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FROM THE EDITORS

Throughout the spring, there have been a series of meetings and cooperative efforts that have given a real boost to the journal. There was a meeting of persons in NCSS concerned with research and subsequent interaction afterwards which has helped us in our efforts to make the journal both more visible and more self-sustaining. We would like to report about these efforts and their results here.

A meeting was called by Howard Mehlinger in Indianapolis in April to discuss generally his desire for the National Council to promote the quality and quantity of research in NCSS, and to make the results of good research more widely accessible. The meeting was attended by Ben Cox, Research Editor for Social Education; Carole Hahn, CUFA chairperson and member of the NCSS Publications Board; Charles Mitsakos, chairperson of the NCSS Publications Board; Dan Roselle, editor of Social Education; Karen Fox, chairperson of the NCSS Research Committee; and the two of us as editors of Theory and Research in Social Education. There was a wide-ranging discussion for approximately 4½ hours in which we tried to sort through the research functions of NCSS. Those at the meeting expressed pride in the CUFA journal, and were eager to continue to view it as a journal for the stimulation of good theory and research articles selected by a referee process on the basis of merit rather than theme. NCSS will publish one bulletin each year for research, organized around a theme and approved by the Publications Board. The Research Department of Social Education will emphasize articles that have direct implications for classroom teachers, who make up the majority of the NCSS membership. This decision about functions sustained the role of the journal and continued to cement it to CUFA as an important CUFA publication. We believe that this clarification will mitigate against possible overlap in research publications, and yet give maximum visibility for research within the NCSS organization.

We feel that this was an important meeting because it generated useful discussion. It was also important because of its offers. There was discussion of NCSS financial support for the operation of the journal. This is necessary because of the number of issues that we are publishing. Later, in its May Board meeting, the NCSS Board and Directors voted to continue supporting our journal. Dan Roselle also gave us an offer to cooperate in whatever way he could to promote the journal. We have been consistently looking for ways to get revenue for the journal. Dan offered to help us in our marketing effort.

Dan's offer was important because advertisers will help us in substantial ways to make a quarterly journal possible. A meeting was held with Dan, Elizabeth Quigley, and Carlyjane Dunn in Washington in late May in which advertising for the journal was discussed. Dan offered to advertise the
journal in *Social Education*. Because there are many university educators who belong to the Council and who are not yet members of CUFA, this will help increase the CUFA membership as well as visibility for the journal. We will have a booth at the NCSS meeting in Cincinnati. The Council has offered us a booth in order to publicize the journal and to talk with potential authors. We will be spending as much time as possible during the convention in the booth and look forward to seeing you there and to sharing ideas about the journal.

We also decided to undertake a major marketing effort. Elizabeth Quigley will help us to identify advertisers and will devise a questionnaire which will surface interested advertisers and help us to determine rates. Liz has developed a list of over 60 potential publishing houses that might advertise in the journal. The survey will indicate their interest and establish a rate, and we will eventually develop a rate card which will allow us to send out mass mailings to publishers to see whether or not they are interested in advertising. This advertising will, in effect, subsidize one full issue of the journal per year, if we can maintain two to three ads in each issue. The journal will also be put on the publication list that goes out for NCSS. This means that we will sell individual copies of the journal, and back issues will be available to a wider audience. We will also have increased visibility because of our place on the NCSS publications list.

This is a lot of help from a group of overworked NCSS people, and we are delighted with the outcomes of these meetings. We also need to ask you for more help in some major ways. The CUFA Executive Board is going to recommend raising dues in order to accommodate a quarterly publication. The question of membership dues will be raised at the CUFA Business meeting in Cincinnati. The editors are recommending to the Board a dues increase to $12.00 for regular membership. Your opinions on these raises are most welcome. The raises are absolutely essential for the establishment of a quarterly publication.

All of these meetings and moves, with the NCSS support they represent, have made the journal stronger than it was in April. The editors are biased, and they hope that it continues to move in the directions we are beginning to chart. A great deal depends on how the CUFA members react to the journal and their continued support for our work. Keep sending us manuscripts and allowing us to impinge on your time for reviews. Your interest and enthusiasm is the fundamental support for our efforts. It is good to know that others outside of the CUFA membership are equally enthusiastic and supportive.

Lee H. Ehman
Judith A. Gillespie
Indiana University
SOCIAL STUDIES SUPERVISORS’
RANKINGS OF THE NCSS CURRICULUM GUIDELINES*

John J. Cogan
University of Minnesota
Linda A. Miner
Gustavus Adolphus College

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

In 1971, the National Council for the Social Studies issued a position statement which set forth guidelines for social studies curriculum development and evaluation (Ness, 1971). The publication of the document was timely, coming on the heels of significant efforts to revise social studies curricula during the 1960’s. The Guidelines offered teachers, supervisors, curriculum committees and others concerned with social studies education, a comprehensive set of principles or standards which could be systematically applied to existing or new social studies curricula to assess and give directions to programmatic concerns.

The limited feedback to the Council, since the publication of the Guidelines, has been rather positive. Hart and Shapiro (1975) conducted an informal survey of members of the NCSS Advisory Committee on Curriculum to determine the extent to which the Guidelines were disseminated and being utilized. Their small sample indicated that where the Guidelines have been used, “they have provided the basis for fundamental, systematic, and innovative change” (p. 95). To gain further insight regarding the impact of the Guidelines, we questioned whether social studies leadership personnel were in agreement as to the most important of the Guideline statements. Thus, the following study was initiated.

Specifically, this study sought first to determine which of the Guideline statements in the 1971 NCSS Curriculum Guidelines were most important and least important according to a sample of members of the NCSS Social Studies Supervisors Association; and second to determine any differences among the respondents in their rankings of the objectives which might be attributed to group membership variables.

PROCEDURES

Questionnaires to gather demographic data on the participants and a Q-sort task on the Guideline statements were sent to a random sample of

*With Douglas H. Anderson and Marlene Mitchell, University of Minnesota.
the NCSS Social Studies Supervisors Association (SSSA). From the results, the priority Guideline statements were identified. We mean priority in the sense that they were considered by the SSSA sample to be more important than the others—not that the other items were necessarily of no importance to social studies education.

Sample

A table of random numbers was used to draw a sample of respondents from a sub-group of the NCSS membership listed as “Social Studies Supervisors Association” (N = 367) hereafter referred to as SSSA. The investigators assumed that this group of people would be vitally interested in social studies education and would be a group directly concerned with the Guideline statements in their daily job responsibilities. The random selection yielded a sample of 118 “supervisors” of social studies education as subjects for the study.

Each person in the sample was sent: (1) a questionnaire requesting basic demographic information; (2) a Q-sort task on the NCSS Guideline statements described below; and (3) a cover letter explaining the task and the import of the study.

The Q-sort Task

The participants were requested to sort each of the 66 Guidelines into one of nine categories. The number of statements to go in each envelope was pre-determined and printed on the outside of each envelope. The nine categories were intended to simulate a quasi-normal curve. At the extremes there were few statements, while the majority of statements went in the middle groupings. This formed a quasi-normal continuum of “least important to social studies education” to “most important to social studies education.”

The number of statements for each category was 2, 5, 8, 12, 12, 12, 8, 5, 2. This task forced the participants to discriminate between items which were admittedly not mutually exclusive. However, to be consistent with the way in which the 66 items were listed in the Guidelines report, the Q-sort items were grouped and mailed to respondents in the nine categories in which they appeared in the report. The Q-sort task was pilot tested with several graduate students and faculty in social studies education before being sent off to the SSSA sample. The time taken for this task during the pilot test varied from \( \frac{1}{2} \) to 1\( \frac{1}{2} \) hours.

We were somewhat hesitant to use a Q-sort task rather than a Likert-type scale for the following reasons: the time involved in preparing and assembling the materials to be mailed; the time involved for participants to
complete the task; and the time of the year, late in May. However, we were intrigued by the potential of the Q-sort Task to force finer discriminations between items and a Likert-type scale, and thus decided to use this technique despite its potential liabilities.

FINDINGS

The total participant return was 69 percent (N = 81) which we considered to be high, given the nature of the task and the time of the year. Although the supervisors were randomly selected, their return was not 100 percent and thus had to be considered volunteer for purposes of data analysis. Forty-six percent (N = 31) of the Q-sort materials were returned within one week after mailing, 42 percent (N = 34) after the first follow-up letter (three weeks later), and 12 percent (N = 16) after a second follow-up. The Q-sort returns were then grouped according to their time of return.

In order to be able to combine the data, a multivariate analysis of variance between the three groups reflecting time of return was run using the 66 statements as dependent variables. No significant difference was found. Therefore, because the three groups did not differ from one another, their responses were grouped for all subsequent analyses.

After the responses were grouped, the means and z scores for each statement were determined. Table 1 shows the objectives in rank order.

After ranking the statements by means, we arbitrarily chose as our cut-off point for establishing the priority of important items a z score of +3.0 and above. These, then, were the priority Guideline statements, in rank order, as ranked by the sample of 81 social studies supervisors who were members of the NCSS Social Studies Supervisors Association:

5.0 Learning activities should engage the student directly and actively in the learning process.
7.2 Learning experiences should be organized in such fashion that students will learn how to continue to learn.
1.3 Students should have choices, some options within programs fitted to their needs, their concerns, and their social world.
5.7 Activities must be carried on in a climate which supports students’ self-respect and opens opportunities to all.
5.3 Activities should include using knowledge, examining values, communicating with others, and making decisions about social and civic affairs.
1.4 All students should have ample opportunity for social studies education at all grade levels, from K-12.
Table 1: The 66 NCSS Curriculum Guideline Statements Ranked by Means

S.E. Means = .40 \hline
N = 81 \hline
X means = 5.004 \hline
\hline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCSS Guideline</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>z Score</th>
<th>NCSS Guideline</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>z Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>(Grouped)</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>(Grouped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.488</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.313</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.975</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.975</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.963</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.913</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.887</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.863</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.813</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.687</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.650</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.475</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.450</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.575</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.425</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.387</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.363</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.363</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.337</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.337</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.175</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.325</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.313</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.225</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.763</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.200</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.200</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.163</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.150</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.237</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.150</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again using as a cut-off point a z score of -3.0 or below, the following objectives, in rank order, were found to be the least important among the 66 statements:

2.6 The program should build upon the realities of the immediate school community.
8.4 Regular, comprehensive, and continuous procedures should be developed for gathering evidence of significant growth in learning over time.
6.6 The social studies program should have available many kinds of work space to facilitate variation in the size of groups, the use of several kinds of media, and a diversity of tasks.
4.3 General statements of basic and long-range goals should be translated into more specific objectives conceived in terms of behavior and content.
7.1 Structure in the social studies program must help students organize their experiences to promote growth.
5.6 Activities should contribute to the students’ perception of teachers as fellow inquirers.
7.0 The Social Studies Program must facilitate the organization of experience.
3.8 The program must include a careful selection from the disciplines of that knowledge which is of most worth.
8.1 Evaluation should be based primarily on the school’s own statements of objectives as the criteria for effectiveness.

Next, an examination of the demographic data was conducted to look for any significant relationships between the priority Guideline statements the supervisors chose and various group membership variables. These possible relationships were tested by a series of multivariate analyses of variance. No relationship exists between the rankings and the following variables:

1. Employment status (full-time vs. part-time).
2. Teaching experience.
3. Control of budget for materials.
4. Control of budget for staff development.
5. Age.
7. Number of teachers supervisor works with.
8. Percent of time spent working directly with teachers.
DISCUSSION

The findings will be discussed in the two sections to follow. We will examine relationships between the highest and lowest ranked statements followed by a comparison of rankings in each of the nine categories.

A Comparison of the Highest and Lowest Ranking Guideline Statements

An examination of the highest and lowest ranking guideline statements produces no clear-cut patterns. The six highest ranking statements are drawn from categories 5, 1, and 7 with frequencies of three, two, and one respectively. The nine lowest ranking statements are drawn from categories 7, 8, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 with frequencies of two, two, and one for each of the remaining five. Thus no category dominated either the high or low ranking statements although categories 5 and 7 appear in both the high and low rankings.

Analysis shows that, in general, the top-rated statements are more global in nature while the lower rated statements, with the exception of 7.0, are more specific and task-oriented. Perhaps there is security in accepting broad, global statements but this security diminishes when specific implementation is denoted or implied. For example, the top-rated statement, 5.0 (learning activities should engage the student directly and actively in the learning process), is stated in rather global fashion while the low-rated 5.6 (activities should contribute to the students' perception of teachers as fellow inquirers), is a more specific attribute of the former. Another example is the highly-rated 7.2 (learning experiences should be organized in such a fashion that students will learn how to continue to learn) as compared with the low-rated 7.1 (structure in the social studies program must help organize their experiences to promote growth) which again seeks to implement the former.

It should also be noted that principles or trends exemplary of new social studies education are to be found in both the high and low ranking statements. For example, 1.4 (all students should have ample opportunity for social studies education at all grade levels, K-12) which is found among the six highly ranked statements is certainly a basic principle of the new social studies as is 2.6 (the program should build upon the realities of the immediate school community) which is found among the lowly ranked statements.

It would appear then that the supervisors place high priority on general or overarching statements while assigning a lower value to the specific implementations of these goals. The Q-sort measure does force choices and it appears that given those choices this sample elected global as opposed to specific statements to reflect their priorities in social studies curriculum development.
We will now examine more closely the relationships between and among each of the nine categories.

A Comparison of the Rankings of Each of the Nine Categories

If we then look at the rankings of the 66 statements above and below the mean several interesting clusters emerge. Statement items in categories 1 and 2 appear to be highly valued. All five statement items in category 1 were ranked above the mean as were six of eight of the statement items in category 2. Statement items in categories 7 and 8 were judged less desirable and fell below the mean. Four of the five statement items in category 7 and seven of the nine statement items in category 8 were ranked as having low priority. Statement items in categories 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9 had generally an equal number of items above and below the mean. We will now proceed with an analysis of the statement items ranked in each category.

Category 1 is the only one in which all statement items are ranked clearly above the mean. The category focuses upon the need for the social studies program to be closely related to student concerns. If there is any clearly agreed upon priority category, then it is this one. This in turn is closely followed by category 2 which focuses upon the need for programs to deal with the real world.

In category 2, an interesting paradox occurs. Dealing with the social world as it really is (2.0) as an active participant (2.7) ranked high while dealing with enduring social issues (2.2) and building upon the realities of the school community (2.6) ranked low. It would seem to these investigators that dealing actively with the social world would begin with one's own community.

In category 3, the development of methods of inquiry (3.2) drawing on all the social sciences (3.4) ranked high while emphasis on current concepts, principles, and theories in the social sciences (3.1) ranked low. These would seem to build upon one another yet the supervisors ranked them quite differently.

In category 4, the statement 4.0 (objectives should be thoughtfully selected and clearly stated in such form as to furnish direction to the program) was rated above the mean while statement 4.6 (objectives should be reconsidered and revised periodically) was rated below the mean. Again it would seem to these investigators that periodic revision is part of giving direction to the program.

Category 5, which has been discussed in some detail earlier, again ranks low students working in their own communities (5.4) as was the case in category 2. Social studies educators often cited this need in new social studies programs, building upon and getting students actively involved in their local communities. Yet the SSSA sample consistently ranks it low.
Also ranked below the mean in category 5 is 5.2 (activities should include formulating hypotheses and testing them by gathering and analyzing data). These activities are basic to new social studies curriculum and instruction. This is a major part of the development of inquiry methods rated high in category 3. A most interesting paradox yet it appears to follow the pattern discussed earlier of the highly rated statements generally being more global while the lower rated items were more specific implementations of the former.

In category 6, the use of a single textbook as the basic resource for a social studies program (6.1) and the use of multi-media resources (6.3) rank just below the mean while the use of a broad range of learning resources (6.0) including resource persons (6.4) is all ranked above the mean. Interestingly, 6.5 which deals with the use of the school and the community as a learning laboratory is also rated high. This is in contrast to statements in categories 2 and 5 which rank use of the community low.

In category 7, only one statement item is given very high priority organizing learning experiences so that students will develop long term learning skills (7.2). Low value is assigned to the remaining four category statements including relating social studies to other areas of experience (7.3), providing for program choice and flexibility (7.4) and the organization of experiences to promote growth (7.0, 7.1), the latter two falling into the very lowest ranked z score groups. Thus very low priority is assigned to social studies curricula facilitating the organization of one's learning experiences. Yet such organization is critical to the development of patterns of lifelong learning.

In category 8, high value is assigned to evaluation in all component areas of social studies education, not just knowledge (8.2) and the continuing evaluation of programmatic goals (8.8) while low priority was given to the seven remaining statements. Evaluation certainly is not a high priority category. Conventional wisdom would seem to support this although growing demands for greater accountability would seem to suggest the potential upgrading of this category.

In category 9, statement 9.3 (decisions about the basic purposes of social studies education in any school should be as clearly related to the needs of its immediate community as to those of society at large) ranks below the mean again. Thus in three out of four categories where use of the community is noted it is ranked below the mean. Category 9 statements calling for vigorous support of social studies education (9.0) including appropriate materials, instructional time and facilities (9.1), active participation of teachers in curriculum decision making (9.4) and regular teacher inservice all ranked high. These, again, are "secure" items to support, stated in their general fashion. Implementation may be another matter.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, dealing with student concerns (category 1) within the context of the real social world (category 2) are the highest priorities with the SSSA sample while the organization of learning experiences (category 7) and systematic, comprehensive evaluation are generally assigned low import. Within the other five categories no clear patterns emerge except that the need to link programs with and utilize the community rank low in three of four categories.

There is also no clear consistency when analyzing the ranking of statements which relate to general principles of new social studies curricula. For example, rather high value was given to drawing upon all social science disciplines (3.4) while very low value was assigned to selecting the knowledge of most worth from each discipline (3.8). These two statement items have to be linked to be functional yet are completely separated by the supervisors' rankings.

Finally, the supervisors generally attached more import to general or global statements and less import to specific implementations of these more general items.

The results of this study will be helpful to those engaged in curricular revision in the social studies. Supervisors or curriculum committees might wish to run this Q-sort task with the social studies teachers in their districts to see how they rank the Guideline objectives as compared to this national sample. Having a sample of students and parents do likewise would give one even further data to use in providing a basis for systematic change in social studies curricula.

In addition the NCSS is currently considering revision of the Guidelines Statement. The results of this study should prove helpful in their work. Any other feedback to the Council as to how and why educators are using the Guidelines as well as suggestions for revision would undoubtedly be appreciated.
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AN ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING SKILLS
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Many social studies educators have advocated the inclusion of higher level cognitive and affective objectives in classroom instruction as well as a variety of instructional activities to achieve these instructional objectives. Their views were reflected in several social studies education texts (e.g., Ehman, Mehlinger & Patrick, 1974, chapter 3; Fraenkel, 1973, chapter 1; Merwin, Schneider & Stephens, 1974, modules 1 & 4). In addition, most of these texts have considered content valid criterion measures as an integral part of social studies instruction (e.g., Ehman, Mehlinger & Patrick, 1974, chapters 9 & 10; Fraenkel, 1973, chapter 7; Merwin, Schneider & Stephens, 1974, modules 6 & 7).

If these views on appropriate social studies classroom instruction were incorporated into a teacher training program then the graduated trainees ought to teach for higher level cognitive and affective objectives, use a variety of activities to achieve these objectives, and use content valid criterion measures. One initial means to determine if a program affected the objectives, activities and criterion measures used by social studies teacher trainees would be to examine the written instructional units of these teacher trainees. It can be assumed that prior to teaching for higher level cognitive and affective objectives, use a variety of activities to achieve these objectives, and using content valid criterion measures social studies teacher trainees would be able to write instructional units which contained higher level cognitive and affective objectives, a variety of activities to achieve these objectives, and content valid criterion measures.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to analyze instructional units of social studies teacher trainees from educational institutions which had programs which advocated classroom instruction aimed for higher level cognitive and affective objectives, a variety of activities to achieve these objectives, and content valid criterion measures. The specific questions with which this study dealt were:

1. What levels of cognitive and affective objectives were written for social studies classroom instruction?
2. What kinds of activities were written to be used in achieving these stated objectives?
3. What were the objective-activity combinations written for social
studies classroom instruction?
4. What levels of cognitive and affective questions were used on the criterion measures written to evaluate social studies classroom instruction?

5. How many of the different cognitive and affective objectives written were tested on the criterion measures written to evaluate social studies classroom instruction?

METHODS

Data Collection

Sixty social studies teacher trainees from seven teacher education institutions in a southeastern state submitted instructional units for examination. These seven institutions had informed the researchers that they trained social studies teachers to plan for higher level cognitive and affective objectives, to use a variety of instructional activities to achieve planned objectives, and to develop content valid criterion measures. The average time spent in the methods courses (five quarter hours) on writing objectives and test items was 33 percent while the remaining 67 percent of class time was spent on examining alternative instructional activities. Each institution had informed its secondary social studies teacher trainees that it had entered into a statewide study of instructional units. The teacher trainees were told that as part of their student teaching assignment they were to prepare an instructional unit for a course and grade level taught. The instructional units contained the major daily objectives, learning activities and materials used to achieve these objectives, and the criterion measure used to evaluate the success of the unit. The teacher trainees were told that these units should reflect their best work.

Thirty-one of the 60 trainees taught grade 11 while the remaining 29 were dispersed between grades 8, 9, 10, and 12. The courses taught by the 60 trainees were government, civics, sociology, psychology, world geography, state history, world history, contemporary history, and American history. Sixteen trainees taught American history while the remaining 44 were dispersed among the other subject areas.

