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits a course</td>
<td>.4971</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning observable to teacher</td>
<td>.6540</td>
<td>Observability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results observable to others (teachers and administrators)</td>
<td>.3852</td>
<td>Observability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results observable to parents</td>
<td>.3730</td>
<td>Observability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If new material is seen as generating increased student interest and student learning, and if it is seen as meeting the adopters’ needs in packaging, content, approach and methods, then it will be viewed as
yielding benefits. To determine if material will yield such benefits, one may note the observable results of using the materials. It is not surprising, then, that the items designed to measure observability are associated together with the items measuring the resulting student interest and learning and the meeting of one's needs and values.

Factor II in both samples looks very much like Rogers' original concept of complexity. It can been seen in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: Factor Loadings for Factor II—"Difficulty"
Indiana and Ohio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Descriptor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Original Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content difficult for students</td>
<td>.7502</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks difficult for students</td>
<td>.7196</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading level difficult</td>
<td>.6207</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult for teachers to use</td>
<td>.7171</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special skills needed</td>
<td>.6094</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not easy for teachers to understand</td>
<td>.6063</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires more time and effort-at first</td>
<td>.4679</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires more time and effort-continued</td>
<td>.5478</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Factor Loadings for Factor II—"Difficulty"
Florida and Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Descriptor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Original Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content difficult for students</td>
<td>.7993</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks difficult for students</td>
<td>.7418</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading level difficult</td>
<td>.7731</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult for teachers to use</td>
<td>.7438</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special skills needed</td>
<td>.5571</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not easy for teachers to understand</td>
<td>.4094</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires more time and effort-at first</td>
<td>.6044</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires more time and effort-continued</td>
<td>.5817</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The six items designed to measure Roger's category of complexity all load on the second factor. In addition, Factor II contains the two items from relative advantage which measure whether one perceives that using new material will require more time and effort initially and with continued use. Materials that are difficult for adopters to understand and use probably do require more teacher preparation time and effort. Factor II is named "difficulty," to distinguish it from the earlier definition of complexity.

The items related to cost and to trialability load together on a third factor. Items related to risk also load on the third factor in data from the southern sample. Factor III is presented in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5: Factor Loading for Factor III—“Investment Requirements”
Indiana and Ohio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Descriptor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Original Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited experiment possible</td>
<td>.7059</td>
<td>Trialability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be tried on small scale</td>
<td>.6493</td>
<td>Trialability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low continuing cost</td>
<td>.5123</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low initial cost</td>
<td>.5543</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits a course</td>
<td>.6767</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Factor Loading for Factor III—“Investment Requirements”
Florida and Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Descriptor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Original Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited experiment possible</td>
<td>.3678</td>
<td>Trialability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be tried on small scale</td>
<td>.4574</td>
<td>Trialability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low continuing cost</td>
<td>.3389</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk in community</td>
<td>.3857</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not risky-lessons succeed</td>
<td>.5807</td>
<td>Relative Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits a course</td>
<td>.4322</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerns about the cost and risk involved in adopting an innovation and whether or not it can be tried on a small scale are concerns one has about the
amount of investment required to try an innovation. Factor III is, therefore, called “investment requirements.”

Perceived similarity with materials and approaches used in the past does not load on a factor with perceptions of meeting one's needs and values as was suggested by the definition of compatibility. The distinct Factor IV, called “familiarity,” can be seen in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7: Factor Loading for Factor IV—“Familiarity”
Indiana and Ohio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Descriptor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Original Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach used before</td>
<td>.7947</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content used before</td>
<td>.7727</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Factor Loading for Factor IV—“Familiarity”
Florida and Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Descriptor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Original Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach used before</td>
<td>.7632</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content used before</td>
<td>.6292</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The factor analysis indicates that perceptions of attributes of new social studies materials do not occur together empirically as the definitions of relative advantage, compatibility, observability, trialability and complexity assumed. Rather, in this study, attributes were perceived as four distinct constructs related to observable benefits, difficulty, investment requirements and familiarity.

Since construct validity was established for the four new factors and not for the four constructs contained in the original hypotheses, it would not be appropriate to test the hypotheses containing the original concepts. Instead, the correlations between the four empirically derived constructs and attitudes and adoption were examined. Attitude toward the materials was measured by an item which asked if the respondent would be willing to use the materials. Kendall rank correlations (tau) between the innovation
attributes and respondent’s attitudes toward the materials were computed. These correlations can be seen in Table 9.

Table 9: Correlation of Attributes of New Social Studies Materials with Potential Adopters’ Attitudes Toward Those Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation with Attitude</th>
<th>Indiana and Ohio</th>
<th>Georgia and Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>n = 228</td>
<td>n = 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I—Observable benefits</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II—Difficulty</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III—Investment requirements</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV—Familiarity</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level.

There is a strong positive correlation between the observable benefits factor and attitude. Potential adopters say they would like to use the material if they perceive that it is better than what they previously used, that it will increase student learning and interest, that it is compatible with needs and values, and that the outcomes can be observed.

There is a weak positive correlation between investment requirements and attitude toward the material. If potential adopters perceive that it is possible to use the materials on a small scale at first, that they fit a course, that the costs of using the materials would be low and, for the southern respondents, if there is not much risk involved, then they are likely to have a positive attitude toward the materials.

The correlation between perceived difficulty and attitudes is negative. if potential adopters perceive materials to be difficult for students and teachers to understand and use, and if they perceive that the materials would require special skills, more time, and more effort then they are more likely to have negative attitudes toward the materials.

There is no significant relationship between familiarity and attitude. Apparently, potential adopters form attitudes toward new materials without regard to whether the materials are like anything they have used before.

Correlations (tau) were also derived to determine the relationships between the four constructs and adoption of the materials. These data can be seen in Table 10.
Table 10: Correlations of Attributes of New Social Studies Materials with Adoption of Those Materials

Correlation with Adoption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Indiana and Ohio</th>
<th>Georgia and Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I—Observable benefits</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II—Difficulty</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III—Investment requirements</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV—Familiarity</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level.
**Significant at .05 level.

There is little relation between how potential adopters perceive attributes of the new materials and whether or not the materials are actually used in the respondents’ schools. Observable benefits have a weak, positive correlation with adoption in the midwestern sample, and a weak negative correlation with adoption in the southern sample. The relationships between difficulty and adoption are not statistically significant in either sample.

The correlation between investment requirements and adoption is weak and position for the midwestern data and weak and negative for the southern data. Familiarity has a weak negative correlation with adoption in Indiana and Ohio, and there is no significant relationship between the two variables in Georgia and Florida.

Correlations were computed also between potential adopters’ attitudes toward new social studies materials and adoption of those materials by their schools to test the hypothesis relating attitudes to adoption. See Table 11.

Table 11: Correlation Between Attitude Toward and Adoption of New Social Studies Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Adopters’ State</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Correlation between Attitude and Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level.
Potential adopters’ stated willingness to adopt new social studies materials is not strongly related to whether or not the materials actually get adopted in their school. The highest positive correlation between attitude and adoption was obtained in Ohio, the only one of the four states without a state textbook adoption policy. Several respondents in Indiana, Georgia and Florida said they were not using the material, although they would like to, because it was not on the list of state adopted textbooks. In all three states, it was possible to use supplemental funds to obtain materials not on the list, but this was rarely done, either because potential adopters did not believe they had the necessary supplemental funds for purchase, or because they believed they could purchase only from the state list. Some of the Ohio respondents were similarly affected by county adoption policies. This may explain why the correlation between attitude and adoption is not stronger than it is in a state without a state-wide adoption policy.

Overall, the weak (and sometimes negative) correlations between attitude and adoption may exist because materials are used for several years, until they “wear out,” whether or not they are currently the most desirable, so there is a lag between attitude toward new materials and their adoption.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One purpose of this study was to determine empirically if potential adopters of new social studies materials perceive the attributes of materials as was assumed in the innovation adoption literature. A second purpose of this study was to determine if perceived attributes of new social studies materials were related to potential adopters’ willingness to adopt the materials and to their actual adoption. Samples of potential adopters of new social studies materials in the south and in the midwest completed questionnaires designed to measure perceived attributes of new secondary social studies materials, respondents’ attitudes toward the materials and adoption of the materials in their schools.

A factor analysis of the responses to the questionnaires indicated that the potential adopters in this study did not perceive attributes of the new materials as was hypothesized from a survey of the relevant literature. Analyses of the data from respondents in two different regions of the country taken a year apart yielded almost identical constructs which were labeled observable benefits, difficulty, investment requirements and familiarity. While two studies are not sufficient to discard long standing concepts, they do suggest the need for further research to determine which concepts are the most useful for describing perceptions of innovation attributes.
Studies are needed to determine if the findings of this study are applicable to the adoption of other kinds of social studies innovations, like materials for elementary students or practices like inquiry and value analysis. Further factor analyses are needed of attributes of educational innovations not related to social studies and of ideas, practices and products in fields other than education.

Further research might also be directed at determining if particular attributes are most important at different stages in the adoption process. During the initial awareness stage, a potential adopter may be primarily concerned with characteristics related to observable benefits: will this material be better than what we are now using? Can increased student learning and student interest be observed by teachers, administrators, and parents when this material is used? If the potential adopter receives negative responses to those questions, he or she may then lose interest in the material. If positive responses are given to those concerns, the potential adopter may then move on to the second stage, persuasion. At this point, the investment requirements might be most important. If the innovation will yield observable benefits, educational decision makers’ second concern may be: can we afford the investment required to adopt it? Can we try it on a small scale first to be sure it will be successful? Are the initial and long term costs low enough? Is there little risk in trying it? If the answers to these questions are in the affirmative, the decision maker may move into the third stage, decision. At this point the greatest concern may be with difficulty.

Potential adopters may now want to know, if we make the necessary investment, will the material be easy enough for our teachers and students to use to make adoption worthwhile? If it appears too difficult, the material probably will not be tried. However, if the material appears to be low in difficulty, the decision may be made to adopt it. If, during initial trial the innovation proves too difficult, use of the material probably will be discontinued. If it proves to be low in difficulty, the innovation might be implemented into the program on a permanent basis.

The relationships between perceived attributes of innovations and attitude and adoption found in this study open up several avenues for further exploration. In this study there was a strong positive correlation between potential adopters’ attitudes toward the material and observable benefits. Investment requirements had a weak positive correlation with attitude, and difficulty was negatively correlated with attitude. There was no significant relation between attitude and familiarity. If these relations are found in other studies of the diffusion and adoption of social studies materials, developers and change agents wanting to build positive attitudes toward their materials should emphasize the ways in which one can observe the benefits of using the materials, the small investment required for trial, and how to minimize difficulties in using the materials. This study,
however, indicates that creating positive attitudes toward the materials is not sufficient to bring about actual adoption.

This study found only weak positive correlations between attitude toward new social studies materials and their actual adoption. Further studies are needed to determine what variables besides potential adopters’ attitudes relate to adoption. Available money and textbook adoption procedures may prevent adopting wanted materials. The correlation between attitude and adoption was strongest in the state without a state-wide textbook adoption list. County textbook adoption policies may have been an inhibiting force even there. Further studies should be directed at the identification of intervening variables between attitudes and adoption. We need to determine why potential adopters of social studies innovations continue to use materials they do not like, and do not use materials which they do like.

In this study, there were no consistent significant relationships between innovation attributes and adoption. This may indicate that factors in the school environment are far more influential in adoption decisions than are the characteristics of the innovation under consideration. Given the competition for resources in a school system, the local priorities may override the merits of a particular innovation in adoption decisions.

The lack of a relationship between attributes and adoption could also be a function of using individual perceptions. One of the difficulties in studying innovation adoption in schools is that decisions, particularly those related to text materials, are bureaucratic decisions rather than individual ones. The superintendent’s office, textbook committees, and principals all have some impact on what materials are used in classrooms. The social studies department heads, curriculum coordinators, and teachers in this study who were identified as having the most influence on the selection of new social studies materials, in reality, do not have total control over the decisions. Many people’s perceptions of innovation attributes may be input to a school’s adoption of a new social studies program.

Earlier research on innovation adoption used independent farmers and doctors as the unit of analysis. Generalizations derived from studies of individual adopters may not apply to innovation adoption in education. More studies are needed to test the applicability of principles of the diffusion of innovations from other fields to education.
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FOOTNOTES

1There is not one potential adopter per school because some principals named several teachers and several principals named the same district social studies coordinator.

2Ninety percent of the respondents verified that they were influential in selecting social studies materials. Most were department heads and teachers. A few were coordinators and curriculum developers.


