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MAN-IN-DIALOGUE: 
AN IMAGE FOR GLOBAL-MINDED CITIZENSHIP

Robert W. Johns
Auburn University

The current interest among social studies educators in global perspectives and global citizenship must be heartening to idealistic and to realistic souls alike. The deep human longing for peace appears to have a new ally: an increasing public recognition of interdependence, dramatized by the Arab oil boycott, environmental pollution, and instant television coverage of events from remote corners of the earth. Nevertheless, if global education is not to become just another wave in the history of American education, social studies educators must have an image of human responsibility which is clear and defensible enough to give order and direction to diverse efforts and inclusive enough to allow for individual variation and freedom. The paper represents an effort to describe and defend such an image. For this purpose I have described an emerging image of human responsibility—man-in-dialogue—and have indicated the nature of man and community it implies, some of the major sources of its defensibility, some of its teaching implications, and its relevance to global education efforts.

THE PROBLEM: IMAGES OF HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY NOT EXPPLICIT

I find that current rationales for global education by leaders in the field have reasonably clear, well thought out knowledge and skill goals, but do not specify value and participation goals. In other words, their rationale statements lack explicit images of human responsibility. They use such words as "responsible", "appropriate", "productive", or "effective" when referring to citizen participation goals, but they do not give these words moral content. For example, Robert Hanvey, an anthropologist, writes the following in a position paper prepared for the Center for Global Perspectives:

The message of the global consciousness movement is brief and to the point: You may not realize it but you are wired into the world circuitry. Think about it. Then behave appropriately (Hanvey 1976, 1).

*"Man" in "Man-in-Dialogue" refers to mankind, not to one or more male human beings.
But what behavior is appropriate? If our era were one of consensus about basic values, then there would be no difficulty in knowing what it means to "behave appropriately"—or at least it would be no cause for serious concern. But our times are characterized by conflicts over what appropriate behavior is. For that reason the citizen, given Hanvey's approach, has no guidance in deciding his or her loyalties when confronted with these basic conflicts. Perhaps Hanvey believes that global educators should not give any such guidance, that they should leave the matter entirely up to individual, private choices. But global education implies a change from present parochial and divisive interests and values. Surely Hanvey does not believe that whatever choices individuals make in private will somehow add up to such a change.

Lee and Charlotte Anderson, in an overview of global education for elementary schools in *Social Education*, define global education as "education for responsible citizen involvement and effective participation in global society". Again, like Hanvey, they leave "responsible" and "effective" to be determined by someone else. They do, however, attempt to explicate what these words mean by saying that "implicit in this formulation" is the "development of student competencies (1) in perceiving their involvement in global society, (2) in making decisions, (3) in making judgments, and (4) in exercising influence" (Anderson 1977, 37). This effort, however, merely shifts the problem to defining what competencies" suggest any moral principle or any idea of the kind of community or relationships one might foster in working toward a better "global society". It is clear that the authors believe that it is better to "perceive" or know how one affects and is affected by global society when one makes, judges, influences, and implements decisions. But they do not specify the moral ends for which this knowledge is to be used.

The Global Studies Project at Indiana University does not specify the moral content of the key phrase in a statement of its "overarching purpose": "to live as productive citizens in an increasingly interconnected world" (Wright 1976, v). Its focus, however, upon helping students to "develop a better understanding of their relationships with other persons—persons in their own community, as well as persons in distant places" by learning to "put themselves in another's place, to see the world as others do" certainly seems to be close to moral considerations. But nothing further is specified on the subject in their statements regarding purposes. Knowing how others see the world is powerful knowledge which could be extraordinarily useful to groups or individuals seeking divergent ends in the world today: domination or cooperation, a pluralistic or a monistic community, a person-centered or business-centered society. An explicit image of responsibility would make it more likely that all parties—developers, teachers, students, parents and other citizens—would deal fully and directly with these crucial moral issues.
The Center for Global Perspectives gives evidence in the rationale for its project, "Global Perspectives: A Humanistic Influence on the Curriculum", that it is aware of the need to indicate in global studies how students can learn what they, individually and collectively, ought to do with their knowledge. The Center describes students who achieve its "overall goal" of developing "a global perspective" as those who know world conditions, including their own connections with them; who are "informed about the opportunities and responsibilities that flow from these conditions"; and "are able to make judgments and decisions about their lives and the future based on such information" (Center for Global Perspectives 1977). For the purpose of deciding what actions to take, the key word here is "responsibilities". Students, the Center suggests, are to be "informed" of their knowledge of the world system and their place in it. But this moral formula does not and cannot guide one's actions because responsibilities do not flow from conditions. Nor do they flow from knowledge. They flow from one's world view, one's assumptions--implicit or explicit--about the good life and the good society. One can be "informed" about what happened or what is, but one's values are the decisive element in the determination of what ought to be. Max Weber makes this point in his *Methodology of the Social Sciences* (Weber 1949, 81):

"Culture" is a finite segment of the meaningless infinity of the world process, a segment on which human beings confer meaning and significance.

In other words, facts do not speak for themselves; only people speak. Human beings select what is important in the world. The Center would presumably affirm this point, but since "responsibilities" has not been defined, students cannot learn from the Project which actions are likely to lead to a better global society.

I believe it is evident, then, that the global education movement needs an ideal model or image of human responsibility. But such an image must not become a dogmatic ideology or a closed system. It must meet the need for order and for basic moral direction, without sacrificing freedom or choice in a pluralistic, open environment. Chaos, on the one hand, and a closed system, on the other, must be avoided. This task is like steering between Scylla and Charybdis, but it seems to me that it is the only course actually open. I believe that an image of human responsibility, man-in-dialogue, which I describe below, can help us steer this course.
IMAGES OF RESPONSIBILITY

I want to contend here that the task of making one's image of the moral life explicit has not been accomplished in some of the major global education efforts. I believe that attempting this task is necessary so that those working on diverse projects can know clearly what moral direction other projects intend, debate its defensibility, make indicated changes, and increase the likelihood of the effectiveness and support of education for global citizenship. This does not mean that all projects must have the same image, merely that it should be clearly articulated.

I attempt below to make clear the conception of man-in-dialogue by contrasting it with two older, perhaps more dominant images of the moral life. I want to emphasize, however, that these contrasts in definition, examples, and implications are used for the purpose of (a) making the idea of a man-in-dialogue clear and (b) arguing that it is more defensible for global education than the other two images. I do not, however, mean to argue that current global education efforts fall under the two traditional images, even though I do find that often both ordinary and professional discussions of "good citizens", or of "civic-minded" or "responsible" actions presuppose all three of the images.

Alternative Definitions

H. Richard Niebuhr, a moral philosopher and theologian, points out that in the history of moral philosophy, life has been interpreted, and responsibility defined, with the aid of three grand images: man-the-maker (homo faber), man-under-law (homo politicus), and, recently, man-in-dialogue (homo dialogicus). Two things should be noted about these images: (1) they are not descriptive or prescriptive concepts but symbolic forms, metaphors which are so deeply embedded in our minds that we tend to take them for granted as self-evident reality rather than meaningful patterns of thought; and (2) they are synecdochic, that is, each represents the use of a special experience or part of life to interpret all that one experiences.

Man-in-dialogue understands life as a conversation, as a matter of responding in a community to challenges and actions according to one's interpretation of them. In this view, responsibility has four elements: response, interpretation, accountability, and social solidarity (Niebuhr 1963, 61-65). Responsibility is a matter of responding, but not in any way one pleases. It must be fitting and it must be entirely predetermined. It must be guided by the responses and the interpretations behind the responses of all parties and things affected by the interaction. That is, individuals are responsible if they stay with their action, accept its consequences, and look
forward and hold themselves accountable to continued interactions in the total community which their actions affect. In short, responsibility is responding in dialogue with all beings and with all things. Given this view, it is irresponsible if one acts as if he or she were a solitary individual—more accurately, an isolated body or mind, an atom in the social universe rather than a social, interpreting agent, or self.

By far the most common image of the moral life is man-the-maker. In this case one understands life as a matter of setting purposes and moving toward them in the manner of the artist or craftsman who has a design in mind all the time as he or she shapes a product. Responsibility is a matter of living up to purposes or ideals. Man-the-maker acts toward an end and fashions himself or herself according to that end. It would be irresponsible, given this model, if he or she did not reject or remove the obstacles which stand across a predetermined path to the realization of his or her goals. In other words, it would be irresponsible if he or she did not fully exercise the most essentially human characteristics, reason and will, by clearly conceiving an ideal, keeping it always in mind, and fully mobilizing energies to achieve it.

Man-under-law, by contrast, understands life as existence under rules, commandments, and laws over which he or she normally has little or no control. Responsibility for an individual is a matter of doing his or her duty. Given the limitations which are built into the personal, natural, and historical world which one has inherited, it is foolish to think that people can do very much to plan their lives or to make themselves. They are irresponsible, in other words, if they do not obey the laws of life, make laws in accordance with them and, above all, follow their conscience.

Examples of Alternative Approaches to Decision-Making

When one decides what should be done about a problem, one comes to the decision by asking certain questions. The person adopting the homo faber image asks: “What is my goal?” and “What is my ideal?” Under homo politicus one asks: “What is the law?” and “What is the first law of my life?” And under homo dialogicus one asks: “What is happening?”, “What is the total community of interaction I am responding to?”, and “What interpretations are in operation?” The differences among the three images have important practical results for citizens in their efforts to deal with events on several levels, as the following examples indicate:

1. On the international issues level: When the citizen attempts to decide a position, for example, on what the United States should do about Communist China’s bans on U.S. trade, one of the images serves as a guide. Under man-the-maker, one asks: “What are the Communist Chinese purposes?” “What are their intentions? Are they trying to win greater Japanese political support? Do they seek complete economic independence
from the U.S.? from all nations? etc.” Also, “What are our leaders’ purposes?” And “What higher purpose might both nations appeal to?”