The instructional units were submitted to the trainee supervisors and forwarded to the researchers. To insure uniformity of material received, each teacher trainee received a form entitled “Classroom Record” on which was recorded the major instructional objectives and corresponding activities. This provided a means of examining the objective-activity combinations.

The study lasted for one spring academic quarter. Units were received from 60 of the 83 teacher trainees originally selected to participate in the study.
Data Analysis

Coding Data. Each instructional unit was coded on a form which contained spaces for each objective, related activity, and whether the objective was measured on the criterion measure. In addition, each criterion measure was coded separately to determine the cognitive and affective level of each question used. The objectives and criterion measure questions were coded using the following cognitive domain (Bloom, 1965) and affective domain (Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, 1964) scheme:

Cognitive Domain
1. Knowledge
2. Comprehension
3. Application
4. Analysis
5. Synthesis
6. Evaluation

Affective Domain
1. Receiving
2. Responding
3. Valuing
4. Organization
5. Characterization by a Value or Value Complex

The activities were coded using a modification of Dale's "Cone of Experiences" (Dale, 1969). Two of Dale's three major categories (Verbal and Visual experiences) were subdivided into the following activities:

Group Verbal Communication
1. Guest Speaker
2. Teacher-Student Discussion
3. Small Group Work

Individual Verbal Communication
1. Individual Work
2. Homework

Group Visual Communication
1. Movie-Television
2. Demonstrations

This final classification did not include Dale's third major category of Experiential experiences because the teacher trainees did not plan any activities which could be classified as Experiential.

Not all the objectives submitted could be classified using the procedures described above. Of the 678 objectives submitted, 143 had to be classified as Other. These Other objectives tended to be teaching procedures and not
objectives. The 535 codable objectives and their accompanying activities were placed in an objective-activity matrix. The questions on the criterion measures and the number of objectives tested or not tested were placed on a matrix which indicated the domain (cognitive or affective) and level within the domain of each question on the criterion measures as well as each question-objective match.

**Interrater Reliabilities.** Two raters classified each objective, activity, and criterion measure question. Six interrater reliability coefficients were obtained using the Interclass Correlation Formula developed by Ebel (1951). First, for the domain of instructional objectives (cognitive or affective) the interrater reliability coefficient was 1.00. For the coding of different levels of instructional objectives, the interrater reliability for coding the cognitive objectives to levels was .86 and the affective objectives to levels was .98. The interrater reliability for classifying activities was 1.00. The coding of cognitive level of criterion measure questions (all questions on criterion measures were in the cognitive domain) resulted in an interrater reliability of .96. The coding of instructional objective-criterion measure question matches was .85.

**FINDINGS**

**Planned Objectives and Activities**

**Objectives.** The column totals in Table 1 indicate that 365 objectives were low level cognitive (knowledge and comprehension), and only 114 objectives were high level cognitive (application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation). The remaining 56 objectives were in the affective domain of which 54 were low level (receiving and responding) and 2 were higher level (valuing, organization, and value complex). Therefore, the vast majority (476 or 90 percent) of the coded objectives were cognitive and 365 (76 percent) of the cognitive objectives were low level.

**Activities.** The row totals in Table 1 indicate the frequency of types of activities planned for achieving the 535 coded objectives. The greatest frequency for an activity was 322 for Teacher-Student Discussion. The activity related to verbal communication (Guest Speaker, Teacher-Student Discussion, Small Group Work, Individual Work, and Homework) accounted for 482 (91 percent) of all planned activities. The activities related to group participation (Guest Speaker, Teacher-Student Discussion, Small Group Work, Movies-Television, and Demonstrations) accounted for 499 (93 percent) of all planned activities. Finally, 446 (83 percent) of all planned activities consisted of group participation using verbal communication.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th></th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speaker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Student Discussion</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Work</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Work</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie-Television</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective-Activity Combinations. The individual cell totals in Table 1 depict the frequency of domain and level of objectives planned by type of activity planned to achieve the objectives. The largest cell total was 221 for cognitive knowledge objectives using Teacher-Student Discussion activities. Table 2 presents a collapsed version of Table 1 in which objectives were defined as low and high level within each domain by verbal and visual activities within group of individual type activities. Table 2 allowed for a better understanding of objective-activity combinations. The major combination (309 or 58 percent) was low level cognitive objectives planned to be achieved by group verbal communications. The largest affective objective-activity combination (33 or 59 percent) was low level affective objectives planned to be achieved by group verbal communications. Therefore, low level cognitive and affective objectives were planned to be achieved 342 times (82 percent) by group verbal communications. Also, 104 times (90 percent) high level cognitive and affective objectives were planned to be achieved by using group verbal communications.

Table 2: Condensed Frequency Distribution of Planned Objectives and Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Verbal Communication</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>(411)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Verbal Communication</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Visual</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>(479)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion Measures

Table 3 gives three types of information about the criterion measures used by the social studies teacher trainees. In the first column, the 1,036 questions used on the criterion measures were classified according to domain and level of question. The second column presents the number of planned instructional objectives tested classified according to domain and level of question. The final column indicates the number of planned instructional objectives not tested classified according to domain and level of question.

The overwhelming majority (1,020 or 98 percent) of the questions used on the criterion measures (first column) were cognitive knowledge level. There were no affective level questions used on the criterion measures. Of the 1,036 questions, only 432 (see note on Table 3) were related to planned unit objectives.

Table 3: Analysis of Criterion Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All* Questions</th>
<th>Objectives Tested</th>
<th>Objectives Not Tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Complex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some objectives were tested more than once. Of the 1,036 criterion measure questions, a total of 432 were related to planned unit objectives.
instructional objectives. Of the 535 planned instructional objectives, only 327 (second column) were tested. The vast majority (311 or 95 percent) of these tested planned instructional objectives were cognitive knowledge level. Comparing the second and third columns in Table 3 demonstrated that of the 324 planned cognitive knowledge level objectives, 311 (96 percent) were tested. However, of the 211 remaining planned objectives, only 16 (8 percent) were tested.

Using the number of questions related to objectives as a guide (432/1,036), the content validity of the criterion measures can be said to be .42. Using the number of objectives tested on the criterion measures as a guide (327/535), the content validity of the criterion measures can be said to be .61. In either case, the overall content validity of the criterion measures was rather low.

**DISCUSSION**

It would not be unusual to find social studies classrooms where the major objectives were low level cognitive, the major activities were group verbal activities, or that the criterion measures were not content valid. Previous studies have shown that classrooms have been such places (e.g., Adams & Biddle, 1970; Bellack, Klieberd, Hyman & Smith, 1966; Davis & Tensley, 1967; Good & Brophy, 1973; Hudgins, 1971). What is unusual is that social studies teacher trainees plan this type of classroom instruction. This is especially true because previous studies have shown that teacher education programs have an effect on behavior (e.g., Borg, Langer & Gall, 1970; Good & Brophy, 1974); and the 60 trainees were “volunteers” (60 out of 83), were informed of the purpose of the study, and were asked to return a unit that represented their best work.

This study did not attempt to uncover why these social studies teacher trainees planned for classroom instruction to be low level cognitive achieved by group verbal communication and to use criterion measures unrelated to planned objectives. However, a number of plausible explanations are advanced about the results of this study which need to be examined in order to determine why the teacher education programs had so little effect on the instructional planning skills of their trainees.

First, the planned classroom instruction for low level cognitive objectives to be achieved by group verbal communications may be the result of beliefs developed by modeling classroom instruction these social studies teacher trainees experienced during their schooling. On the other hand, the planned classroom instruction may be the result of modeling the environment of the cooperating teacher or school dictated curriculum. Yet, this type of planned classroom instruction may be the result of these social studies teacher trainees’ assessment of what students need. Or, these social studies teacher
trainees simply cannot plan classroom instruction for higher level cognitive and affective objectives to be achieved by varied activities because they did not have the cognitive ability to do so.

Second, the apparent failure to make classroom instruction criterion referenced (i.e., evaluation based on content valid criterion measures) might be the result of the criterion measures actually reflecting the "true" objectives of classroom instruction while planned objectives did not. In contrast, social studies teacher trainees might not believe that classroom instruction needed to be criterion referenced. Or, these social studies teacher trainees did not have the cognitive skill to make criterion measures which related to planned objectives and thus have content validity.

Whatever the reason or reasons, this study indicated that certain features of the instructional planning skills of social studies teacher trainees did not reflect the type of instructional planning (objective-activity-evaluation relationship) for which the participating teacher education institutions trained. Some changes in program learning experiences seem warranted after investigating the reasons why the programs had such little effect. Further, other institutions with similar program goals should investigate their teacher trainees to ascertain whether their teacher trainees are similar or different from the sixty teacher trainees in the study. These other teacher education institutions may need to investigate the same reasons for the ineffectiveness of their teacher training programs on instructional planning skills.

REFERENCES


Merwin, W., Schneider, D., and Stephens, L., *Developing Competency in Teaching Secondary Social Studies* (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1974).
TEACHING ABOUT SCIENCE AND SOCIETY: MORAL JUDGMENT AND THE PRISONER'S DILEMMA
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INTRODUCTION

In an article titled "The Tragedy of the Commons," Garrett Hardin (1968) outlined the general scenario for a class of social question that appears on the surface to be scientific, but which he recognized to have deeper social and moral overtones.

The commons, or village green, was a pasture owned mutually by all members of rural English villages. The scenario presented by Hardin contains the classic Malthusian principle, central to the science of ecology: as the population of grazing animals increases it must eventually reach the carrying capacity of the pasture. At this point the individual is tempted to add another animal and overgraze the commons, gaining greatly at the cost of smaller losses to each neighbor. The decision is more often based upon economic or socio-moral considerations than the fact that such actions will ultimately destroy the commons.

Obvious contemporary examples of this dilemma are the pollution of our air and water, but many more subtle instances could be cited. Proposed solutions are more often social than scientific. Economists, for example, argue that society should require payment for the "external" costs that arise from the use of mutually owned resources. What is extremely important is Harden's assertion that these problems have no technical solution, and can only be resolved by "mutual coercion, mutually agreed upon." The implications of this statement would seem to require new approaches by educators who wish to deal with science-related social issues in the classroom.

This study is an analysis of a simulation, the Prisoner's Dilemma, which may be useful in such a context. In form, the simulation seems to replicate exactly the situation described by Hardin, and a variation called "Shepherd's Fleece" has been constructed which is parallel in almost all respects. In classroom use, this simulation is quite similar to the moral dilemmas used by Lawrence Kohlberg in assessing levels of moral reasoning.

Prisoner's Dilemma is the generic name for a variety of simulations with very carefully defined structure. In its most familiar form, the simulation involves two suspects apprehended by the police near the scene of a crime. Each is approached in confidence by the prosecutor and asked to confess.
The payoff, which depends upon the decisions of both players, is as follows:

1) If neither confesses, both will get light sentences, because the only evidence is circumstantial;
2) If both confess, they will get moderate sentences;
3) If only one confesses, he will get a suspended sentence, while his confederate who remained silent will be punished heavily.

The matrix for constructing such a simulation is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cooperate</th>
<th>Defect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player B</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defect</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where R is the reward for mutual cooperation and P the penalty for mutual defection, T the payoff to the person who was tempted, and S the sucker's reward. The rules for construction of the simulation require that:

\[ T > R > P > S \]

The general elements of this dilemma are immediately obvious. Although both players benefit more from mutual cooperation than from mutual defection, a player who defects in the face of cooperation wins, while the opponent loses heavily. The problem may be seen even more clearly in the case of the extensive studies by Rapoport (Rapoport and Chammah, 1965) where subjects were asked merely whether they wished to cooperate or defect, and paid on the basis of their winnings in the game. However, the elements of this contrived experimental situation are identical, both fiscally and morally, to those faced either by the eighteenth century user of the village green or the modern driver of a large automobile.

In analyzing this simulation in game-theoretic terms, Rapoport suggests that the sophisticated player has little choice other than the defecting move. Faced with the probability that the opponent also understands the situation, as would be the case in playing against a computer, the defecting move becomes a mini-max solution that yields the greater possible reward. In real life, this corresponds to the idea that everyone else will pollute regardless of what I do, so why should I bear the extra cost? But other factors are also important to human beings, which is what makes this simulation so interesting. In particular, it has been suggested that individuals who operate at higher levels of moral reasoning will be more likely to play the chancy, but potentially rewarding, cooperative move in the Prisoner's Dilemma (Raser, 1969).
Moral reasoning is usually thought of as an example of cognitive development such as has been described by Piaget (Inhelder and Piaget, 1958). Modern theories of developmental moral reasoning grow from Piaget's pioneering work (Piaget, 1965), in which moral reasoning is defined as reasoning about the structure of rules. Based upon extensive studies where subjects are asked to describe their reasoning about the solutions to moral dilemmas, Kohlberg (Kohlberg and Gilligan, 1971) has shown an age-related development in moral judgment. Turiel (1973) describes the characteristics of successively more sophisticated levels of moral reasoning:

1) Preconventional: at this level the child is responsible to cultural rules and labels of good and bad, right and wrong, but interprets these labels in terms either of the physical or the hedonistic consequences of action (punishment, reward, exchange of favors), or in terms of the physical power of those who enunciate the rules and labels;

2) Conventional: at this level maintaining the expectations of the individual’s family, group or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of conformity to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it, of actively maintaining, supporting and justifying the order and of identifying with the persons or group involved in it;

3) Postconventional, autonomous, or principled: at this level there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles which have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups.

Research by Kuhn, Langer and Kohlberg (1971) indicates that only 10 percent of the adult population in America reasons at principled moral levels. Developmental theory suggests that intervention leading to what Piaget has called “disequilibrium” can produce movement to higher levels of cognitive development and, although “cognitive maturity is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for moral judgment maturity” (Kohlberg and Gilligan, 1971), such intervention might also be expected to raise levels of moral judgment. Indeed, Blatt and Kohlberg (1975) have shown classroom discussion of moral dilemmas to be an effective technique in this respect.

This analysis would seem to suggest that Prisoner’s Dilemma, if thought of as a dilemma requiring moral choice, might prove a useful vehicle for dealing with an important class of social problem in the classroom. This is an exploratory study of Prisoner’s Dilemma in such a context, and attempts to answer two questions.
The first is related to the general skepticism of many educators toward the behavior of students in simulation games. One major objection is that the link between personality variables and actual behavior is uncertain. It is important to demonstrate that participants in simulations exhibit behavior different than the highly artificial and conforming type that is so often typical of the classroom. The studies cited earlier lead to a particular prediction, that the level of moral judgment of the individual will be reflected in simulation behavior, and that subjects operating at higher levels of moral reasoning will prefer to cooperate in the Prisoner's Dilemma.

The second is more straightforward, and grows directly from previous moral reasoning research. If discussion of moral dilemmas is effective in raising levels of moral reasoning, then simulations that involve moral issues should have similar effects. This leads to a prediction that repeated simulation gaming in the Prisoner's Dilemma format will raise levels of moral judgment among participants.

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE**

As an exploration of the use of Prisoner's Dilemma in the classroom, this study was conducted in two parts. The first group of subjects consisted of 18 graduate students in elementary education, and the second of 36 high school senior physics students.

The first scenario used with both groups was titled "Shepherd's Fleece." This simulation requires a decision of whether or not to overgraze a small summer range in Grand Teton National Park. The payoff for this game is as follows:

1) If both ranchers limit their flocks to 100 sheep, each will receive $50 per fleece, the maximum possible, or a total of $5,000 at the end of the summer;
2) If both increase their flocks to 200 sheep, the resulting overgrazing will yield only $20 per fleece, a profit of $4,000 for each rancher;
3) If one doubles his flock (200 sheep) while the other does not (100 sheep), the moderate overgrazing yields $30 per fleece. In this case one rancher would net $6,000 and the other only $3,000.

As an introduction to the simulation, subjects were asked to read a scenario describing the situation faced by two ranchers, Hatfield and McCoy, and a discussion was conducted to make sure that is was understood. Subjects were also given the following matrix, which conforms exactly to the rules for construction of Prisoner's Dilemma:
Players were asked to choose a partner and sit with their backs to one another. It was made clear that no talking was allowed, and that neither player would have prior knowledge of the other's choice (a necessary condition of Prisoner's Dilemma). The scenario included this rule of the game in stating that neither rancher would have full knowledge of the other's action until their sheep had been removed from the range at the end of the summer. Play consisted of simultaneously exchanging slips of paper upon which each subject had written either "100" or "200." Each subject recorded the result after each exchange on a score sheet, and totalled the winnings for himself and his opponent at the end of the game.

Each simulation consisted of twenty exchanges between participants, with a discussion after the tenth exchange (first half-game) and a debriefing after the twentieth (second half-game). The discussion after the first half-game was confined to clarifying any details of the scenario or rules of the game. The debriefing ranged widely, and included both the moral issues in the scenario and the behavior of individual participants.

The high school group played only "Shepherd's Fleece." The college group experienced four additional simulations, for a total of five over a period of five weeks. The additional simulations used with the college students contained issues of energy utilization, population control, abortion and the social responsibility of scientists. Later scenarios used with the college group were quite complex, and involved payoff structures that were more subjective than the simple rewards or punishments of Prisoner's Dilemma or "Shepherd's Fleece."

The Defining Issues Test (DIT) was administered to all subjects as a pre-test, and scores are used as a dependent variable in comparison to the behavior of all subjects in "Shepherd's Fleece." The DIT was also administered as a post-test to the college group, which experienced the intervention of repeated simulations, so that growth in moral reasoning could be assessed.

The Defining Issues Test is a measure of moral judgment developed by James Rest (Rest, et al., 1974). The DIT contains a series of moral dilemmas similar to those used by Kohlberg, followed by stage-typed statements. The subject is asked to identify from these the four most important considerations in arriving at the solution to each dilemma, and
to rank order them from most to least important. These scores are then weighed and converted into a percentage preference for preconventional, conventional and principled statements.

Rest (Rest, et al., 1974) considers the Kohlberg procedure for assessing level of moral reasoning suspect. He states that:

Kohlberg’s method of moral judgment assessment produces material that is not strictly comparable from subject to subject; the assessments are vulnerable to interviewer and scorer biases; and scoring the material involves complex interpretations and rather great inferential leaps from the data. The test-retest reliability in several studies has been poor.

Rest reports that, for a sample of 28 ninth graders, a test-retest Pearson correlation of .81 was achieved for the P index of the Defining Issues Test. Kohlberg normally does not report reliabilities for his measures, and relies instead upon evidence that they reveal age-related developmental patterns. For senior high school students, Rest found a correlation of .67 between age and P-score, which he takes as evidence that the DIT measures moral development. For a sample of 47 subjects ranging from high school to graduate school, a comparison was made between the P-score on the DIT and stage scores using Kohlberg’s procedure:

The correlation was .68, not high enough to regard the two measures as equivalent tests; nevertheless this correlation is the highest correlation of Kohlberg’s measure with any other measure that we are aware of for a sample of at least this size.

There is a good deal of discussion in the literature over the issue of the use of Kohlberg’s interview procedure or the more mechanistic DIT in assessing levels of moral reasoning. Certainly, the clinical interview technique used by Piaget and elaborated by Kohlberg is more fruitful in developing theories of moral reasoning, and should be the technique of choice in such studies. However, the DIT is the only measure of moral reasoning available that allows a rapid evaluation in studies of this sort, which are more concerned with using Kohlberg’s results in developing instructional strategies than in continuing his important research. Because it parallels Kohlberg’s work so carefully, and because of serious questions regarding the reliability of the clinical interview technique, the DIT seems the measure of preference for this type of study.

An independent measure of game behavior proved very difficult to define. This results from the fact that a participant’s choice is very heavily affected by the opponent’s action in the previous exchange. Only one variable, the initiation of the first defecting move in a half-game, allowed a clear description of game behavior. This is a very stringent definition,
which requires that all subjects used in the analysis must be assigned into one of two categories:

1) Cooperators: Those who never initiate the first defecting more in a half-game, and;
2) Defectors: Those who always initiate the first defecting move in a half-game.

Assignment to these two groups was based upon play in the first simulation, “Shepherd’s Fleece.” Surprisingly, in spite of the stringent requirement that, in order to be included, a subject must either never or always initiate the first defection in both half-games, 34 subjects fell within these categories. These included 15 defectors and 19 cooperators, with 14 from the college and 20 from the high school groups (Figure 1). The remaining subjects were excluded on the grounds that they could not be assigned to either class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cooperators</th>
<th>Defectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Number of High School and College Subjects as Cooperators and Defectors

The two variables used in this analysis, then, are the dichotomy of cooperation or defection, and DIT scores reflecting a percentage preference for preconventional, conventional, and principled moral reasoning. A statistical re-statement of the hypotheses of this study takes the following form:

1) Subjects who initiate the first defection in neither half-game of “Shepherd’s Fleece” will show a higher preference for principled moral reasoning as measured by the DIT than those who initiate the first definition in both half-games, and;
2) Subjects who have experienced repeated simulation gaming in the Prisoner’s Dilemma format will show an increase in preference for principled moral reasoning as measured by the DIT.