4For a discussion of the stages in the adoption process, see Rogers, E. and Shoemaker, F., Communication of Innovations, Chapter 3, 1971.
APPENDIX

MATERIALS INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE*
©1974, Carole L. Hahn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student interest will be greater if ____ is used than it was (is) with the text or material used previously (now).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ____ is packaged in a format (hard or soft cover, units, semester or year length) that we need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The results of using ____ are not observable to other teachers and administrators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To use ____, teachers need special skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In our community, it is more risky to use ____ than to use what was used previously or is now used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For the class in which ____ is, or could be, used, we need material with the type of approach or methods it uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ____ is relatively difficult for teachers to use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Parents can observe the results of using ____.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The reading level of ____ is difficult for many students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ____ costs more on a continuing basis than did (does) what was (is) used previously (now).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please turn over the page over and continue)

*Reprinted by permission of Carole L. Hahn. Persons wishing to reproduce and use this questionnaire should obtain the author's permission.
11. Teachers would spend more time and effort preparing lessons when they first use ____ than they did (do) previously (now). (11) ___ ___ ___ ___

12. ____ may be experimented with on a limited basis. (12) ___ ___ ___ ___

13. The content of ____ is like something I (we) used before. (13) ___ ___ ___ ___

14. Student learning would be greater with ____ than it was (is) with the materials used previously (now). (14) ___ ___ ___ ___

15. There is a greater chance that students who have had ____ will do poorly on standardized tests than if they had used the previously used (currently used) material. (15) ___ ___ ___ ___

16. Use of ____ will continue to require more teacher time and effort than did (does) what was previously (is now) used. (16) ___ ___ ___ ___

17. There is a greater chance that lessons will not succeed if ____ is used than there was with the material previously (now) used. (17) ___ ___ ___ ___

18. ____ is better than the material previously (now) used. (18) ___ ___ ___ ___

19. The content in ____ is needed for the class in which that material is or could be used. (19) ___ ___ ___ ___

20. The approach in ____ is like something I (we) used before. (20) ___ ___ ___ ___

21. ____ requires students to do tasks that are difficult for them. (21) ___ ___ ___ ___

22. ____ costs less to purchase initially than the material previously (now) used. (22) ___ ___ ___ ___

23. ____ easily fits into a course we previously (now) taught (teach). (23) ___ ___ ___ ___
24. The content of ____ is difficult for many students.  
(24) ___ ___ ___ ___

25. ____ teaches things I think should be taught in social studies.  
(25) ___ ___ ___ ___

26. ____ cannot be tried on a limited basis or small scale before one decides whether or not to adopt it.  
(26) ___ ___ ___ ___

27. ____ is easy for teachers to understand.  
(27) ___ ___ ___ ___

28. The teacher can observe increased student learning when ____ is used.  
(28) ___ ___ ___ ___

29. If I was given the choice, I would like to adopt ____.  
(29) ___ ___ ___ ___

30. I have much influence in deciding which social studies materials are selected to be used in our school.  
(30) ___ ___ ___ ___

31. ____ We are not using the above material.

____ We are using the above material on an experimental basis.

____ We are using the material on a regular supplementary basis.

____ We are using this as the basic material for a course.

32. What was the major reason for your school using, or not using, this material?
THE LATENT VALUES OF THE DISCIPLINE-CENTERED CURRICULUM

Thomas S. Popkewitz
University of Wisconsin-Madison

INTRODUCTION

One of the legacies of the 1960's reform movement is the organization of social studies curriculum around the social disciplines. Projects initiated during this period tend to focus upon ways children can learn the subject matter and methods of social sciences such as anthropology, history and political science. The intent of these projects was noble. The social disciplines, educators felt, are important dimensions of our Western heritage and powerful modes of social analysis. In learning disciplined approaches to social issues, educators believed children could become responsible, to some extent, for their own ideas.

At one level of curriculum planning, educators have succeeded in their intent: social science curricula do provide comprehensive ideas for understanding social affairs. Scientific generalizations and methods of inquiry do provide ways for students to order and interpret human events. At a deeper level of interpretation however, educators have created conditions which actually impede the free inquiry they sought to foster. This is because their presentation of the social sciences abstracts scientific theory from its social context. Scientific ideas are presented as immutable laws instead of tentative, but vital theories. Educators fail to make explicit the assumptions imbedded in social theory which direct a student's actions in the world. Because these tacit assumptions remain subliminal and unexamined, they are more compelling than the overt choices provided by curriculum. (See, for example, Berger & Luchmann, 1966; M. Young, 1971.)

To understand the tacit meanings of discipline-centered curricula, three curriculum projects will be examined. The central purpose of the analysis is to understand how curriculum strategies define social control, social authority and the role of individuals in public affairs. The first section provides an analysis of the social origins of social theory. The arguments of this section are intended as background for the sections examining the representative curriculum materials. The later sections explore the consequences of assumptions underlying curriculum approaches by focusing upon the role of social theory in curriculum design, values in curriculum content, the role of scientific knowledge in curriculum materials, and the manner in which instructional strategies define scientific truth. The task here is not to impute motive, but to explore the construction
of meaning in, and possible consequences of conventional educational practices. The essay is written to stimulate dialogue about the assumptions by which educational work proceeds.

THE SOCIAL ORIGINS OF SOCIAL THEORY

Many different and competing approaches to the study of social affairs exist among the social sciences. Among them are "consensus" and "revisionist" historians; functionalist, ethnomethodologist or Marxist sociologists; behavioral and normative political scientists. Each of these approaches provides particular ways of thinking about the social world. Somewhat like Thomas Kuhn's (1970) idea of paradigm, many different orientations towards thinking about our social situation exist within any one social discipline. Revisionist historians, for example, may "see" the world from its underside. Their focus may be upon the struggles, conflicts and injustices done to those who have suffered from the existing social and economic arrangements. "Consensus" historians, on the other hand, might organize their problems and data to understand how a society maintains stability and harmony. "Melting pot" ideas might become central to their study. Each perspective on history maintains a certain orientation towards what are the problems, acceptable data and definitions of social relationships.

At this point, one might ask, why are there different and competing perspectives to social affairs? Science is an objective pursuit. Should there not be a single, truthful answer to our questions? To answer the question adequately, we need to consider the social origins of theory which emerges from an interplay of disciplined inquiry, social location and the personal biography of a theorist.

Social science arises from a community of discourse. (Storer, 1966; Hagstrom, 1965) People who participate in a discipline accept certain lines of reasoning and premises for certifying knowledge. The social system of science sustains certain norms to guide the interactions of its members. Among these norms, Storer argues, are organized skepticism, individual autonomy and a public sharing of knowledge.

These norms and lines of reasoning are not static. Through social discourse, discipline's ideas, problems and techniques evolve and change. (Toulmin, 1972) What was considered appropriate political science knowledge or techniques during the 1930's is no longer considered adequate as problems and methods have been altered. The present dominant perspective, behavioralism, is itself being challenged by men and women who want a science of politics to reflect different values and purposes. (See McCoy and Playford, 1967.) Social science, then, involves continual conflict among members about the purpose and direction of study.
The conflict within a discipline must be viewed as having social and cultural roots as well. Each age has certain preconditions that provide people with certain unpostulated and unlabeled assumptions about what the world is like. These may be that society is highly integrated and cohesive or loosely stranded; or that people are rational or "irrational." The assumptions of an age become deeply noted in a particular theorist's personal reality and is almost never questioned by that person. Imbedded within the writings of St. Augustine, for example, is the Medieval assumption of a cosmos—a drama written by God according to a central theme and a rational plan. The function of intelligence was for Augustine and his contemporaries to reconcile experience with the pattern determined by God rather than to inquire into the origin of existence. (Becker, 1936)

The underlying assumptions of functionalism, a dominant mode of modern social analysis, can be examined as having social origins. (Gouldner, 1970) Functionalism in sociology, Gouldner argues, reflects the biography of its creator Talcott Parsons and his insulated position at Harvard during the crisis of the 1930's. Parsons' social theory was a conservative response to the upheavals that were occurring in Europe and America. The fundamental posture of functionalism towards the surrounding society is an acceptance of certain master institutions in order to maintain traditional loyalties.

The human content of theory is deepened by the fact that our ideas are expressed symbolically, primarily through words. All language is an abstract interpretation of reality. To create words to talk about the meadowlark's song, the setting of the sun or political behavior is to invent symbols about the real encounters of people. The names given do not mirror those experiences but select and organize them so there is meaning. The meaning given is partially pre-determined by existing assumptions about the world. Our involvement in social theory becomes more complex when we compare it to that of the physical sciences. (Schutz, 1973) Physical scientists live in a symbolic world that they do not share with the things they study. The naming of an atom means nothing to the atom. Social scientists, in contrast, live in the very world they study. They use their taken-for-granted world as the very background to their studies. Social theory is a secondary abstraction built upon our commonsense language and experiences.

The naming and classifying function of theory has implications for social action. We tend to think of theory as a purely descriptive, neutral enterprise. However, social theories provide comprehensive perspectives or "lenses" for social affairs. Generalizations help us transcend specific practices to locate ourselves with a larger cultural world. In that classifying process, theories help us determine the significance of our everyday reality. (See Berger and Luchmann, 1967.) Theoretical relationships give people
direction in judging the plausibility and integration of disparate institutional practices. One can think about the influence learning psychology has had in schooling, "systems" analysis in government and business, or "pluralistic" theories in politics. The definitions provided by these theories have become part of our commonsense knowledge and orient us to what is to be considered important in human affairs and to what is adequate change.

The manner in which theory provides rules and status to social action can be illustrated through the problem of poverty. Two distinct theoretical orientations toward poverty exist within social science. (See Edelman, 1975.) One is to define the problem of poverty as that of welfare. This perspective guides us to "see" those who suffer as responsible for their own plight, to accept authorities and professionals as helping while protecting the rest of society against irresponsible and dangerous people, and to view social structures as basically sound. An educational response of this position is to view the poor as "culturally-deprived," to design compensatory curriculum and linguistic theories of deficit, and to import therapeutic and medical models to minister to the poor.

A second approach to poverty is to define it as related to dysfunctional social and economic institutions. An alternative scenario for solutions thus develops, with its own values, judgments and emotions. The poor are thought of as victims of elites. Professionals serve to extend privilege and deprivation. Social structure is viewed as basically exploitative. Community control of schools and social action curriculum are strategies of response to this perspective of the problem. Each approach to poverty has a moral quality about what ought to be as well as what seems to be.

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL THEORY IN CURRICULUM DESIGN

The peculiar modes of scientific thought do not lie, as educators have assumed, in the logical forms and structures of a discipline's dominant conceptual apparatus. A consequence of ignoring the conflict and social dimensions of inquiry is distortion of the nature and character of study. As I have argued elsewhere (Popkewitz, 1976), a reconstructed logic of science is accepted by more curriculum writers as a model of what scientists do. These writers believe that science consists of following the logical, deductive steps of the "hypothetical-deductive" method or the logical procedures reported in research manuals. These reports of scientific activity, though, are logical reconstructions of the findings of science. (Kaplan, 1964) They are designed to be an after-the-fact examination concerned with internal coherence of conclusions and methods. The reconstructed logic of science is not a reflection of what researchers actually do in inquiry.

If the previous discussion accurately describes the origins of social
theory, then it is clear that curriculum specialists have overlooked critical dimensions of theory in curriculum design.

First, curriculum specialists have ignored the social and communal nature of social inquiry. Curriculum development has focused upon the logical elements of inquiry. Some educators have looked for the structure of knowledge, identifying dominant concepts or generalizations used in the findings of the disciplines. Others have identified internal logical dimensions of inquiry (analyzing, classifying, inferring) or standardized procedures (the so-called hypothetical-deductive model) as scientific method. These curriculum practices treat the social disciplines in an assorted manner, independent of the interactions, values and purpose that give meaning to inquiry.

Second, curriculum planners have ignored the multiplicity of perspectives found in any one social discipline. Each perspective provides a vantage point for interpreting social phenomena. The development of an adequate view of society and its components requires an ability to shift from one perspective to another, working with the various questions people use to confront their existence. (See Berger, 1963.) The discovery of different layers of social reality from logically conflicting perspectives enlarges our perception of the whole and our relationship to its structures. Mulkay (1969) argues that creativity and imagination in science are produced through the interplay of divergent cognitive structures. Others view the rationality of science as contained in the manner in which and the conditions on which a field engages in criticism and change of accepted doctrines. (Toulmin, 1972)

A result of confusing the reconstructed model with actual scientific activity is to present ideas as static in children’s materials. The dialogue and criticism which create the tentative nature of scientific knowledge is ignored. The community skepticism and conflict about purpose, methods and findings are lost. In their place, ideas and methods are reified, that is, ideas seem as givens or impartial reportings of the way things are. This certainty is evident in the accountability movement. (Popkewitz and Wehlage, 1973) The emphasis on behavioral objectives or competencies posits a belief that ideas are immutable and unrelated to human intent and purpose. To focus upon a child’s listing of three factors for the rise of the industrial revolution, as suggested by one leading accountability advocate, will likely lead a child to make a list without reflecting upon or gaining insight into the historical process or even the personal meaning history can provide. This stabilization of ideas flattens reality and makes our human conditions seem predetermined. Further, the conception of knowledge, research and individual autonomy in accountability stands in contrast to the intent and purpose of the social sciences.

It is to the implications of a reconstructed logic of science we now turn
our attention. It will be argued that discipline-centered projects have abstracted ideas from the dominant professional groups in social science. In doing so, they have eliminated the cross-fertilization of ideas which is so necessary for the vitality and creativity of inquiry. Substituted are instructional programs which obscure the ways in which society's goals are mediated by individuals and which reifies values under the guise of objectivity.