By contrast, the citizen who adopts the image of man-under-law asks: “What Confucian, Maoist, or other ethical laws guide the conduct of Chinese leaders?” “What conditions, natural and social, limit the courses of action of their leaders?” Also, “Can we accept certain actions, given our own laws, limits and conscience?” And “What higher law or principle can we as nations together appeal to?”

Under the image of man-in-dialogue, on the other hand, one asks: “What is there in the Communist or Chinese world view which might have led them to ban much of their international trade with us?” “What is there in their history, including the history of their encounters with the West, that might explain these trade bans?” Also, “Why have so many of us interpreted this Chinese move as an unfriendly act?” And “Are there alternative ways we might together interpret their actions and ours?”

2. On the domestic issues level: In addressing problems such as management-labor disputes, one is led by homo faber to attempt to know what stand to take by answering the question: “What are the goals of labor? of management?” Or following the homo politicus image one asks, “What national or ethical laws has each party laid down or followed?” If one lives within the parameters of homo dialogicus, however, one asks less about goals or laws than about what goals each side believes the other’s actions are aimed at: “How is each party interpreting the others responses?” “What does each side think the other side means by its stated objectives and by the procedural and ethical rules it recommends?”

Mediation of disputes generally involves a search primarily for a goal, a rule or legal principle, or a reinterpretation, depending upon whether one’s image is faber, politicus, or dialogicus, respectively.

3. On the individual level: Teachers and parents deal with children in different ways, depending in part upon the image of life they have. The image, man-in-dialogue, leads the adults who have the task of shaping the child’s character, to pay less attention to the content of adult “do’s” and “don’ts” (politicus) or to the content of their statements about the “good person” (faber) than to the child’s interpretation of the attitudes these injunctions and ideals express.

4. On the historical inquiry level: The image of man-in-dialogue implies that one begins with and continually returns to selves, to ordinary and extraordinary individuals who are searching for, among other things, meaning in their encounters with each other and with their social institutions. By contrast, historical study for man-the-maker and man-under-law begins not with responses but, respectively, with concepts such as social class, power, and enculturation or with descriptive or prescriptive laws. Under these older images the student always looks
through the lenses of these concepts or laws. The student builds a view of historical events, in other words, upon scholars' images of self-and-world, not a personal image.

**Implications for Educational Choices**

The discussions above of the three images suggest certain principles one can use to decide the nature of social education which is guided by the image of man-in-dialogue, by contrast with the other two images. It should be noted that man-in-dialogue is an inclusive image. The two older images have views of man which tend to reduce an individual to a "nothing but", e.g., a thinking or feeling or pleasure-loving or freedom-loving being on the one hand (*faber*), or, on the other, to one whose conscience acknowledges only one particular natural or spiritual law (*politicus*). There is a place in the dialogue for all of these, though not the central or primary place. At the center of the dialogue is a self, an agent interacting with other selves. Ideals and laws of all sorts are part of one's interpretations and actions in the dialogue, though there are situational, historical, and personal factors which also enter into one's decisions. It follows, therefore, that in identifying principles to guide programs under man-in-dialogue, one must think of the primacy of one factor over another, instead of the exclusion of one by the other. The principle, the primacy of the practical over the theoretical, also follows because man in *homo dialogicus* is an agent whose first, or primordial, relationship is to other agents, rather than to abstract ideals or laws.

A second principle is the primacy of the self as a unity over individuals existing only in relation to ideals or laws. This follows from the fact that the two older images tend to reduce man to some feature of the self rather than to keep the whole thinking, feeling, judging, acting self as the central moral idea.

A third principle is the primacy of the interactive over the non-interactive. This follows from the fact that the self cannot exist except in response to the other selves. Because the self cannot be or know itself except by reflection from others one is interacting with, a fourth principle is implied: the primacy of the reflexive over the non-reflexive. Non-interactive and non-reflexive approaches to learning would be useful given the image of dialogue, but only as interacting individuals find that these approaches illuminate their interaction, their experience.

A final principle is the primacy of unclosed communities united primarily by personal loyalties over communities united by universalistic ideals or laws. This principle follows from the definition of responsibility as a matter of staying with the interaction of personal dialogue, which includes all the beings and things affected by one's response in it. The community is
necessarily unclosed if one must respond in any sort of personal way to all beings and all things. This contrasts sharply with communities united not by personal loyalties but by ideas of the good (faber) or by laws (politicus) even if these be universalistic ideals or laws.

**Instruction Based on Man-in-Dialogue**

The *sequence* of teaching and learning stages implied by the dialogue model would include those indicated in the following chart:

**BASIC TEACHING STRATEGY: MAJOR STAGES**

Stage 1 — Experiencing and Interpreting

Stage 2 — Knowing and Valuing

Stage 3 — Choosing and Applying

As the discussion of alternative approaches to decision-making suggested, one is able to discover what to do under man-in-dialogue by, in effect, asking oneself what is happening and how one is to interpret what is happening. In other words, one’s starting point, and therefore the starting point of learning, is experience—the interaction of self and world. By contrast, one knows what to do, given the man-the-maker and man-under-law images, by asking oneself, respectively, what one’s ideal is or what law one’s conscience acknowledges. In other words, the starting point for both of the older images is not experience, but truth (i.e., the *principle* which each believes to be most important in life).

If one defines experience, the central reality of man-in-dialogue, as the interaction between self and world, then it follows that the teaching and learning sequence charted above (1) begins when contact is established with students’ experience and images of self and world [Stage 1: Experiencing and Interpreting]; and continues so long as the student utilizes whatever descriptive and/or prescriptive ideas and laws test, extend, and refine the image of self and world [Stage 2: Knowing and Valuing], and so long as contact is maintained with experience through choices or applications of new perspectives [Stage 3: Choosing and Applying, plus returning when needed to Stages 1 and 2].
Several other matters should be noted regarding the sequence. First, the fact that knowing and valuing are to be the focus of a single stage means that matters of fact and value, knowledge and belief, thinking and feeling are to be considered not separately, as so often happens under the other two images of man, but together, which is more nearly as individuals experience them. Second, the fact that knowing and valuing are never to be the final stage in the sequence means that teaching and learning should not stop with warranted conclusions or with defensible value positions, which are presumably the practical goals under man-the-maker and man-under-law, respectively. Finally, the fact that the final stage is choosing, following not immediately after experiencing and interpreting, but only after knowing and valuing means that the goal is defensible choices, and that "defensible" means both (a) building upon one's interpretation of his experience and (b) testing the interpretation by considering matters of both value and knowledge.

The pattern of instruction and the tasks in each stage of teaching and learning are suggested by the outline and the teaching examples which follow.

Stage 1 — EXPERIENCING AND INTERPRETING

a. Stimulate student interest, curiosity, or doubt about his/her image(s) of self and world. (Partly pre-assess what they know and believe.)
b. Focus on unit objectives.
c. Provide for students opportunities to experience, directly or imaginatively, the self-world and interactions of ordinary or extraordinary individuals, including their own self-world images; and/or
d. Provide for students opportunities to speculate or hypothesize about the self-world images and other causes of their actions and interactions.

Stage 2 — KNOWING AND VALUING

a. Challenge or require the student to test his/her imaginative reconstructions, speculations and hypotheses via evidence and alternative interpretations and concepts found by the student and/or presented by the teacher.
b. Challenge or require the student to test value positions by confronting the following:
1. conflicting evidence;
2. alternative choices and consequences;
3. dogmatisms and exclusive behavior; and
4. implications for wider communities (Gemeinschaften) and societies (Gesellschaften), including global community (all beings and all things).

c. Help students acquire the concepts, facts, and skills necessary to accomplish a and b, above.

Stage 3 — CHOOSING AND APPLYING

a. Require students to have some use of tested ideas via:
   1. action in immediate or larger communities and/or
   2. making defensible decisions in simulated situations in immediate or larger communities.
b. Assess learning outcomes, including those from possible student actions in school and community situations.
c. Identify deficiencies in the development of defensible choices or applications, including awareness of and response to interdependence (interpersonal, community, societal, global).

SUPPORT FOR MAN-IN-DIALOGUE FROM THE SCHOLARLY DISCIPLINES

Before indicating the implications of man-in-dialogue for views of man and community and for global-minded citizenship, it may be useful to indicate the many diverse lines of inquiry with which this image is congruent. This selection represents the inquiries in which the thought pattern is interactional. Niebuhr describes this comparatively recent development in modern thought:

The faculty psychology of the past which saw in the self three or more facient powers, and the associationist psychology which understood the mind to operate under laws of association, have been replaced by a psychology of interaction which has made familiar to us the idea that we act in reaction to stimuli. Biology and sociology as well as psychology have taught us to regard ourselves as beings in the midst of a field of natural and social forces, acted upon and reacting, attracted and repelling. We try also to understand history less by asking about the ideals toward which societies and their leaders directed their efforts or about the laws they were obeying and more by inquiring into the challenges in their natural and social environment to which the societies
and their leaders directed their efforts or about the laws they were obeying and more by inquiring into the challenges in their natural and social environment to which the societies were responding. It will not do to say the older images of the maker and the citizen have lost their meaning in these biological, psychological, sociological, and historical analyses, but when we compare a modern psychology, a modern study of society, a modern history, with older examples of similar studies the difference thrusts itself upon one. The pattern of thought now is interactional, however much other great images must continue to be used to describe how we perceive and conceive, form associations, and carry on political, economic, educational, religious, and other enterprises (Niebuhr 1963, 56-57).