The first hypothesis can be tested for both the college and high school groups, based upon play in “Shepherd’s Fleece.” The second can be tested only for the college group, which includes the only subjects who experienced repeated simulations.
RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The first analysis, a comparison of mean scores for cooperators and defectors (Student's T, two-tailed), shows significant differences in scores on the DIT. The first hypothesis can be accepted. Cooperators exhibit greater preference for principled reasoning, and defectors for preconventional reasoning. The magnitude and direction of these results are consistent across both the high school and college samples (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Defectors</th>
<th>Cooperators</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 15)</td>
<td>(n = 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean (S.D.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean (S.D.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Principled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>36.7 (9.7)</td>
<td>42.6 (14.9)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>32.6 (16.2)</td>
<td>44.6 (7.8)</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.6 (14.6)</td>
<td>43.4 (12.2)</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>48.0 (18.6)</td>
<td>41.1 (22.9)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>48.1 (12.8)</td>
<td>51.7 (9.6)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48.1 (14.0)</td>
<td>45.3 (19.0)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pre-Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.6 (5.1)</td>
<td>1.6 (2.9)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>10.4 (10.3)</td>
<td>1.3 (1.4)</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.9 (9.4)</td>
<td>1.5 (2.3)</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05  
** p ≤ .01

This would seem to suggest that the link between personality variables and behavior, at least in the artificial setting of the classroom, is stronger than often accepted. There is no question, at least, that the level of a subject's moral reasoning is reflected in game play, and in the direction predicted by theory.

As an individual matures, moral reasoning shifts from forms which reflect self-interest to those of group conformity, and finally to statements of universal ethical principles. In this study, subjects who were consistently tempted to choose the personally rewarding option of defection also
displayed greater preferences for pre-conventional reasoning, a form of hedonistic instrumentalism designed to achieve the greatest immediate personal reward. On the other hand, subjects who were inclined to cooperate also showed a greater preference for principled reasoning.

The second hypothesis is tested by comparing mean pre- and post-test scores on the DIT for the college group. Although this comparison revealed increases in average levels of moral reasoning, with increases in preference for principled, and decreases in conventional reasoning, statistical significance cannot be attached to the differences, and the hypothesis must be rejected (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Conv.</td>
<td>% Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21.6)</td>
<td>(13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21.0)</td>
<td>(19.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, future researchers must keep two points in mind regarding this result. The number of subjects involved in this analysis was small, and increases in the direction predicted by theory were observed. More important, this increase was not evenly distributed within the sample. The score for principled judgment of four subjects rose by nearly twice as much as the variation in score of any other subject, either above or below their post-test score. Presumably, the observed increase in mean scores for the sample resulted mainly from the dramatic gains made by this small number of individuals.

The results of this study fail to support a hypothesis that an intervention can lead to higher levels of moral reasoning. However, they do suggest the value of further investigation. Stage theory in developmental psychology predicts that some individuals will be in "transition" while others will be firmly placed in a stage. Intervention might be expected to alter the level of reasoning of subjects in transition, and such an explanation could account for the relatively large gains in moral reasoning on the part of a small number of the college subjects in this study.
DISCUSSION

Since 1956-57, when the topic of the 27th yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) was *Science and the Social Studies*, there has been sporadic interest in teaching about science and social issues. The February, 1975, issue of *Social Education* was devoted to this topic, and a joint committee of NCSS and the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) is charged with its consideration. More recently, a special interest group of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) was formed to study teaching about science-related social issues. Still, after twenty years of apparent interest in this subject, little progress has been made either in research or curriculum development.

Growth of our modern, techno-scientific society will continue to present dilemmas which, if Hardin’s analysis is correct, have no technical solutions. The SST, Red Dye No. 2, saccharin and nuclear power are only the most obvious examples. The format of simulation gaming is particularly attractive to the educator who wishes to develop the subtle interplay between social and scientific considerations in such situations.

Teachers are often unwilling to move into the area of values activities for two reasons. First, they are wedded to the transmission of traditional content, and such methods are rarely framed in contexts which clearly relate to their specific teaching objectives. Second, they do not feel that student responses are related to real attitudes, values, or other basic personality characteristics, or that such activities might have clear and valid results.

Although only one of the many types of simulation games, Prisoner’s Dilemma is unique in its structure, which can be so clearly shown to be related to specific content in both science and the social studies. As re-constructed in the scenarios of “Shepherd’s Fleece” and other science-related dilemmas, it has proven extremely attractive to teachers. Aside from any other results of this study, Prisoner’s Dilemma has pedagogical value to the extent that it is widely acceptable and scenarios can be easily constructed around a variety of issues.

The second issue is perhaps a more serious one. Available research indicates that few among the adult population are reasoning in the most appropriate fashion about contemporary social issues. Before schools will accept the development of moral reasoning as a legitimate objective, its importance must be made evident, and proof must be given that specific educational programs can have the desired effect. This study does not directly answer such a question, but may point the way for future research in what is probably one of the most important problems presently facing science and social educators.
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INTRODUCTION

Throughout our nation's history many scholars, educators and politicians have placed great faith in education as a means of creating a better and more perfect democracy. They have expected schools to prepare young people intellectually, psychologically, and emotionally for their roles as democratic citizens. According to such thinkers, the public schools must help students develop these social competencies, analytical skills, and personal feelings of efficacy characteristic of responsible, democratic citizens.

The development of political efficacy, in particular, has underpinned several prescriptive writings on citizenship education. One common assumption made by advocates of a vibrant civic education is that the acquisition of political efficacy—the feeling that an individual can influence the government—must be transmitted to the student, somehow, in the school (Newmann, 1975; Massialas, 1972; Cleary, 1971; Gibson, 1969; Mahoney, 1945). Likewise, various educators and scholars have given strong support to the particular idea of student participation in school management.

The rationale for encouraging students to participate in the decision-making processes of their schools is expressed in two different ways: (1) Such participation is educative and will lead to political participation in the future, and ultimately, to a more active citizenry; (2) In the absence of such participation, students in their immediate environment will develop attitudes of political cynicism and futility, leading to undesirable behaviors on the part of adolescents in our society.

The first position is frequently derived from the now seminal study of Almond and Verba, *The Civic Culture* (1965). This study found that individuals in five nations who had participated in family and school decision-making, and in decision-making at their work place, were more likely than others to participate in politics (1965:271-272). More recent research, however, has challenged this “transference model” which suggests that the experiences that youngsters have in their pre-adult institutions somehow determine how they will relate to authority in later years (Takei, and Kleiman, 1976; Jaros and Kolson, 1974). Moreover, to test this proposition requires longitudinal studies which, given the nature
of social science research in his society, are usually not feasible (Crain, 1976).

PURPOSE

It is the second proposition, then, that will be the focus of this essay, for it is based on a more testable assumption: that at a given point in their lives, individuals will feel politically efficacious to the extent that they are made to feel involved in the decisions that directly affect them. It is my hypothesis that high school students situated in schools which solicit and encourage their input into school decision-making will reflect higher levels of political interest, political trust, social integration, and political efficacy than will students in more authoritarian schools. I hypothesize, further, that such attitudes will be reflected in reference to the school as well as in reference to the society at large.

OTHER STUDIES

Several observers of American schools have maintained that these institutions are blatantly undemocratic in both structure and operation (Task Force '74, 1975; Weinstock, 1973; Gorman, 1972; Danforth and Ford Foundations, 1970; Silberman, 1970). The concern of this particular study, however, is with those projects which have isolated and measured differing kinds of school structures, as well as the impact of such structures on the political attitudes and behaviors of high school students.

During the mid-1960's, Hoy, Willover, and Eidell adopted the concepts of "humanism" and "custodialism" to depict contrasting types of ideologies and the school climates they seek to rationalize and legitimize (Rafaledes and Hoy, 1971). Their characterization can be summarized in two general orientations (1971:102).

The Custodial Orientation

This is the traditional high school which provides a rigid and highly controlled setting concerned primarily with the maintenance of order. Students are stereotyped in terms of their appearance, behavior, and parents' social status. Teachers who hold a custodial orientation conceived of a school as an autocratic organization with a rigid pupil-teacher status hierarchy: the flow of power is unilateral and downward. Students must accept the decision of teachers without question. Students are perceived as irresponsible and undisciplined persons who must be controlled through punitive sanctions.
The Humanistic Orientation

The school is conceived of as an educational community in which students learn through cooperative interaction and experience. Learning and behavior are viewed in psychological and sociological terms rather than normative ones. Self-discipline is substituted for strict teacher control. The humanistic orientation leads teachers to desire a democratic atmosphere with its attendant flexibility in status and roles, sensitivity to others, and increased student self-determination.

Rafaledes and Hoy visited 45 high schools of various sizes and communities, and administered the Pupil Control Ideology Form to nearly 3,000 teachers and 8,000 students (1971:106). Their findings were clear: Students in the "custodial" schools were far more likely to exhibit feelings of alienation (measured in terms of Seeman's categories) than were students in "humanistic" schools (1971:106). Regarding the high correlation between "custodialism" and student perceived powerlessness, the authors said that in custodial schools, "The 'system' seemed to be perceived by students as a rigid and impersonal authority structure over which they had little control" (1971:106).

In his 1970 study of ten senior high schools that had been disrupted by protests or riots, and that were located in seven different states, Wittes concluded that the school climate has a profound impact on the development of students' beliefs in internal control: the belief that rewards and punishments are contingent upon one's own behavior, and not controlled by outside forces over which one has no control (Wittes, 1972). The schools in which the highest feelings of internal control were reported exhibited two characteristics: (a) students had some decision-making power; (b) students knew exactly how much power they had—the lines of authority were clear (1972:115). The second point is crucial, as Wittes remarks, because students find it difficult to control that which is unpredictable (as is often the case in "alternative schools"). Wittes says that a feeling of internal control is crucial to the development of democratic attitudes and behaviors, because in the absence of this feeling students become frustrated and alienated, and frequently engage in violence and vandalism as a response to their felt impotence (1972:117).

In their 1971 study of high school students participating in the Close Up Program, Grove, Remy and Zeigler found that the variable of "educational climate" (defined as the student's affective attitudes toward school) correlated much more strongly with student "dissent" (defined as alienation or activism) than did the variable of "political ideology" (defined as the student's categorization of American society as elitist, pluralistic, or democratic) (1974:268).
The Ehman-Gillespie Framework and Findings

Of all the studies reviewed, the work of Ehman and Gillespie most clearly formulates a methodology of viewing schools in political terms. Using an Eastonian approach,¹ they define politics as those activities through which values are authoritatively allocated in a society (1974:1). Major allocational activities and behaviors, then, become the focus of research; such activities include political decision-making, political leadership, political participation, political influence, and political communication (1974:2).

Using these variables, Gillespie and Ehman identify five kinds of school political systems: elite, bureaucratic, coalitional, participant, and directed participant (1974:1-10). Below is a description of the elite, bureaucratic, coalitional, participant, and directed participant models.

**Elite:** The principal and other leaders in the system use force—disciplinary threats on job security, etc.—to mobilize individual and group activity. Decisions are made by the elite. Participation in political leadership is selective and based on the appointment of the leadership. Most communication is restricted to decision-makers and passed indirectly to most teachers and students.

**Bureaucratic:** The principal and other leaders use the authority of their position to mobilize individual and group activity. Decisions are made according to a vote of participants. Participation in political decision-making depends solely on one's position in the hierarchy. Communication is restricted to decision-makers, but advice from other groups is sought.

**Coalitional:** The principal and other leaders represent various interests and use the advocacy of that interest to mobilize individual and group activity. Decisions are made by coalitions of interests achieving a majority. Participation is open and people generally join groups in which their interests are served. Communication is largely within groups, but bargaining goes on between groups forming coalitions.

**Participant:** The principal and other leaders use a variety of political resources—ideas, skills, monetary promises—in order to mobilize individual and group activity. Decisions are made according to a rough majority or consensus rule. Participation in decision-making is voluntary and depends on the particular interests of the participants. Communication between administrators, teachers and students is constant.

**Directed Participant:** Promises for student participation have not materialized; a high degree of direction by teachers and administrators still exists.

---

¹ For the purposes of this discussion, an Eastonian approach refers to the work of E. H. Carr, who emphasized the role of power and politics in the formation of international relations. The term "Eastonian" is used here as a shorthand reference to this approach, but the specific application in the text is a critique of the work of Ehman and Gillespie.
Guided by these kinds of paradigms, Ehman and Gillespie attempted to assess the exact relationship between the "hidden curriculum," the structure and process of a school, and the attitudes and/or behaviors of students situated in that school (1974a). The attitudes they examined were political interest, political trust, social integration, and political confidence. They measured student attitudes on each variable (interest, trust, integration, and confidence) with regard to the student’s own school and with regard to society at large.

The attitudinal variables were given specific definitions, as follows (1974a:30-31):

**Political Interest:** The set of beliefs that predisposes people to “respond favorably to the political features of their environment.”

**Political Trust:** The belief that human behavior is governed, at least in part, by positive motivations, such as justice or fairness.

**Social Integration:** The set of beliefs that predispose people to associate with others in their environment, and not to feel cut off from that environment.

**Political Confidence:** The belief that one’s actions can have an impact on political affairs, and that one has some control over his or her own environment.

Thus, two sets of questionnaires were administered to high school students: one asking them for their perceptions of the power structures in their schools and the other asking them for their attitudes on the four variables mentioned above. The researchers’ task, then, was to measure the correlations between structure and attitude. In terms of structure, the researchers surveyed 13 high schools and found three elite, four bureaucratic, four coalitional, one participant, and one directed participant school (1974a:46). They found “interpretable patterns” (or correlations) between school political types and student attitudes with reference to their schools. Their most significant finding was that political confidence and trust in others are strikingly high in the participant school. As they conclude (1974a:46):

Our study demonstrates that schools have general bureaucratic patterns of everyday political life which can be easily demonstrated. However, underlying this basic characterization, five different types of political systems can be found. The underlying characteristics of schools are not only different, but they seem to make a significant difference in the attitudes of students toward political participation and their political environment. Generally, students in schools with bureaucratic and directed participant patterns of political life tend
to have much more negative attitudes toward politics. They are less integrated, trusting, and confident than other students.

A STUDY OF MASSACHUSETTS HIGH SCHOOLS

The study reported in this paper sought to utilize the Ehman-Gillespie model in an analysis of high schools in the State of Massachusetts. The author sought answers to the following questions: (a) Do schools, in fact, approximate the elite, bureaucratic, coalitional, participant, and directed participant paradigms developed by Ehman and Gillespie? (b) To what extent are differences in the amount of power given to students a reflection of the socio-economic status of the community? (c) Are differences in the structure of schools, in fact, important in terms of the political development of students? (d) Do participant school structures somehow induce feelings of political efficacy among students? (e) Is the dimension of school structure more consequential than the formal social studies course offerings in fostering efficacious attitudes?

To gain this information, the author, during the spring and fall of 1975 and the spring of 1976, visited high schools in the State of Massachusetts which appeared to be different in many respects. Two sets of questionnaires were administered to students at each school. A total of 143 students responded to the first questionnaire on school structure, and 168 to the second on political attitudes. This was not a purely random sample, since arrangements had to be made in advance and since the researcher stipulated that the students had to be currently enrolled in at least one social studies class. Moreover, almost all of the respondents were sophomores and older; only in one school (School C) were freshmen included in the survey. In addition, lengthy interviews were conducted with social studies teachers and chairpersons at each school.

The information will be presented in the following format: (a) a brief description of the schools in terms of their administrative structures, as perceived by the author from his impressionistic conclusions and from his talks with teachers, students, and officials; (b) a presentation of the data gathered from questionnaires; (c) a discussion regarding the comparisons and contrasts among the five schools; and (d) conclusions.

THE SCHOOLS

At the outset it should be noted that Massachusetts has a somewhat unique formal arrangement to facilitate student participation in educational decision-making. In 1971, the Massachusetts State Legislature established the Student Advisory Council to the State Board of Education. The members of the Council are elected by eleven regional student councils
throughout the state, and the chairperson of the State Advisory Council serves a one year term as a full voting member of the State Board of Education. Thus, on the state level, students have a significant impact on the policies that determine the nature and content of their education.4

At the local level, each school is supposed to elect a student advisory committee to meet regularly (twice a month) with the local school committee. As of May, 1976, however, only 125 out of 450 school committees in the state had actually established student advisory committees.4 And even when the committees had been established they have relatively little influence, due to a great deal of ambiguity in the minds of the students at large regarding the role of the advisory committees vis a vis the local student councils.

School A

School A is a large high school of approximately 3,800 students; the school is situated in an urban, predominantly white, lower-middle and middle class community. The city is 97 percent white and its inhabitants have a median education of 12.2 years and a median annual income of $11,150 (Massachusetts Department of Commerce, 1973).

Administration. This is a traditional high school whose administration is dominated by a relatively impervious headmaster. Beneath him are four submasters in charge of discipline and four who deal with curricular matters. It is the four submasters charged with discipline with whom students interact most frequently. These men resolve school problems, such as vandalism (which costs School A $50,000 a year), truancy, and smoking, and they usually do so in a highly punitive manner. In general, the attitude toward students is a disparaging one and the “keep them in line mentality” is immediately evident. In this sense, the school typifies the modus operandi of “silence” and “a lack of motion” depicted by Silberman (1970:91).

Students at School A are highly apathetic. Even the ambitious, college-bound students seem to withdraw from the political arena. This is partly attributable to the fact that they come from apolitical homes, and partly to the insouciance of the administration toward most student proposals and protests. One student compared his experience with the administration—one of the discipline submasters—to “running into a brick wall.”

In other respects, School A seems to resemble the ELITE paradigm developed above. Rarely do students participate in school decision-making, and communications flow downward from the headmaster, as do instructions, directives, and requests. For example, the students were more surprised than anybody else at the school when they found out one day that an open campus policy now prevailed at their school.
School B

Although this school closely resembles School A in its formal administrative structure, there is a qualitatively different climate at the school, a climate characterized by liberalization and openness. This high school has 2,100 students and is situated in a predominantly white, upper-middle class suburban town, about ten miles outside of Boston. In Community B, the median number of school years completed by persons 25 years or older is 14.5, the median annual income $15,600 and the occupational structure preponderantly professional (37 percent) and white collar (40 percent).

Administration. The sense of openness alluded to transcends the official administrative arrangements of the school which, as mentioned, resemble those of School A. At the pinnacle of power is the principal and under him are two vice principals, one for discipline and student affairs, the other for business and budgetary matters. Beneath these people are departmental heads and housemasters, and beneath them teachers and students. The housemasters have frequent contact with students and are, generally, less punitive than are their counterparts in School A. The administration at this school has successfully implemented open campus and arena scheduling into the school and both operate smoothly. In general, there is more trust regarding the students and less of the “keep them in line” mentality.

The picture is not all idyllic, however, because of a recent experience. The most explosive issue in School B in recent months (spring, 1975) has been the question of smoking in school. (In fact, this was true at most schools the author visited.) Students, teachers, and some administrators at the school collectively supported a proposal which would have allowed the designation of certain areas of the school building for smoking. In spite of considerable student interest in this issue, a recalcitrant superintendent in collaboration with a five-member school board vetoed every smoking proposal that surfaced.6 Hence, students in School B, at the time of the author’s visit, were perhaps more “alienated” from the administrative process than usual. Subsequent to the superintendent’s veto, students approached the principal of their school and he did next to nothing. Graphically, one student referred to the whole experience as “running into a pillow.” This indicates a more flexible situation than that depicted in School A (“running into a brick wall”), but the result in both cases seems to have been the same. On balance, School B seems to approximate the BUREAUCRATIC paradigm.

School C

This is a small, alternative public high school of 180 students. The school is located in an urban, predominantly white lower-middle class and working
class community where the median number of school years completed by persons 25 or older is 12.2 and the median annual income is $8,000 (Chamber of Commerce, 1976).

School C came into existence six years ago as an experimental high school within the public school system of Community C. It was operated at first as a joint venture by the city and a neighboring graduate school of education. Today it is run solely by the city. It was the intention of the founders of the school to generate an experiment in flexibility within a large, urban school system and to experiment with different methods of involving students in the management of school affairs.

**Administration.** In design and by the articulated positions of its founders, School C represents a participant school on the continuum of decision-making structures, although in operation it has become less participant over the years. Like many alternative school philosophers, the founders of School C began with the notion that a good deal of alienation, disaffection, and apathy among high school students could be traced to "irrelevant or culturally biased curricula and to the impersonality of the school bureaucracy." Accordingly, School C was to be an attempt to create "a community of students, parents, and educators mutually accountable to each other for the goals, the program, and the successful operation of the school."

To implement this ideal, a committee of students, parents, and staff, during the third year of the existence of the school, formulated four principles which were to underline the basic operation of the school: diversity and representativeness of the student body relative to the city's population; open and non-authoritarian, non-regimented human relationships within the school community; a truly democratic decision-making process in the school; and a programmatic focus on the needs and concerns of individual students.

It is the third principle in particular which suggests that School C approximates, at least by design, the "participant" end of the spectrum. Operationally, the designers of the school's decision-making structure isolated two dimensions of the school democracy: (a) a large degree of community control over school policies and operations ("community" meaning parents, students, and teachers), and (b) two-way communications and accountability.

In terms of community control, students, parents, and staff have shared decision-making power over program and structure (curriculum, selection of courses), as well as staffing (selection of Director, interviewing candidates for teaching positions). The mechanism is one of co-determination (Cook and Morgan, 1971:5), whereby parents, students, and staff sit on committees and arrive at decisions. In terms of two-way communications and accountability, staff meetings are open to parents
and students, and their input is encouraged.

Almost all of these mechanisms, which were designed in 1970 and 1971, still exist. However, it is now 1977 and the fit between the mechanisms and the students is becoming more and more awkward. The central decision-making structure—the all school meeting—has floundered from a lack of student interest. Such a pattern seems fairly typical of alternative schools (Wittes, Chester and Crowfoot, 1975; Center for New Schools, 1972). The number of all-school meetings is supposed to be a function of the number and intensity of student demands. Between September 1975 and March 1976 (when the author visited the school), there had been only 15 all-school meetings, and attendance at these meetings was low. In general, however, this is a more PARTICIPANT school than the others.