VALUES AND CURRICULUM CONTENT

As this discussion has argued, the social sciences reflect many perspectives—each different viewpoint conditioned by the specific social context from which it emerges. Yet, curriculum experts have neglected the multi-dimensional nature of social inquiry. (See, for example, discussions in Apple, 1971.) Instead they have adopted a singular "systems" approach to social events. This approach portrays the social world as a closed system whose parts operate together in harmony and stability. Each person, each institution, each structure has a function which maintains that harmony and stability.

A systems approach in curriculum, Apple (1971) argues, provides children with a consensual "lens" by which individuals are expected to adjust to established authority and to officially defined interpretations of reality. The curriculum emphasis on cooperation and harmony functions as a constitutive rule for acting in society. That is, the consensual view of social interaction becomes part of the basic rules of the game or rules of trust by which we organize our daily lives. Unquestioned and hidden, the vision of society in curriculum is one in which individuals are functionally related to maintaining the ongoing system and its institutional arrangements. Eliminated is the social function of conflict in preventing the stagnation of existing social institutions by exerting pressure on individuals to be creative and innovative. The fact that these consensual orientations remain tacit makes them psychologically compelling in the construction of meaning. That is, consensual view is taken for granted as part of our definitions of what is reasonable and normal in our daily affairs.

The Consensual Model in Three Representative Texts

To illustrate the manner in which these latent values operate within the discipline-centered curriculum, I have selected three representative curricula for examination. These texts are: Investigating Man's World (Hanna, Kohn, Lee and Ver Steeg, 1970); the Holt Secondary Series (Fenton, 1967); and American Political Behavior (Mehlinger and Patrick, 1972). In examining each, attention has been given to values, to social, political rules,
and to the role of the individual implicit in the text content. Where more than one text exists in a series, one text is cited as illustrative of that series. In a few cases, different material from the programs is presented to support the conclusions.

In general, it will be seen that these texts maintain a systems approach to social theory. The consensual model of social relationships is maintained by *Investigating Man's World* and the *Holt Series*. In these texts problem-solving is presented as a matter of individual acceptance of existing political, social and economic structures. The third program, *American Political Behavior*, openly discusses the value of conflict in social action. Yet in spite of its explicit content, its approach remains implicitly that of the consensus model.

It is curious that *Investigating Man's World: Metropolitan Studies* gives no attention to conflict in its political science section. Many political scientists view conflict as a major aspect of the political process. Instead the emphasis is upon the legitimacy and benevolence of elected leaders and rules. Political generalizations are concerned with students learning that "people govern through elected representatives" and that "laws and the functions of governmental bodies can be changed by the people through their elected representatives." (T. p. 66)

The value orientation of the discussion becomes clearer as the actual children's text is examined. Students are told: "The people in a local community choose leaders to work on big problems. Because everyone can't work on every problem, the people choose some men or women to represent them." (p. 110) The organization of knowledge suggests individuals have no further public responsibility once leaders are selected. While the curriculum knowledge is at one level correct, its oversimplifications hide the fact that under 1 percent of the people are involved in nominating, and that the classical purpose of democracy is to involve all people in decision-making about public affairs. Current political forms are asserted to be morally correct without any critical scrutiny.

The role of individuals in society becomes clearer as we examine the section on rules.

Rules are needed. Rules help everyone to have a good time. Because rules help people, people should follow the rules. Rules tell people what they should do and what they should not do. (p. 116)

... Sometimes all the people do not like all the laws. But after the laws are made, everyone must follow or obey them. (p. 118)

The materials announce on the cover that they are based upon specific social sciences. Once we go beyond the aesthetic feeling of the material and the formal statement of intent, there occurs under the banner of science a
heavily ideological stance concerning consensus and social life. Statements
inundate children with definitions of people as recipients of values. Soci-
etal and institutional arrangements have laws and rules that reside
outside of human interactions and purposes. The ethical, political and
moral considerations inherent in the acceptance of rules are ignored. One
thinks when reading this section of the Watergate conspirators who said,
“When the President says you do something, you assume it’s right.”

A similar value orientation is found in *Comparative Political Systems:
An Inquiry Approach* (Fenton, 1967) The instructional approach uses
concepts of leadership, ideology and decision-making to compare different
political systems. However, investigation of the text reveals that judgments
are already made by the authors. The purpose of children’s “analytical”
work is to make the teacher’s answers plausible. Let’s look at this somewhat
closer.

The major comparison is between the United States, “a democratic
political system,” and the Soviet Union, “a totalitarian state.” These labels
are suggestive not for their analytical qualities, but their ideology. It has
been suggested that “totalitarian” social theory arose during the cold war
of the 1950’s to distinguish between our friends in Western Europe and
communists in Eastern Europe. “Totalitarian” and “democratic” in the
context of the text have no “scientific” use. For example, a dichotomy is
established between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States.
The personal characteristics of the U.S. political leaders are cited as energy,
tact, ability to tend to many things at once, ability to operate effectively
under tension and so on. (T. p. 40) On the other hand, a Soviet leader is
described as one “not given to resistance, who is a little above average in
energy and intelligence and below average in imagination.” (p. 54) Under
the guise of “social theory,” a dichotomy is established which seems to
prevent critical scrutiny rather than nurture it.

Where conflict does appear as a curriculum dimension, its utility seems to
be in asserting the legitimacy and good of the existing social system. In
Holt’s *Comparative Political Systems: An Inquiry Approach* (Fenton,
1967), some emphasis is given to the right of dissent and disagreement in
society. At one level, the purpose of the lesson is to assert dissent as normal
in our political system: “Children should know that in the United States
individuals have considerable freedom to express dissent.” (T. p. 110)
However, certain restrictions on the meaning of dissent are made. The
determining criterion for appropriate dissent is the decorum of the group.
“Views which are expressed quietly at an orderly forum which is designed to
explore all the possible views on the subject cannot be equated with the
same views shouted at an angry mob on the point of violence.” (T. p. 111)

We do not argue for violence and force. However, one needs to examine
dissent beyond the superficial criterion of group decorum. The civil rights
movement during the 1950's and 1960's was considered violent at that time because demonstrators broke basic rules of society, especially those concerned with personal property. The civil rights "activists" were viewed by some as violent even when they were self-disciplined to the non-violent, passive resistance displayed in the "sit-ins." Often they were blamed for violence done to them. Judging dissent upon its procedural consequences rather than on both the nature and the means of expressing grievances legitimates the repression of the civil rights movement. At the time of the protests, civil rights groups did confront commonly held procedures about redressing grievances.

The normative nature of the discourse can be understood further by examining American Political Behavior. (Mehlinger and Patrick, 1972) This curriculum is designed to have students learn the descriptive manner in which political scientists explain politics. The materials are fairly accurate, reflecting much of the current work in the behavioral field of political science. There is also an attempt to direct attention to social injustices such as racism. However, the sole use of a behavioral political science perspective posits certain tacit dispositions towards the social world. (See Merelman, 1976; McCoy and Playford, 1967.) Descriptions of what occurs in the world often become valuative models for judging human action.

The text's use of voting theory illustrates the integrating and moral quality of theory. Behavioral political scientists have devoted a great deal of attention to voting behavior in this and other countries. Therefore, it is reasonable that a major section in American Political Behavior is "Elections and the Behavior of Voters." The text discussion, though, not only describes variables influencing voting but uses the "ballot" theory to describe the good and potency of the existing American political system. Voting becomes a criterion for students to judge good citizenship and the worth of individuals and political institutions.

A society's methods of choosing government leaders has crucial consequences. The extent to which a society enjoys political stability, peace, order and justice is related to its methods of selecting its rulers. The surest way to determine the extent to which society is democratic or anti-democratic is to examine its methods of selecting rulers. A democratic society selects its governmental leaders through majority vote of the people and protects the rights of those in the minority. A democratic society offers regular opportunities to vote new individuals to ruling positions. (p. 164)

Later, in focusing upon the increasing influence of Blacks in American politics, the authors state:

People who believe in democracy stress that voting in public elections is a means to influence public officials. Through the vote citizens can
defeat unsatisfactory public officials and support those who are suitable. Abraham Lincoln's famous phrase, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," only has meaning in our country if the vote is an important political resource. (p. 234)

The normative characteristics of voting expressed here are problematic. First, to maintain that the major characteristic of democracy lies with the actions of voting makes a comparison between the United States and the Soviet Union difficult—more people vote in the Soviet Union. Second, to describe democracy through voting theory makes the voting act become the functional equivalent of democracy. The emphasis on voting maintains a belief that participation qua voting is a necessary, and possibly the sole condition for good citizenship. (See Merelman, 1976.) The responsibility for other types of political action is shifted to elites. One might conclude that ordinary people, on the other hand, are asked to remain passive and not participate in more direct methods of influencing public issues.

However, *American Political Behavior* does give direct attention to conflict in social life. For example, students are asked to consider how different groups (Filipino mountain people, Yugoslavian Serbs and U.S. citizens) solve personal conflict. Discussion also focuses upon people who are politically alienated, such as Black rioters, bomb-makers, and imprisoned Japanese Americans during World War II. The politically alienated are juxtaposed to "patriotics" who can also be extreme in emphasizing conformity and unthinking obedience. However, the very notion of political socialization implicit in the case studies tends to treat conflict as a form of deviance rather than as an integral and creative aspect of political life.

In summary, it should be clear that curriculum specialists have neglected a critical aspect of social science—the dialogue of competing perspectives. Within the disciplines themselves, this dialogue creates a cross-fertilization of ideas which prevents stagnation. In contrast, curriculum workers abstract out and crystallize scientific theory. The result is a logic of inquiry that reifies the values embedded in social ideas.

**THE ROLE OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE IN CURRICULUM MATERIALS**

In drawing upon the social disciplines, curriculum planners incorporate a specialized vocabulary for talking about social affairs. Educators have sought to identify central social science concepts as focal points for instruction. Words like "socialization" or "power" are thought to enable students to develop more inclusive explanatory categories. The instructional language of science provides students with a "dialect" that gives students different perspectives for thinking about human conditions. However, the
introduction of social science vocabularies may have two latent consequences: (1) to detach individuals from everyday experiences and (2) to legitimate professional definitions of social affairs.

**Detachment from Everyday Affairs**

At a first glance, the introduction of social science words would seem uncontroversial. A feature of the discipline-centered reform movement is to have children learn the basic ideas of the social disciplines. "Structure," a commonly used word in education, generally refers to the organization of curriculum around basic concepts of social science. Educators view scientific statements as aids for student analysis of human events.

The classification systems, though, move people away from face-to-face contacts in which intention and purpose are expressed. Educators incorporate secondary abstractions into instruction by using scientific concepts. "Socialization," "ideology" or "dyad" are words which are based upon more direct encounters people have. For example, a child goes to school, interacts with teachers and other students. A personal knowledge about school is developed which involves a composite of the facts, feelings, attitudes and beliefs. The word socialization allows us to filter from these first-hand experiences by ordering and selecting certain dimensions of the interactions as important. The screening of our social situation moves people away from the realm of their personal experience to those established by professional definitions.

The use of "economics" in *Investigating Man's World* (Metropolitan Studies) illustrates how curriculum content detaches students from the realm of personal control. The text directs attention to "an economic process" which has components of labor, technology, capital, and resources. Each of these components is in turn referred to in abstract, impersonal ways. Labor concerns "the work it takes to get a job done." (p. 113) Technology "means the way men get a job done." (p. 122)

The task of instruction is to have children replace commonsense words with the specialized economics words. For example, "division of labor" is to be used to describe the invention of different jobs to make a pair of blue jeans in a clothing factory. A later discussion of technology focuses on a drawing of a bicycle and a car with students responding to the question, "Which kind of transportation needs the most technology to produce?" (p. 122) The text underlining emphasizes the importance of accepting correct words for talking about social phenomena.

An unique conception of work develops from inquiry. Students are not to "see" or understand themselves as working with other men and women who have interests, commitments or conflicts. Labor and technology are made to seem independent of each other and of people's hopes, desires,
and struggles. Each is defined as a distinct and technical problem. Individuals are taught not to react to their personal experiences but to the detached reality defined in curriculum. The very fact that these terms are defined as discrete and unrelated makes it more difficult for students to understand the social effects of technology on social relationships.

*American Political Behavior* maintains a similar emphasis upon replacing commonsense words with the esoteric language of a social discipline. A purpose of study is to have students use the words of political science. The concept of "political socialization," for example, is used to have students think about political beliefs and customs as a product of living in a particular culture and being born in a certain social circumstance. Success of instruction is often related to students' ability to talk with professional words. Students, for example, are expected "to demonstrate what (they) have learned about relationships of socialization to political beliefs and behaviors." Among these "demonstrations" are students responding to pictures of political symbols in a way that "reflects knowledge of political socialization as a process of learning political beliefs and human patterns." (T. p. 45) A different problem of detachment occurs in *American Political Behavior* than is found in *Investigating Man's World*. Students are asked to move away from their direct experiences through the quantification of data. Voting behavior and political socialization units, for example, use frequency counts from surveys to make interpretation. One of the earliest activities in the curriculum is to have students learn how to read statistics in tables and graphs. Later in the text, students are asked to work with a variety of quantified data, such as organizing responses to an anti-democratic attitude questionnaire into percentages. Thus particular individual actions are translated into a number such as 16 percent of people in manual vs. 37 percent non-manual occupations are highly involved in local politics.