Inquirers with diverse intellectual orientations have converged upon this image of man-in-dialogue. Each observes or presupposes that society is prior to the individual, that is, that an individual is dependent upon the social process for his or her very being and for self-knowledge. Seminal thinkers in social psychology who have taken this view include Harry S. Sullivan, George H. Cooley, and George H. Mead. Mead, a social behaviorist whose position is built upon an evolutionary, this-worldly perspective, pointed out that it is “reflexiveness”—turning back upon one’s own experience—that makes it possible for the biological being to become an individual self who has a mind. In other words, one becomes human by role-taking, by taking toward oneself the attitude of other selves with whom one interacts.

The self, as that which can be an object to itself, is essentially a social structure, and it arises in social experience....When it has arisen we can think of a person in solitary confinement for the rest of his life, but who still has himself as a companion and is able to think and to converse with himself as he had communicated with others (Mead 1934, 134 & 140).

With this view, then, people tend to know themselves as they respond to whatever companions and social groups they are aware of. For the purposes of this paper one should take note of the fact that Mead was a globalist in his thinking. He found that the social process of taking the role of the other naturally extends to the whole “society of human beings” because “the person who is a stranger calls out a helpful attitude in ourselves. It makes us all akin. It provides the common human nature on which the universal religions are all built” (Mead 1934, 271-272). For Mead, then, the social process is at least the foundation of the moral process, and its movement is potentially global.
Martin Buber, who represents a group of thinkers whose orientation is very different from Mead's, comes to conclusions similar to Mead's. Buber, an existentialist theologian, developed the view that man has a two-fold relationship to the world. He referred to this relationship as "I-Thou" and "I-It". I-Thou is, to use Mead's terms, a reflexive relationship; it is persons interacting. I-It, on the other hand, refers to one's relationship to things, to nature, but also means relating to people in an impersonal way—as if they were things. Buber believed that a certain degree of impersonal relations or structure is necessary in society, but he emphasized that too many I-It responses and relationships stand in the way of both fulfillment and responsibility. These can be achieved only in I-Thou, only in dialogue. "All real living", he says, "is meeting" (Buber 1958, 11). The "I" in I-It is a detached, uncommitted observer. "Real Living", however, is I-Thou, which means in its fullest sense, persons responding with a total continuing commitment to each other as persons. Only by responding in this way—by giving oneself fully to others—can one achieve the highest degree of responsibility and fulfillment. People find themselves by losing themselves in others. For Buber, it is in these special I-Thou moments that one is responding not only to companions but to the "eternal Thou", or God. Buber's concept of the moral society would be person-centered, a community in which I-Thou relationships predominate, though he would presumably acknowledge that the highest level of this type of relationship is rare.

It should be noted also that Buber contended that one may have an I-Thou relationship with impersonal or natural things. This implies that any being or thing in nature is important in itself and that to act responsibly one must take it seriously since it is a part of creation. It appears to be Buber's view, then, that the eternal Thou which underlies "all real living", is present in all beings and all things.

My sampling of theories of historical development also reveals a pattern of interactional thinking and, with a few reservations, the controlling image of man-in-dialogue (Johns 1974, 60-66). A monistic-pluralistic spectrum was used as a sampling device. The extreme positions on both ends of the spectrum are represented by Karl Marx's monistic theory that class struggle describes, explains, and predicts the essential shape and content of historical change and by Wilhelm Dilthey's pluralistic conception of historical change as the result of many forces and agencies somehow tied together, though not made predictable, by man's search for meaning. The intermediate positions on the spectrum are represented by Jose Ortega Y Gasset, Hippolyte Taine, Max Weber, and Arnold Toynbee. These historians and philosophers, otherwise disagreeing, agree at least that all history is biographical and interactive; that is, that both ordinary and extraordinary individuals are historical beings and agents of historical
change in their search for meaning in encounter, or interaction, with their social environment.

Here again life is understood as a matter of responding to challenges or actions and to the meaning behind them. "Meaning" means a sense of continuity and mastery but, above all, a sense of connectedness between oneself and some larger scheme of things which one values and belongs to. Although there is some significant disagreement over the content and origins of this larger scheme—notably between Marx and the rest of the sample, the underlying *homo dialogicus* image is intact.

As in the cases of Mead and Buber, the image of life in this sampling of theories of historical development contains a global, moral thrust: the human need for meaning—for connections between self and a valued larger scheme of things—spurs one to seek a perspective and loyalty which transcends or extends beyond the immediate family, community, or society into which one is born.

Among the prominent social and behavioral scientists whose views are congruent with man-in-dialogue are the following: Robert J. Lifton, who built upon his own psychosocial concepts in attempting recently to describe an "evolving paradigm" which he finds in psychological inquiries—a model which stresses the centrality of the symbolizing process in "the life of the self" (Lifton 1967; 1976, 13); Kenneth Boulding, an economist, whose major work, *The Image, Knowledge in Life and Society* (Boulding 1956) attempted to restructure knowledge about man and society in such a way that knowing and valuing, knowledge and action, and the individual and society are interconnected; Erik Erikson, whose psychosocial concepts of identity and identity vacuum (Erikson 1964, 202-204) have been applied to psychotherapy as well as to his own psychohistorical studies of Luther and Gandhi (Erikson 1958; 1969); Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, sociologists who call for scholarly inquiries which connect "the structural and historical features of modern society" with "the most intimate features of man's self" and who made their own response to this challenge with the central interactive concept of role (Gerth & Mills 1953, xix); and political scientists—such as Dankwart Rustow, David Apter, Adam Ulam, and Robert Tucker—whose studies in leadership build upon, but extend Weber's symbolical, interactive concept of charisma and bureaucratization (Rustow 1970).

Among the prominent philosophers and theologians whose ideas are congruent with *homo dialogicus* are the following: Adam Smith, the economic theorist of early capitalism, whose concept of the "impartial spectator" points to the essential social nature of moral judgments; Ernst Cassirer, whose philosophy of symbolic forms is a creative synthesis of many fields (religion, language, art, science, history, etc.) which redefines man as a symbolical being, not primarily a mere rational or social being (Cassirer 1944); John Macmurray, whose Gifford lectures were a critique of
the Cartesian image of man as Solitary Thinker, and the development of the thesis: “All meaningful knowledge is for the sake of action, and all meaningful action for the sake of friendship." (Macmurray 1957, 15; 1961); and Richard Niebuhr, who contends in his theological inquiries that certain aspects of the Bible, such as Scripture dealing with personal suffering, freedom, and eschatology (“last things”), can be illuminated through the *homo dialogicus* image of responding to challenges in time and history, but not through the essentially time-less images of *homo faber* and *homo politicus* (Niebuhr 1963, esp. 65-67).

**MAN-IN-DIALOGUE: UNDERLYING VIEW OF MAN AND COMMUNITY**

All moral theories, like theories of education, depend upon assumptions about man and community. Because these assumptions are the most fundamental considerations in decision-making about global education, I want to indicate here the assumptions about man and community which underlie the image of man-in-dialogue by contrast with the two older images of man-the-maker and man-under-law.

As the above discussions of alternative images and supporting inquiries suggest, man-in-dialogue presupposes that man is a social, symbolical, historical agent. The individual envisioned by this emerging image, in other words, is one who has his or her being only in society and in time and history, and only in continuing response to other beings and things in a common search for symbolic meaning. None of these characteristics of man is presumed to be basic by the other two images. *Homo faber* views of man tend to be highly individualistic, ahistorical, and reductionist—i.e., they posit that man can be reduced to a particular characteristic or essence (e.g., rational, producing, pleasure-seeking, freedom-loving). *Homo politicus* views of man tend to understand individuals as passive or conditioned and tend also to be ahistorical and reductionist.

The views of Rene Descartes and Immanuel Kant illustrate the assumptions about man made by the two older images. Descartes’ view of man as Solitary Thinker, which has virtually dominated Western thought for three centuries, reduces man to thinker and removes the social, historical, practical world (Macmurray 1957: 1961). Descartes found that he could doubt everything except the fact that he doubted. He then reached his famous conclusion: “I think (or doubt), therefore I am.” This view implies that the primordial reality is one’s individual consciousness or ideas. Further, since in this view man’s thinking is an individual matter, someone is characteristically human when withdrawn from action. *Within this conception of man*, therefore, there is no place for ideas which can guide the world of action—the practical, social, historical world.
Kant, whom Niebuhr describes as “the most consistent representative” of *homo politicus*, of “man as obedient to law”, is like Descartes in holding a basically ahistorical view of man. Kant wrote:

> When the law of our intelligible existence (the moral law) is in question, reason recognizes no distinction of time, and only asks whether the event belongs to me, as my act, and then always morally connects the same feeling with it whether it happened just now or long ago (Niebuhr 1963, 91-92).

*Within Kant’s moral image*, then, one has no past or future. One is not a historical being. It may be logically concluded, therefore, that within the views of both man-the-maker and man-under-law—as represented by Descartes and Kant respectively—individual choices and actions are not to be based upon any historical considerations; only the present exists and it is important only as one uses it to conform to an entirely predetermined moral ideal or moral law.

Man-in-dialogue, by contrast, is an historical being and has more than just the present moment which the other two images imply. Man finds or creates meaning by assimilating previous encounters to present ones in a way which makes sense of the total experience. It should be noted in this connection that the time in which one seeks meaning, however, is not clock time. Within this *homo dialogicus* image one lives in the still-present, and of course the now-present, and in the already-present, i.e., in the past encounters (still-present) one holds in memory and in future encounters (already-present) one anticipates in imagination. This follows from the fact that a key activity of man within man-in-dialogue, the symbolizing process, involves interconnecting inner and outer events in one’s life. The detached, or external observer of the other two images may not readily comprehend historical events because, in the *homo dialogicus* view, the observer fails to realize that past and present events, often quite removed from each other in time and place and often apparently quite dissimilar, are held together by a common meaning which the individual gives to them in responding to the environment. The image of man-in-dialogue gives man a world which, it appears, people do not have within the two older images.