School D

This is an extremely large high school, situated in an urban, lower-middle and working class, predominantly white community. Within this school of 6,400 students, the author surveyed one class of approximately 35 students. The class is called "The City," and is taught by a young, alert, controversial man who brings a real enthusiasm to his subject and demands a good deal of effort from his students. If anybody at School D wants students to think about democracy, it is the teacher of "The City."

Administration. Administratively, School D is quite similar to School A. On top of the professional hierarchy is the principal and under him are four housemasters concerned with school management problems. Underneath them are four assistant housemasters concerned solely with discipline.

The reaction of various social studies teachers and of the chairman of the social studies department to the question of student activism was that what occurs in the school is largely a function of the community in which the school is located. Students, like their parents, are not oriented toward political activism. In terms of the effects of the school itself, the social studies chairman was emphatic in attributing student apathy to the intransigence of the administration. This intransigent posture, he said, makes a mockery of the activism taught in social studies classes. Thus, School D seems to resemble the ELITE pattern of school governance.

School E

This is a high school of approximately 2,000 students. It is located in a predominantly white, middle class suburban community. The median annual income is $11,400 and the median number of school years completed by persons 25 and older is 12.7 (Massachusetts Department of Commerce, 1973).
One interesting variable at School E is the existence of a social studies chairman who is profoundly committed to the idea of citizenship education, and who has initiated some very interesting community-oriented programs for students. In fact, many students have participated in School E’s Peace Corps Program and have derived a great deal from the experience. The researcher was interested in assessing the impact of this variable on the political attitudes of students in School E, especially those related to political efficacy.

Administration. On the level of administration, the prevailing attitude among students seems to be one of apathy born of futility. The student government, like most others, is virtually impotent. Moreover, the students feel that it is essentially the administrators in cahoots with the school board that make policy. Students see themselves as having little power to alter or modify policy; for example, a year ago the students wanted to introduce a psychology course into the school curriculum. (State policy provides for the ability of students to introduce courses through petition.) The idea was almost immediately vetoed by the school board. According to students, the reason for this action was that the cover of the book they wanted to use in the proposed course depicted a breast-feeding scene.

At the time the researcher visited the school (March 1975), feelings of student powerlessness were particularly salient, because of a recent decision made by the principal. Before that decision, juniors and seniors who had study during the last period of the day could leave the school early. A few students abused the privilege rather severely by vandalizing property and assaulting elderly passers-by, and the principal summarily revoked the privilege. Many students felt that this was just one more manifestation of the autocratic nature of school governance.

Year after year, proposals for the designation of a smoking lounge are vetoed. The dress code was overhauled, but only after a long, arduous struggle. In general, the feeling articulated to the research by students (and some teachers) was that the school is run by an unresponsive and conservative school board. Administrators were seen as not being willing or able to defy the school board and, therefore, equally insouciant to student needs. The ELITE pattern seems to prevail.

THE DATA: POLITICAL PROCESS

A “Political Process” Questionnaire was administered to a total of 168 students at five schools. The breakdown of the schools was as follows: School A, 23 students; School B, 24 students; School C, 40 students; School D, 28 students; and School E, 28 students.

Political activities were measured in the following way:
**Political Decision-Making:** by asking students to choose from among four options describing who makes decisions in their schools: one person or a small group; a few persons or small groups; a majority; almost everybody.

**Political Leadership:** by asking students how leaders in their school get things done: they use force; they use status; they bargain; they use merit.

**Political Influence:** by asking students to choose from among four influence patterns to describe their school: students and teachers do what administrators decided they shall do and that's it; students and teachers can get administrators to listen to them on some issues, but administrators still have the final say; students and teachers can get administrators to go along with them quite often; on different issues, students, teachers, and administrators have roughly equal chance to get their way.

**Political Communication:** by asking students to choose from among four options to describe how different groups find out about school decisions: one group makes a decision and then announces it; information goes through a "funnel," and administrators tell teachers who tell students; different groups share information, but they share it among themselves; most groups talk with other groups.

Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the frequency distributions with other groups given by students at the five schools to questions regarding political activities. It is immediately apparent that School C is the most PARTICIPANT school on every political activity, and that Schools A and E seem to be the most ELITE of the schools. The other two schools (B and D) seem to fall somewhere in between.

**ELITE Schools.** Taking the school types on a continuum, we note that in terms of political decision-making, influence, communication, and participation, School E reflects the highest number of ELITE-type responses. In terms of leadership style, School A reflects the highest ELITE response rate. Students at School A, that is, were the most likely to say that leaders in their school use force and pressure to get things done. In terms of influence patterns and participation rates, School A is also relatively high in ELITE responses. We would have to conclude that School E is an ELITE school and that School A is an ELITE/BUREAUCRATIC school.
Table 1: Percent of Political Decision-Making, Leadership, Influence, and Communication in Five Schools (n = 143)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political Decision-Making</th>
<th>Political Leadership</th>
<th>Political Influence</th>
<th>Political Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E  B  C  P</td>
<td>E  B  C  P</td>
<td>E  B  C  P</td>
<td>E  B  C  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>17 45 30 8</td>
<td>46 16 22 11</td>
<td>28 46 6 13</td>
<td>26 40 22 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>24 44 28 3</td>
<td>8 60 10 22</td>
<td>0 88 4 7</td>
<td>12 41 30 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>2 13 40 42</td>
<td>17 10 17 52</td>
<td>2 25 27 46</td>
<td>17 40 7 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>20 57 20 2</td>
<td>40 53 3 3</td>
<td>10 83 3 2</td>
<td>33 40 15 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>25 50 22 2</td>
<td>30 63 3 3</td>
<td>35 53 4 7</td>
<td>70 12 9 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E = Elite
B = Bureaucratic
C = Coalitional
P = Participant
Table 2: Percent of Political Participation:
Five Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always Participate</th>
<th>Participate Half the Time</th>
<th>Never Participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUREAUCRATIC Schools.** Schools B and D appear to fall somewhere in between the ELITE and BUREAUCRATIC paradigms. School D reflected relatively high levels of ELITE-type responses in terms of Political Leadership, but high levels of BUREAUCRATIC-type responses on most other variables. The same is true for School B which, with the exception of Decision-Making, approximated the BUREAUCRATIC pattern. In both of these schools, the BUREAUCRATIC pattern was clearly expressed in terms of Political Influence, Leadership, and Communication. In the case of School B, elements of the DIRECTED PARTICIPANT school seem to prevail.
PARTICIPANT School. School C was clearly perceived by its students as a PARTICIPANT school. An overwhelming majority of students in the survey felt that decisions are made by a majority or by everybody (Political Decision-Making); that leaders get things done on the basis of bargaining or merit (Leadership); that on certain issues students and teachers can have as much influence as administrators (Influence); and that teachers always participate in political decision-making (Participation).

Thus, to answer the first question raised above, the schools in this survey approximated, though they did not replicate, the Ehman-Gillespie typology. Clearly, Schools A and E appear to be ELITE schools, and School C appears to be a PARTICIPANT school. In terms of Schools B and D, however, classification is more problematic, because the data are ambiguous. This is especially true in School B where one day the school might seem like a well-run bureaucracy and on another day like a kettle waiting to boil over because of promises unfulfilled.

The data suggest that simplistic characterizations of schools as authoritarian or democratic is somewhat misleading and perhaps fallacious. Careful analysis of several dimensions of the school is needed for a truly clear picture to emerge. On the other hand, as stated, the data definitely indicate that schools differ in their power structures and in the degrees to which they treat students in a democratic fashion.

In answer to the second question raised above, the amount of power given to students does not seem to be a reflection of the socio-economic status of the community. School C, the most PARTICIPANT school in the sample, is located in one of the poorest communities. Moreover, School E, located in the second wealthiest community, turned out to be the most ELITE of all the schools. These findings do not parallel those of Litt regarding the differences in civics curricula among working, middle, and upper class communities (Litt, 1963); nor do they parallel the findings of Levenson (1972) regarding the differences in curricular emphasis in college prep courses (political participation) and vocational oriented courses (political loyalty).

Two additional points need to be made, however, before concluding that there is no correlation between the wealth of a community and the management orientation of the school: (a) Most inner-city schools do not resemble School C (Corwin and Schmit, 1970; Schrag, 1967); (b) School B’s flexibility is, at least in part, a reflection of the sophistication of the highly educated professional constituency of the school district.

To answer the final three questions raised above, attitude data must be considered. On the basis of studies cited in opening sections of this paper, one would predict that students in School C would reflect the highest levels of political interest, trust, efficacy, and social integration, and that students in Schools A and E the lowest. Attitudes in Schools B and D would fall somewhere in between.
THE DATA: POLITICAL ATTITUDES

Four attitudes were measured with reference to the society at large and with reference to the student's own school: Political Interest, Political Trust, Social Integration, and Political Confidence. The variables were operationalized by asking students to agree with, disagree with, or claim uncertainty on specific statements.

**General Political Interest:** (1) I would enjoy taking a course where government and politics are discussed. (2) I am usually interested in political affairs. (3) Some day I would like to run for political office.

**School Political Interest:** (1) If I had a chance I would like to hear someone discuss how decisions are made in my school. (2) It would be interesting to hear the school board make decisions. (3) I enjoy listening to teachers talk about school problems.

**Trust in People and Politicians:** (1) There are many people who I would not trust. (2) If I were in trouble, most strangers would help me. (3) There are many people in politics who do not care at all about what the people think.

**Trust in Others at School:** (1) There is almost no one at this school I can trust. (2) Most teachers are out to get me. (3) Leaders in my school would like to make it a better place.

**General Social Integration:** (1) What I do doesn't matter to anyone but me. (2) A person like me needs to know what's going on with other people. (3) I would very much like to be a hermit.

**Social Integration at School:** (1) A person like me needs to know what's going on with other people in the school. (2) It really doesn't matter to me if the Student Council gets some rules passed or not. (3) There are many people in this school I care about.

**General Political Confidence:** (1) A person like me can have quite a bit of influence over the political decisions that affect me. (2) It is well worth the effort to write to government officials about the feelings we have on important issues. (3) Nobody would ever ask me for advice on how to act in a political situation.

**School Political Confidence:** (1) If I disagree with a school rule, I am able to do something to help change it. (2) If I had a complaint about an unfair school rule, I believe I could get the principal to listen to me. (3) It seems pretty silly that some people think they can change what the school rules are.
School A. As shown in Table 3, students at School A reflected relatively low levels of General Political Interest and School Political Interest. Moreover, on another dimension of General Political Interest, students at School A reflected low levels of agreement. Only 20 percent agreed that, "I think it would be interesting to run for political office someday."

In terms of General Political Trust, the students at the school demonstrated relatively high levels of skepticism regarding the sensitivity of politicians to the needs of citizens. In terms of trust in leaders at school, students at this school reflected low levels of trust. Though not shown in table form, students at School A demonstrated relatively high feelings of Social Integration with regard to both school and society. Finally, in terms of Political Confidence, students at School A had low scores with reference to school and society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Political Interest</th>
<th>School Political Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would enjoy taking a</td>
<td>It would be interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>course where government</td>
<td>to hear the school board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and politics are discussed.</td>
<td>make political decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>(n = 30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 31)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 44)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 35)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 28)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Percent of General and School Political Trust: Five Schools (n = 168)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Political Trust</th>
<th>School Political Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are many people in politics who do not care what the people think.</td>
<td>Leaders in my school would like to make it a better place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A (n = 30)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B (n = 31)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C (n = 44)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D (n = 35)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E (n = 28)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Percent of General and School Political Confidence: Five Schools (n = 168)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Political Confidence</th>
<th>School Political Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person like me can have quite a bit of influence over the political decisions that affect me.</td>
<td>If I disagree with a school rule, I am able to do something to help change it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A (n = 30)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B (n = 31)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C (n = 44)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D (n = 35)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E (n = 28)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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School B. Students at School B showed high scores on General Political Interest and School Political Interest. They reflected relatively low levels of skepticism regarding politicians and high trust in leaders at school. Again, they were overwhelmingly supportive of statements indicating Social Integration. And they reflected surprisingly low scores on both dimensions of Political Confidence.

School C. Measures of General and School Political Interest at School C showed only moderately high levels of interest, compared to the other four schools. Students at School C reflected high levels of distrust toward politicians and relatively high levels of trust in leaders at school. Once again, Social Integration was high with regard to both school and society (and the same is true at Schools D and E). As shown in Table 5, students at School C were the most likely of all the students in the survey to express efficacious attitudes with regard to both school and society.

School D. Interest levels at School D were extremely high with respect to both school and society. Trust levels on both dimensions were low. Levels of General Political Confidence were low, while levels of School Political Confidence were moderately high.

School E. Students at School E reflected relatively high levels of General and School Political Interest. They were relatively skeptical toward politicians and also toward leaders at their own school. Students at School E reflected surprisingly high scores on both levels of Political Confidence.

DISCUSSION

The findings in this study do not confirm the hypothesized relationship between school structure and four social-political attitudes in an absolute sense. For example, the author found no correlation between school structure and the direction or strength of attitudes toward Social Integration.

Likewise, there was not a statistical correlation between school structure and either measure of Political Interest. Table 3 shows that students in Schools B, D, and E, all of which were more authoritarian schools than School C, showed more interest in political affairs in and out of school than did students at the PARTICIPANT school. Explanations for this readily come to mind. We might say, for example, that the enthusiasm of the social studies teacher at School D, or the excitement generated by the social studies chairman at School E, or the air of liberalization at School B, can arouse students to become interested in things political. In the case of School B, moreover, we might correlate high interest levels with the numerous stimuli in their upper-middle class homes and community. (Gillespie and Ehman also found that interest levels were high in ELITE schools.) Thus, the more PARTICIPANT nature of School C does not
seem to contribute to a higher level of Political Interest among its students.

Nor did differences in school structure correlate in the expected direction with attitudes of General Political Trust. In fact, the result was the exact opposite of that which was predicted: students at School C reflected the highest levels of cynicism toward politicians. This might be a function of the relatively radical political position of their teachers. In this sense, the pattern of teachers being more trusting and less skeptical than educated parents about government that has been found on a national sample (Jennings and Ehman, 1976) does not prevail at School C. Parents and teachers at this school are fundamentally committed to social change and are apparently transmitting this message to their children/students. This makes the low levels of Interest even more surprising.

In general, however, students in this survey were more cynical toward politicians than were adolescents in earlier studies (Jennings and Niemi, 1974). As noted by Arterton (1975), the effects of Watergate on the political attitudes of young people are profound.

On the other hand, there does seem to be some correlation between school structure and School Political Trust. Students at Schools D and E reflected the lowest levels of trust in their school leaders, and students at School A were not much more trusting of their school leaders. Moreover, students at School C were the most trusting of their leaders, which is not surprising in the context of that particular school. This corroborates the findings of Ehman and Gillespie regarding PARTICIPANT schools (1974a). The relatively high levels of trust in leaders at School B is somewhat surprising, given the recency of the debate over smoking in school.

The strongest correlation found seems to be between school structure and both dimensions of Political Confidence. Students at School C reflected efficacious attitudes to a substantially greater extent than did students at the other four schools. This confirms the hypothesis in this study as well as the contention made by Schwartz (1973) that political efficacy is not solely a function of socio-economic variables. If it were, students at School B would reflect higher levels of political efficacy than they do. Rather, the development of efficacy or confidence results from a constellation of factors, including the individual's history of interactions with authority figures and structures.

In the four other schools, however, there was not a noticeable correlation between school structure and political confidence. This suggests that the differences among the other schools are not consequential, and that cosmetic differences between an ELITE and a BUREAUCRATIC school do not contribute to the growth of political efficacy among students.

One disclaimer is in order. Students at School C voluntarily enter this alternative program and are possibly more efficacious before entering the
school than are students at the other schools. Hence, a problem of self-selection might be operating.

In summary, the data in this study indicate that schools are different in their structure and operation and that, to an extent, these differences matter. In terms of preparing students for democratic citizenship by building in them attitudes of political efficacy, there are substantial differences between an ELITE school and a PARTICIPANT school. There are not, on the other hand, substantial differences in the development of efficacy between an ELITE school and a BUREAUCRATIC school. Whether school officials repudiate student proposals outright or whether they simply allow them to die from inaction, the result is the same: students feel powerless.

As well, differences among the five schools in trusting school officials were also correlated with school structure. As expected, students in the PARTICIPANT school had the most faith in school leaders.

Yet school structure was not found to correlate with either dimension of Social Integration or Political Interest. Thus, the influence of school structure was found to be less pervasive than other studies would indicate.

Finally, an interesting finding of this study is that even in the context of an authoritarian school structure, a dedicated social studies teacher or chairman can generate interest in political affairs, both in and out of school. But once students realize that their interest cannot be translated into action, because of the resistance of the administration, they reflect low levels of political confidence.

CONCLUSIONS

Several forces in our society mitigate against citizen participation in political activity, and one of these is the personal powerlessness and system unresponsiveness that many citizens perceive. To suggest that providing students with participatory experiences in school will automatically transform them into activist citizens in the future is to ignore a good deal of research and some common sense as well. Serious questions need to be raised regarding the kinds of decisions in which students want to be involved and the extent of their involvement in such decisions.

Nonetheless, the evidence gathered in this study, and the data that has been collected by others, indicates that students learn a good deal about citizenship through their daily interactions with school officials and that if such interactions are totally asymmetrical and punitive in nature, these students are not likely to develop efficacious attitudes and behaviors needed for responsible democratic citizenship. Nor are such students likely to develop attitudes of trust toward school officials and other adult authority figures.
This reality is especially significant for social studies educators who are charged with the awesome responsibility of teaching students about democracy. Assuming such an enterprise is desirable, the focus must be on that which will make it possible. The data gathered here and in many other places indicate that textbook learning about democracy is insufficient and, at times superficial. A logical starting point for teaching about democracy might be the school itself. How is power organized? Who participates in making decisions? Who controls the decision-makers? These questions can complement textbook lessons about “Political Power,” “Elites and Masses,” or “Leadership,” and also make such lessons less abstract. Howard Wilson expressed the idea many years ago, and his statement is worth quoting at length (1938:217-218):

...It must be emphasized that, so far as can be observed, the emotional and volitional drives for civic action will not arise from classroom instruction alone... However, the social studies staff can contribute to the broader ends of education in two direct ways. In the first place, social studies teachers have been trained to a keener perception of the social processes within the school. It lies within their own field of work to view the school as a sociological phenomenon, and for this reason they should be continuously active in the stimulation of pupil groups. They should seek to utilize in the school as nearly as possible the same social forces which pupils will utilize in adult life.

But of even greater importance than this, social studies teachers must do more to make pupils conscious of the social operation of the school. The social studies curriculum must deal more directly with the school as an instance of group living, not merely the school as a historical or narrowly intellectual institution, but also the school as a political and sociological expression. Pupils need to be guided into an understanding of the forces that immediately surround them if they are to see realistically the forces that operate in the larger society. In social studies classes it is not too much to ask that pupils study such matters as forms of student participation in school government, how one gets elected to office, what qualities make for popularity among one’s mates.

FOOTNOTES

'It should be noted that most of the sources cited are ‘Establishment’ people, and a long list of ‘Romantic’ critics, including Kozol, Holt, and Friedenberg, could be added.
Seeman (1959) has isolated five categories of alienation. For example, he distinguishes **powerlessness**—"The expectancy or probability held by the individual that his or her own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes he seeks"—from **normlessness**—"a high expectancy on the part of the individual that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve one's goals."

3David Easton has developed a "systems" approach to political science, and it is one of the most widespread theoretical constructs in the discipline (Easton, 1957).


5Confirmed by students and teachers at Waltham High School; this was not one of the schools in the survey.

6Since the author's visit, a proposal has finally passed, but this is not relevant to the configuration of students' attitudes during the time of the survey.

7From the bulletin of School C.

8From the bulletin of School C.

9Research indicates that interesting students in politics, and particularly in social studies courses, will continue to be a vexatious problem. Gross (1977:200) reports that a recent study of almost 800 urban high school students indicates that the social studies are less important and even less interesting than other high school subjects, and that this area was designated as that most frequently studied merely to gain grades.
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EDITOR'S NOTE

During the 1976 C.U.F.A. meetings in Washington, D.C., a session was held which was devoted to examining the ethics of the social studies profession. The session, organized and chaired by William Joyce, was very well attended and there was considerable discussion of the ideas presented there afterward in the halls and in other settings. Unfortunately, there was no time for indepth and systematic discussion of these important and controversial ideas during the session itself, even though several persons in the audience wanted to respond. In the following three articles the original presenters from that session have revised and expanded their original papers. They are printed here in hopes that the systematic dialogue, which did not take place in Washington last fall, will continue. Responses, either in the form of short letters or full-length analytical articles, are welcomed. Short responses will be judged by the editors. Full-length articles will be refereed in the same way that the present papers were judged—anonymously by three blind reviewers in the social education field. In either case, an opportunity will be extended to the present authors to write a rejoinder. Let us have your responses so that this crucial issue of the profession can be subjected to careful scrutiny and analysis by the best thinkers in the field.

The papers are organized around the conceptual scheme introduced by Hartoonian in his article. He identifies three areas or groups involved in ethical questions in the social studies field: rights of students; rights of teachers, administrators and authors; and rights of society in general, and parents in particular. Further, Hartoonian introduced the concept of “parity,” which is used in the sense of a sharing or participation in the function of ruling. Hartoonian then focuses on the rights of students as an ethical concern of our profession. Ochoa continues the analysis, extending her arguments to relate to the rights of social studies teachers, students and parents. She uses several hypothetical case studies to illustrate her positions. Finally, Wronski uses a recent case study, in which he was personally involved, as a springboard to illustrate and analyze societal and academic rights which have ethical implications for our field.