The use of "percentages" in social science seems to eliminate ambiguity in that a percentage point appears certain. However, the numbers are devoid of any values except those in the number themselves. To say 16 percent of those in non-manual occupations are active tells us little about the lives of those people and why there is little political involvement. The percentage provides an abstraction which ignores the diversity, irregularities, contingencies and values inherent in the social contexts in which people act. The curriculum defines people as classes of respondents who have low, medium or high scores on a scale. The scale is not brought back to test or illuminate what personal options and responsibilities individuals may have.
The Certified Expert

Detachment from everyday experiences can serve to legitimate a professional expert organized society. Illich argues that people in technological societies continually must look to experts for definition and interpretation of personal and social problems. We have in fact witnessed a phenomenal growth of guidance, counseling and therapeutic professions. We are given instant analysis of presidential addresses through the media. We call in sociologists and political scientists to deal with the ethical problems of desegregation and busing. An unintended consequence of discipline-centered curricula is to make reasonable reliance upon certified experts.

How is the expert legitimated? First, social problems are defined according to disciplines. Yet one can see the focus of a single discipline as an historical accident. Curriculum authors overlook the fact that social problems do not come in neat packages. Problems of technology, for example, are problems which involve an interrelationship of social, political and economic dimensions. Without understanding the interplay of these dimensions, the problem is inadequately understood.

Second, the curricula establish the importance of the professional/expert as the final arbitrator of what is important. The purpose of the Metropolitan Studies unit of Investigating Man’s World, for example, is to have children understand the economist as an interpreter and explainer of human work. Instruction begins by identifying the economist as a person who interprets the “best ways” in which a society can make resources care for human wants and needs. Economics is “the study of the ways that people use resources to care for human wants. Economists try to find the best ways of changing resources to take care of human wants.” (p. 102) Since there are not enough resources for everyone, the economist makes choices about “the best ways . . . that produce the most goods and services to take care of the most human wants for the least costs.” (p. 102)

This description leaves us with certain conclusions. First, human work is a seemingly neutral dimension of production. Second, students are to understand an economist as the person who transforms people’s wants and needs into the best way of using resources for production. People working at the Vega plant in Lordstown might want to ask how does the economist determine their needs and wants? And in whose interests are the “best ways” devised? These questions, though, are made irrelevant or inappropriate by the text dialogue. The problem of work, labor, and production becomes definitional and technical. That definition is supplied by an expert. It should be noted that the very notion of economists as used in Investigating Man’s World distorts the conflict and multi-perspectives this occupation uses to engage in study. (See Nell, 1973.)
In part, the social function of language in a discipline-centered curriculum can be illustrated by Keddie's study of an English high school (1971). The particular school she observed was organized around three tracks: (A) high ability, (B) middle range, and (C) low ability students. Teachers had different expectations and demands for each track. Teachers of the low ability (C) tracks tended to reject the common everyday experiences students offered for understanding the social phenomena being studied. For example, in a lesson about the concepts of sociology, a student suggested that a nuclear family is an extended family including grandparents living outside the house. The teacher wanted the students to accept a definition of family that included common residence as a deciding factor. Through instructional questions and cues (such as responding to a discrepent answer by saying, "Does anyone disagree?" or "The answer is not as obvious as you might think."), the teacher attempted to have the "C" student accept the social definition.

Keddie goes on to suggest that the student's acceptance of a teacher's definition is what actually distinguishes the performance of A and C students. The "high ability" students accepted on trust the teacher's system of thought and abstraction. The "A" students took over the teacher's definition of what is to constitute the problem and what is to count as knowledge. In effect, this knowledge of "social science" made students regard their everyday, shared knowledge as irrelevant. Problems and their interpretations were to be officially defined by specialists of the disciplines.

In this section we have explored a second, latent function of reconstructed logic of inquiry. Social affairs are made more anonymous as students are discouraged from making connections with their everyday life. Concepts are crystalized and made to seem predetermined and certain. Detachment from communal shared relationships may make social relationships become less amenable to individual control. Further, a special significance is given to certified experts who are responsible for explaining and interpreting social affairs. Students are asked to accept unquestioningly the definition of social life given by those experts who present themselves as knowledgable and willing to make decisions.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES AS DEFINING SCIENTIFIC TRUTH

Because all social theory arises from our everyday knowledge and commitments, no theory can be neutral. Thus, any curriculum disposes a student toward social action. However, before a social idea can be effective in influencing action, it must first be validated. To understand how this validation is achieved, we need to examine teaching strategies and criteria by which students are expected to judge the truth of curriculum ideas.
The manner in which children are asked to work with ideas is important to understanding curriculum. That is, the meaning of social ideas is partially derived from the social context and "strategies" of teaching. If instruction treats ideas as tentative and capable of being tested with data from community life, then we can argue instruction is designed to give individuals autonomy and responsibility. On the other hand, if learning of pre-determined knowledge becomes the end point, the design of instruction becomes an imposition upon students of a closed system of thought. Ideas appear fixed, unchanging and unyielding. The system of thought seems independent of human action and intervention. The interests and values implicit in the naming and classifications remain hidden.

Throughout the curricula under review, a contradiction between purpose and practice is found. The purpose of a New History of the United States (Fenton, 1967) is "to help students develop into independent thinkers and good citizens" and "to learn concepts and analytical questions and use them to develop hypotheses." The actual tasks of instruction, though, provide a different notion of individual responsibility. The organization of instruction calls upon a teacher to (1) identify a knowledge objective for children to learn (e.g., to know that in 1800 primitive land and water transportation contributed to sectional isolation and national disunity in the United States); (2) have children do "inquiry," that is, to read prescribed materials in the textbook, look at filmstrips, and respond to questions posed by the teacher or text; (3) warn a teacher to refrain during lessons from "pushing" any generalization; and (4) define the specific outcomes of the lesson ("The students should understand that because Calhoun believed national strength, security, and unity were at stake, he thought the federal government should build roads and canals"). (T. p. 88)

The language of the instructional objectives is itself revealing: "Students are to know..." "Students can identify..." The tacit function of inquiry is to have children learn the generalizations of a social science as an accepted "truth" rather than propositions in need of continual testing and retesting. Whereas social scientists conceive of their findings as tentative and maintain a stance of skepticism, the work of children is different. Children's knowledge is fixed, unchanging, and unyielding.

In American Political Behavior, students are openly invited to think critically in introductory lessons. One early lesson talks about political inquiry as a human adventure. Political knowledge is considered dependent upon the types of questions people deem important. Inquiry is viewed as a form of testing hunches. Further, the difficulties of dealing with human complexity and variety are discussed. Social theory is defined as tendency statements. It describes how people are likely to do things. The statements themselves are to be viewed as tentative.

Beyond the introductory lessons, however, a different orientation to
knowledge is suggested. As with the Holt materials, students typically read preselected stories and identify certain author-defined conclusions. For example, generalizations about the relationship of socioeconomic status and political behavior are developed. Students read case studies of an attempt to restore legislative cuts in aid to dependent children and a boycott of Montgomery’s bus system by Blacks. The objectives of the lesson (one class period) are “students can infer the following conclusions” about the case studies:

The campers (in legislative story) had low socioeconomic status which meant they had, as individuals, relatively less political bargaining power than individuals of high economic status . . .

The following factors contributed to the successful outcome of (Montgomery’s Blacks) political activity: good leadership and organizations, availability of financial resources, economic pressures on the bus company . . . (p. 53)

The suggested teacher’s procedure for the lesson includes identifying parts of the prepared text to answer predefined knowledge of objectives.

The answer to Question 3, page 131, should be in terms of Objective 1 above. Students should respond that the following factors contributed to the campers’ lack of success in achieving their political goals . . . (p. 54)

The intent of Investigating Man’s World, as well, is “to help young people develop patterns of thought and inquiry that will be useful to them in new situations.” Again, a contrast is found between the stated intent and the actual instructional sequence. In the text, Metropolitan Studies, for example, lessons contain: a generalization to learn, pictures to promote class discussion, a short reading section and a discussion question, which contains a peculiar stipulation: questions are to be “carefully structured to the inductive approach.”* That is, “pupils will automatically interpret the pictures first, then the text, then return to discussion of ideas that will lead to the unit understanding or a related understanding.” (T. p. 14)

As one goes further into the text, the lessons must be understood as legitimating what Jules Henry called “education for stupidity.” Children are asked to assume that they are knowledgable as a result of reading over-generalizations and over-simplifications of social problems. For example, after viewing six photographs of an urban area and reading three written pages (pp. 200-208), children are asked to answer, “Why do

*My stress.
children drop out of schools?" "Why do slum dwellers need to help as well as outsiders in solving the slum problem?" (T. pp. 73-74)

The test of inquiry is whether student definitions coincide with knowledge in the text. The purpose of instruction is to have children master the statements and ideas as one would fill a hat with items. The certainty projected in curriculum makes it difficult for children to understand the limitations inherent in the knowledge of social science. This becomes crucial as we consider social knowledge as having normative implications. The use of the social disciplines in these curricula seems not so much a change from emphasis on content to process but how that content is organized. The authority of teacher as knower is maintained.

Friere (1970) has called this approach to education the "banking approach." It assumes knowledge is a gift, education as an act of depositing. Students in the guise of inquiry are to receive, memorize, and repeat. Curiosity exists and extends only so far as one can collect and catalog knowledge as one does with things. The notion of education becomes a pseudo-inquiry. It is bound up in the predefined questions and data posited in textbooks and worked out in advance by educators and social scientists. Actions and reflections are based upon passive entities. The capability of banking education, Friere argues, "to minimize or annul the students' creative power and to stimulate their credulity serves the interest of the oppressors who care neither to have the world revealed nor to see it transformed." (Friere, 1970, p. 60)

CONCLUSIONS

Curriculum designers have tended to ignore the social, personal and communal processes which characterize social science. In their place, a reconstructed logic of science has been adapted. The concern is with the logical tidiness of the findings of study and the identification of standardized procedures as methods of inquiry. Whereas the reconstructed logic of science is used by scientists to check the internal consistency of the findings of scientific activity, educators use it as though it mirrored the actual activities of disciplined inquiry.

The acceptance of a reconstructed logic produces a contradiction between the intent and actual instructional work of curriculum. The search for a single set of scientific ideas and procedures has led curriculum specialists to crystalize and stabilize the dominant "systems" approaches and the values embedded in it. Social theory in curriculum assumes a normative curriculum function in which individual autonomy and responsibility is denied.

The valuative stance is made more compelling by the treatment of knowledge as certain and detached. The discipline-centered curriculum may serve to legitimate the knowledge, power and prestige of existing
professionals. This is critical in light of critiques (e.g., Mills, 1967) which suggest self-perpetuating and self-serving relationships between professional groups and existing social/political authority structure in society.

Constructing curriculum requires that educators give attention to the social disciplines as a human product whose meanings are transmitted in social processes. Instruction should give serious attention to the conflicting views of the world these crafts generate, the social location and the social contexts of inquiry. To plan for children’s study of ideas, educators are compelled to inquire into the nature and character of the discourse found in history, sociology or anthropology. What problems does each deal with? What modes of thought exist? What are its paradigmatic tasks? What limitations are placed on the knowledge of their findings? Instruction should be concerned with the different perspectives of phenomena that are within each discipline and how these men and women come to know what they know.

The rationality of science lies not in ordering the information into tidy categories of knowledge or the reconstructed logic of its procedures. The rationality of inquiry is understood by illuminating the interplay and procedures practitioners establish for changing their concepts and techniques. Of the textbook series authors, only Mehlinger and Patrick seemed aware of the communal dimensions of social inquiry. None of the authors came to grips with the competing and divergent perspectives that define disciplined study, with the social conditions that produce and maintain a community of discourse, or with personal autonomy and control a researcher needs to make his craftsmanship imaginative and creative. Understanding social inquiry as social invention can enable the modes of social analysis to enlarge our perception of the whole and our relationship to social structures, challenging in the process the very presuppositions and prescriptions by which we act. To reify inquiry, in contrast, is to create new forms of mystification which make the social world seem mechanistic and predeterministic.
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**FOOTNOTES**


2The notion of social science is used in its generic sense (see Collingwood, 1956) rather than in its narrower usage of referring to fields of study which have adopted a behavioral orientation. For editorial convenience, social science and social disciplines will be used interchangeably.

3I have sought to explore these issues more fully in Popkewitz (1972), (1976), (1977). The discussions focus upon the implications of research in the sociology of social science and knowledge to social studies curriculum theory.

4The curriculum projects were chosen for three reasons: (1) they are representative of discipline-centered curriculum. One project focuses upon a single social discipline. The others are organized around many social sciences; (2) the three projects are representative of both elementary and secondary curriculum; and (3) they have received wide-spread use in schools through major commercial textbook publishers.