The image of man-in-dialogue implies a view of community basically different from that implied by the other two images. The differences are important for considerations of global responsibility in at least two respects: (1) the kind of community man-in-dialogue envisions is one bound together primarily by loyalty to persons and the causes they stand for, rather than merely by abstract laws or ideals; and (2) the movement of the social process which man-in-dialogue implies is universalistic without being abstract, without being a relationship first to higher ideals (*faber*) or higher
laws (*politicus*) and only then to other persons. I will discuss each of these points in turn.

The *homo dialogicus* community is initially the group with which one has face-to-face relationships and unlimited commitments. Fred Newmann and Donald Oliver have described a model of community which fits the man-in-dialogue image (Newmann & Oliver 1967, 61-62):

A community is a group:

1. in which membership is valued as an end in itself, not merely as a means to other ends;
2. that concerns itself with many and significant aspects of the lives of members;
3. that allows competing factions;
4. whose members share commitment to common purpose and to procedures for handling conflict within the group;
5. whose members share responsibility for the actions of the group;
6. whose members have an enduring and extensive personal contact with each other.

It is important to notice that the "competing factions" included in this definition means not simply that competing power groups are allowed, but also that competing ideas are accepted in the dialogue.

The acceptance of competing factions and ideas implies that the responsible community cannot be a closed society. *Homo dialogicus* points to a community which encompasses all beings and all things. The other two images have a universalistic thrust, too, but in both cases the thrust is a movement toward greater abstraction without direct personal connections; a movement toward universal ideals or laws. The image of man-in-dialogue, by contrast, has an element which never loses direct contact with individual actions and choices and with immediate communities. The responsible dialogue has three sides: that of the individual, his or her companions, and a cause. One finds and knows oneself, under this image, only in response to other selves. But the individual and his or her companions answer not only to each other but to what Niebuhr calls the "third reality": causes which they share (Niebuhr 1963, 82-86). For example, patriots look not only to their fellow citizens but also to their country or its representatives for support, criticism, praise, blame, approvals, and disapprovals. In all of their interactions they anticipate these responses and do what they believe fits this three-sided transaction.

But this three-sided transaction is not all there is to this *homo dialogicus* community. The patriot, again, is related to co-patriots and to the country. But what does being related to the country mean for a patriot? It means one must respond in some way not only to persons in the country who represent
it now but to others, those who have represented it in the past—founders and heroes. It also means that one must answer to what these past and present leaders stood for and stand for because that is central to who these founders and leaders are and to who the responders are becoming. Answering to American founders such as Jefferson and Franklin, for example, means answering to what they stood for as embodied, in part, in the Declaration of Independence. This means that individuals confront the fact that one standard for the founders’ actions was “a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.” The patriots have a choice, a choice of accepting this larger community of interaction and meaning (mankind), or ceasing to be patriots—or at least patriots believing as Jefferson and Franklin did. The patriots must also reckon with yet a larger cause and community to which Jefferson and other founders referred, “Nature and Nature’s God.”

This double character of every object of loyalty, binding together persons in relationships and causes and referring to persons and causes beyond itself is the global dimension of man-in-dialogue. It is open to all human inquiries and all human concerns and it interconnects self and world in all of their dimensions, including global, moral ones. In normal times, amidst the routine and familiar activities of our daily lives, we ordinarily are not aware of such global, moral implications which are associated with loyalties. But in critical moments such as the present, on the “D-Days” of our personal and collective existence, we are obliged to confront them and, it seems to me, we give usual routine responses only at great cost and perhaps at great peril.

MAN-IN-DIALOGUE IN GLOBAL EDUCATION: A DEFENSE

Basic arguments for utilizing man-in-dialogue are listed and then discussed below. In most of the arguments I am contending either that man-in-dialogue does certain things that the other two images do not do, or that it does them better. In a few cases I am arguing only that man-in-dialogue meets a need that is not being met. As indicated previously, I am not arguing that current global education efforts are guided by the two older images rather than man-in-dialogue. Some of the arguments are discussed earlier and therefore not repeated here.

Argument One: *Man-in-dialogue conceptually interconnects self and world, including the responsible self and global responsibility.*

Argument Two: *Man-in-dialogue is an image of global interdependence and global responsibility.*
The definition of responsibility and dialogue are the key considerations here. Responsibility means responding in dialogue with all beings and all things. Dialogue means the interaction of self and world which stays with and accepts the consequences of one's action in the total natural and social world which it affects. Therefore, given these definitions of responsibility and dialogue, one is related directly to the total global world as a person by the double character of every object of loyalty (discussed in the preceding section on views of community under man-in-dialogue). Through this identification process, the person is related directly to persons and situations anywhere in the world and at any time in history. This is particularly important for teachers who want (a) to relate the experience (self-world images) of students to the experience of individuals in other cultures and in global society and history; and (b) to produce students who, seeing these interrelationships and the global consequences of their actions or decisions in a direct personal way, can make grounded moral decisions, i.e., choices based upon knowledge, thinking, and evaluation of all the consequences of alternatives they know.

Furthermore, the reflexive nature of the self, and of dialogue, and of responsibility makes it conceptually, morally—and perhaps also motivationally—warranted to move the study of any situation or problem from student to world and then to return to the student with insights to test, evaluate, act upon or integrate into his or her world view. In this reflexive teaching-learning process, guided by the interactive nature of dialogue, the framework makes it conceptually and morally defensible to directly connect, as Gerth and Mills said, the "most intimate features" of the student's self with any institutional environment, including the most remote "structural and historical features" of society, and then to return to the more immediate experience of the students—in a continuing cycle (Gerth & Mills, xix). At the same time, it should be noted, this tracing of interconnections and consequences is directly teaching both global interdependence and global responsibility.

As the above discussion of the teaching-learning process implies, the *homo dialogicus* framework interconnects not only self and world, the students and their social-natural world but also, and at the same time, interconnects knowing and being. Self-knowledge is interrelated with knowledge of the world. (The exceptional importance of meeting this human need, given our present social reality, is discussed below in Argument Seven.)

The two older images lack the conceptual capacity to guide the considerations of these interconnections (between self and world, student and environment, knowing and being, moral and intellectual dimensions) because their views of man and community are ahistorical and posit the primacy of the theoretical over the practical. They have no interactive or
reflexive concepts (a) because individuals are related first to ideals or laws and only then to persons or society; and (b) because man-the-maker, pursuing personal purposes, tends to be very individualistic and man-under-law, focusing upon obedience to laws, tends to be collectivistic.

The fact that knowledge and action, the intellectual and moral dimensions, are conceptually interconnected in the homo dialogicus image meets a need in current global education efforts, assuming the sampling I discussed earlier is representative.

Argument Three: Man-in-dialogue is conceptually open to and can integrate all human inquiries.

Argument Four: Man-in-dialogue is conceptually open to and can integrate divergent approaches to social education within and beyond the United States.

Argument Five: Man-in-dialogue is conceptually open to all human concerns.

Argument Six: Man-in-dialogue can deal directly with the pressing global problems of conflict and change.

The key point here again is the nature of dialogue, particularly the underlying definition of man as symbolical, as opposed to some reductionist or dogmatic definition of man which is typical in the other two images. Philip Rhinelander makes this point in the following passage:

If we build on the fact that man is a symbolical animal, several important consequences follow. In the first place, we are no longer impelled to conceive of man in terms of any one particular interest or need. We do not have to give primacy to his desire for knowledge, his demand for autonomy of the will, his need to reconcile the tension of conflicting impulses, or his concern for survival and material welfare. Instead, man is conceived of in terms of a capacity that is vitally implicated in all his activities, including those concerned with meeting each of his particular needs. We are, therefore, in a position to do justice to all types of human concern, in their multiplicity and variety, without having to assume that one of them must be dominant under all circumstances. Second, we can establish a connection (instead of a disjunction) among man's science, technology, art, literature, religion, philosophy, social activities, politics, rituals, games and so forth. All typically human activities are symbolical activities. The highest powers of abstract thought depend on man's ability to construct and manipulate symbols, as does the child's capacity for make-believe (Rhinelander 1973, 79).
Man-in-dialogue implies this sort of openness Rhinelander describes, not only in man’s symbolic activity, but in his social interaction. Since man is also a social being, all psychosocial perspectives or concepts are useful. This is important for social education because it means that all historical narratives and social data have a place in the framework. (It should be noted at the same time that man’s symbolical nature means that the only directly useful concepts or laws which are directly useful are those that take for granted man’s overriding need to find some meaningful relationship between self and world, i.e., an inner synthesis.) The previously cited and discussed variety of inquiries and perspectives congruent with *homo dialogicus* from diverse intellectual disciplines testify to the inclusiveness of man-in-dialogue.

The man-in-dialogue framework’s inclusiveness makes the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches to global education a feasible and conceptually adequate goal, one not open to the reductionist approaches of the other two images. This is a particularly important fact for several reasons: (1) If Barr, Barth and Shermis are correct, as I believe they are, that current functional definitions of social education “represent distinct competing philosophical systems, each attempting to establish itself as the principal approach to social studies,” then certainly a non-reductionist conceptual framework has considerable potential to develop the unity within diversity, which is necessary to get on with the pressing tasks of developing global perspectives and global responsibility (Barr, et al. 1977, 70). (2) International and cross-cultural perspectives on approaches to social education can serve the function of challenging unconscious assumptions. (3) *Homo dialogicus* implies, and the works of Thomas Kuhn and Michael Polanyi confirm (Kuhn 1962; Polanyi 1962) that one’s knowledge is norm-related, i.e., knowledge always has a significant personal-sociological element because it is developed out of the dialogue. For this reason it is more likely that research and knowledge under man-in-dialogue can become less tied to narrow and unconscious cultural-personal norms and therefore become more generalizable and global.