Although it is not our policy to publish topical issues of the journal, this set of three articles does center on the ethics of our profession. The general membership, during the 1975 annual business meeting in Atlanta, resolved to push ahead with systematic inquiry in this important area. These three articles are one tangible result of that effort. It is our sincere hope that more discussion of these ideas will surface in the annual meetings and in this and other journals.
Ethics have to do with the relationships that exist between and among people, with the modes of conduct that exist within a profession, and with the moral principles of the cultural heritage to which a society or civilization makes reference (Allport, 1951; Burtt, 1967; Gallie, 1968; Kuhn, 1963; Mueller, 1955; Winch, 1970). In any discussion of pedagogy and ethics, it would seem that two notions come immediately to the forefront. First of all, there is the concept of knowledge (the right and responsibility to know) and the methods of studying and developing such knowledge. Second, there is the concern for purpose. That is, for what ends or reasons is knowledge so studied and developed? Certainly, the two ideas of knowledge and purpose are interrelated, but their separation here is appropriate for analysis. This, by the way, is an ethical decision of professional conduct.

Given the fact that the people involved in education, such as students, teachers, authors, and parents have different biases relative to what knowledge is important to know and the purpose or use of this knowledge, it is inevitable that dilemmas will develop. Since these dilemmas involve relationships among people, professional modes of conduct and references to the cultural heritage, the dilemmas become ethical questions and problems.

These problems can be illustrated so that we can see some points of intersection between individual and group rights in juxtaposition to knowledge and purpose. Such a framework can also point out possible areas of concern, that is, the delimiting of rights and the movement away from educational equilibrium and parity. Parity means an equivalency of liberty within a community as well as a sense of individual and group ethical responsibility.

The significance of the idea of parity stems from the concept of democratic community. In such a community certain conditions must be operative. Some of these conditions include open communication, respect for human dignity, responsibility and accountability to the "governed" as well as to the cultural heritage as represented in the governed. Today we can also add to the concept of community such attributes as bureaucratic structures, mass communications and interdependence. The democratic community strives to maintain and advance ethical parity, for, by definition, without this parity responsible citizenship cannot function. In a word, there is a sharing of the function of ruling. And for this capacity to survive in the individual citizen, attention must be given to the ethical
implications of people as they work, play, and build their lives toward individual and collective views of the future(s).

Further, we all need to study the relationships between ethical and political phenomena which education makes manifest whenever decisions are made about what should be taught, how it should be taught, and why. In a sense, the relationship between ethics and politics is like viewing an iceberg. Politics can be seen as that part of the iceberg above the waterline. It is supported by the ice under the water which is, in this analogy, the ethical underpinnings of the human family. Educators must know the whole iceberg and must be willing to articulate those areas or decision points where the possibilities are strong that ethical parity can be impaired.

When we study these decision points we can build a model that reveals the relationships between educational actors and the questions of what to teach, how and for what reasons.

Looking at some aspects of the model we can see the dynamics that exist among several elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge (Methods of Study)</th>
<th>Purposes of Schooling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Teachers, Admin-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>istrators, Authors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Society (Parents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This paper deals only with that part of the model in which the student and his or her rights and responsibilities are affected by decisions about knowledge (methods of study) and purpose(s) of schooling.

STUDENT RIGHTS

"The rights of students . . ." What does this mean? Educationally, it does not mean things like "the student has the right to read" or "the student has the right to know American history" in the sense that reading and historical knowledge are intrinsic qualities that will simply blossom forth. In this context, students do not have a right to read, but a responsibility to know how to read as a member of a democratic society. These ideas, like the "right to read," are not rights, but individual
responsibilities that will lead to a loss of political, social and economic rights if not attended to. Such is the nature of the moral community; freedom is a function of knowledge which, in turn, is necessary for responsible decision-making. Thus, the pursuit of knowledge and, through it, the possibility of individual freedom must be the work of the student, even when it seems to be against self interest or comfort.

Do we mean by student rights the complete freedom of curriculum choice? Should the student have the "right" to take anything or nothing in the school program? This suggests a right to be in touch with one's culture or not; sensitive to art and literature or not; able to argue rationally and make appropriate decisions or not. Again, in a democratic setting there is no choice here. To the limits of one's ability, the individual is responsible to be in touch with his or her cultural heritage, and be able to make moral decisions.

Without student responsibility and effort in the learning process, it makes little sense to talk about the educational rights of individuals. Democratically, as well as educationally, you cannot take from nor give to an individual something that is beyond the individual's willingness to embrace. The given must be the student's willingness to work at developing political, economic and social literacy. Without this attitude there can be no discussion of rights.

What, then, are the student's educational rights and how are they affected by the educational process? To answer this question we should appeal to the ideal of the democratic community and study the notion of "parity of rights" within this country. We should note again that the delimiting of student's rights must be seen in relationship to the rights of others. As the role of student is seen in this light we can observe those areas where the greatest dangers appear relative to the loss of liberty.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

In the area of knowledge and methods of study there are at least two important ethical concerns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge (Methods of Study)</th>
<th>Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The pursuit of truth versus what is acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The invasion of privacy versus the use of therapeutic and client-centered methods of study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to the former, student rights are limited when areas of inquiry are closed not only by the selection of content, but by the modes of presentation. Cicero once observed that the authority of those who teach is often an obstacle to those who wish to learn. This is certainly the case when educators confuse the pursuit of truth with the presentation of what is “acceptable.” Much of what went on during the civil rights movement of the late 60’s—the inclusion of Black History in the social studies curriculum for example—was a manifestation of a plea for more truth. However, in many places it “was not acceptable.” When teachers and/or authors suggest even tacitly that there is one truth they confuse acceptability with truth, and infringe upon the rights of students.

If students’ rights are to be respected, then the methods of study must embrace the highest intellectual limits that the educational community can muster. Educators must understand the complexity of our human cultural heritage and the obligation we have to carry this heritage to the next generation. But, in addition to the knowledge transmission, we must also provide for the process or way in which knowledge is studied and truth is pursued. This means a respect for the demands and integrity of logic as well as for the community of scholars engaged in the pursuit of truth. To the limit of the infringements upon the rights of educators and society, students must be able to pursue truth with skill, taste, and sensitivity. In a sense, there should be a “social contract” between the student and teacher which addresses mutual respect and craftsmanship.

The second issue, that of the denial of a student’s right to privacy, is most repugnant in a democratic setting. In the case of its relationship to certain methods of study it is even more offensive because it speaks implicitly to the notion that the student is sick and in need of therapy. It is interesting to note the similarities between client-centered therapy and some methods of teaching that stress: (1) the need for treatment, (2) what successful treatment should do for the patient, (3) the process of treatment, and (4) the role of the therapist:
# Similarities Between Client-Centered Therapy and Values Clarification on Certain Key Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Client-Centered Therapy</th>
<th>Values Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conditions which produce the need for treatment</td>
<td>Modern society with its array of value positions makes it difficult for people to choose a satisfying way of life. \n&quot;But with its conflicting subcultures, and its contradictory sets of values, goals, and perceptions, the individual tends to be exposed to a realization of discrepancies in his perceptions. Thus internal conflict is multiplied&quot; (Rogers, 1965:192).</td>
<td>Modern society with its array of value positions makes it difficult for people to choose a satisfying way of life. \n&quot;Could it be, we wonder, that the pace and complexity of modern life has so exacerbated the problem of deciding what is good and what is right and what is worthy that large number of children are finding it increasingly bewildering, even overwhelming, to decide what is worth valuing, what is worth one's time and energy?&quot; (Raths, 1966:7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The outcomes of successful treatment</td>
<td>Persons tend to value themselves as worthwhile, become more able to function productively, develop their own self-evaluations and become more consistent and congruent. \n&quot;He moves toward a conception of himself as a person of worth, as a self-directing person, able to form standards</td>
<td>Persons become more productive and proud of themselves. They see their role in choosing their own values and their verbally stated values become more consistent and congruent with their behavior. \n&quot;In different words, many students have been helped to become more purposeful, more enthusiastic, more positive and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Client-Centered Therapy</td>
<td>Values Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and values upon the basis of his own experience. He develops much more positive attitudes toward himself” (Rogers, 1961: 65).</td>
<td>more aware of what is worth striving for” (Raths, 1966:12).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Key aspects of the treatment process</td>
<td>An atmosphere of trust and acceptance is established in which the client examines his own feelings and experiences, and accepts responsibility for himself and his own judgments.</td>
<td>An atmosphere is established in which persons must be able to express their ideas and feelings without contradiction from others. The clarifying response is nonjudgmental, helping the student recognize his own confusions and his responsibility to make his own decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The individual increasingly comes to feel that this locus of evaluation lies within himself. Less and less does he look to others for approval or disapproval; for standards to live by; for decisions and choices” (Rogers, 1961:119).</td>
<td>“It puts the responsibility on the student to look at his behavior or his ideas and to think and decide for himself what it is he wants” (Raths, 1966:53).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Role of the therapist/teacher</td>
<td>The therapist is intimately related to establishing the process. He or she must be nonjudgmental, accepting, trusting, empathetic.</td>
<td>The teacher must be nonjudgmental, not “moralizing,” and accepting of the students’ views. He or she must provide a setting and seek to draw out the students’ feelings and ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The client finds “... every aspect of self which he exposes is equally</td>
<td>“... We emphasize the need for a nonjudgmental approach...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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accepted, equally valued." "... He experiences a freedom from threat which is decidedly new to him" (Rogers, 1965:192-3).

"In client-centered therapy, however, one description of the counselor’s behavior is that he consistently keeps the locus of evaluation with the client" (Rogers, 1965:150). The client "... finds the therapist showing a consistent and unconditional positive regard for him and his feelings" (Rogers, 1961:63). "... when the counselor perceives and accepts the client as he is, when he lays aside all evaluation and enters into the perceptual frame of reference of the client, he frees the client to explore his life and experience anew..." (Rogers, 1965:48).

students will probably not enter the perplexing process of clarifying values... if they perceive that the teacher does not respect them. If trust is not communicated..." (Raths, 1966:77, 81).

"The theory outlines a role for the teacher that is characterized by the following:

"1. Unconditional acceptance of the student and the problem.

"2. No advice-giving, even when that is requested, but many clarifying questions and comments.

"3. Looking at the issue from the vantage point of the values of the student and not of the teacher" (Raths, 1966:149-50).
The similarities between client-centered therapy and values clarification are significant enough to conclude that values clarification is, in essence, a form of client-centered therapy (Lockwood, 1973). When students are coerced to reveal their "inner feelings" in a classroom and when teachers play at being psychiatrists, psychologists or therapists we have a situation where the setting of 30 to 1 (patients to therapists) and the lack of training of these therapists must raise ethical concerns about the invasion of privacy as well as competency.

In addition to the question of privacy, there is the additional dilemma in some methods of study that argue for a relativistic moral position. This dilemma is particularly appropriate to consider here as it presents an interesting definition of ethics. That definition seems to be one of intra-personal health as opposed to the establishment of ethics that are grounded in societal or human standards. This is a serious ethical and methodological issue with which educators must come to grips, for it changes drastically the definition of ethics that has to do with basic principles which members of society use to determine what is right or wrong as well as point out individual limits of moral rights and responsibilities.

RIGHTS AND PURPOSES

Turning to the second category, that of the purposes of schooling and student rights, we find that citizenship, awareness of cultural heritage, and economic literacy are only three of many reasons stated relative to the purposes of social studies programs. Yet, because of our involvement in the total schooling process and because of the almost mindless acceptance of the contradictions between stated purposes and classroom, school administrative, and societal practices, some ethical problems arise. I would like us to look at the following concerns which reflect this condition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge (Methods of Study)</th>
<th>Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Students</td>
<td>1. Using children to change society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grading students for societal convenience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training students with utilitarian skills deemed necessary by society's need for workers, parents, and citizens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first issue dates back in our history at least to 1932 and George Counts’ rhetorical question in book form, “Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?” Counts made the now popular claim that since educators represented neither the interests of the moment nor of any special economic or social class, they could seek and use power on behalf of the “great masses of the people.” As noble as this charge was and is, it fails to deal with the philosopher/king dichotomy. That is, can the profession of pedagogy influence political power and morality at the same time? This is what Counts was asking rhetorically. However, there are at least two ethical problems with this question that we seem unwilling to face relative to students’ rights:

1. Whose image of the future are we to move toward?
2. Why should children have to play the role of experimental creatures in the social experiments?

Most of us would say that we should move toward a more just society and plan to build a situation where the human habitat and the natural environment are in harmony. This goal is very noble in intent, but there are concerns of definition as well as method here. First of all, what is justice? What is the just society? What is a just person? To what extent do we study the nature of justice? Can we move toward a concept like justice which receives such a small amount of attention in school? Next, take our method of implementing justice. The idea is usually set for action in the next generation. If we want a just society, perhaps we should practice justice now—in our schools and in our communities.

How can we tell Black and White children, for example, to live and work together when the adults will not? In this light, forced busing of students for racial balance is a dodge. Our problem is not geography, it is attitudinal and attitudes are changed not by telling or talking at children or even moving them around, but by what they see in the character of adults. They are saying to us . . . “I cannot hear a word you are saying, for what you are is speaking too loudly.” If we are going to use buses on students let us make sure that other problems are also accounted for, such as open housing and employment opportunities. A “parity of rights” should exist between child and adult—the children cannot do it alone.

On the other hand, we hear quite often that experimenting with the lives of students does not hurt them. Indeed, life is an experiment. Hurting, however, is not the issue—the manipulation of human life is. If experimentation is desirable, perhaps it should begin with the adults. At least we ought to ask: “By what right does society use children to foster change?”

A second issue that has to do with the purposes of schooling and students’ rights is the grading procedures which are used. I believe that these are analogous to the system used in a pickle factory I used to work in as a
teenager. In this factory farmers and pickers would bring cucumbers to the plant and empty their sacks or trucks on conveyor belts that would carry the cucumbers to a vibrating grid. The grid had various sized openings ranging from approximately two inches at the beginning to approximately one foot at the end. Cucumbers would fall upon the grid and would "move along" until their size and the size opening in the grid coincided and they were "graded." Thus, number "ones" fell in one group, number "twos" in another, number "threes" in a third and so forth until only the very large cucumbers were left and they were turned into relish. This grading procedure made it very convenient for the processors who could come by and pick out the number "ones" or the number "threes" they wanted.

This grading process in the pickle factory is not unlike the grading process in schools. In most instances, the procedure of grading a student has more to do with societal considerations than with individual growth. Employers want to know what kind of student they are hiring. Universities want to know how students have done and will do in their academic work. Again we have to ask by what right do schools "grade" students for societal efficiency?

Finally, there is the ethical issue of whether or not the purpose of school is to prepare the student directly for society. Is the purpose for running school utilitarian in nature? Should it relate to the present societal need and norms for workers, parents and citizens? A job, a happy married life and good mental health seem to be examples of why we run schools. Some say education is needed to socialize students, to bring them into society. Noble reasons, all—but intellectually weak and dangerously misleading. Although education may be helpful in all of the above endeavors, it is different from political advocacy, social work and psychiatry.

Thus, the purpose of schooling cannot ethically address only present societal concerns, for education is accountable to a broader perspective of time and place. Education is a search for meaning. It is a process which allows the individual to see life differently—with sensitive eyes that address the fullness of what it means to be human. Education provides a temporal link between the past and the future. And it provides the individual with a vehicle by which he or she can develop a continually expanding conceptual framework for studying and deriving meaning from the world. Education helps us develop intrinsic standards for making moral judgments. Finally, education is concerned with developing perspective—an understanding of the past, present and future and their relationships to each other and to the individual.

Clearly, the rights of the student can be truncated when educators and society fail to look at certain ethical dilemmas such as: (1) the pursuit of truth versus what is acceptable; (2) the right of privacy versus the use of certain methods of study; (3) the desire for a "better" society versus using
children to change society; (4) society’s desire to more effectively use educated human resources versus grading students; and (5) the opportunity to be put in touch with one’s cultural heritage versus society’s need for utilitarian skills. These dilemmas need to be placed upon our educational agenda.

Perhaps the above discussion can provide one useful way of dealing with and understanding some of the ethical dilemmas of schooling relative to the rights of students. However, the concept in most need of understanding is the dynamics that exist when these rights of the students, together with those of educators and society, are functioning in the same cultural setting. In other words, looking at rights per se is not enough. We should also analyze the degree of power and vulnerability that each actor has as a function of the rights of other actors.

In any study of ethics, the interest of other people must be considered in juxtaposition to self-interest. Consider, for example, the power and vulnerability of the student. Power is a function of autonomy, or self-government. It suggests an inner control that is relative to the forces that control one from the outside—from others. Power is manifested most vividly in unilateral decision-making. At its best, power can provide self-harmony and feelings of self-sufficiency. At its worst, power infringes upon the self-harmony of others. Power is the opposite of vulnerability. Vulnerability speaks to the nakedness of the human being in terms of ability, dependency and adherence to social norms. Whether academic, athletic, sexual, artistic, or moral, our abilities are never what we would hope them to be, and to the degree that we feel inadequate, we are vulnerable and diminished in power.

Our dependency on other people and institutions is also widespread and demonstratable. Whether it is General Motors, the state university system or our families, we are dependent; for that matter so are the institutions. Dependency is another name for order, and order and routine are necessary to the survival of any institution, community or society. In fact, societies provide the means for developing dependency—it is called socialization. Children are dependent on parents and teachers. Teachers, in turn, are dependent on administrators who are dependent on Boards of Education, who are dependent on State Departments of Education, who are dependent on parents. Thus are the roots of dependency nurtured—with fear, with the promise of success and with self-esteem or enhanced reputation. Those who deviate run a high risk of losing honor or reputation. Yet, it is interesting that many of the world’s more important reformers, scientists, artists and philosophers were nonconformists in the sense that they were “out of step” with the social norms of their time.

Understanding a parity of rights has much to do, then, with the trade-offs between power and vulnerability—between power and powerlessness.
To understand that too much power corrupts is also to understand that too little power also corrupts. Thus, a balance of individual power and powerlessness is needed. Both power and vulnerability are necessary in the just community—be it a nation, a school or a family. If a "parity of rights" (balance between power and vulnerability) is one attribute of justice then it becomes clear that this parity can only be achieved via total community development and involvement—a situation in which self-harmony and vulnerability, self-significance and dependency can thrive.

It should also be clear that ethics and equal rights are not the same. Indeed, the notion of treating all students the same, or treating adults and students alike is dysfunctional to justice and parity of rights. For example, an individual may need much more "discipline" or "strict rule enforcement" at age five than another individual or the same individual needs at age twenty-five. However, there must be a parity of rights for all actors or groups of actors, or responsible self-government will never be achieved or maintained. And, within the school setting, questions about the "purpose of schooling" and the "nature of knowledge" and their relationship to responsible self-government are central to any discussion of students' rights.

If we are concerned about the ethics of our profession vis-a-vis students, then we must be willing to share with them that measure of equal consideration made logically unavoidable by the knowledge that they will live in the future without us. Therefore, the best we can do is to develop with them a sense of perspective. Ethics, in essence, is perspective—a view of time, place and culture that transcends our brief moment here and gives all of us the criteria for grace, beauty, truth, work, faith and justice.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to identify standards that should guide the ethical behavior of social studies teachers. Although social studies literature is replete with rhetoric, few systematic efforts have been made to create an ethical code for the profession.

The central areas for concern regarding ethics in education are two-fold. The first deals with the purposes of schooling. In this case the focus is on the purpose of social studies education. The second attends to the knowledge that is transmitted or learned and the methods by which it is learned. These are the areas around which disagreement occurs. These are the areas that social studies must address unequivocally if they are to become a profession.

The position taken in this paper recognizes that there are several sets of actors who are involved in educational decision making. Parents, teachers, students, authors of instructional materials, and citizens who support schools all have to be considered. In recognizing this multiplicity of actors, it is important to discuss the principle of parity. Parity, in effect, means a sharing in the function of ruling. The democratic ethic requires that all of these actors share rights and responsibilities with respect to educational decisions. None is omnipotent. Parity implies an equilibrium of power, authority and responsibility. Each of these actors is limited by the rights of the others. This paper, however, will confine itself to the responsibilities of teachers.

Two sources of values are integrated in this statement. The first source utilizes the three criteria for educational processes that are presented by the educational philosopher, R. S. Peters in his book *Ethics and Education* (Peters, 1967). The second source draws on the democratic ethic and gives paramount emphasis to human dignity and rational processes. Taken together these values may not be exhaustive. They are presented here as a useful point of departure.

The values derived from Peters' work apply to all persons who teach regardless of their content fields. It can be argued that the values derived from the democratic ethic have general applicability as well. However, these values are especially important for social studies educators who are primarily concerned with developing an informed and active citizenry.
Implicitly, this statement suggests that the specific nature of ethical conduct for social studies teachers will reflect their responsibilities as teachers in the general sense as well as their special responsibilities as social studies educators.

THREE ETHICAL CRITERIA

The three criteria for educational processes posited by Peters entail values that explicitly guide the behavior of teachers. The first criterion states that education must entail the transmission of what is worthwhile. What is worthwhile has some inner standards of skill, efficiency and style. Further, worthwhile activities are those that are capable of holding interest over time. Such activities offer opportunities for discrimination and skill. They have value because they are not consumable. Worthwhile activities entail theoretical studies. The objects of these studies have stability and permanence. They do not die. In effect, it is impossible to learn everything about them. They entail an everlasting search for truth. Finally, worthwhile studies have the capacity to expand the individual's insight—they involve explanation, assessment and illumination of different facets of life. Understanding of the worthwhile shapes an individual's intellectual orientation. It creates a conceptual framework that changes everything an individual does. It is significant to note that worthwhileness is not justified by the criteria of giving pleasure, fulfilling wants, or utility. Although these criteria may be met by worthwhile activities, they are not sufficient. Sufficiency is obtained by the standards inherent in what is studied and the potential for intellectual enlightenment. Worthwhile activities inform the intellect and character of the individual.