5The idea that educators need to consider social science as having different perspectives is explored in Clements, Fielder and Tabachnick, 1967.
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"... There's glory for you!"
"I don't know what you mean by 'glory','" Alice said.
Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously. "Of course you don't—
till I tell you. I meant 'there's a nice knock-down argument for you'"
"But 'glory' doesn't mean 'a nice knock-down argument','" Alice objected.
"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful
tone, "it means what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."
"The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean
so many different things."

Lewis Carroll
Through the Looking Glass

INTRODUCTION

Since its initial conceptualization by political scientist Angus Campbell
and his associates at the Survey Research Center in the early 1950's,
"political efficacy" has assumed a prominent position in theories of
political participation, political socialization, and political learning. A
central idea of democratic theory is that responsible citizens must take
active roles in the political system that surrounds them. Such active
participation is the touchstone of system responsiveness. But before a
citizen is likely to invest the time and energy in participation, he or she must
surely have developed feelings of confidence that such an expenditure of
effort will be worthwhile. It is this subjective feeling that has been labeled
"political efficacy."

The purpose of this exposition is to illustrate the variety of ways in which
the construct "political efficacy" has been measured. Specifically, the
authors attempt to show that these various measurement efforts fall short
of standards of adequate scale reliability, and also that they lack face
validity when compared to the original definition proposed in The Voter
Decides. The authors conclude by comparing the external validity of a
political efficacy "subscale" against two other scales, both of which, it is
argued, are theoretically interesting ways to measure the construct.
RESEARCH ON SENSE OF POLITICAL EFFICACY

Empirical research of the last two decades has established a substantial basis in fact for a link between personal feelings of political efficacy and individual political participation. Angus Campbell and his colleagues during the mid and late 1950's found a significant relationship between feelings of political efficacy and levels of political participation as measured by their Campaign Activities Index. These findings were supported by Almond and Verba in their five nation study reported in *The Civic Culture* (1963). *The Civic Culture* dealt with a construct termed "subjective political competence" instead of political efficacy. Dahl's study of power and participation in New Haven, Connecticut, demonstrated that those in positions of power and governance scored significantly higher on political efficacy scales than did the average citizen of New Haven. (Dahl, 1961, pp. 287-291) In support of these findings Verba and Nie in the 1972 study, *Participation in America*, found that those citizens who could be identified as activists—whether their participation was partisan or non-partisan—exhibited much higher levels of political efficacy than those who were either completely politically inactive, or who limited their political participation to the act of voting.

Empirical confirmation of the link between efficacy and participation prompted further research in two areas. A prominent study was directed at discovering at what point in the socialization process this personal orientation identified as political efficacy begins to emerge. This study proved useful in identifying the development of perceptions of efficacy in children. Easton and Dennis (1967, pp. 31-33) as well as Hess and Torney (1967, p. 79) reported a considerable increase in Sense of Political Efficacy from grade three to grade eight, with especially striking increases occurring between grades four and six.

The largest proportion of studies on political efficacy have been directed at illuminating the conditions that contribute to it. Several studies have established a relationship between socioeconomic-status and political efficacy. Dahl (1961, pp. 288-291), for example, shows that people with higher income levels and education tend to exhibit higher levels of political efficacy, and that people from middle and upper-class families feel more highly efficacious politically. These results were supported by the Almond and Verba cross national study, the S.R.C. studies (Campbell *et al*, 1960) and the socialization study (Easton and Dennis, 1967, p. 36, and Hess and Torney, 1967, pp. 255-256).

The effect of sex identity on political efficacy was established by the S.R.C. studies on adult populations, but no significant sex differences have been found among school age children (Easton and Dennis, 1967, p. 37; Hess and Torney, 1967, pp. 212-215; and White, 1968, p. 719). Race is
also a factor affecting efficacy. Black ghetto children exhibit lower levels of political efficacy than white children, even when compared to white children who live in ghetto areas (Lyons, 1970). Some evidence has also been generated which hints at linkages between participation in family and school decisions and political efficacy (Almond and Verba, 1963, Chapter 12, and White, 1968, p. 716). Closely related to this is the discovery by Langton (1969, pp. 38, 144-158) that efficacy levels are higher for those whose primary and secondary association groups are highly politicized and who have had more politically related experiences in the nuclear family.

By the late 1960's political efficacy had become a "standard" construct in the field as a concomitant of active adult political behavior, and was now being used as a criterion variable in its own right. As a part of the wave of socialization research, the school was hypothesized to be an institution which could be expected to influence the socialization of young people to politics. However, the work of Langton and Jennings resulted in the conclusion that the high school civics curriculum had little perceptible impact on the levels of political efficacy among white high school students and only moderate impact on black students. The study by Easton and Dennis and Hess and Torney focused on pre-high school socialization. Even though no explicit civics curricula exist in grade school, the conclusions generally were that development of a sense of political efficacy was due mainly to school influences rather than the family and political culture. The emphasis that these and other researchers placed on political efficacy as an important individual-level citizenship attribute soon had its impact on political educators.

Patrick and Mehlinger, the developers of a best selling high school civics curriculum first marketed in 1971, posited gains in political efficacy as a worthwhile outcome of their course. However, summative evaluation of American Political Behavior reported no gain in students' political efficacy as a result of the year long course (Patrick, 1972, pp. 178-179). Since A.P.B., curriculum developers in political education have increasingly framed their efforts within the models of individual citizenship behavior. Comparing Political Experiences, under development now by Gillespie, Lazurus and Patrick at Indiana University, promotes the attainment of basic competencies by students and provides opportunities for applying them. Through such applications it is postulated that students will come to view themselves as more effective political actors. This theoretical framework also broadens the notion of citizenship to include citizen actions in areas which are not explicitly connected with such political acts as voting and writing to Congresspersons. Fred Newmann, author of Education for Citizen Action, also conceives of social studies education goals in terms of individual citizenship characteristics. The Institute for Political-Legal Education, directed by Barry Lefkowitz, again sees the citizenship model as
the appropriate outcome for its curricular efforts. This curriculum, which
started as a Title III ESEA project, is now being disseminated nationally.
Evaluation of this project relied heavily on a scale measuring “Inclination
to Participate.” CLOSE UP, an organization in Washington, D.C.,
providing political education programs for high school students, sees its
desired student outcomes as individual political attitudes and traits which
are relevant to future active and informed citizenship behavior.

The political science construct efficacy has become prevalent in the
curriculum theorizing of several social-political educators. It appears that
political efficacy has gained the status of a worthwhile outcome variable in
social education. Yet there has been little evidence that educational
programs and practices have been effective in changing students’ levels of
political efficacy.

Research in the 1950’s dealt with political efficacy, along with other
variables, as indicators in survey studies of political participation and
voting behavior. Research in the 1960’s dealt with political efficacy, along
with other variables, as outcome variables in assessing the relative
importance of various political socialization agents on youth. Now in the
1970’s, political efficacy, and other citizenship variables, are taken as
criteria for effective programs in political education. This construct has
been defined, conceptually and operationally, in a variety of ways
throughout its more than twenty years of use. Current research and
evaluation applications require that a construct be as conceptually precise as
possible and that its measurement be as reliable as possible. The construct
needs to be conceptually “tight” because instructional practices require a
well defined “target” to focus on. Operationally, the construct needs to be
measured with high reliability, otherwise trying to measure pre-post
instructional change with the scale results in “change scores” which are
dominated by “error” variance. The scale is a criterion for making
decisions about how to spend tax dollars on curriculum development. Even
more importantly, the scale is a criterion for making decisions about
individual students and their social-educational growth. For these reasons,
the authors believe that political efficacy, a worthwhile political education
outcome criterion variable, needs to be re-examined. We will attempt to do
so in the remainder of this paper.

OPERATIONALIZING THE THEORETICAL
CONSTRUCT POLITICAL EFFICACY

Campbell, Gurin and Miller used the construct “sense of political
efficacy” in their study of the 1952 presidential election, The Voter Decides.
“Sense of political efficacy” was conceived as a predictor of voting in
presidential elections. This construct was operationalized as a Guttman
scale of four agree-disagree items:
1. I don’t think public officials care much about what people like me think.
2. Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.
3. People like me don’t have any say about what the government does.
4. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on.

These four scale items were used extensively by Campbell and his associates; data gathered by the S.R.C. was used to support much of the early research establishing the linkage between political efficacy and formal political participation. Only recently have systematic critiques of this scale developed. These critiques have centered around the reliability and construct validity of the scales.

George Balch and Herbert Asher in separate articles in a 1974 issue of *Political Methodology* launch attacks against the reliability and validity of the original efficacy scale. These studies used traditional reliability analyses and a novel item analysis of scale items that demonstrated a lack of consistency in the correlations of the individual items in the scale with external criteria—such as measures of interest and participation. More specifically, both studies suggested that the S.R.C. efficacy scale could more realistically be conceptualized as two scales—measuring related but distinct components of efficacy. The first component (characterized by scale items one and three) seemed to have much more in common with the idea of diffuse system support or political trust, while the remaining two items tapped a sense of citizen effectiveness. The latter component seems much more in line with the definition of political efficacy that Campbell offered.

The evidence suggests that at best only two items in the S.R.C. scale may actually correspond to the theoretical notion of individual political effectiveness or political efficacy. The adequacy of a two item scale to measure a complex psychological phenomenon must be seriously questioned. The influence of the other two items in this additive scale would seem to have a less than desirable effect on the already unreliable score from the two more “valid” items.

Not all political scientists were dependent on the S.R.C. scale however. Those who desired to measure political efficacy in pre-adults as part of their exploration of the political socialization process found the scale wanting in some respects and set about the development of a scale more suitable for measuring efficacy in pre-adults.

This effort was notable in the work by David Easton and Jack Dennis and by Robert Hess and Judith Torney in 1967. Easton and Dennis report an 8-item political efficacy scale (Easton and Dennis, 1967, p. 29). Seven of these items required Likert-type responses. These seven items are presented in Table 1.
Table 1: Four Political Efficacy Scales

**Easton-Dennis Scale**

+1. My family doesn’t have any say about what the government does.**

2. There are some big powerful men in the government who are running the whole thing and they do not care about us ordinary people.**

3. Citizens don’t have a chance to say what they think about running the government.**

#4. Voting is the only way that people like my mother and father can have any say about how the government runs things.**

5. Sometimes I can’t understand what goes on in the government.**

6. I don’t think people in the government care much about what people like my family think.**

7. What happens in the government will happen no matter what people do. It is like the weather, there is nothing people can do about it.**

**Langton Scale**

1. The political views and activities of students are very important.

2. When people like me become adults we will not have any influence on what government does.**

*3. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what is going on.**

**Jennings-Levinson Scale**

+1. My family doesn’t have any say about what the government does.**

#2. Voting is the only way that people like my mother and father can have any say about how the government runs things.**

*3. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what is going on.**

**Langton-Jennings Scale**

#1. Voting is the only way that people like my mother and father can have any say about how the government runs things.**

*2. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what is going on.**

**Negatively phrased item

#* + Identical items
Not only have these two efficacy scales been widely used, they comprise the universe of items for three other researchers who utilized the concept of “political efficacy” in their research. Kenneth Langton and Kent Jennings in their 1968 study, “Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the United States” (Langton and Jennings, 1968, p. 856), used a two-item scale in their research. And in a 1970 report Jennings, this time in coordination with Levinson (Jennings and Levinson, 1970), discussed a study of political learning in high school students that utilized a three-item political efficacy scale. This was constructed by the addition of one item to the Langton-Jennings scale. Another variant on these three appeared in another scale by Langton (Langton, 1969, pp. 143-144). This study has been recognized as one of the important contributions in the field of political learning. This scale was composed of three items. (All of the above scales are listed in Table 1.)

These scales have served as essential measurement instruments in studies that have generated a great deal of what is now accepted as “established” knowledge about political behavior. The next section of this paper will critically examine these four scales and the items that make them up. First, a general reliability analysis will demonstrate that virtually all of these scales can be characterized by low levels of scale reliability.

Secondly, a factor analysis will demonstrate that each of these scales is characterized by multi-dimensionality so that the argument that any one of them actually measures a unified concept of efficacy is invalidated. Finally, efficacy items representing two of the underlying factors will be compared for their external validity.

The first and second analyses are generated from a data set representing a questionnaire in which all the items in these four scales were included. This questionnaire was administered to 719 senior high school students in New Orleans, Miami, Houston, and Minneapolis-St. Paul who were 1974 participants in CLOSE UP—an intensive political education program which contracts with the authors of this paper for evaluation work. The analysis of external validity of the efficacy factors will be done using two different data sets. The first data set is a national sample of approximately 1,500 CLOSE UP student participants from the 1975 program year. This sample represents students from 40 metropolitan areas of the United States. The students were self-selected for participation, and thus not representative of all high school students in this country. The second data set is somewhat more representative of high school students, although the sample was drawn from only one metropolitan area. The respondents are approximately 600 students from ten high schools in the Cleveland, Ohio, metropolitan area. The sampling unit in these high schools was the 11th grade Social Studies classroom. All of the students in 2-4 classrooms in each school were surveyed. All three data sets come from an ongoing evaluation study supported by the CLOSE UP Foundation.
THE RELIABILITY OF POLITICAL EFFICACY SCALES

The first concern of this analysis is the comparative reliability of the four political efficacy scales just reviewed. In a broad sense, scale reliability analysis provides an estimate of the extent to which items of a scale are measuring the same thing. As a representation of reliability this analysis will utilize the coefficient alpha, which is an index of the variance that the scale items have in common in relation to their total or additive variance, a total which includes extraneous variance.