Among the human concerns to which *homo dialogicus* is open are the global problems of conflict, change, and communication. The unclosed dialogue promises direct help with the difficult tasks of improving communication and overcoming other barriers to cooperation. The dialogue implies respect for differences and opposition to all dogmatisms and all closed systems. For the purpose of coping with change, *homo dialogicus* promises more help, I believe, than *homo faber* or *homo politicus*. This is because of their divergent approaches to one’s past. The two older images, being ahistorical, demand that one put one’s past behind. If one thinks, for example, of the United States’ experience with its Civil
War, it becomes apparent that in dealing with present problems one cannot ignore the past or put it behind. Re-interpretation of the past, which is implied by man-in-dialogue, appears to be a better tactic in dealing with changing conditions. Psychotherapy and interpersonal psychology, as well as ordinary experience is coping with change, seem to confirm the effectiveness of re-interpretation (Lifton 1976, 26-27 & 93).

Argument Seven: Man-in-dialogue deals directly with underlying societal problems, barriers to global society and responsibility.

Newmann and Oliver argue in their analysis of American society that many, if not most, problems are a result of the loss of community which for the individual is an increasing depersonalization and the loss of a sense of identity (Newmann & Oliver 1967). Using Tonnies’ distinction between Gemeinschaft--a community of interdependent person-centered relationships--and Gesellschaft (literally “business”)--which refers to impersonal, contractual, independent, mistrusting relationships--they suggest that the Gemeinschaft is missing. They contend, rightly I think, that, to use Buber’s words, there is a predominance of I-It over I-Thou relationships (This view is held by many, though by no means all, major social critics'). Another relevant consideration here is Harman’s analysis of our changing society which concludes that there are two plausible alternative futures, which he calls second-phase industrial society, which is a simple continuation of present trends, and “person-centered society,” which is a shift toward a society where Gemeinschaft and I-Thou are predominant.

Man-in dialogue has the potential to meet these problems and help to move society toward a person-centered community. Its central conceptual focus is upon the search for self in the context of a community which is characterized by predominantly I-Thou, personal relationships. Furthermore, this search for meaningful connections between self and world has a global, moral thrust which confronts the searching individual with the choice of extending the identification-identity formation process to more and more persons in community and to the causes they stand for. For these reasons the homo dialogicus framework has the potential to begin with and overcome two underlying problems in present social reality, loss of self and community. At the same time, it makes the solution of these problems an integral part of building global society and global responsibility. If, at the same time, Harman is correct that a person-centered future is plausible, then perhaps global responsibility, as defined by man-in-dialogue, is a functional moral ideal, not merely an infinitely distant one.
Argument Eight: *Man-in-dialogue can provide moral direction without sacrificing freedom, choice, and individual and cultural variation.*

This final argument refers back to the criterion I established at the outset for an acceptable image of global responsibility, namely, one that charts the narrow course between moral chaos and a closed moral society. I believe that *homo dialogicus* meets this criterion. The commitment to dialogue it envisions is an unlimited commitment which begins with the persons one interacts with directly and extends to all those beings and things by which one's actions and interactions are affected. This is a commitment to oppose all dogmatisms, all closed systems, and all intolerance of cultural or individual differences (all reductionist views of man and responsibility). This commitment gives moral direction but also moral freedom. It is a commitment to unity within diversity.

**SOME UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

The adequacy of man-in-dialogue as an image for global-minded citizenship no doubt depends upon factors not fully or directly considered here. The defense of the image has directly considered assumptions about the nature of moral values, man, community, present social reality, and, to some extent, the nature of knowledge. Assumptions about the nature of learning and about proper educational environments need at some point to be made explicit and to be examined. For now I want to note only that since the image of man-in-dialogue posits that (a) the process of experiencing is the primordial reality and (b) responsibility grows or develops out of such experiencing, it follows that learning environments must be models of dialogue--as nearly as possible. Also, the emerging Walkabout programs, which emphasize learning by experience and productive activities as well as by study in personal and social as well as academic environments, would certainly seem to be congruent with man-in-dialogue (Gibbons 1976).

Some will object perhaps that global education in dialogue is personally, intellectually, and morally demanding for teachers, teacher education, and the public alike--perhaps too much so. But it is no more demanding that the tragic problems which develop in moral vacuums or in closed moral systems. In any event I hope there can be an unclosed dialogue about what global responsibility means.
FOOTNOTES

1 The debate centers on whether the larger scheme of things derives mainly from the self or from the system and whether its achievement is primarily a function of man's relation to spirit or to nature. The common view of Marx's theory as completely mechanistic, leaving no room for mean-seeking selves who are agents of change is, in my view, unwarranted. See Johns 1974, pp. 76-88, esp. 86-88.

2 The dialogue with the natural world has been addressed insufficiently here, though Buber's suggestion that one can and should have an I-Thou relationship with nature since the eternal Thou, the creator of it all, is present in it. From a very different (this worldly) framework, Marx agrees with Buber on the importance of nature, though he seems to go further: "Nature is the inorganic body of man....To say that man lives from nature means that he must remain in continuous interchange in order not to die" (Quoted in Johns 1974, 82). See also Niebuhr 1963.

3 Rhinelander points out, for instance, that Herbert Marcuse, a Marxist, sees the basic problems of modern society to be a result, not of the fragmented, but of the monolithic nature of society. Marcuse refers to "one-dimensional man," not the man who, according to Newmann & Oliver, is lost at least in part because of the plurality of values. I believe Rhinelander's argument that Marcuse's account is basically invalid. See Rhinelander 1973, 29-31.
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SELF-CONSTRUCTS AND SOCIAL EDUCATION

Michael K. Lindsay
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Interest in affective education, including its roots in the psychology of William James and the philosophy of John Dewey, has led many social educators and social science investigators to include among their educational objectives and research variables several constructs that relate to the self. The self has been particularly emphasized in recent social studies objectives at both the national and state levels, for example, as well as in the writings of various individuals (e.g., Engle, 1971; Gross, 1974-75; Hunkins and Spears, 1973). Such terms as "self-respect," "personal values," "fundamental worth of the individual," "self-realization," "self-esteem," and "self-worth" have been prominent in objectives stated by the 1971 National Council for the Social Studies Task Force on Curriculum Guidelines (Manson et al., 1971), the 1974 National Assessment of Educational Progress (Objectives, 1974), and the social studies conceptual frameworks of California and Wisconsin, two states which have been generally recognized for their exemplary efforts in producing documents of this sort (Dunfee, 1970).

It is noteworthy, too, that the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) included at least 60 different if not clearly distinct self-related terms among the descriptors in its 1974, 1975, and 1976 publications of Current Index to Journals of Education (CIJE) and Research in Education (RIE). Six of these descriptors contained more than 80 percent of the 2030 self-related entries for those years, including multiple listings. The six descriptors are identified in Table 1.
Table 1: RIE and CIJE Self-Related Descriptors Containing the Most Entries in 1974, 1975, and 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self concept</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self actualization</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self esteem</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self control</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self concept tests</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While these figures may provide a suggestion as to the general focus of investigators who utilize self-related constructs, they do not yield any insight into the more important consideration of what the researchers are really investigating and what kinds of specific construct variables they are using. Among the six descriptors, for example, self-evaluation might refer to the process of evaluating or it might be more concerned with the product or outcome of the evaluation. Similarly, although the descriptor "self-actualization" is customarily presented as a developmental process (Maslow, 1968b; Rogers, 1969), it can also be construed as an outcome or end result. This is apparent in its measurement as a product of the Personal Orientation Inventory as in the conceptual scheme of Cangemi and Englander (1974).

In a hypothetical model of self-development, Cangemi and Englander (1974) have identified a specific set of self-related constructs from self-awareness to self-actualization. Self-awareness, their starting point, is used to mean awareness of one's own behavior--one's thoughts, speech, desires, actions, needs, inner urges, and compulsions. Self-awareness leads to insights about one's behavior. The interrelationships of the accumulated insights with the given contexts and with other prior knowledge then result in self-understanding and, ultimately, in self-actualization. Cangemi and Englander merely trace through the hierarchy of their model, however, without providing complete conceptual definitions:
Self-awareness leads one to insight about his own behavior; which then leads to understanding and accepting his behavior; thereafter propelling the individual toward psychological growth. Mental hygiene is then observed. From this state of psychological health the individual unfolds further and is free at this point to utilize more fully his abilities and potential. (1974, pp. 90-91)

In consideration of the general lack of conceptual clarity of these and other self-related constructs, it is the intention in this article to clarify certain self-related constructs as they are used in theoretical and empirical research. Specifically, this article presents an examination of the constructs “self,” “self-awareness,” “self-acceptance,” “self-perception,” “self-concept,” “self-insight,” “self-understanding,” and “self-actualization” with respect to their utility as educational objectives and research constructs. Omitted from this examination are such assessment-related constructs as “self-regard,” “self-esteem,” and “self-evaluation,” for example, which function as meta-processes in the sense that they serve as an umbrella of processes operating on other processes.

**SELF**

The self is customarily presented as a philosophical and subjectively phenomenological construct rather than one that is objectively empirical (Bertocci, 1945; Combs and Snygg, 1959; Combs and Soper, 1957; James, 1890; Kash et al., 1976; Lantz, 1964; Patterson, 1961; Rogers, 1959; Staines, 1958; Wylie, 1961). The existence of the self, its subjective or objective qualities, its organization as a structure or as a process, and its composition of isolated experiences or as a unity have all been identified and debated on a philosophical level.