Peters' second criteria for educational processes concerns what he describes as the cognitive aspects of education. These cognitive aspects include knowledge and understanding and cognitive perspective. Here, Peters argued that to be educated it is not sufficient for an individual to possess a skill. Rather he or she must acquire a body of knowledge and a conceptual scheme that is more than the accumulation of isolated facts. In effect, the learner must be able to see the object of study from the inside. He/she must be aware of its standards and procedures. Just as importantly, education should facilitate a commitment to those standards or principles that undergird a field of study.

Cognitive perspective involves the individual seeing a relationship between what is studied and a coherent pattern of life. The learner must not see what he/she studies in isolation. Rather, he or she should be able to create meaningful intellectual linkages between the field of study and life in general. The first criterion of worthwhileness and the second criterion regarding the facilitation of cognitive aspects of education may, on first
glance, appear redundant. It is important to underline that the first calls for the transmission of that which has internal standards and that which provides the learner with conceptual frameworks for viewing the world. On the other hand, the second criterion emphasizes that education should facilitate the learner’s awareness and commitment to these standards or principles as well as help the learner relate these to a coherent pattern of life.

Peters’ third criterion confines methods that are used to those which engage the learner in a willing and voluntary way. He argues that educational processes must be ones of which the learner is mindful. If intellect and character are to be developed, learners must understand what it is they are learning about. Teaching requires that reasons be revealed to the learner. Learners must not be treated as mindless robots or bundles of stimulus-response connections. This criterion does not, however, rule out the use of expository techniques as long as the learner is given reasons for what is going on and for what is being learned. Conditioning and brainwashing are ruled out because they are processes that do not reveal reasons to the learner.

To the extent that teachers implement the educational process, these three criteria, or educational values, should guide their decisions and actions.

1. They must transmit that which develops the intellect and character of the learner and that which helps the learner know the truth.
2. They must provide students with a conceptual grasp of an area of thought or field of study, they must introduce learners to the standards of a field and cultivate respect for those standards and finally they must facilitate the development of a broadening of the learner’s intellectual perspective so that the understanding of a given field of study is integrated into a coherent pattern of life.
3. They must insure that students are mindful of the teacher’s methods.

In the context of social studies, the application of these criteria might be illustrated in the following manner:

A social studies faculty might agree that topics such as the following will be dealt with in a United States history course: (1) the conflict between labor and business; (2) cultural pluralism in the United States; (3) protest and power; (4) changing social values; (5) revolution and war; etc.

Such topics are selected as themes that are threaded through this nation’s history. Each of them will be studied from the perspective of their historical development and their current manifestation. Students will be introduced to a variety of perspectives on each topic. They will interact with alternative historical accounts as well as the view of policy analysts and social critics. They will not only be able to learn the content of these alternative views but will have opportunities to understand the principles and practices that guided the development
of these perspectives. They will be encouraged to develop respect for these principles and practices and to clarify the impact of their new understandings on the meaning they bring to new experiences and situations and to relate their understandings to life itself. The teachers will use a wide range of methods and techniques including lectures, films, independent study, group discussion and teacher-guided inquiry. In each instance teachers will give reasons for the methods and/or techniques being used.

DEMOCRATIC VALUES

The discussion that follows focuses on the second source of values that derive from the democratic ethic. Although these values are ones that apply to all teachers, the social studies teacher needs to be especially mindful of them. Since social studies teachers seek to foster the development of informed citizens who can and will behave ethically in the context of a democratic society, these values take on major importance. In this way, the teacher is an agent of society who is responsible to the society for contributing to the socialization of youth (Shaver and Strong, 1976; Shane, 1976).

Democracy seeks to enhance the individual fulfillment of its citizen as well as to maximize the contribution that citizens will make to society. This purpose assumes human dignity as a central value. The premise that every individual has worth and is deserving of respect is the sine qua non of a democratic society.

The value of human dignity is, in this society, the basis of deriving other values such as equality, freedom and rationality. The value of equality does not suggest that all people are equal in their attributes or endowments. Nor does it imply that all people should be treated in precisely the same way. Rather, it claims that the dignity of each person requires that he or she have an equal chance to fulfill individual goals and that each is entitled to equal legal rights.

Human dignity also leads to the value of freedom—the right of individuals to choose, to live as they wish, to act as they wish as long as they do not violate the rights of others. Freedom of expression, be it oral, written or religious is essential if truth and wisdom are to be sought. As John Stuart Mill stated, truth is the sufferer if opinions are stifled (Mill, 1975).

Human dignity and the democratic ethic also lead to the value of rationality. To ask questions, to seek reasons and evidence, to be able to give reasons enhances the stature of individuals. To expand one’s understanding of the world, such freedom of expression is essential. To suppress such activities is to promote ignorance, passivity, alienation and to inhibit the potential of human beings.
The defense for democracy and its fundamental values was well captured by John Dewey in *Experience and Education* where he points out that the case for democracy is ultimately based in the belief that democratic social arrangements lead to a higher quality of human experience, one which is more widely accessible and enjoyed than that found in non-democratic societies (Dewey, 1971:75). These values are especially salient for social studies teachers who are contributing to the socialization of youth in a democratic society.

**DEMOCRATIC VALUES AND THE THREE CRITERIA**

How then, do these values relate to the three criteria for education posited by Peters? They provide additional substance and definition to the criterion that education must transmit that which is worthwhile. In addition to the idea that education should develop the intellect and character of the individual, adherence to democratic values suggests that what is worthwhile must lead the learner to understand and appreciate basic democratic values. In effect, educational processes should equip citizens with the knowledge, values and participation skills that enhance the individual’s potential to think and act as an effective citizen in a democratic society. In this way, *the rights of the teacher are limited by the right of a democratic society to socialize the young in ways that are consistent with its values and to transmit knowledge and skills which inform the intellect and character of the learner.*

Peters’ second criterion deals with the cognitive aspects of education. Specifically, it calls attention to the learner’s meaningful understanding of what is transmitted as distinct from acquiring only descriptive knowledge. In addition, this criterion focuses on understanding of the standards of a body of thought. Finally, it emphasizes cognitive perspective—the intellectual capacity to integrate a body of thought into a wholistic and coherent pattern of life. When meshed with the values of a democratic society, the standard for teacher conduct that emerges is one that states that social studies teachers have a responsibility to transmit a meaningful understanding of the standards by which actions are judged in a democratic system and to lead the learner to see democratic values as but one set of values that can guide a political system. Here, *the rights of the teacher are limited by the rights of students to develop meaningful understanding of democracy and to gain perspective of how that body of knowledge or thought fits into a coherent pattern of life. In short, the rights of the teacher are limited by the rights of students to know the truth and the rights of the society to socialize its young.*

The third criterion stresses that the methods (and techniques) used by the teacher should engage the learner in a thoughtful, not mindless, manner.
Peters stresses the responsibility to give reasons for what is taught and how it is taught. The overarching value of human dignity serves to strengthen this criterion in that respect for the individual further requires that the learner not be manipulated in ways of which he/she is not conscious. Therefore, it expands Peters' concept of consciousness on the part of the learner. It also requires that the teacher relate what is taught to the concerns of the learner.

Further, the value of freedom suggests that while the learner has the right to share ideas, opinions and feelings there can be no requirement to coerce the learner to do so. In effect, freedom of speech also means the freedom not to speak. Freedom of beliefs means the freedom not to believe—even if the set of beliefs that are rejected are democratic ones. Therefore, while the teacher has a responsibility to support and strengthen democratic values, such values cannot be mandated. Such compulsory practices would misrepresent democratic values and would, at best, only beget token compliance rather than willing commitment.

Regarding the method of education, the teacher is limited by the rights of students to learn in conscious ways that do not violate respect for the individual. This includes the rights of students to know the reasons behind what they are being taught as well as the reasons behind why they are being taught in a particular way. Respect for the individual's freedom also entails the responsibility to relate what is learned to the concerns of the student and to respect the student's right to privacy.

It should be pointed out that this position regarding ethics rejects certain elements of the naturalistic philosophy that guided the efforts of the early progressivists. It rejects the view that the source of wisdom and morality is found in nature. It rejects the faith that this point of view placed in the natural development of human beings. Simply because individuals possess certain kinds of attributes does not mean that these attributes should be developed and maximized. For human beings have the capacity for evil, for destruction, for indolence and despair. Promoting such potential is consistent neither with human dignity nor strengthening the intellect and character of the individual.

Neither does this position embrace the view of essentialists who emphasize only intellectual training through the acquisition of basic knowledge and subject matter. Knowledge is not morality. Even though understanding of the world may contribute to responsible human behavior, it is not sufficient for the development of ethical citizens. Mastery of fixed bodies of knowledge at any given time is not sufficient to prepare individuals for even the immediate future. Knowledge is constantly changing. To accept the essentialist view is to confine learners to outdated views of the world.

Rather, the position expressed here most closely approximates the view
of experimentalists which supports the utilization of nature but not submission to it. It includes the view that human beings will continually have to solve problems in their environment and use their intelligence to satisfy their basic needs and generate creative responses for a better social life.

Having discussed the value base that should guide the ethical conduct of social studies teachers, I would like to turn to dilemmas that arise between parents, teachers and students regarding the purposes of schooling and the knowledge and methods of study that are utilized.

PURPOSES OF SCHOOLING

What then is the ethical stance that social studies teachers should take regarding the purpose of schooling? Guided by the values previously stated, the purpose of schooling for the social studies teacher is to develop educated and ethical citizens who possess the knowledge, values and skills to be effective participants in a democratic society.

Two illustrative cases will be used to highlight value conflicts between parents, teachers and students. From these cases, some implications for the ethical conduct of social studies teachers will be derived.

Case #1: Teacher v. Parent

One current concern of many parents is cast in the form of a call for “the basics.” Let us suppose that a group of such parents has confronted a school’s administration demanding that the curriculum of the school focus dominantly on the development of reading, writing and computational skills and that attention to such “frills” as social studies be minimized if not eliminated. These parents have, in effect, challenged the purpose of schooling as held by teachers of social studies. The teacher of social studies sees this effort by parents as one that suggests a narrow focus on skill development and thwarts the opportunity to develop educated and ethical citizens. As such it is not consistent with the criteria for education in a democratic society. If implemented the purpose of developing educated and ethical citizens will be aborted or severely limited.

How should social studies teachers respond to this challenge? First of all, it seems clear that social studies teachers have a responsibility to act. The purpose of education in a democratic society is being subverted. As agents of such a society they must act to preserve that purpose. To assume a passive posture would allow any group of parents or citizens to violate the ethical criteria for education in a democratic society. Secondly, the social studies teacher must be willing to engage in a rational dialogue with parents about the purposes of schooling. They must actualize the value of rational
discourse by marshaling their arguments and attempting to enlighten and broaden the view of parents regarding the purposes of schooling. They need to make the point that no group of citizens has the right to divert the purpose of schooling in a way that prevents or inhibits the socialization of the young to democratic values. In sum, teachers are ethically compelled to act in such cases and act in reason-giving ways. Finally, it should be noted that inaction on the part of teachers would disturb the equilibrium of freedom and power between the three principal groups concerned with education.

Case #2: Teacher v. Student

Let us suppose that a small group of students object to the school’s requirement that they must select one of several social studies electives in their senior year. They claim that the social studies class has no practical value. It will not help them to get a better job and that they would rather elect an advanced course in business that would better prepare them for the world of work. The response of the social studies teacher in this case is limited by the right of the society to socialize its young to democratic values and by the teacher’s role as an agent of society. The teacher must protect the purpose of schooling to develop educated and ethical citizens. Although the school may provide opportunities for students to develop career skills that is not its primary purpose. The teacher has the responsibility to give reasons for this position and to do all that is possible to relate those reasons as well as the content of the course to the concerns of students. To acquiesce to these students would both violate the values of a democratic education and would disturb the equilibrium between teachers, students and the society.

KNOWLEDGE AND METHODS OF STUDY

To be ethical regarding the knowledge that is transmitted and about the methods by which it is transmitted, the teacher must be able to argue that both are worthwhile in that they enhance the development of an educated and ethical citizen in a democratic society. To meet this condition the knowledge presented should represent the following criteria:

1. The knowledge should be reliable in that it can be supported logically or empirically.
2. The knowledge presented should be representative of all human diversity—cultural, racial, ethnic and economic.
3. Knowledge should be presented as tentative and subject to change.
4. The knowledge presented should illuminate a meaningful understanding of pervasive and enduring social issues.
5. The knowledge presented should include alternative values and value judgments along with their alternative supporting rationales.
When knowledge is so characterized, it can be argued that it enhances the student’s opportunity to know the truth and it provides a reliable base for educated and ethical decision-making action.

The following case is presented to illustrate tension that can arise between parents and teachers regarding knowledge.

Case #3: Teacher v. Parent

Let us suppose that in a ninth grade civics class, the students are engaged in a consideration of welfare policy. The majority of students take a position that opposes welfare programs. To balance this view, the teacher distributes a magazine article that articulates the case in favor of certain welfare programs. The teacher explains to the students that the article presents a different point of view to the one supported in class. The students are asked to identify the reasons and evidence given in the article and are subsequently involved in a class discussion about it. A few days later the teacher is confronted by an angry parent who states that the teacher has no right to influence the values of the students.

Ethical behavior on the part of the teacher would require pointing out that teachers have a responsibility to present students with alternative value judgments not in an attempt to coerce them but to enlighten their decision-making process. Emphasis needs to be placed on the point that not doing so would limit the student’s opportunity to know the truth and to make informed decisions about issues. In effect, the teacher has a responsibility to act in a reason-giving way and the reasons must reflect the values that guide education in a democratic society. To give in to the parent by agreeing not to engage in such practices again disturbs the equilibrium between parents and teachers, and violates the values of a democratic education.

When making decisions about the methods of study the teacher needs to be mindful of several factors that are derived from the values that guide education in a democratic society.

1. The student has a right to learn.
2. The student has a right to be aware or conscious of the methods of study that are being used. In addition, the student has the right to know the reasons for employing a specific method of study.
3. The student has a right to privacy.

However, the teacher has a responsibility to employ methods that will contribute to the ability of students to make informed and ethical decisions. This responsibility entails the use of methods that will permit students to apply knowledge in decision-making contexts. The following case illustrates a dilemma between teachers and students regarding the methods of study.
Case #4: Teacher v. Student

A teacher has engaged students in a discussion of their opinions about euthanasia. One student has remained silent. The teacher specifically calls on her for an expression of opinion. The student says that she would rather not talk about it. The teacher presses her further by stating that issues must be discussed if decisions are going to be made about them. The student responds by saying she does not have any opinions. After class the student tells the teacher that she does not feel that she should be pressured into stating opinions.

In this case, the student has called an appropriate foul. While teachers have the right and responsibility to provide a forum for the open discussion of issues, this does not include the right to coerce students into publicly stating their views. Ethical behavior in this case would involve an apology on the part of the teacher and a commitment not to engage in such tactics in the future. The student is claiming rights that she is entitled to in the context of a democratic education. Not to agree with the student in this case would not only violate those rights but disturb the balance of power between students and teachers by providing the teacher with ungrounded authority.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the position taken here has tried to articulate the values that should guide the conduct of social studies teachers. It has delineated the role that teachers can play in preserving the equilibrium of power between society, teachers and students. Finally, it has stated that when the values inherent in democratic education are challenged, teachers have a responsibility to act. These actions should take the form of marshaling arguments in defense of such values and their related behaviors and engaging other actors in the educational arena in rational discourse. In this way social studies teachers assume an active responsibility for the nature of the public educational institutions.

At best, this paper represents a preliminary exploration into the ethics and the conduct of social studies teachers. This treatment has not been exhaustive of all domains of concern nor of all contingencies that might arise. Hopefully, it represents a thoughtful probing into a difficult but crucial dimension of the profession.
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INTRODUCTION

Ethical issues in social studies education frequently emerge from unexpected quarters and under unanticipated circumstances. Who would imagine, for example, that an international organization which was established to promote the educational, scientific and cultural concerns of humankind would itself be the source of profound ethical controversy? Yet such is the case with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). It should not be surprising, of course, if specific programs or activities of such an organization were to evoke ethical controversies—such as the role of educational institutions in reconstructing the social order, or the impact of cultural imperialism in a given society. But when a world-wide controversy emerges over the issue of whether members of the academic community should even participate in the activities of UNESCO, then it seems appropriate to inquire into the circumstances given rise to such an ethical question.

Taking as its point of departure a specific situation involving a UNESCO related activity, this analysis focuses on three dimensions of the relationship between ethics and education: (1) sources of ethical authority, (2) an evolving international morality, and (3) implications of both of the above specifically for social studies educators. This exposition is further predicated on the assumption that ethical issues are indeed susceptible to rational analysis. It rejects the notion that all ethical issues are essentially a matter of personal preference or opinion and that “one person's opinion is as good as another.”

Also starting from a stance which rejects the notion that “in matters of value anything goes,” Israel Scheffler observes, “The word has gone out, it seems, that ethical and moral questions are beyond the reach of rational discussion. As a result, dogmatic appeals to commitment multiply and persuasive rhetoric replaces argument, short-circuiting the deliberate process, frustrating the demand for reasons and stilling the critical impulse” (Scheffler, 1965).

No one situation, or case study, is likely to encompass the full range of all conceivable ethical issues. The episode selected for extended analysis here falls within the constraints of this limitation. This being the case, it is appropriate to sketch briefly some advance organizers within which the case
study can be dissected. The first of these is the concept of authority.

The idea of authority has several connotative and denotative meanings. On a rather simple level, we frequently refer to the authority of a chieftain, a parent, or even a classroom teacher. Similarly, we refer to the authority invested in presidents, kings, or monarchs. Max Weber was one of the first to identify and describe an expanded conception of authority—one having a legal and rational basis. He argued that different conceptions of authority can be distinguished by reference to the grounds of legitimacy supporting them (Weber, 1947). Benne expanded upon Weber’s analysis and inquired into the nature of educational authority (Benne, 1943).

Written over three decades ago, Benne’s analysis of the concept of authority is still incisive and relevant. He points out that, especially since the Second World War, we have erroneously equated the term authority with authoritarianism. While categorically rejected the latter, he cogently points out that some source of authority is unavoidable in any society. Our obligation in a democratic society is to ground such authority in principles, not in persons. Benne goes on, “Educators must redefine the character and limits of their non-authoritarian authority under changed conditions of life. To deny their authority is, in effect, to surrender responsibility for the community function which, as educators, they exist to serve.”

The second advance organizer has to do with a modified conception of international morality. It may appear to be presumptuous even to speak of such a global ethical scheme. It is introduced, however, not to promulgate a novel all-encompassing philosophy but rather to extrapolate from Benne’s recommendation that educators redefine authority “under changed conditions of life.” There are, of course, numerous examples of significant social changes that have taken place since the Second World War, but for purposes of this exposition two developments merit specific consideration: (a) the changing nature of individuality in a global society, and (b) the development among social scientists of a common epistemological base for verifying knowledge claims.

It is unnecessary at this stage to say anything more about the third advance organizer, the implications for social studies education, except that each reader will undoubtedly perceive different issues and raise divergent questions. In order to achieve some kind of convergent thinking on this particular case study, the following over-arching issue is posed: To what extent is an institution of higher learning justified in rescinding, even on a temporary basis, its historic function of serving as a marketplace for the free and responsible exchange of ideas?

Before some background information and pertinent data on the case under study is presented, a caveat should be invoked. As a participant observer in this particular case, I am acutely aware of the potentiality for bias and factual error to creep into even the most ostensibly objective
account. I have not only done the utmost to prevent this, but cite an important fact which tends to support the objective nature of this narration. It is simply that the essence of the account here presented has been made available since November, 1976, to all significant parties involved in this controversy. To this date I have received no corrections of the facts presented. Opinions contained in the narration are clearly identifiable within the context of the presentation.

A SUMMARY OF THE CASE UNDER STUDY

Events Prior to the Conference

1. In December, 1974, I attended the annual meeting of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO after having been appointed to the Commission early in 1974. While at the meeting, I was informed by a member of the Commission staff that UNESCO was planning to hold an international conference on "The role of the social studies in education for peace and respect for human rights."

2. As the then president of the National Council for the Social Studies and a member of the Michigan State University Institute for International Studies in Education, I inquired about the possibility of holding the proposed conference at MSU.

3. At the suggestion of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, I also approached officers within the National Council for the Social Studies to inquire if they would be interested in being involved in the conference. I reported on the possibility of such a conference to the Board of Directors of the NCSS in May, 1975. Since there was no certainty at that time as to what country would host the conference, the report was primarily informational and did not require any formal action on the part of the Board. By unanimous consent, it concurred with my request to pursue the matter further on behalf of the NCSS.

4. During the summer of 1975, the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO cabled a request to the UNESCO Secretariat in Paris to have the proposed conference held at MSU in May, 1976. The conference was to be hosted by MSU in cooperation with the National Council for the Social Studies and the U.S. National Commission.

5. UNESCO approved the request in August 1975 and included the list of fifteen countries to be invited.

6. At the NCSS Board of Directors meeting in November, 1975 I reported more fully on the planned conference. The Board unanimously voted continued support for holding the conference. I also reported to the NCSS International Activities Committee and it passed a motion by a vote of 9-1 in support of NCSS cooperation with the conference.
7. Beginning in the Fall, 1975 several faculty members at MSU voiced strong objections to having a UNESCO sponsored conference on the MSU campus. The University withdrew its offer to host the conference in February, 1976. I requested permission to hold the conference as originally planned at the Kellogg Center for Continuing Education on the MSU campus but without any official University hosting or funds. The hosting functions were to be taken over by the U.S. National Commission and the NCSS. This request was initially denied by MSU.