The reliabilities, along with other item/scale statistics, were computed by the Reliability Subprogram of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Table 2: Alpha Reliabilities and Correlation Matrices of Political Efficacy Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Correlation Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis Scale (7 Items)</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton Scale (3 Items)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings-Levinson Scale (3 Items)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton-Jennings Scale (2 Items)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All items were represented with a 5 point Likert response scale, maximum range 1-5. Negatively phrased items have been reversed for the analysis. The analysis is based on 719 cases. It was carried out with SPSS 6.5 subprogram RELIABILITY on the CDC 6600.
As can clearly be seen from the data in Table 2, the scales are characterized by generally low reliability coefficients. These are so low, in fact, for all but the Easton-Dennis scale, that they would be virtually useless in a time series, or a pre-post research design. While coefficient alphas of .5 to .6 are considered adequate for exploratory research, anything lower than that must invoke doubt about the utility of the scale. It might be argued that these extremely low reliabilities are due to the low number of items in the two scales but close examination of the inter-item correlation matrices shows that the primary reason for low reliabilities is the fact that the items have generally low correlations among themselves. This is particularly true in the case with the Langton, Langton-Jennings and the Jennings-Levinson Scales. In the Easton-Dennis Scale three of the items have very low item-whole correlations. Further illumination of the low internal consistency of these scales is provided by the factor analysis that follows.

We have established that there is at least one potential problem with the scales designed to measure political efficacy; with the exception of the Easton-Dennis Scale items, they are characterized by extreme alpha-unreliability. And we have seen that even the Easton-Dennis Scale seems to contain at least three items that have low correlations with the remaining items in the scale.

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL EFFICACY ITEMS

The analysis we have carried out up until this point sheds little light on the reasons why these scales are unreliable. Factor analysis will provide a closer look at the items in these scales. By using factor analysis to cluster the scale items into groups exhibiting high levels of intra-group covariance, we can determine whether the efficacy items do exhibit an underlying undimensionality or whether the items might not more accurately be seen as multi-dimensional in nature.

To settle this question, the 10 separate items making up the four scales we have presented were grouped and subjected to an alpha factor analysis. We hypothesized a priori four separate factors underlying the set of potential efficacy items. One of these dimensions was only represented by one item in the four scales, so we added another item to our questionnaire with the identical wording but with a different referrent. This item is similar to the one used originally in the political efficacy scale reported in The Voter Decides. This item is: "Voting is the only way people like me will have any say about how the government runs things." Four factors emerged with eigen-values greater than 1.0. The factor pattern matrix appears below. To simplify the reader’s analysis of the separate scales, common items will appear more than once. (See Table 3.)
Table 3: Alpha Factor Analysis of Efficacy Items (N = 719)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 1+</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 2</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 3</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 4#</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 5</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 6</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 7</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton 1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton 2</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton 3*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings-Levinson 1+</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings-Levinson 2#</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings-Levinson 3*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton-Jennings 1#</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton-Jennings 2*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell et al. 2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§The ALPHA factor analysis was carried out with SPSS 6.5 subprogram FACTOR on the CDC 6600. An oblique rotation was employed, since we hypothesize that multiple dimensions in the efficacy scales, if present, would be correlated. The oblique rotation which appeared to provide the best simple structure was produced with the SPSS obliqueness parameter DELTA set at 0.3. Factors resulting from simple structure rotation are defined by the loadings above. Before analysis all negatively phrased items were reversed so that high scores represented an “efficacious” response.

A look at the solution to the factor analysis is revealing. The Easton-Dennis Scale, for example, contains items loading on four distinct factors. The three combined Langton-Jennings-Levinson Scales load on three of the factors. Clearly, then, there is some confusion in the measurement of political efficacy. The most popular scales do not measure a single, unified concept. This conclusion poses an interesting question. Are the scales tapping a concept of efficacy that is multi-dimensional in nature,
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or are some of the items in the efficacy scale measuring some extraneous concepts that really do not relate to the conceptualization efficacy at all? A closer examination of the content of these items comprising each factor is in order. The two items that load on the fourth factor are addressed to the idea of political responsiveness—the particular systematic component that serves as a focus is public officials.

—There are some big powerful men in government who are running the whole thing and they do not care about us ordinary people.

—I don’t think people in the government care much about what people like my family think.

The third factor is composed of two items from separate scales. The two items are nearly similar in wording and relate to the respondent’s attitude toward voting. Although it is difficult to know exactly which direction a “politically efficacious” individual would respond, these items were reflected for the analysis.

—Voting is the only way people like me will have any say about how the government runs things.

—Voting is the only way that people like my mother and father can have any say about how the government runs things.

The second factor, too, is composed of two items. Both of these items relate the individual’s attitude toward a component of the political system—its complexity.

—Sometimes I can’t understand what goes on in the government.

—Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a like me can’t really understand what is going on.

The first factor, accounting for the major portion of the variance in the student responses to the efficacy items, is composed of five items.

—My family doesn’t have any say about what the government does.

—Citizens don’t have a chance to say what they think about running the government.

—What happens in the government will happen no matter what people do. It is like the weather, there’s nothing people can do about it.

—The political views and activities of students are very important.

—When people like me become adults we will not have any influence on what government does.
What is it that these items have in common? Clearly, they have to do with perceptions of the ability of the “average” citizen to influence the operation of the political system.

Thus, our factor analysis has revealed four underlying characteristics of political efficacy as it has been operationalized by the political scientists we have cited. These are: (1) a belief in the responsiveness of public officials; (2) a belief in the existence of a means of influence besides voting; (3) a feeling that the government is not too complicated to understand; and (4) a belief that average citizens influence the course of government. How do these dimensions accord with the definition of political efficacy?

Obviously, the content of the items loading on the first factor that we identified bear a great deal of resemblance to the definition that has been offered of political efficacy. As statements of affect, they specify a source—the “average citizen,” an attitude—feelings of effectiveness, and an object—the government. When respondents agree to the statements loading on this factor, they are expressing their feeling that the governmental system is indeed responsive to citizen input.

The fourth factor that we identified seems highly similar to the first. It deals with responsiveness to the input of citizens. However, the object of a respondent’s agreement with the items lying on this dimension has changed. Instead of the political system being the object of the attitude expressed—a representation of that system, its leaders, enters the picture. Agreement with items on this dimension might be more clearly pictured as a belief in the responsiveness of public officials—more possibly related to the idea of political trust than to political efficacy. Although the first and fourth dimensions should be highly related, conceptually they appear to be distinct.

The content of the second factor that we identified, however, seems to stray considerably from the idea of effectiveness or responsiveness. Instead it centers around the idea of perceived “political understanding.” That is, the respondent who agrees strongly with the statements on this dimension is indicating that he or she has trouble understanding the way government works. It is not difficult to imagine a citizen who could agree with this sentiment while still feeling that the citizenry does or can affect the course of government. Clearly the first and second factors we have identified appear conceptually distinct. The factor correlation matrix confirms they are also empirically distinct. The items that form this dimension are ill-suited for inclusion in a valid, reliable scale to measure political efficacy.

The third factor that we discovered had to do with (in its affirmative form) the belief that the avenues available to citizens were not limited to the act of voting. There is some doubt that agreement with the two statements loading on this factor (the statements are worded negatively) necessarily indicate a lack of efficacy. The validity of these items becomes confused
with the respondent’s faith in the voting process. Again, it is easy enough to imagine the individual who would agree with either of the two statements yet still feel highly efficacious because of a strong belief that the political system was extremely responsive via the electoral process. This dimension might have something in common with efficacy if everyone had the same attitude toward the effectiveness of the voting act—the fact is, however, that this is not the case. Our interpretation is that knowledge of and beliefs about voting *vis a vis* other methods of political influence are thoroughly confounded with confidence in the voting act itself in these items. Thus, the items loading on this “voting” dimension should not be included in a valid, reliable political efficacy scale.

Where does this leave us in our examination of the item pool most commonly drawn from in measuring political efficacy? Three conclusions have emerged at this point. First, the scales that have been used are characterized by low levels of reliability. Secondly, our factor analysis has shown these scales to be multi-dimensional in nature with three of the four dimensions discovered being conceptually distinct from the definition of political efficacy that we considered earlier. And thirdly, the items remaining that are associated with a dimension resembling the concept of efficacy are not sufficient to create a scale with an acceptable level of reliability. In addition, there is some doubt as to whether these items actually represent the “contextual meaning” of the construct of political efficacy as it is *used* by researchers.

**AN EMPIRICAL RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF POLITICAL EFFICACY**

There are at least two areas related to item content that the authors of this paper suggest need to be considered in the construction of a valid and reliable scale to measure levels of political efficacy in pre-adults. The first, and more important, thing that needs to be considered is that the scales dealt with so far do not require the respondent to make inferences about his or her own behavior but about the behavior of individuals as a part of a collectivity. A quick perusal of the items we have considered shows that the item stems are replete with collective references: “citizens don’t have a say,” “people like me have a say,” “people like my family think.” Using items like this to arrive at measures of individuals’ perceptions of their own effectiveness assumes a perfect relationship between individuals’ perception of themselves and their perception of everyone else. Such an assumption does not necessarily hold since it is a very logical possibility that citizens view the average citizen as being ineffective but view themselves as being effective. Such feelings would be more likely to be found among the politically elite in a society. On the other hand, those in less powerful
segments of society might reason in just the opposite way. They might view citizens in general as being able to affect the course of government but view themselves as being powerless. The construct falls far short of measuring feelings of personal political efficacy, although the construct is very often used theoretically as an individual-level construct. Such distinctions are theoretically interesting to us as researchers in political socialization and learning. These distinctions should guide our choice of measurement tools.

A second consideration that a political efficacy scale should reflect is suggested by a closer look at Campbell's definition, "...political efficacy may be defined as the feeling that individual political action does have, or can have an impact on the political process...." While Campbell may have considered the "can have" idea a definitional throw-away and did not include items to measure it in his original scale, further consideration highlights its importance to the concept of political efficacy.

It is possible to envision the person who takes the outlook that citizens are not generally able to affect the political system not because of some defect in the system but because of apathetic orientations of citizens. This apathy or lack of interest can also operate on the individual level—a person might believe that in general he or she is ineffective in the political system—but could be effective if he or she tried to be. This idea of potential effectiveness should be an important dimension in the formulation and measurement of the efficacy concept.

With these two ideas in mind, ten new items were developed by the authors for possible inclusion in a scale to measure political efficacy. See Table 4.

These items were included in the same questionnaire administration as were the items in the earlier analysis. When another factor analysis is run including these new items, some interesting comparisons with the earlier solution appear. See Table 5.

The most obvious difference between this analysis and the earlier one is that a fifth factor has emerged (the criterion is that eigenvalues > 1). Four of the factors look very familiar. Factor 1 corresponds to the first factor in our earlier analysis. The second factor corresponds to the "trust" factor we found earlier. The third and fourth factors correspond exactly to the "faith in voting" and "system understanding" factors we isolated earlier.
Table 4: Ten Additional Political Efficacy Items

1. Individuals cannot influence government all the time, but when they act, they can often influence the government.

2. I don't think that people in the city government care much about what people like me think.*

3. As an adult, I will be able to influence government decisions if I am willing to work at it.

4. If I had some complaints about a local governmental activity and took that complaint to a member of the local government council, I would expect that person to pay attention to what I said.

5. If I joined together with others with similar political ideas, we could cause some of the laws to be changed.

6. As an adult, if I believe strongly in what I say, I would have a fair chance to influence the government.

7. If I wanted to, I could get someone in the city government to listen to what I want.

8. As an adult, I should not worry about current events or public affairs, because people like me can't do anything about them anyway.*

9. If the average citizen would quit complaining and get active, he or she could change what the government does.

10. As adults, people like me can have quite a bit of influence over the local government.

*These are negatively phrased items, which were reversed for the analysis to follow.
Table 5: Alpha Factor Analysis of Expanded Efficacy Item Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 1+</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 3</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 4#</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 5</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 6</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Dennis 7</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton 1</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton 2</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton 3*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings-Levinson 1+</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings-Levinson 2#</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings-Levinson 3*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton-Jennings 1#</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton-Jennings 2*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell et al. 2</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Item 1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Item 2</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Item 3</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Item 4</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Item 5</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Item 6</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Item 7</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Item 8</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Item 9</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Item 10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#* + Identical Items

*Again subprogram FACTOR of SPSS was used. The ALPHA routine best approximated simple structure where DELTA was set at 0.4.
Since we earlier eliminated the dimensions corresponding to factors 2, 3 and 4 from our consideration as valid efficacy items, our interest is now shifted to the first and fifth factors. Interestingly, the new fifth factor is comprised solely of items drawn from the 10 new items that were generated. An examination of the contents of the five items that have the highest loadings on this factor reveals that they all contain the “individual can have” idea discussed earlier. Generally, agreement with the items in this dimension characterizes a respondent as feeling he or she can have influence over decisions if willing to try hard enough or work at it. Essentially, it involves some positive act on the individual’s part to have influence.