Perhaps the clearest conceptualization of the self can be derived from a psychoanalytic perspective. In this perspective the self is viewed as the cornerstone of the personality insofar as it integrates id, ego, and super-ego into one dynamic structure. Through these components the psychoanalytic self incorporates notions of an individual’s awarenesses and experiences of his or her organism as differentiated from others and in relation to others. While these awarenesses and experiences may fluctuate, the self is not usually altered markedly by changes in the external environment other than those changes which are the result of traumatic or euphoric experiences (Lantz, 1964). Within this psychoanalytic perspective, then, the self can be conceptualized as an inner, relatively permanent structure which gives consistency and integration to the personality.
In contrast to the theoreticians, empirical researchers have not been much concerned with the self as a research construct per se. Instead, the empiricists have focused their attention more on the behavioral aspects of the biological entity. The construct of the self is of interest to this group of researchers primarily as a starting point for subsequent referencing. This is quite consistent with May's conclusion:

We do not need to prove the self as an "object." It is only necessary that we show how people have the capacity for self-relatedness. The self is the organizing function within the individual and the function by means of which one human being can relate to another. It is prior to, not an object of, our science; it is presupposed in the fact that one can be a scientist. (1967, p. 79)

While the self may not be of particular interest to empiricists as a research construct, it has been of great concern to social educators in terms of educational objectives. Social educators clearly have been concerned with developing both the organizing functions within individuals and the functions of social interaction between individuals. Indeed, since its identification as an educational field with the formation of the NEA Committee on Social Studies in 1913 (Engle, 1971), social studies has been inextricably oriented toward providing education for democratic citizenship—that is, for the role and relation of the individual in a democratic society.

Among its general social studies objectives, for example, the 1974 National Assessment of Educational Progress (Objectives, 1974) identified understanding of major relationships involving culture, the group, and the self. Hunkins and Spears have written that "The importance of finding and knowing one's intimate self for the achievement of sincere involvement in the concerns of one's society must be acknowledged by social studies" (1973, p. 8). Finally, psychoanalyst Bettelheim has addressed the individual and social functions in his conclusion that "it may be said that the greatest service the social studies teacher can render to his adolescent students is to educate them to a critical understanding of themselves and of the society in which they live" (1948, p. 592).

With a concentration on particular aspects of knowledge, skills, and values, social studies education has been able to contribute to student growth in both individual and social areas of functioning. In addition to providing educational awareneses and experiences for the student's self as an integrating structure, social studies education can contribute to the functioning of specific self-processes. These processes are of greater interest to empirical researchers, and it is to these processes that we will now turn.
SELF-AWARENESS

Self-awareness generally is presented as awareness, or conscious recognition, of one's own behavior, including the attitudes, feelings, and values that accompany the behavior (Barksdale, 1972; Bessell and Palomares, 1973; Carroll, 1964). For an experiment, Chandler (1970) operationally defined self-awareness as the degree of agreement between one's actual inferences and the logical products of the individual's rule system to account for those inferences when the rule system is applied by another person. Self-awareness thus identifies one's ability to monitor his or her behavior reasonably congruently with external observation.

Self-awareness helps to free one's intelligence for understanding one's psychological constitution and needs (Redl and Wattenberg, 1959). Carroll (1964) suggests that with self-awareness there is little denial of the realities of life and that reality is perceived and accommodated without undue difficulty or strain to the organism. Glasser (1969) argues, moreover, that self-awareness is essential for developing one's own identity, which he claims is the one basic psychological need of humans. Healthy persons are those who are aware of themselves, accept themselves, and accept responsibility for the consequences of their choices and actions (Cangemi and Englander, 1974).

That self-awareness as a process can vary situationally in its occurrence has been demonstrated by Chandler (1970), Ickes et al. (1973), Haigh (1949), Staines (1958), and Vargas (1954). The changeability of self-awareness relative to specific external situations and events suggests the appropriateness for educators to emphasize and develop this process capability in their students and for researchers to increase their attention to this construct.

Student self-awareness may be manifested in the classroom in several ways. Increases in self-referenced verbalizations or in previously undescribed aspects of the self (Vargas, 1954) represent two such behavioral criteria. Additionally, empirically testable and confirmable explanations of procedural sequences, thought patterns, and perceptions of social relationships may be taken as examples of student self-awareness (Chandler, 1970). Also, the ability to locate oneself within time, space, object, and task orientations may be included as evidence of self-awareness.

It becomes apparent that the social studies emphasis on inquiry is particularly appropriate for the development of student self-awareness. The value of inquiry for this purpose lies in the first phase of the general problem-solving process, which relates to the recognition and definition of the problem situation. The first goal of the teacher or the prepared curricular material in inquiry situations is to stimulate the student to perceive multiple facets of the situation. As Chapin and Gross indicate,
"one of the most important skills that a student can acquire is the ability to point out the critical issues of a problem" (1973, p. 154). By introducing problems that are more immediate to the student's own life and thereby presumably increasing the likelihood of directly involving the student's self in the inquiry task, social studies teachers may be able to increase the amount of self-awareness that is being applied by the student at the given moment.

The potential for self-awareness as a construct for social education research is vast. Researchers could contribute to the understanding of this construct by examining, for instance: (a) situations in which manifestations of self-awareness occur more freely than in other situations; (b) curricular and instructional stimuli—including the specific use of inquiry— which tend to elicit greater or fewer manifestations of student self-awareness; (c) situations in which both too much and too little self-awareness could become dysfunctional; and (d) possible relationships between self-awareness and various measures of aptitude and achievement.

SELF-ACCEPTANCE

Three main conceptualizations of self-acceptance stand out in the literature: (a) as judgment of approval or disapproval, in the sense of self-liking and self-compatibility (Staines, 1958; Stevens, 1956; Trent, 1957; Wylie, 1961); (b) as congruence between self or self-concept and ideal self, which also implies a degree of compatibility (Crowne and Stephens, 1961; Staines, 1958; Wylie, 1961); and (c) as a sort of filter which participates in selecting those perceptions that will be admitted to awareness (Combs and Soper, 1957; Grebstein, 1969; Keezer, 1971; Maslow, 1954; Rogers, 1951).

It is the recommendation of this investigator that self-acceptance as a research construct and educational objective be confined to the third conceptualization. The first conceptualization could probably be better served by applying a term that reflects more active appraisal, such as self-regard or self-esteem. Likewise, the second conceptualization would also appear to be better served by using another construct, and in this case congruence or self-ideal congruence would seem to be descriptively appropriate alternatives.

The conceptualization of self-acceptance as a filter of admissibility to awareness, in contrast, would appear to provide the greatest theoretical and empirical utility for this construct. The theoretical utility lies in its relationship to self-perception and self-awareness, whereby self-acceptance serves as the monitor or censor for admitting perceptions to awareness. Combs and Soper (1957) reflect this conceptualization by restricting self-acceptance to mean the ability of the individual to accept into awareness facts about himself or herself with a minimum of defense or
distortion. Self-acceptance in this sense bears a relationship to accuracy of observation and self-awareness.

The empirical utility of the filter conceptualization relates to the fact that not all perceptions of the self are admitted to awareness or become part of the self-concept (Patterson, 1961; Rogers, 1969), just as not all object-perceptions are admitted into consciousness (Shepard, 1975). The selection process for admitting perceptions to awareness depends in part on factors such as self-concept, which contributes to selective perception (Combs and Snygg, 1959; Ickes et al., 1973; Perkins, 1958; Raimy, 1948), and it depends in part on the perceptual and cognitive processing capabilities of the individual (Arnhem, 1968; Neisser, 1967; Patterson, 1961; Rogers, 1959).

Self-acceptance in the filter sense can be enhanced in school by emphasizing the interpretation of realities as experienced differentially by different individuals (Gendlin, 1973; Glasser, 1965; Morse, 1963). This suggests that in a discussion or in problem-solving tasks, for example, the teacher should solicit students' perceptions rather than simply relying on his or her own perceptions of the situation. Acknowledging differential perceptions, stressing accountability for the consequences of behavior, identifying the role of attitudes and values, recognizing reality contingencies of the setting, and confronting student assertions and assumptions are examples of instructional techniques that would particularly appropriate for enhancing the student's filter of self-acceptance in social studies classrooms.

Further investigation of the self-acceptance construct is necessary to confirm the filter function and to verify the suggested relationship between self-acceptance and accuracy of self-awareness. Additional research would also be useful for relating self-acceptance to various other perceptual and cognitive processes. Another interesting area of investigation would be to seek potential relationships between levels of self-acceptance and levels of personality traits, such as those measured by the 16 Personality Factors Test or the California Personality Inventory, for example. A final example of potential research using this construct would be to study the suggested effects of instructional techniques on the occurrence and development of student self-acceptance capabilities.

**SELF-PERCEPTION**

Self-perception, like self-evaluation, is subject to interpretation as a process or a product. As a research variable it seems to be used primarily to refer to a process, although self-perceptions as end products are often identified with and, indeed, confused with self-concepts (Bledsoe, 1964;
Wylie, 1961). Combs and Soper (1957) have made the distinction that "self-concept" is an internal organization of the individual's perceptions about himself or herself, whereas "concepts of the self" refers to the atomistic self-perceptions. Gordon and Combs define perception as "the process of attributing meaning and significance to the immediate situation. It emphasizes the perceiver, rather than the object perceived, as the organizer of his world" (1958, p. 433).