8. After writing a letter to President Wharton of MSU requesting that he reconsider the above decision, I received a reply from him on March 15, 1976 permitting the conference to be held at Kellogg Center with the U.S. National Commission and the NCSS as hosts.

9. At its meeting held in May, 1976 the NCSS Board of Directors approved my request for approximately $1,200 to defray anticipated expenses incurred in hosting the conference.

**The Conference and Its Aftermath**

The conference was held as scheduled during the week of May 23-29, 1976. The official delegates to the conference were fourteen persons holding positions of high responsibility for social studies education in the following countries: Australia, Colombia, Egypt, England, France, Iran, Japan, Madagascar, Nigeria, Philippines, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States. It should be stressed that these persons attended as private individuals and not as official representatives of their government. A total of over 50 other individuals attended the conference as official and informal observers. The United States delegate, Howard Mehlinger, then President-elect of the NCSS, was elected by the other conferees to be the chairman of the conference.

The report of the conference (in three languages) has been distributed widely to key decision makers in the social studies in various parts of the world. It has also been used as input to the agendas of similar regional conferences held in 1976 in Central America and Africa. It will also be used in another planned follow-up conference in South America in December, 1977. A major substantive contribution to the report is the basic background paper prepared for the conference by James Becker and Lee Anderson. The report contains recommendations relating to teacher education, research, and dissemination as well as rationale and strategies for teaching about peace and respect for human rights.

Five months after the May, 1976 conference, a group entitled The Committee for an Effective UNESCO1 continued to list the MSU conference under a heading entitled "List of known university cancellations of UNESCO sponsored meetings." The Committee is an extremely
powerful pressure group. It has taken the leadership in bringing about the
cancellation or indefinite postponement of UNESCO sponsored meetings
scheduled to be held on several American university campuses—including
Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, American University, the University of
California at San Diego, and the University of Texas at Austin. Although
my initial reaction was to ignore this obviously erroneous and potentially
libelous listing from the Committee, yet another development was taking
place which gave me no alternative than to respond. This second
development, in September 1976, involved the preparation of a resolution
to be submitted to the November 1976 meeting of the NCSS House of
Delegates. The resolution, prepared by the Association of Teachers of
Social Studies in the City of New York, was critical of UNESCO and called
upon the NCSS to “disassociate itself from all UNESCO activities until
specifically authorized to the contrary by the House of Delegates.”

My response to the Committee for an Effective UNESCO was contained
in a lengthy open letter to Committee members. The essence of this letter
was also incorporated into my response to the New York teachers group. It
consisted of five major points, the first four summarized here briefly and
the fifth elaborated.

1. As a result of actions taken by individuals espousing the point of view
of the Committee for an Effective UNESCO, high administrative officials
at Michigan State University took the literally unprecedented step of deny-
ing the services of its Continuing Education Service to one of its faculty
members acting on behalf of a recognized and respected national
professional organization of which he also happens to be a past president.

2. The Committee for an Effective UNESCO's list of “cancelled”
conferences has been used in such a manner as to have insidious
consequences for the academic community.

It was pointed out here that in at least two known instances individuals
had referred to “cancellations” at three universities (including MSU) when,
in fact, discussions concerning the holding of the conferences were still in
process. In one instance, I corrected the individual and he later issued a
retraction. In the second instance, the individual indicated no retraction.

3. The Committee for an Effective UNESCO and those who subscribe to
its points of view have contributed an incremental but highly significant
imbalance to whatever parity may have existed on given campuses involving
the relative weight of university administrators and faculty in the decision-
making process.

The key point here is that MSU administrative officials made the decision
to withdraw official hosting of the conference despite the fact that all of the
faculty members whose major teaching responsibilities included social
studies courses favored the holding of the conference and four out of five
wrote to the University president indicating their support.
4. The Committee for an Effective UNESCO has itself exhibited unscholarly conduct and lack of objectivity—the very kinds of defects it has attributed to UNESCO.

The erroneous references to the "known cancellations" of the MSU conference are only one category of such instances. I cited also the use of a list of organizations which the Committee refers to as "List of known protests and resolutions condemning UNESCO politicalization (sic) by American learned societies and professional organizations." Although these resolutions tend to exhort individual members (rather than organizations or institutions) to withhold their services to UNESCO, they were used on the MSU campus as part of a rationale for urging institutions of higher education to withhold collaboration with UNESCO sponsored activities.

5. In arguing against the politicization of UNESCO, the Committee for an Effective UNESCO and its adherents have proposed courses of action that are in themselves highly detrimental to the cause of academic freedom.

Perhaps the most frequently voiced criticism leveled against UNESCO and its sponsored conferences is that they have become politicized to such an extent that no self-respecting scholar should have anything to do with either until they mend their ways. This position has been prominently disseminated and supported by the Committee for an Effective UNESCO. Putting aside for the moment the extremely complex semantic problem of determining what constitutes politicization, let me relate some of the actual consequences on the campus of MSU emanating from the use of this line of reasoning by those who opposed the holding of the conference here.

An all-university advisory committee on international affairs spent over two and one-half hours discussing the pros and cons of permitting the conference to be held. A major argument of the opposition revolved about the issue of politicization. The adopted motion (by a one vote majority) stated that the committee "wishes to support the hosting of the conference if the conference agenda were to include, and focus upon, the reconsideration of the UNESCO resolutions against Israel's membership, or the membership of any other country, in UNESCO on a regional basis as well as at the general level." This motion, in substance, insisted that the meeting become politicized. One cannot help wondering how each of these faculty members (whose academic interests ranged from animal husbandry to zoology but none of whom were in social studies education) might have reacted had he or she been the initiator of a professional conference and then was confronted with a mandate for interjecting extraneous and highly volatile political issues into the agenda as a pre-condition for holding the conference.

Another use to which the politicization argument was put on the MSU campus is more comprehensible, but even more damaging to any academic
environment. It is, in effect, 180 degrees removed from the above notion. According to this argument, the university should be given adequate assurances that any planned UNESCO conference would not become politicized before it gives permission to have it held. A request from MSU for such an assurance was conveyed to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, one of the two organizations formally cooperating with the sponsor of the conference. A letter of response from one of the Commission staff members pointed out the difficulty of giving an ironclad guarantee for this or any other conference. He raised the question, for example, of who can predict with certainty what any delegate, acting as a private citizen, may say in the heat of professional dialogue. He also pointed out, however, that the chairperson of such a conference is traditionally the delegate from the host country. This person would be in a position, by using proper parliamentary procedures, to forestall or lessen the impact of such politicization. This response was deemed to be inadequate and not satisfactory by an MSU administrator who was opposed to having the conference held.

Consider the implications of such an opposing stance. It is prejudicial in the literal sense. A pre-judgment about the conference participants has already been made. These private scholars—our counterparts throughout the world—are presumed to have lost whatever scholarly integrity and objectivity they possess when they leave their countries and set foot on the soil of an American university.

The Committee for an Effective UNESCO has distributed a statement by Professor David Landes of Harvard University delivered before the Subcommittee on International Relations of the U.S. House of Representatives. The Committee indicated that the statement "includes discussion of issues bearing upon UNESCO's politicization about which we share similar concerns." One of the sentences in this statement reads, "Now, in such an atmosphere [of politicization], I submit, effective international cooperation is impossible." (italics mine) I invited the Committee to contrast this opinion about the impossibility of like-minded world scholars to cooperate with one another with the demonstrated fact of free and responsible discourse that characterized the UNESCO sponsored meeting held at MSU. How much of an element of self-fulfilling prophecy is there in a position which postulates as a foregone conclusion the "impossibility" of such international cooperation among members of the academic community? This position taken by the Committee for an Effective UNESCO has already been successful in building a soundproof wall around the campuses of several universities in the United States. A logical extension of this communications boycott is the building of a similar wall around the entire American academic community.

It has come full circle. What the Committee for an Effective UNESCO
has effectively been advocating is this: In the name of *opposing* politicization of a world academic community it is *proposing* politicization of selected members of the American academic community. It is aiding and abetting academic balkanization.

The above letter to the Committee for an Effective UNESCO was dated November 4, 1976—ironically the date of the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of UNESCO. On that same day the NCSS House of Delegates considered the two resolutions relating to UNESCO. One was submitted by the Michigan Council for the Social Studies and, in essence, supported the holding of the conference at MSU. A significant strengthening amendment was added from the floor which specifically charged that "domestic pressures to secure support for a total boycott of UNESCO activities are resulting in an equally dangerous suppression of the principles of academic freedom . . . ." The resolution offered by the New York teachers association was severely amended on the floor by withdrawal of the statement criticizing UNESCO and the statement urging that the NCSS "disassociate itself from all UNESCO activities." Both resolutions, as amended, were passed by a voice vote.

**RESPONSES FROM THE COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE UNESCO**

On November 16, 1976, I received a two and a half page response to my open letter to the Committee. It was from Professor Landes who said he was taking the liberty of replying to my letter "since you mention me in it." He summarized many of the same arguments he presented in his lengthier statement before the House Subcommittee on International Relations. The essential points in his letter were the following (italics are mine):

1. He expressed agreement with me in opposing "prior scrutiny or precensorship of scholarly conferences on political grounds." Any scholars who want to "should be able to get together to talk about any issues they want to talk about."

2. A major point of difference he identified was "in our assessment of the acceptability and appropriateness of UNESCO's sponsorship or affiliation in the present circumstances. I think that an organization that, under the color of support for educational, scientific, or cultural activities, seeks to reduce the State of Israel to pariah status and contributes thereby to a campaign for its political and moral outlawry, is an inappropriate and undesirable partner for scholarly endeavor."

3. He acknowledged that no university should take on such condemnations lightly. "But neither should someone like yourself take lightly the prospect of engaging your reputation with an organization that was for a time on the way to violating its purpose and becoming an
instrument for a political and moral crime.”

4. Much of the dispute is now moot, he argued, because UNESCO was in the process of rescinding one of its previous actions and allowing Israel to join the European regional group. But it was only the vehemence of the reactions against previous resolutions which “succeeded in persuading UNESCO to reverse direction on this issue.”

A shorter letter by Ruth Levine, Executive Staff Consultant for the Committee for an Effective UNESCO, was received on December 7, 1976. It was outspoken and pointed. She wrote, “The Committee was pleased to provide information to those of your colleagues who requested it, in support of their efforts to have MSU join the world community of intellectuals who have, individually and collectively, acted courageously to preserve academic freedom . . .” Furthermore, “It is a disservice to your colleagues, to your University, and certainly to the academic constituency of the Committee for an Effective UNESCO, to suggest that free scholarship was in any way infringed upon by denying official support to you.” Finally, the letter accused me of invoking “trivial” and “spurious” semantics.

Let us now turn to an analysis of the ethical implications of the events surrounding the UNESCO episode at Michigan State University and other American university campuses.

ETHICAL AND EDUCATIONAL AUTHORITY

The proponents of an academic boycott of UNESCO related activities grounded their beliefs in at least two types of authority. The first and most easily identifiable base was in persons—individuals who themselves had acquired justifiable reputations in their areas of academic competence and who were literally “authorities in their field.” The Committee for an Effective UNESCO, for example, prominently displays on its letterheads the names of distinguished Nobel Laureates. At Michigan State University this list of supporters was frequently invoked by those who opposed the holding of the UNESCO conference.

For purposes of this analysis the appeal to such authorities provides a rather weak justification for ethical decision making. On almost any kind of ethical issue such appeals to individual authorities can be cancelled by equal and opposite lists of opposing individuals. The argument is especially weak on either side if the lists contain individuals whose academic competencies are outside the field of the particular conference or meeting that is being boycotted. For example, with respect to the conference at Michigan State University which dealt with the topic of social studies education, none of the authorities invoked by the Committee for an Effective UNESCO professed competence in this area. On the other hand, the five faculty
members at Michigan State University whose special area of competency is in the social studies, and who have established national reputations in the field, favored the holding of the conference.

A second and much more significant basis for authority resides not in persons but in principles. It is important to identify the principles on both sides of the UNESCO controversy to which the parties appeal as a basis for making decisions within the educational enterprise. The proponents of academic boycotts frequently use such terms as "holding firm" and "maintaining pressure" on UNESCO, thus forcing that organization to rescind actions which are deemed to be "politically motivated." By their overt actions they have also brought pressure on academic institutions not to give in to UNESCO sponsored activities.

Thus the stage is set for resolving an ethical issue by appeal to the principle of pressure group tactics. Let there be no denying the fact that this is a perfectly logical and defensible principle. It is the basis on which much of the western democratic political process operates. One of its manifestations in the economic system—the boycott—has been devastatingly used. A concomitant irony of its use in international economics has been its retaliatory and escalating qualities. But the crucial issue under consideration here is its ethical justification as a basis for decision making in the academic community.

Operating under the principle of pressure group tactics, one of the leaders of the opposition to the UNESCO conference on the MSU campus acknowledged that his stance was the academic equivalent of a military pre-emptive strike. He argued that it was perfectly justifiable to bring enough pressure on the university so that the conference was destroyed before it could inflict the damage that was imputed to it. The damage, in his opinion, was that the university would be giving aid and comfort to an organization that was intent on destroying the sovereign state of Israel.

An opposing principle postulates that universities serve intrinsically as marketplaces for the free and responsible exchange of ideas. It is possible, of course, that the exercise of this principle may result in consequences that are disruptive to society in the same manner that boycotts may be disruptive. As with most ethical controversies the choice is rarely between one principle which is unequivocally good versus one which is unequivocally bad. Before one can assess the validity of the pressure group principle, one is obligated to inquire into the consequences of actions emanating from its use. And this leads us to the First Amendment.

By actively engaging in a campaign to prohibit the holding of such conferences on American campuses the adherents of this position are practicing a form of pre-censorship that violates both the spirit and the letter of the First Amendment to our own Constitution. In the development of American constitutional law there has emerged the principle of "clear
and present danger” as a necessary condition for denial of the rights to free speech. The opinion of some individuals that there may be danger or even the possibility of such danger are not sufficient cause for pre-censorship. Did the holding of a conference at MSU on the role of the social studies in education for peace and respect for human rights constitute such a clear and present danger? Demonstrably not. Is it likely that the holding of similar conferences (e.g., on the fine arts or lifelong education) meets the criterion of clear and present danger? Very likely not.

An additional regrettable consequence of such pre-censorship is the image of the American academic community that is conveyed to our world-wide colleagues. They are not so naive that they fail to see the contradiction between our professions of constitutional faith and our actions. These contradictions are regrettable wherever they occur but they are especially inappropriate in an academic setting.

AN EVOLVING INTERNATIONAL MORALITY

In a lecture on Soviet education,4 the late George Counts related a conversation he had with a leading Soviet educator in the 1920’s. Counts asked, “What are you up to?” After a pause the educator replied solemnly, “We are going to change the character of the Russian people.” In his lecture some thirty-five years later, Counts said, “I smiled, . . . I knew that was utter nonsense.” And then, upon reflection, he concluded, “Now, . . . I wouldn’t smile.”

In a like manner any reference to a new international morality may evoke similar smiles. But one need only recall the enormous changes in attitudes that have taken place worldwide during the past generation on such matters as family planning, life styles, the environment, energy use, and especially the conception of our planet as spaceship earth. Similar changes—perhaps not as perceptible, but of great significance—may also be taking place which have profound implications for ethical decision making within the academic community. The first of these has to do with the nature of individuality.

Briefly stated, this changing conception of individuality amounts to a Copernican revolution in social thought. The classical literary conception of the individual puts him or her at the center of a social universe. Other individuals, material things, and social institutions revolve around each individual. They are viewed in relation to the individual. What if—repeat, if— this conception of the individual is in error in the same way in which the pre-Copernican view of the earth as the center of our solar system is in error? Lest this be regarded as sheer fancy, it should be pointed out that the philosopher Elijah Jordan argues very cogently for this revised concept. He states his case even more emphatically. “The individual of modern ethical
theory," he writes in The Good Life, "has no existence and never had existence" (Jordan, 1949).

Barnett and Otis have expanded upon the educational implications of Jordan's philosophy (Barnett and Otis, 1961). Included in their analysis is a conception of educational authority that is grounded neither in individuals nor in competing groups. They write:

Education's authority does not derive from any group or collectivity of persons acting as a causal mechanism from without. Education, through the form it has taken, is a reality in its own right and the authority of education is the logic which best defines both its static and dynamic tendencies. Said another way, its authority is superindividual in precisely the same sense that scientific authority is superindividual. Neither science nor education has an organic reference to particular scientists or educators, but rather to the body of logically validated categories which most adequately characterizes the object of study and concomitantly defines the capacities necessary for a scientist or educator.

Whether one agrees completely with Jordan's ideas on individuality, the events of the past quarter century tend to confirm the view that it is the individual who is shaped by the social order more than each individual shapes the social order. If this is so, and if Max Weber's analysis of authority has validity, then humankind appears to be moving in the direction of viewing authority as deriving not from individuals but from a higher cultural order binding the interdependent collection of individuals.

A concomitant development supporting such an emerging global morality is the internationalization of knowledge and especially the means by which knowledge claims are verified. A global epistemology has emerged. This is not a surprising development in such academic disciplines as the natural sciences and mathematics. A physicist in the Soviet Union can easily have his experiments replicated and verified elsewhere—and vice versa. What is surprising is the growing extent to which social science knowledge is being subjected to similar standards and criteria. This common epistemological base has already led to a large degree of internationalization of the social sciences. And, for better or for worse, the social and behavioral sciences are having their impact on the way people view the world social order.

Thus the changing nature of individuality and the growing common epistemological base both support the need for viewing the educational enterprise within a world context. The intrusion of ephemeral nationalistic disputes and the use of these as a basis for decision making in the academic community is contra-indicated as a prescription for a growing international morality. No one is so naive as to assume that inter-nation conflicts are a thing of the past. But should they be used by academicians to impede halting steps toward a more mature world society?
IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATORS

"The social studies invite controversy," Charles Bear wrote four decades ago (Beard, 1932). And so it is today. One of the implications for social studies teachers of the UNESCO controversy is that it compels us to examine our stance on the matter of dealing with controversial issues—whether in the elementary or secondary school classroom or on the college campus. We are all aware of instances in which social studies teachers have been criticized by parents, or school administrators, or both, for inviting to their classrooms persons with views that go contrary to the prevailing beliefs of the local community. Some teachers have even been dismissed for such actions despite the fact that most statements on academic freedom (including those issued by the National Council for the Social Studies) specifically uphold the teacher’s right to do so.

Most social studies teachers almost instinctively rise to the defense of other teachers who are criticized or harrassed because of their exercise of this academic freedom. But an astonishing consequence followed as a result of the UNESCO conference at Michigan State University. The organization which co-hosted the meeting (the NCSS) was the target of a censuring motion offered by a local social studies teachers’ organization on the floor of the NCSS House of Delegates annual meeting. Furthermore, the organizer of the conference was singled out by name by a member of the local organization as meriting a specific motion of censure. Such actions raise serious questions about the degree of support that our professional co-workers are prepared to give to a cornerstone of the academic edifice.

An even more disturbing implication of the position taken by the opponents of the UNESCO conference is the failure to apply the same analytical tools to this issue that we, as social studies teachers, espouse to our own students. Most social studies teachers properly point out that even though the people of Topeka, Kansas, overwhelmingly endorsed the idea of segregated schools, the Supreme Court appealed to a higher source of principles (the Fourteenth Amendment) in deciding the case. The authority that resides within a school district—or the majority within a local professional group—may be superceded by appeal to the principles embedded in the authority inherent in a more inclusive entity, e.g., a national constitution or the raison d’etre of educational institutions.

Another implication of the UNESCO controversy, while ostensibly ancillary, has serious implications for the social studies and for the society as a whole. It has to do with the responsibility of the mass media in dealing with controversial educational issues. We are all aware of the enormous impact the media may wield in specific instances—e.g., in the treatment of textbook censorship, sex education, or specific social studies curricula such as Man: A Course of Study (MACOS). Educators are not necessarily
looking for a favorable press on all such issues, but they do expect a responsible and reasonably balanced treatment. Let us briefly examine the role of the mass media with respect to the academic boycott of UNESCO related activities.

During the years 1975 and 1976 newspaper articles reporting the cancellation of UNESCO sponsored meetings appeared in several papers including the Washington Post, the New York Times and the Paris edition of the Herald Tribune. One would reasonably assume that, if the cancellation of a UNESCO conference is a newsworthy event, then the reporting of the only uncanceled UNESCO meeting held on an American university campus in the entire year of 1976 is just as newsworthy an event, if not more so. Yet, despite the issuance of a press release by the NCSS on the MSU conference to the major news wire services and to approximately fifteen of the leading newspapers in the country, not one newspaper reported on the MSU conference to the best knowledge of the NCSS. I followed up with specific letters to key editors of the Post and the Times. Still no word. I prepared and submitted in-depth articles for the magazine sections of both papers. They were rejected. I submitted similar in-depth articles to several leading opinion magazines in the mass media. They were similarly rejected.

There is a doubly ironic twist to this silent revolt of the media masses. During the latter part of 1976, literally scores of editorials appeared in the American press angrily denouncing a draft declaration on the mass media which was being considered (and later returned for re-drafting) at the biennial General Conference of UNESCO held in Nairobi, Kenya, in November 1976. The editorials inveighed against the draft declaration because it would allegedly restrict the free flow of information in the world press. What is an impartial observer in the Third World likely to conclude about the self-proclaimed objectivity of the Western press? What is he or she to conclude about its locus of control? What indeed is the symbiotic relationship between two major social institutions in American society—education and the mass media? What should it be?