—If I joined together with others with similar political ideas, we could cause some of the laws to be changed.

—As an adult, if I believe strongly in what I say, I would have a fair chance to influence the government.

—If I wanted to, I could get someone in the city government to listen to what I want.

—If the average citizen would quit complaining and get active, he or she could change what the government does.

—As adults, people like me can have quite a bit of influence over the local government.

Two of the items that were written with the same ideas in mind have loaded with the “citizens do have influence” items on the first factor. One new item loaded on factor 2, the “trust” factor. And two items failed to load clearly on any of the factors. Of the five items that define the fifth factor, two of them refer to the “city” government and the “local” government. These referrents are identical to those of Almond and Verba’s *The Civic Culture* subjective political competence scale. Although it seems reasonable to include these more immediate referrents in a political efficacy scale, this is a difference between the first and fifth factors. We argue that this is not the major difference between the two factors since only two of the five items contain these specific referrents.

While there seems to be some conceptual difference between the first and fifth factors, the interpretation of this difference is shrouded in ambiguities. At this point the best that can be said to support the argument that we have uncovered two different dimensions in the efficacy concept is that the first factor is predominantly a “citizens do have influence” factor and the fifth factor is predominantly composed of items thrust in the direction of “I can have influence if I try.”

A possible explanation for the appearance of two factors might lie in a measurement artifact associated with the positive or negative wording of the
items. The first factor has five of the seven high loading items worded in a negative direction, and the fifth factor has all five high loading items worded in a positive direction. This greatly confounds our being able to support or reject the argument offered above without further research and/or analysis. Factors one and five are highly correlated in the population we have sampled. The population under study is not representative of all high school students. They are students from metropolitan areas who voluntarily attended a week long workshop in government. A more heterogeneous sample might accentuate the difference between these two factors.

Where does this leave us in the quest for a set of items that reliably measure political efficacy and yet retain validity as an individual-level variable? First, we have established that the traditional measurement scales and the items comprising them are inadequate. We have shown that they have several major weaknesses. First of all, the items that have been used to measure a supposedly undimensional efficacy construct in fact exhibit a multidimensional structure. They measure not only the respondent’s belief in the average citizen’s effectiveness vis a vis governmental institutions but feelings of distrust and bewilderment or frustration as well. An extension of this problem is that the scales are characterized by low levels of alpha reliability—a fact which we have documented in this analysis. This makes their use especially suspect in research and evaluation studies that embody time series designs. A third problem we have pointed out with respect to the universe of efficacy items is that their validity is called into question when they are used for pre-adult populations. The key to their appropriateness is that they are geared in the “citizens do (or do not) have influence” direction and ignore the “I can have influence” idea central to the definition of the concept originally suggested by Campbell. The second factor analysis presented above suggests that these are, in fact, two empirically distinct constructs. This demonstration by factor analysis is less than definitive, however, since, as we suggested, the results are confounded by a highly correlated factor structure and very possibly by response set bias.

EXTERNAL VALIDITY OF POLITICAL EFFICACY ITEM SETS

Another avenue is available for examining the differences between these two efficacy factors. If the items do in fact represent different dimensions of affect, then we should expect them to be related to external criteria in different ways. Unfortunately, the data set on which the earlier analysis was based included no items measuring other political attitudes, political behavior, or individual characteristics.

However, two additional data sets have been built by the authors for testing external validity. These come from parallel studies involving high
school students. Both studies included several of these political efficacy items as well as items measuring several other dimensions of thought and behavior relevant to describing individual political personalities. Thus, we are able to look at the correlation of two of the Easton-Dennis “citizens do have influence over government” items and four of the conceptually distinct “I can have influence over government” items with a number of external criteria. In addition to these items which characterize factors one and five in our factor analysis, these two additional studies included a number of items constructed by the authors to free the efficacy concept from its strict dependence on formalized institutions of government as referents. The authors felt that in order to measure feelings of efficacy in pre-adults it is necessary to work with a more generalized set of political referents, since adolescents do not have the same level of opportunity to come in contact with the agencies and institutions of formal government as do adult citizens. Thus, our attempts at measuring political efficacy in pre-adults have taken the direction of a more generalized concept that centers around the idea of potential personal effectiveness in the general political environment—a concept that might more appropriately be called “political self-confidence.” We believe that these items tap an “I can have influence over political events” belief on the part of the adolescent respondents.

All of the efficacy items and many of the external indicators were measured with a 9-point response scale rather than the 5-point agree-disagree scale used for the data presented earlier. Students were instructed to think of “government” and “politics” in general terms, rather than merely as national-level referents. Table 6 includes the items used in each of these three efficacy categories for the external indicator analysis.

The external correlations of items in each of the three “efficacy” sets will be presented for two separate samples of high school students. The upper entry in each cell (pearson correlation) represents a national sample of participants in the CLOSE UP programs during 1975. Approximately 40 metropolitan areas are represented by 1,549 students. For some of the correlations the number of valid cases drops to 950 respondents. This sample represents students who are self-selected for the CLOSE UP programs, thus they must be considered atypical of students from their respective high schools. The second sample represents students surveyed in their 11th grade history classes in ten high schools in the greater Cleveland, Ohio, area. There are 588 students in this sample, although the correlations reported will be based on as few as 349 in some instances. The ten schools were chosen to be broadly representative of the more than 70 high schools in the Cleveland area which participated in CLOSE UP during 1975. These students are more nearly “typical” of students in their schools. Both samples were used in our attempt to contrast the differences in the three efficacy item sets in order to add confidence to these contrasts.
Table 6: Contents of Three Efficacy Item Sets for the External Validity Analysis

"Citizens Do Have Influence" Items:

Citizens don’t have a chance to say what they think about running the government. (CITDO1) (Easton-Dennis 3)

What happens in the government will happen no matter what people do. It is like the weather, there is nothing people can do about it. (CITDO2) (Easton-Dennis 7)

"I Can Have Influence over Government" Items:

If I joined together with others of similar political ideas, we could cause some of the laws to be changed. (ICAN1) (New Item 5)

If I wanted to, I could get someone in the city government to listen to what I want. (ICAN2) (New Item 7)

As adults, people like me can have quite a bit of influence over the local government. (ICAN3) (New Item 10)

As an adult, if I believe strongly in what I say, I would have a fair chance to influence the government. (ICAN4) (New Item 6)

"I Can Have Influence over Political Events" Items:

I am the kind of person who can influence how other people decide to vote in elections. (SELFCON1)

I can be very effective in political situations. (SELFCON2)

I am potentially very capable of influencing political decisions in groups. (SELFCON3)

The reader will note that the distinctions between efficacy item sets generally hold across both samples. (See Table 7.) The correlations are not high by any means. But the reader must remember that we are dealing with single items in most of the correlations; the correlations are attenuated by the existence of measurement error.
Table 7: Correlations of Three Sets of Efficacy Items with Theoretically Relevant External Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Variables</th>
<th>&quot;Citizens Do Have&quot; Influence over Government Items:</th>
<th>&quot;I Can Have Influence over Government&quot; Items:</th>
<th>&quot;I Can Have Influence Over Political Events&quot; Items:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CITD1</td>
<td>CITD2</td>
<td>ICAN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Political Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How active do you expect to be in politics or public affairs in the future?</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How interested are you in political matters?</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interest in Politics Scale (6 Items)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political Information Test (15 Correct-Incorrect Items)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How many times have you worked for a political party or in a local government office?</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Behavior in the Peer Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Interest in School Politics Scale (6 Items)</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Number of Offices Held during High School</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How many times have you talked in front of 50 or more people?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How many times have you participated in a model U.N. or a model legislature?</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Number of occasions respondent has participated in selected social political activities (6, 9, 10 above plus 5 other activities)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Behavior in Organized Groups of Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I organized projects or run meetings in the groups I belong to.</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I try to convince others to follow my suggestions in groups I belong to.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I ask others to take part or explain their views in groups I belong to.</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I try to get the group to consider all the good points and bad points of an idea before deciding.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Entries are pearson product-moment correlations. NA = Data not available.
**Similar to Factor 4 from earlier factor analyses.
The two Easton-Dennis items correlate differently than the other "political efficacy" items across a range of high-school relevant activism variables. For some of these external "non-efficacy" variables both of the "I can have influence . . ." item sets correlate similarly, and at different levels from the "citizens do have influence" items. This is true for our single item measure of political interest (External 2), for our Interest in Politics Scale (External 3), and for our Interest in School Politics Scale (External 7). The traditional efficacy items both correlate markedly higher with our Belief in Responsiveness of Public Officials Scale (External 4) than do the items in the other two sets. The contrast between the efficacy sets is not as well defined when they are correlated with our Political Information Test (External 5). For all of the rest of the external variables there is a similar trend between the three efficacy sets: the Easton-Dennis items generally correlate lowest, the "I Can Influence Government" items correlate higher, and the "I Can Have Influence over Political Events" items correlate highest of all three sets. The variables for which this trend holds are all variables which have fairly concrete referrents in the experiences of these high school students: activism behaviors and activities within adult political culture and the adolescent culture.

The "new" items here are different because they have an "I Can Influence" content. They are different because their referrents are collectively broader than voting—the prediction of which was the motivation for the development of the original S.R.C. Scale.

Across the entire range of external variables we have considered, the traditional efficacy items fail to correlate as meaningfully as do efficacy items which have a more personal meaning and more germane political referrents. We believe that these new items much more closely tap the sense of political effectiveness construct—an activist predisposition that is usually implicit and sometimes explicit in the political behavior and political socialization literature—than do the Easton-Dennis items. We believe that many previous researchers have been measuring something other than the individual's belief in his or her potential political effectiveness; they have been tapping a variety of "subject" orientations, ranging from belief in the democratic norm and trust in public officials to political alienation, and a sense of anomie. These elements have often been summed or scaled into one "unidimensional" index, resulting in an amorphous assignment of a political attribute to an individual or class, a measurement topped off with a generous measure of error variance. We see numerous tests of reasonable hypotheses in the political socialization-political learning literature which have yielded unreasonable results because the operational definition of political efficacy did not fit the theoretical one.

We have been attempting to measure a construct which will be meaningful in describing the political development and predicting the future
political behavior of adolescents—a construct that will also be useful in curriculum research in social-political education. It is a political construct representing a person’s “sense of potential personal effectiveness in the area of politics.” We believe that Campbell defined a useful theoretical variable in The Voter Decides with political efficacy. The problems came with operationalizing this construct, as we have tried to point out. These findings suggest that political efficacy can be measured in a way that better corresponds to the theoretical use of the construct. The measurements relate to activist political variables at higher levels than do the original measurements. They also relate at higher levels and in the expected direction with activism-related variables in the adolescent “political” milieu. These conclusions are, of course, tentative. More research is needed to identify political efficacy, as operationalized here, as a robust concomitant of active adult political roles. These roles need to be defined in terms of a normative theory of democratic behavior—a theory which conceives of active and responsible political behavior more broadly than merely as voting and campaigning for political candidates. To the extent that these activities are thoughtfully carried out in the future, political educators can begin to gain understanding and influence over the citizenship effects of the school.
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**FOOTNOTES**

1"Sense of political efficacy may be defined as the feeling that individual political action does have, or can have, an impact on the political process, i.e., that it is worthwhile to perform one's civic duties. It is the feeling that political and social change is possible, and that the individual citizen can play a part in bringing about this change." (Campbell et al., 1954, p. 187)

2"Persons who believe they can accomplish things through politics could be said to have a positive attitude toward it. Such persons feel efficacious about political action and an efficacy scale has been devised to measure this feeling." (Milbrath, 1965, p. 56)

3"What are the major psychological variables that we might think of as relevant to an individual's decision to vote and to his choice of candidate?
In the planning of the present study, six factors were proposed as having sufficient importance to warrant specific investigation in the interviews. They were:

1. Personal identification with one of the political parties;
2. Concern with issues of national government policy;
3. Personal attraction to the presidential candidates;
4. Conformity to the group standards of one's associates;
5. A sense of personal efficacy in the area of politics;
6. A sense of civic obligation to vote.

Each of these factors may be thought of as having significance in the total motivation of the vote. The first four of the six have the effect of not only stimulating the individual to vote, but also of influencing the direction of this vote. The remaining two have relevance only to the act of voting, not to the direction of the vote." (Campbell et al., 1954, p. 86)
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**PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS**

**PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL MODELS: APPLIED CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTIONAL RESEARCH.**

M. J. Rice, Anthropology Curriculum Project, Geography Curriculum Project, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

The thrust of the curriculum and instructional research in these two projects is the application of learning theory to the writing of materials for instruction, and experimental testing in which relevant instructional variables are controlled or descriptively considered. The investigator begins by the selection of content about some organizing topic and develops a psychoeducational model drawing from one or several learning theories. Operationalization of the model requires detailed specification of the writing procedures related to the model and the relevant classroom procedures. A clear distinction is made between curriculum-as-artifact and instructional procedures. A unit of instruction is then written which purports to exemplify the psychoeducational model.