By extension, self-perception would be the process of attributing meaning and significance to the self or to aspects of the self in the immediate situation. The attribution of meaning implies that there is cognitive processing that is operant in perception as well as sensory processing of information. Self-perception occurs when the self or aspects of the self serve as objects in the perceptual field and are therefore accessible for sensory and cognitive processing. Self-perception is like self-acceptance in that it is another self-construct that has been portrayed as a mediating process-factor between the individual (in terms of self-awareness and self-concept) and his or her social and physical environment—as the locus of social interaction and individual performance alike (Gordon and Combs, 1958).

Many varying influences on self-perception can be identified in educational and psychological research. An individual's self-perception is influenced by feelings of personal inadequacy (Combs and Soper, 1963); an individual's behavior is influenced by self-perception (Eriksen and Browne, 1956; Zuk, 1956); an individual's social relationships and behavior are related to self-perception (Combs and Soper, 1963; Gordon and Combs, 1958; Miyamoto and Dornbusch, 1956); an individual can be trained to develop increased perception in observation (Felker et al., 1973; Gordon, 1959); an individual's self-perception and behavior can be changed by changed behavior in others, including teachers (Moustakas, 1956; Yando and Kagan, 1968); an individual's self-perception is influenced by affective processes (Jenkin, 1957) and by time (Combs and Soper, 1963; Murphy, 1956); and an individual's self-perception is related to school performance (Walsh, 1956).

Accuracy of self-perception, as conveyed in self-referenced reports, appears to be critical for accurate self-concept formation and hence for mental health (Jourard and Remy, 1957; Laird, 1956; Murphy, 1956). Self-perception in students, then, is another essential process area of development where social education can contribute with further instruction and research. Because of the many social interactions and individual behaviors in which students become engaged during the daily school activities, teachers can use these activities as opportunities for eliciting student self-perception by inquiring about the meaning students attach to particular events, behaviors, and relationships.
Student self-perception is another area rich in possibilities for research. Beyond the findings already cited, researchers might profitably investigate: (a) the kinds of meanings students attach to themselves; (b) the salient features that are included and excluded in the process of attaching meaning; (c) the various ways in which others—particularly teachers and other students—can affect student self-perception; and (d) the relationship between self-perception and other variables, including other self-constructs.

SELF-CONCEPT

Self-concept is the self-related construct which has received the most emphasis in recent research, as indicated in Table 1. As with the term "self," however, "self-concept" has been applied with much conceptual confusion. The construct has been applied with variation along such dimensions as subjective-objective, perceptual-conceptual, stable-changing, summative-formative, and unified-componential (Shavelson et al., 1976). Definitions have ranged from simple statements, such as a person's perceptions or attitudes and feelings about himself or herself (Lantz, 1964; Shavelson et al., 1976), to more complex statements, such as a learned perceptual system which functions as an object in the perceptual field and which influences behavior and in turn is influenced by behavior (Raimy, 1971).

Just as not all perceptions of the self are admitted into awareness, not all those perceptions which are admitted into awareness become part of the self-concept. Only those perceptions which seem to the individual to be important and characteristic of himself or herself will become a part of the self-concept. This suggests that the self-concept is not merely an accumulation of perceptions but is rather an organization of a selected subset of perceptions that have a particular meaning for the individual. In sum, the self-concept may be taken as the internal organization of those self-perceptions which seem most important to the individual in identifying or contemplating himself or herself.

It would appear that the self-concept is quite capable of having the kind of fluctuation that Shavelson et al. (1976) described. The process of self-awareness, for example, indicates that the self can function as both subject and object. Additionally, the process of self-perception seems to involve both perceptual and conceptual processes as meaning is attributed to the perceptions of the self. As a further example, the relative stability of the self and the susceptibility of self-perception to external influence suggest the stable-changing dimension.

Even if the self-concept were stable, though—which is an assumption that has yet to be demonstrated conclusively—the situational variance of self-awareness and the susceptibility of self-perception to external influence
renders the individual's access to his or her self-concept as also varying situationally. The self-concept must therefore be inferred by others from the individual's responses to situations, with the situations and responses being either physical or symbolic. There is thus a distinction made between self-concept, which is restricted to a person's report of himself or herself, and inferred self-concept, which is another's attribution of a person's self-concept (Combs and Soper, 1957; Parker, 1966; Shavelson et al., 1976).

Inferred self-concept is usually determined by applying instruments such as the Michigan State Self-Concept of Ability Scale, the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale, the Self-Concept Inventory, the Interpersonal Check List, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, variations of the Q-sort, and various other instruments as reviewed by Crowne and Stephens (1961), Gordon and Combs (1958), Leviton (1875), Shavelson et al. (1976), Strong and Feder (1961), and Wylie (1961). Frequently the specific focus is on the relationship between self-concept and academic achievement, as seen in Bledsoe (1964), Brookover et al. (1964), Campbell (1967), Davidson and Lang (1960), Fink (1962), Leviton (1975), Purkey (1970), and Thomas (1974).

While the importance of self-concept for educational and psychological consideration has been theoretically and empirically demonstrated, the construct itself has not been precisely and unambiguously defined with any consistency or general acceptance. What needs clarification is just what the researcher or curriculum developer means when referring to self-concept: Is it a summative, stable notion that is relatively permanent or is it a formative, changing notion that is immediate to a given situation? Is it the sum of one's self-perceptions or is it the individual's evaluation and organization of those perceptions? Until such clarification is provided, the continued emphasis on self-concept as an educational objective must be regarded questioningly.

It is suggested here that investigators cannot continue to use the term "self-concept" to denote so many different meanings with so many potentially confusing conceptual interpretations. Instead, until research can provide a concise conceptual definition that is more universally understood and accepted, it might be more beneficial to concentrate on the more discrete processes which contribute to self-concept formation. Minimally, statements of operational definition—which have not always been provided in the literature—are imperative. Optimally, more discriminating terms should be applied to the subtle dimensions and phenomena of the self that are being investigated.
SELF-INSIGHT

Two definitions of self-insight suggest its relationship to reality. Staines (1958) and Wylie (1961) present insight as the degree to which an individual's self-concept corresponds to reality. Wylie adds that in the classical Freudian and neo-Freudian view, lack of insight is alleged to be accompanied by defensiveness and/or maladjustment. She reports that most, but not all, operational definitions of insight involve a discrepancy between the individual's self-report and an observer's report about the individual.

One definition which does not include this discrepancy provides what is perhaps the most useful conceptualization of self-insight. Gross states that self-insight is "the acceptance and admission of both the presence and absence of personality traits within oneself when this acceptance runs counter to a system of emotionally toned ideas or when the admission of these ideas clashes with one's self-esteem" (1948, p. 223). Keezer (1971) also points out that insight is affected by the level of self-acceptance that an individual attains. The relationship between self-acceptance and self-insight is particularly suggestive if we conceptualize self-acceptance as the degree to which an individual can admit or accept into awareness both his or her own self-perceptions and the observations of others.

It is recommended here that self-insight be conceptualized as the occurrence of accepting into self-awareness realistic but previously latent, blocked, incomplete, or undiscovered perceptions of one's experiences and then using the new awareness to reorganize the situation-specific and/or general conceptual and perceptual self-processes. This suggests that it is self-insight that attaches the meaning or significance to observations of the self in the process of self-perception. In this way self-insight stands in close relation to both self-perception and self-acceptance, and it would appear also to be the link of congruency between self-concept and ideal self-concept, or between self-concept and self as perceived by others.

Probably the most apparent classroom examples of this phenomenon would be student self-disclosure and student self-monitoring and self-correcting of verbal thought processes while the thoughts are being expressed. As W. H. Auden once wrote, "How do I know what I think until I see what I say?" (Arnheim et al., 1948, p. 174). Or, as Jourard has expressed this notion, "I am beginning to suspect that I can't even know my own soul except as I disclose it" (1964, p. 10)—which may be related to the significantly greater number of affective self-disclosures found by Hekmat and Theiss (1971) in high self-actualizing persons than in others.

Instructional strategies for freeing the individual to experience self-insight have been described by Lindsay (1972, 1977), Mattocks and Jew (1974), Rogers (1969), and Saltmarsh et al. (1975) as well as by developers.
of specific curricula for personal growth (Dinkmeyer, 1971; Long and Wolsk, 1971; Randolph and Howe, 1966). Three general strands of recommendations for teachers are included in these sources: (a) using attentive listening and non-judgmental response patterns to create a socio-emotional climate in which students can perform their own self-assessment; (b) providing projective experiences as opportunities for student self-insight to occur; and (c) practicing teacher self-disclosure which, based on Ehrlich and Graeven (1971), may increase the likelihood of student reciprocity of self-disclosure.

Further empirical investigation is needed to confirm the relationships between self-insight and self-disclosure and between self-insight and self-acceptance. Specifically, more investigation is needed in the realm of self-insight as it relates to externalization or self-disclosure of the self-perception process and to reorganization of the self-processes. Additionally, evidence is needed to confirm the effect of instructional techniques and curricular materials on occurrences of student self-insight.

SELF-UNDERSTANDING

Self-understanding is typically portrayed as a cognitive process (Cangemi and Englander, 1974; Staines, 1958). As such, it can be depicted as representing cognition of the perceptual and conceptual self-concept and of the thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and behaviors which the individual experiences. Self-understanding is frequently presented in educational objectives and psychological principles as accompanying and often preceding understanding of others and of the world (California State Board of Education, 1975; Goals for Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1973; Maslow, 1968b; Rogers, 1951). Understanding of the self has also been identified as a specific social studies goal by Bettelheim (1948), Gross (1974-75), Hunkins and Spears (1973), and Lindsay (1974-75).

Gergen (1971) studied self-understanding as a major source of avoid pain and achieving pleasure. The quest for self-understanding is usually a haphazard one, he concluded, involving sporadic glimpses of reality, sudden insights, and the more common stumbling through the disconnected and ambiguous events of daily life. This haphazard quality is attributed to the individual's lack of training to observe, to lack of a systematic approach toward events, and to lack of utilizing the appropriate perceptual, cognitive, and affective tools.