A further analysis of the ethical responsibilities of the mass media with respect to the worldwide educational scene would be most illuminating, but it is beyond the scope of this treatment. I conclude instead by responding to the over-arching question in this entire UNESCO episode: To what extent is an institution of higher learning justified in rescinding its historic function of serving as a marketplace for the free and responsible exchange of ideas? It is only when the authority to which one appeals resides in a principle that transcends the raison d'être of a university. For example, one may possibly (but not necessarily) invoke the principle of survival in a total war situation as a justification for modifying this historic function. But in the year 1976, on American university campuses, to invoke the authority
that resides within pressure groups, however well-intentioned, is not sufficient justification. Any educational institution acceding to such ephemeral pressure does so at the risk of weakening the same principles that support academic freedom.

FOOTNOTES

1 In December, 1976 the organization re-named itself The Committee for and Effective UNESCO and Other International Organizations.
2 Resolution Number 76-4 and Resolution Number 76-5.
3 It was later learned from the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO that Israel itself had sent a representative from its Gluck School of Archaeology to a UNESCO sponsored conference on Preservation of Historic Sites held in February, 1976 in Warsaw.
4 Delivered and tape recorded on February 2, 1961 at Michigan State University.
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Reviewed by Jan L. Tucker, Florida International University

"The purpose of this book," as indicated on the cover, "is to provide teachers, school administrators, curriculum writers, and university instructors with information for the development and assessment of education programs whose major thrust is mankind's quest for human dignity, human rights, and world peace." A noble aspiration—but grandiose for any one book about such a complex topic, no matter how comprehensive or profound.

International Human Rights and International Education, however, is a good introduction for social studies educators to human rights education, a field where a beginning is long overdue. If the reader can approach this book knowing that the title is broader than its contents and that the millenium is not close at hand (or even to be revealed), it is possible to gain much from this rather thin volume of 149 pages (plus sixty-two pages of appendices).

The 1974 UNESCO "Recommendation Concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms" is the primary message. The entire book has a UNESCO focus which is consistent with the fact that the volume is sponsored and published by the United States National Commission for UNESCO, a 100-member body created by the Congress in 1946 to advise the U.S. Government on UNESCO's programs and budget and to carry out programs in the fields of education, science and culture. In addition, the authors, one an international lawyer and the other a psychologist, were members of the U.S. Government delegation which developed the Recommendation. It is out of this UNESCO background and experience that the book evolved.

The 1974 UNESCO Recommendation is dealt with in Chapter 1. Here, the authors provide an overview of its origins, the debate in the UNESCO General Conference where the United States was one of five nations to cast a negative vote, and its content. The full text of the Recommendation is found in the Appendix along with other basic international documents dealing with human rights such as the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1948. The reader may be
disappointed to discover that the human rights section of the 1975 Helsinki Agreement, signed by thirty-five European and North American nations, is not included in the Appendix. In view of the present administration's emphasis upon human rights as a cornerstone of a new direction in American foreign policy, especially with regard to the Soviet Union, the omission of any reference to the Helsinki Agreement is unfortunate and detracts from the usefulness of the book as an up-to-date documentary reference on human rights.

The following objectives are identified in the UNESCO Recommendation as major guiding principles in the development of educational policy in the member nations:

a) an international dimension and a global perspective in education at all levels and in all its forms;

b) understanding and respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilizations, values and ways of life, including domestic ethnic cultures and cultures of other nations;

c) awareness of the increasing global interdependence between peoples and nations;

d) abilities to communicate with others;

e) awareness not only of the rights but also of the duties incumbent upon individuals, social groups and nations towards each other;

f) understanding of the necessity for international solidarity and cooperation;

g) readiness on the part of the individual to participate in solving problems of his community, his country and the world at large.

These are goals with which most social studies educators will identify.

Chapter Two provides a brief history of international education in the United States and notes that international education is primarily a post-World War II phenomenon. Proper credit is given to the landmark study by James M. Becker and Lee F. Anderson, "An Examination of Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in United States’ Elementary and Secondary Schools" (United States Office of Education, 1969). Many social studies educators, however, will search in vain for important contributions to international education made under the aegis of the National Council for the Social Studies. Unmentioned, for example, are two important yearbooks of NCSS published during the 1960’s: New Perspectives in World History, Shirley H. Engle, editor, 1964, and International Dimensions in the Social Studies, James A. Becker and Howard D. Mehlinger, editors, 1968.

Chapters Three and Four give an overview of the basic human rights documents upon which the 1974 UNESCO Recommendation is based. For instance, the human rights and fundamental freedoms promoted in the
Recommendation, "are those defined in the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the International Covenants on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and on Civil and Political Rights." Taken in the aggregate, these four documents comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. Other relevant documents are the Genocide Convention, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the UNESCO Convention and Recommendation Against Discrimination in Education, the Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women and the Declaration of the Rights of the Child.

The authors point to the regional European Convention of Human Rights as "the most advanced international system for the protection of human rights in existence today." The European Convention is subscribed to by most western European nations and includes a Court of Human Rights and a European Commissioner of Human Rights which have the power to try and decide cases brought by individuals against governments. Some 500 cases are handled each year, a testimony that multiple-nation agreements on basic human rights and freedoms can have teeth and can result in measurable impact.

Chapter Five describes the role of the United States in the development of the concept of international human rights. This role is justifiably depicted as "a bundle of contradictions dictated by sometimes irreconcilable domestic and international policy considerations." Although the United States has a modest right to be pleased with progress made toward greater human rights domestically, it has failed to ratify any major international human rights treaty. For example, the United States has still to ratify the 1948 Genocide Convention. This reluctance stems mainly from the historical fear of the Congress that international human rights documents might be used to further the cause of civil rights in American courts. In the 1940's and 50's, this possibility created strong concern in Congress and many argued that international treaties were an infringement upon national sovereignty. This concern resulted in the 1952 "Bricker Amendment" which essentially would have given Congress complete control over international treaty-making and domestic implementation. Although the "Bricker Amendment" was defeated eventually by one vote in the Senate, it was only after President Eisenhower promised Congress that he did not intend to support the various human rights covenants developed in the United Nations. In the meantime, great strides were made on behalf of civil rights through the Supreme Court's interpretation of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, e.g., Brown v The Board of Education, 1954. These gains, according to the authors, have now obviated the earlier concerns and the time is ripe for renewed Congressional vigor in the field of international human rights. This observation seems to be validated by the
generally favorable reaction of Congress and the American public to President Carter's recent initiatives on human rights. But we should be only cautiously optimistic. International human rights is uncharted territory and the United States is now holding its collective breath as its people await world reaction to these bold moves.

The social studies community will find the chapter on research to be very enlightening and useful. The research section is strengthened by the intense involvement of co-author Torney in several research studies on political socialization. Of major importance is the Torney, Oppenheim and Farnen multi-national study reported in Civic Education in Ten Countries: An Empirical Study (New York: Halstead Press of John Wiley, 1975). Two especially important findings for social studies educators are identified from this research literature: (1) the period before the age of fourteen is very important because the child's openness to diversity in this period is more likely to foster positive international attitudes; (2) students in the United States tend to possess less knowledge about international matters than about national matters and to be less motivated to participate in discussion of international affairs outside the classroom than are the students of other countries. Each of these findings has important implications for social studies practice.

The final chapter, written by Richard W. Fogg, is a description and evaluation of existing curriculum materials in international education. Unfortunately, all of the materials reviewed are for grades 7-12. The reasons for the complete omission of elementary materials is not clear. It is probably a combination of the author's preferences and the lack of materials at the K-6 level. For whatever reason, this void contrasts sharply with the previously reported research which suggests that the pre-fourteen years are critical in developing positive international attitudes. The failure to make this connection in the book points out the pitfalls of "plugging in" a practical chapter without appropriate attention to the theory and the research. Nevertheless, secondary teachers and curriculum directors will find the chapter to be valuable.

The major weakness of the book, in the judgment of this reviewer, is the absence of a chapter or even any substantial discussion of teacher attitudes, behaviors and role vis-a-vis human rights and international education. This void is especially puzzling in the light of the authors' assertion that the only school-based variable that seems to contribute to positive outcomes of civic education (students who are more knowledgeable, less authoritarian, and more participant) is "classroom climate—in particular whether . . . students are encouraged to express their own opinions." Despite the obvious importance of teacher perspectives and skills in the development of an open-classroom climate, the authors dismiss this critical issue on the grounds that it is this aspect of schooling "which is probably most difficult
to modify." This is difficult to defend. Why should we expect to change students, or arrogate the right to do so, if we, as educators, fail to come to grips with our own shortcomings? The book would convey more credibility if these teacher-related issues were addressed. Perhaps a place to begin would be to use a modified version of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a measure of climate in social studies classrooms. For example, Article 19 of the Declaration states that "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression . . . ." If this right is abridged in any substantial number of social studies classrooms across the land, then what are the implications for human rights education? Human rights education begins at home in the everyday discourse and procedures of classrooms and schools.

I do not wish to end this review on a harsh note. This volume has much to offer the social studies community and should be read. It breaks new ground and provides a useful service in pulling together valuable information about human rights education not generally found in the social studies literature. Most significantly, it contributes to the enlargement of the concept of citizen education which is too often circumscribed by our own national identity. It is important to know that other people are genuinely interested in human rights and that Americans do not have a monopoly on this scarce resource.

This book can initiate the reader into a challenging inquiry about the complex relationships between social studies education and international human rights education. The rationale and the developmental agenda for making international human rights an integral part of social studies education is still to be conceived and written—perhaps by one of the readers of this volume who will then owe a substantial debt to this first attempt.

EDUCATION FOR CITIZEN ACTION by Fred M. Newmann, McCutchan Publ., Berkeley, 1975; and SKILLS IN CITIZEN ACTION: AN ENGLISH-SOCIAL STUDIES PROGRAM FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS by Fred M. Newmann, Thomas A. Bertocci, and Ruthanne M. Landsness, Citizen Participation Curriculum Project, Publisher, Madison, Wisconsin, 1977.

Reviewed by Jack L. Nelson, Rutgers University

The most recent book, Skills in Citizen Action, was initially the target of this review. But two factors demanded that the review encompass the 1975 book, Education for Citizen Action: (1) the books are linked together with Newmann's common authorship in which the 1977 work is an attempt to provide practical assistance for implementing ideas expressed in the earlier
volume, and (2) the Skills book is so practical in orientation that, by itself, it would not be an appropriate book for review in this journal. This latter point is important in that it expresses one view of the kinds of books that *Theory and Research in Social Education* should be reviewing, leaving the teacher guides, workbooks and technique books for other appropriate journals and focusing on those books which offer thoughtful rationales, research-based positions, research methodology, solid critiques or innovative perceptions of the field of social education.

It is in the context of thoughtful rationales and innovative perceptions of social education that these two books deserve review here. Newmann’s earlier book has been reviewed elsewhere but it is important to the Skills book to note the framework for citizen action proposed in 1975. Newmann begins his proposal for a curriculum designed to enhance citizen action by citing the negative social effects of powerlessness and the meager response of traditional citizenship education.

He argues that, “If skills in policy research, persuasion, and organization were increased significantly in the citizenry at large, this would at least eliminate personal incompetence as a factor contributing to powerlessness” (p. 3). This, he suggests, offers the chance to test which of the three sources of powerlessness (required by the system as a way to maintain elites; discriminatory practices against minority groups; or based on human complexities that are insoluble by rational thought) can be eliminated. In the first source system change is required; for the second, policy reform; and for the third, one can only “drop out.”

Newmann characterizes standard citizenship education as falling short of the goal of producing actively participating citizens. He proposes that the right of each person to “exert influence in (in contrast to ‘thinking critically about’ or ‘taking an active interest in’) public affairs” is the most crucial part of democratic theory and yet, the schools neglect it. This leads Newmann to the curriculum in which environmental competence is the goal of the schools.

Drawing mainly on the psychological work of Robert W. White in defining competence as the ability to produce intended consequences, Newmann notes that environmental competence ties intentions to consequences in a person’s external environment and encompasses purposeful action or influence. Further, the book establishes the need for moral determination of intentions and consequences and for educational decisions about which of the many environmental competencies should be developed in schools. The author pulls out one such competency, the ability to exercise influence in public affairs, and provides a curricular structure for it.

The proposed curriculum incorporates the practices of moral deliberation and social policy research, persuasion and group work techniques, and a
practicum in the exercise of influence. Students, according to Newmann, would be voluntary in order to not unjustifiably restrict student freedom. He suggests that if too many students volunteer, they be screened but the screening criteria suggested are vague and unworkable. Newmann describes some of the difficulties that occurred in having volunteers in the project which was a school application of his ideas.

The 1977 Skills book is a sort of teacher's handbook and detailed explanation of the curriculum. Some of these ideas were conducted experimentally under a 1976 grant from the Rockefeller Family Fund. While the previously described 1975 book offered thoughtful views and discussion of the need for restructuring schools, this volume offers superficial glosses. The authors, social studies and curriculum experts who apparently feel qualified in language and literature, state an assumption that, "if citizen participation is taken seriously it can enrich learning and life." That is a claim that could be made for virtually any educational program.

This book proposes a curriculum for a one-year program that fits within the conventional school structure. In that sense it is scarcely as radical as its beginning tribute to Saul Alinsky would suppose. The authors readily admit that this book is aimed at high school teachers and administrators who want more community involvement through a structured curriculum. They also admit that it is not a major rationale for citizen action programs, and that there is no body of research literature to support the claims, but that the book rests on general reading, personal experience and consultation with others. Apparently, the view is that the school practitioners do not deserve, cannot understand or should not have a proper explanation of the bases on which the program rests. Those who read only the 1977 book get short shrift on rationale. Of course, Newmann's earlier book is referenced but the provocative thrust of his position on citizen action and social consequences is severely blunted by the significantly more conservative writing in the 1977 book. They state, "the most desirable type of relationship between the citizen and the state is outlined in the structure of constitutional representative democracy." That seems to be a "chosen people" conservative view that permits no inquiry.

There is some confusion in the chapter on rationale that dictates the traditional orientation of citizens to a state while arguing for ethical justifications for goals and student actions. The authors do not address the possible conflict among national interest, traditional representative democracy and ethical justifications. Also, they present a case against having to always win while still trying to increase student ability to produce outcomes. That appears nearly contradictory.

Although Newmann's 1975 book talks generally about competencies and behaviors, he does not seem smitten by the competency-based or behavioral
objectives sirens and their ultimately conservative bias. The 1977 manual, however, proposes specific competencies and becomes much more limiting as a result. I had some troubling suspicions about the undercurrent in the 1975 book that carried the seeds of conformist and elitist traditions through its espousal of competencies handled in technical and how-to courses for volunteer students to sharpen their exploitative skills. The 1977 book strengthens my suspicions that the program is too easily subverted from laudable goals of social reconstruction and thoughtful social criticism to mechanical, behavioral manipulation consistent with traditional national beliefs.

The program outlined by the three authors is for juniors or seniors, volunteers, nearly all day, and containing the following courses: political-legal process, communication, community service internship, citizen action project, action in literature, and public message (a PR kind of course). A detailed explanation of each course is presented, with good discussions of the way students get turned off and what to do about them. The suggestions on the field-based portion of the proposed program are excellent.

The model of communication used is very simplistic and traditional. The authors claim that students should learn communication terminology but no reasons are presented and the idea seems outdated. This is especially striking since the authors eschew the jargon of academics and evaluation experts as being unimportant to social studies teachers but want the students to learn the jargon of communications experts.

The chapter on literature is interesting but is mainly a book list by topic. It is the weakest chapter in terms of purpose and practice. There is little on literary criticism. An extension of this lack of attention to thoughtful criticism of literature is that the book does not seem to provide for the use of critical judgment on a continuing basis as is implied in the earlier volume.

The 1975 Newmann book is a welcome addition to the literature of the field. It is generally well-argued, stimulating and provocative. There is a serious intellectual difficulty in its sophist approach to social education where techniques of persuasion, rhetoric and manipulation of opinion are heavily emphasized for voluntary students. This is countered to some extent by a concern for ethical justification and a hesitancy about the obvious elitism engendered by improving the manipulation skills of the children of those already in power. The book, however, is worthy of reading and debate.

The 1977 Skills book is useful for workshops and unthinking practitioners, but has a confused and superficial treatment of rationale. If it is a more current application of Newmann's ideas, then his ideas may be less interesting than they appear in the original. Education for producing active citizens in a democracy is not a new development. The literature of social education has a number of much older works making that point. The field
argues for citizen participation. Newmann, however, has proposed a link among moral deliberation, intentions, enabling skills, and community involvement that is refreshingly like some of the early reconstructionist writers (Counts, Childs, Rugg, Brameld). The later Skills book does not convey that orientation.
SKILLS IN CITIZEN ACTION: AN ENGLISH-SOCIAL STUDIES PROGRAM FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS
Fred M. Newmann, Thomas A. Bertocci, and Ruthanne M. Landsness, Citizen Participation Curriculum Project, University of Wisconsin, 225 North Mills Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

This citizenship program is being developed for eleventh and twelfth grade students, who would work nearly full time for a year in the curriculum. Rather than a single text or course, the program proposes a comprehensive citizenship effort, emphasizing communication skills, moral deliberation, realities of the political-legal process, community-based learning and student use of media. Included in the program are courses in both social studies and English.

The program development is based on the conception of citizen action as purposeful behavior in which people attempt to exert influence in their social environment. Competence of high school students as citizen actors is the major goal of the program. The assessment of program outcomes centers around four distinct reference points: (1) accountability; (2) credentialling; (3) program improvement; and (4) student learning. One example of an assessment device is "student portfolios." These cumulative products of the program represent evidence for both accountability and student learning. This particular means of collecting student proficiency and productivity data is an integral part of the program.

Six courses comprise the program:

1. The Political-Legal Process Course will teach "realities" of influence and power in the political-legal system. Instruction will be related to field assignments in which students collect various data about the political-legal process in its natural settings. Analysis of these data plus ethical analysis and moral deliberation will lead to grounded positions on controversial aspects of public policy.

2. The Communications Course will focus on the use of written and spoken language to achieve individual and group goals. In addition to mechanical skills, reflective examination of one's and others' communication goals will be emphasized. Exercises in writing, speaking, listening and reading will deal with three broad contexts: personal communication, rational advocacy on public issues, and building cooperative group process to achieve action goals.
3. The Community Service Internship will place students in volunteer service positions in local social agencies, government bodies, and public interest groups. As the students become involved in this work, they will analyze aspects of institutional process in the Legal-Process Course, and will work on relevant language skills in the Communications Course. A weekly seminar will synthesize experiences and identify common problems and issues for the interns' second semester citizen action project.

4. The Citizen Action Project will involve students, working in small groups, in attempting to influence public policy. Skill clinics and project counseling sessions will extend and solidify needed support and competencies in civic action.

5. The Action in Literature Course will examine persisting issues of citizenship through literature. This course provides a special opportunity for the teacher to introduce students to the work of previous thinkers who have addressed universal problems of citizenship from literary, philosophical and social scientific perspectives.

6. The Public Message refers to the culminating report of each student's Citizen Action Project. This report will communicate the meaning of the work to peers and to wider publics. It could take a number of forms, including a written report, radio or TV program, play, film or photo essay.

The complete description of this program is contained in the Skills in Citizen Action book reviewed in this volume which can be obtained by mailing an order and $2.00 per copy to the address given above. The publication of the book marks the end of the Citizen Participation Curriculum Project. However, the Madison Public Schools have received a Title IV grant to develop the program in their system during 1977-78. Plans have been tentatively made for implementation of the program in a year-long field test in 1978-79.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE NATURE AND USE OF SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM PROJECT MATERIALS
Catherine Cornbleth, University of Pittsburgh

The wave of "new social studies" curriculum development activity during the 1960's and early 1970's produced an abundance of materials. However, use of many of the social studies curriculum project materials (CPMs) does not appear to be widespread, and the available data regarding
teacher reactions and student outcomes when the CPMs have been used are limited. Further, most descriptions of the CPMs tend to be superficial, emphasizing format more than substance. Studies and reviews have been primarily concerned with the diffusion of CPMs and factors associated with the adoption of innovations. Most have not directly considered differences in the characteristics of the CPMs or evidence of the CPMs' effectiveness in promoting intended student outcomes.

This two-part study will synthesize and extend previous investigations of the nature and use of social studies CPMs. In Part I, which is essentially a meta-analysis, currently available data are being used to compare selected CPMs in terms of classroom use, teacher perceptions, and student outcomes. A review of the literature revealed five multistate surveys of the use of new social studies CPMs conducted since 1970. Of the CPMs surveyed, the eleven that were included in at least two of the studies were selected for analysis. Relationships among extent of use, teacher liking, teacher perception of effectiveness, and effectiveness measured in terms of student outcomes (promoting knowledge acquisition, skill development, and/or attitude change) will be examined.

Part II consists of an analysis of the CPMs according to ten dimensions relevant to individual differences that affect learning, using the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System. Differences in the CPM characteristics thus identified will then be related to extent of use, liking, and effectiveness.

Synthesizing current knowledge about the CPMs in the terms of classroom use, teacher perceptions (liking, estimated effectiveness), and effectiveness should provide perspective and suggest directions for future curriculum activity. The usefulness of such a synthesis should be enhanced by further examination of the nature of the CPMs to identify more specific relationships between CPM characteristics and use, liking, and effectiveness. With this additional data, curriculum research, development, and dissemination activity would potentially be more productive.