The field testing of the materials involves an experimental attempt to ascertain the facilitative effects of the psychoeducational model in comparison with some other curriculum-instructional design. Psychoeducational models which have been utilized in the past include reception, stimulus-response, inquiry, mastery, and conceptual learning. Specific sub-components have involved use of advance organizer, visual organizer, individualized instruction, tutor texts, and class paced instruction.

Field testing of materials thus far does not indicate the superiority of any curriculum design in terms of achievement measured by test scores; other variables, such as prior pupil knowledge, time spent in learning task, and teacher-pupil learning set, appear to be more important than the psychoeducational model. Psychoeducational design nevertheless serves as a useful heuristic device for systematic curriculum development, helps students clarify the interface of curriculum and instruction, and constitutes a practical means of developing alternative curriculum design.
This progress report focuses on the High School Political Science Curriculum Project. The Project has received support from the National Science Foundation since its initial funding period beginning in 1972. NSF granted the funds to the American Political Science Association whose Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education subcontracted the curriculum development work of the project to the Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University. In 1972 a conceptualization statement was written which has guided the development work of the project staff. The chief purpose of the project has been to build upon the conceptualization to develop a two semester high school program in American government which serves as an alternative course of study to those programs currently available to schools.

Comparing Political Experiences presents students with information about American government and important political issues. It emphasizes those political arenas which are closest to the lives of students—schools, peer groups, labor unions, and communities—and makes national and international politics meaningful for students. Three sets of political competencies define the instructional objectives for the course. They include: (1) knowledge of key concepts useful for analyzing political life, (2) intellectual skills including analytical skills, valuing skills, and methodological skills, and (3) participation skills including training in basic citizen roles and participation skills. These three competency areas are integrated in the instructional program.

The project has been testing experimental instructional materials in approximately twenty-five pilot schools since the 1973-4 school year. During this period, small prototypes, or sample instructional sequences, were written by the project staff and implemented on an experimental basis. These prototypes represented the first test of essential instructional and conceptual ideas which undergird the program. For example, several strategies for concept learning, intellectual skill exercises and participation skill exercises were tested through these prototypes. Additionally, several prototypes tested the idea of using the school as a political laboratory where students could observe political life and consider ways of participating in it. While some of these prototypes proved useful for students, others did not help students achieve program objectives.

Based upon the 1973-4 field test, developers made judgments about the workability of different kinds of instructional sequences for incorporation into a new high school course in American government. 1974-5 saw the first field test of a one semester program titled Comparing Political Experiences.
The course was composed of three units which were tested sequentially. As with the prototypes, field test information was measured through unit mastery tests, student reaction questionnaires, teacher reaction questionnaires as well as site visitations by project staff. The staff synthesized these data to further refine the ideas contained in the one semester course and also to create another course to complete the development of a full year American government program. The first and second semesters were called Political Systems and Political Issues respectively.

Systems and Issues were field tested during the 1975-6 school year. As with the previous two field tests, the test sites were representative of students of varying ethnic groups, different socio-economic backgrounds, different regions of the country as well as different community size. This field test served as the final trial of the entire program, the results of which are being fed into the final published version of the course.

Another aspect of the formative evaluation has augmented the field trial of the instructional materials. Throughout the history of the project, various outside reviewers have critiqued the curriculum materials. While the staff has gained several types of information from students in schools, approximately 100 outside reviewers have provided new insights into content validity, method of presentation, appropriateness of instructional objectives, and other fundamental design components. Reviewers also offered their views with respect to the treatment of ethnic groups in the instructional material.

In the fall of 1976 an ethnic panel was constituted composed of representatives of the black American community, the Asian American community, the Spanish speaking American community, as well as the Native American community. The commentary offered by this panel served to further sensitize the project staff to a full and adequate treatment of ethnic groups.

In addition to the subject matter specialists and the ethnic review panel, "parent reviewers" also critiqued the course materials from the perspective of parents who have students in high schools. As with other outside reviewers, the parents came to the Social Studies Development Center in Bloomington, Indiana, to share their written reviews of the materials and to discuss in detail the content of their reviews with the project staff.

An active diffusion campaign has complemented the evaluation effort. Prior to submitting the original funding request in 1972, the staff appeared at national and regional conferences and also published articles which provided a rationale for the course they ultimately would develop. The publication of articles and presentation of ideas have continued since 1972.

To aid the diffusion activities mentioned above, the National Science Foundation supported an implementation project, the Comparing Political Experiences Diffusion Project, which had as its purpose to spread the ideas.
and instructional materials created by the High School Political Science Curriculum Project. The small diffusion project sponsored six conferences throughout the United States in 1975 and 1976. At each conference, sixty educators were invited to learn about the program. It has been a hope and often a reality that some of these conference participants continue to talk about the course after leaving the conference and returning to their jobs in school systems and universities.

In November of 1974 and 1975, publishers conferences were held. At these conferences commercial publishers examined the CPE materials and questioned the project developers. Advertisements calling for bids on the course were taken out in publisher journals in the spring of 1976. A number of bids were received and evaluated. The project staff chose the strongest bid and, with the approval of the National Science Foundation, began meeting with Prentice-Hall, Inc. on the published version of the course. Course developers are currently working with editors at the publishing company. The work involves frequent communication with the editors, revising the course a final time prior to publication. Together, the developers and editors are attempting to mold the Political Systems and Political Issues courses into a textbook for use in American government classrooms. This textbook will be available to schools in September, 1978. The appearance of the book will mark the transition from the activities of the curriculum development project to a marketable program for high schools. It will also mark the beginning of an effort to disseminate Comparing Political Experiences on a widespread scale.

The High School Political Science Curriculum Project is co-directed by Judith A. Gillespie, Howard Mehlinger, and John J. Patrick. Comparing Political Experiences is being developed by Judith A. Gillespie, Stuart Lazarus, and John J. Patrick.


The Comparing Political Experiences Diffusion Project is co-directed by Stuart Lazarus and Howard Mehlinger.

CENSORSHIP POLICY IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT.
Jack L. Nelson, Rutgers University.

This study is an examination of policies which develop in schools to control or limit school access to information. It draws from considerations
of purported legitimate grounds for censoring activities in schools, and the emerging literature in educational policy studies.

The research problem is to examine the relationship between censorship policy and perceived implementation in a school district. Specifically, the study intends to determine the nature, compatibility, legal framework and perceived operation of censorship policies in one school district in New Jersey.

Method of study incorporates:
1. Examination of the legal bases for screening teaching materials in the state. This will include review of state laws, State Board regulations, and relevant court decisions.
2. Content analysis of written policies in a selected school district in the state.
3. Structured interviews of selected district personnel.

DISSENGTATIONS IN PROGRESS

University of Georgia:

Russell Cobb, Effects of Linguistic Training on Children’s Map Conceptualization: An Examination of Piaget’s Developmental Theories.
Kevin Laws, Comparison of the Effects of Differential Stimuli and Immediate and Delayed Response in Historical Geography.

Indiana University:

Paul Armstrong, Effects of a Global Studies Course on the Ethnocentrism of Junior High School Students.
Devon Metzger, The Study of Student Social and Political Orientations as They Relate to School Political Systems.
Lee Morganett, Advanced Organizers in Social Studies Materials.
Bruce Smith, Influence of Solicitation Pattern, Type of Practice Example, and Response Mode on Concept Attainment and Commitment to Classroom Discussion.
Victor Smith, The Effects of a Global Studies Course on the International Attitudes of Junior High School Students.
Michael Stentz, The Effect of an Experiential Political Education Program on the Political Self-confidence of Selected Secondary High School Students.

*Rutgers University:*

Ronald Conry, A Historical Study of Values Conflict in the Education of the Cherokee Indian.
Anthony D’Elia, A Study of Re-settled Migrant Farm Workers.
Michael Grant, A Comparison of College and Non-college Educated Police Recruits.
Tom Hill, The Alternative Senior Year: Its Implications for Social Education.
Willard Kenvin, A Comparison of the Level on Which Students in a Religious Private School and Students in a Secular Public School Make Value Judgments.
Ernestine Leach, Dr. John Malcus Ellison: Prototype of a Black Preacher Educator.
Bruce Loria, An Assessment of the U. S. Army Race Relations Program.
Arthur Nast, Tolstoy as Educator.
Mark Schuman, An Examination of Social Studies Teachers’ Perceptions of Situations Depicting Nationalistic Education.
William Stanley, Social Reconstructionism: A Study of Its Influence and Applicability in Social Studies Education.
Richard Strade, The Validation of Program Objectives of the Police Science Program at Ocean County College.
John Surak, An Experimental High School Course in Thanatology.
Ben Thomas, Factors Influencing the Inclusion of Population Education in Social Studies Curricula.
Robert Wilson, A Study of Runaway Youth.
Mae Yanowitz, An Analysis of the Role of Moral Education in the School System and Its Implications for the Teaching of English. (This study is in English Education but includes social education faculty, conceptual framework and literature.)
Stanford University:

Yaqub Abu-Helu, Images of the Arab World Held by American Teachers.
Sam Bell, Social Studies Textbooks and Inquiry: A Content Analysis.
Helen Britton, Diffusion of Social Studies Innovation in Santa Clara County, California.
Dean Cozine, A History of Social Studies Teacher Education.
Les Edwards, A Task Analysis of Social Studies Courses in Continuation and Comprehensive High Schools.
Lynda Falkenstein, MACOS Dissemination and Controversy in Oregon: A Case Study.
Gary Knox, Teacher Perception Combining Innovative Recommendations in Social Studies Education.
Art Kubersky, Dissent Toleration and Social Studies Classroom Processes.
Paul Robinson, An Historical Reinterpretation of the Emergence of the Social Studies.
James Slay, Religion in the Social Studies Curriculum.
Robert Thompson, Advanced Placement American History in California High Schools.

Utah State University:

Ross Lehman, Examination of Values for Teachers.
AUGENE H. WILSON, "A Philosophy for Intercultural Education."

There are at least two possible philosophies which could undergird intercultural education. One, pragmatism, has been the usual and taken for granted philosophy. Another, phenomenology, has rarely been considered and is at least equally appropriate.

This article describes both pragmatism and phenomenology and then hypothesizes the advantages and disadvantages of each in relation to intercultural learning. Second, the article shows how each philosophy is or could be applied in intercultural curricula in schools. Finally, the author makes a case for allowing phenomenology to be a competing and complimentary philosophy for intercultural education so that students can "experience experience" as well as think about experience.

CAROLE L. HAHN, "Attributes and Adoption of New Social Studies Materials."

This study tested the applicability of generalizations in the literature on innovation adoption and diffusion to the adoption of innovative curricular materials in social studies. In particular, it sought to determine empirically whether or not the concepts of relative advantage, compatibility, observability, trialability, and complexity were valid constructs for categorizing attributes of new social studies materials. The study also examined the relationships among attributes of materials, potential adopters' attitudes toward the materials and adoption of the materials.

Questionnaires developed to measure attributes, attitudes and adoption were sent to potential adopters of new secondary social studies materials in 1,000 schools in two southern and two midwestern states. Factor analyses of the responses from the two samples, taken a year apart, yielded four almost identical constructs. The empirically-verified constructs differed from those hypothesized to exist. The new factors were labeled observable benefits, difficulty, investment requirements and familiarity. A strong positive correlation was found between observable benefits and a stated willingness to try the material. There was also a positive correlation between investment requirements and attitude and a negative correlation between difficulty and attitude. Correlations between attributes and adoption were not consistently and significantly related.

Curriculum designers have tended to ignore the social, personal and communal processes which characterize social science. In its place, a reconstructed-logic is adapted which focuses upon the logical characteristics of findings and the identification of standardized procedures as methods. The acceptance of a reconstructed-logic produces a contradiction between intent and the actual instructional work of curriculum. Examining three discipline-centered textbooks, a dominant social science perspective of "systems" is crystalized and stabilized. Social theory in the curricula assumes a normative function which denies individual autonomy and responsibility. The valuative stance is made compelling by the treatment of knowledge as certain and detached.


This article examines the construct 'sense of political efficacy'—a concept which the authors suggest is becoming an important outcome variable for many secondary political and citizenship education programs. The purpose of the article is to illustrate and to critique the variety of ways in which political efficacy has been measured. Specifically, the authors, using national samples of high school students, show that these measurement efforts are characterized by unreliable scales and that they also lack face validity when compared to the original definition proposed in The Voter Decides. Factor analysis is used to identify the several dimensions which exist in these efficacy scales, and to test a reformulation of the construct. The authors conclude by comparing the external validity of traditional efficacy items against two other sets of political efficacy items. Both of these new efficacy item sets, it is argued, are theoretically more significant ways to measure the construct in populations of secondary school students.