Jersild (1952) has advocated training students for self-understanding as part of his recommendation for including psychology in secondary school curricula. Jersild characterizes self-understanding as the ability to find oneself and to face problems realistically; as the insight into tendencies within oneself that influence attitudes toward self and toward relations with
others; and as the examination of the personal factors that influence one’s thinking, feeling, and perceiving. In sum, it may be said that self-understanding is the cognitive result of using various self-processes to explore the thoughts, feelings, and attitudes that underlie one’s behavior as well as to examine the behavior itself.

In the sequence presented in this study, self-understanding would represent cognition applied to the interaction of the processes of self-awareness, self-acceptance, self-perception, and self-insight. Self-understanding thus represents an important composite target for the focus of educators and researchers on the various self-processes. It is the general recommendation of this investigator, then, that educators and researchers concentrate their concerns with student self-development in the area of self-understanding and its component processes.

**SELF-ACTUALIZATION**

Self-actualization, finally, is recognized as being richly described (Maslow, 1954, 1968b) but unsatisfactorily defined for research purposes. It represents a degree of process development between a person’s potential capabilities and his or her actual expressed patterns of thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and other behaviors. Maslow (1968b) has described self-actualizing persons as being motivated by needs to be open rather than closed, to love others and self without giving in to aggression or manipulative needs, to act in ways that are ethically and morally good for society, to express autonomy and creativity, and to be curious, spontaneous, and lively in their interactions with others and with the environment.

Given these characteristics, the self-actualizer is one whose values and functioning are motivated by the needs of expressing his or her being rather than by the needs of satisfying his or her deficiencies. The self-actualizing person, in short, is one who appears to be living life in a relatively healthy, fulfilling, and satisfying way.

Several experiments have been conducted using the Personal Orientation Inventory to measure self-actualization at a given point in time. LeMay (1969) has found that self-actualization and scholastic achievement are not directly related but are related secondarily through relationships with other variables. Foulds (1970) demonstrated that personal-growth group experiences can be effective for fostering positive mental health, personal growth, and self-knowledge in students. Hekmat and Theiss (1971) have found that high self-actualizing individuals have a higher rate of affective self-disclosure than less self-actualizing individuals. As a final example, Murray (1972) showed that students perceive self-actualizing teachers as more concerned than non-self-actualizing teachers.
These results provide support for the inclusion of self-actualization as an educational concern, as has been recommended by several educators and psychologists (Cangemi and Englander, 1974; Jersild, 1952; Kelly, 1962; Maslow, 1968a; Rogers, 1969). Because self-actualization is an unsatisfactorily defined process, however, it may be that with regard to this construct, too, educators might more beneficially concentrate on developing the more discrete processes that are involved in the student’s self-actualization. At the same time, though, it would appear that researchers could continue their search for providing operational definition and measurement of this construct as it relates to other variables. Particular attention to self-actualization as it relates to the other self-constructs discussed in this article would be appropriate, for without the full functioning of self-awareness, self-acceptance, self-perception, self-insight, and self-understanding, self-actualization would hardly seem likely to occur.

SUMMARY

Eight specific self-related constructs found in theoretical and empirical research were presented. Conceptual definitions and recommendations for educational practice and further research were offered. Among the constructs, “self” was found to be of little concern to investigators as a research variable but of vital concern to social educators. In contrast, the subjective phenomenon of self-concept was found to be of great interest in research but to be suffering from much conceptual confusion and therefore to be of questionable present utility for educational objectives. Self-actualization was recognized as being of much interest to both researchers and educators, but here, too, conceptual definition has been inadequate for the purposes of research variables and educational objectives.

Consequently, further clarification and operational definition have been called for with respect to self-concept and self-actualization. Meanwhile, it has been recommended generally that it may be more beneficial for researchers and especially for educators to concentrate their efforts on the more discrete processes that lead to self-understanding. These specific processes were identified as self-awareness, self-acceptance, self-perception, and self-insight.

CONCLUSION

The constructs reviewed in this article suggest a tentative reconceptualization of Cangemi and Englander’s (1974) model of self-development. Through the pivotal process of self-awareness, the individual is able to
observe his or her individual behaviors and social relationships. Observations of the self can occur directly by the individual or through his or her responses to observations that are made explicitly or implicitly by other persons.

Not all observations are admitted to awareness, however. When observations are not admitted, it is the filter of self-acceptance which excludes them. Also, some observations that are admitted to awareness through self-acceptance are relatively unimportant, and no particular meaning is attached to them. These observations remain merely as perceptions of the self. When meaning is attached to the observations, then the conscious process of self-perception is occurring. Self-insight serves both to attach meaning to the observations and to select and organize important self-perceptions into the self-concept. It appears, then, that a simultaneous functioning of self-awareness, self-acceptance, self-perception and self-insight may be necessary for self-concept formation to take place.

Through a feedback loop, the self-concept combines with perceptual and cognitive skills as well as with environmental factors and emotional predispositions to influence self-perception and self-acceptance, and thereby also self-awareness. Self-understanding is the result of cognition applied to the interaction of the self-processes of self-awareness, self-acceptance, self-perception, and self-insight. Self-understanding would also imply cognition applied to the self-concept. Self-actualization occurs as self-understanding and the self-processes develop toward fulfilling their potential and as the self-concept approaches some sort of ideal self-concept. With self-actualization the individual becomes increasingly more motivated by needs of being and increasingly less motivated by needs of satisfying deficiencies. The self-actualizing individual will be observed as living a healthy, satisfying, and fulfilling life in his or her individual functions and social relations.

It is hoped that the contents, conclusions, and model of self-development presented in this study may contribute both to better conceptual understanding of self-related constructs and, ultimately, to more productive application of these constructs as education objectives and research variables. The suggestions contained in this study have intended neither to dismiss nor to ignore the role of self, self-concept, and self-actualization (nor of self-esteem, self-regard, and self-evaluation, even though these constructs were not discussed) as being unimportant for self-development. The specific emphasis on the contributory processes of self-development as outlined in this article seems to be particularly appropriate in light of the following remarks by Gergen:
In the final analysis, one's personal conduct is based upon his conception of "reality" rather than upon reality itself. And it is the process of self-understanding that is more important than the "self" which the individual attempts to understand. The "self" may always elude our comprehension, but the process of comprehension is always open to our understanding. (1971, p. viii)

Development of self-understanding and its contributory processes is an especially important learning objective in the education of individuals for social functioning. If there is any credence to the recommendations of Bettelheim (1948), Gross (1974-75), Hunkins and Spears (1973), and others who have identified individual as well as social purposes for social studies education, then the social studies not only should teach students about their society but also should provide students with opportunities for learning about themselves as individuals who function within the society. As long as the social studies field continues to be concerned with citizenship as the social functioning of the individual and as long as the social studies field continues to be concerned with society as depicted by the social sciences, then the social studies field has the responsibility of contributing to students' individual and social functioning by using research and instruction to foster the development of students' self-processes.
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THE IMPACT OF SCHOOL POLITICAL SYSTEMS
ON STUDENT POLITICAL ATTITUDES
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It has always been assumed that schools play an important role in the political socialization of American youth. Almost every historical and contemporary statement identifying major goals for public schools has included some direct or indirect reference to political socialization. Such goal statements are usually made in vague references to the nebulous term citizenship education. In fact, though extremely ill defined, citizenship education is and has been recognized as one of the most universally accepted goals of American education.

Yet in spite of the consensus surrounding this goal, and comprehensive efforts at achieving effective citizenship, there exists a rather long history of research indicating schools have not had the positive impact on the political socialization of their students that educators have expected. Because of this realization, a growing interest has emerged in determining the aspects of schooling that have an influence on citizenship education, specifically political socialization.

In recent years researchers have defined the concept of citizenship education in more specific terms and have begun to identify specific variables associated with the political development of youth. One of the newer areas of research is the school environment - the formal and informal rules and norms which govern the interaction of individuals and groups within the educational institutions.

This article is a report on a research project that focused on one dimension of the school environment, that characterized as the school political system. The study explored the question of whether or not different school political systems could be identified, and if so, what impact the systems might have on student social and political attitudes.

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

During the last twenty years, research studies have helped to indicate the degree and kind of influence schools have on the political socialization of American youth. Although the research findings are sometimes mixed and occasionally even in conflict, it is difficult to overlook several areas of
emerging agreement. Generally, it seems that schooling has its strongest impact on the transmission of political knowledge. Although a variety of studies over the years have demonstrated that student knowledge in the political area is far less than desired, it nevertheless appears to be the schools most valid claim to contributing to the political socialization process. In the most recent survey of research on the function of the school in the political socialization process, Ehman (1977) supports this claim and also reports the impact of schooling on the political attitudes of students:

"...it seems fairly clear that schooling is more closely linked as an important socialization agent in the acquisition of political knowledge and awareness than as a shaper of political attitudes and participation. This seems an altogether reasonable finding, given the emphasis on cognitive outcomes in U.S. schooling. Nevertheless, it is also evident that several researchers have found that the formal education process intersects the formation and modification of political attitudes as well as cognitive political outcomes. (p. 6)

Because this study is most concerned with attitudes associated with citizenship education, research reported here will be concerned primarily with this area.

As early as 1938, the New York Board of Regents conducted a comprehensive study of student "civic responsibilities" that proved alarming to educators (Education for American Life, 1938). In 1957, the now famous Purdue Opinion Poll was conducted involving the largest number of school age students ever polled, and reported equally disturbing results. In spite of years of public education, students appeared to have negative democratic attitudes (Remmers, Radler, 1957). Recent research has helped explore the area of student attitudes in more detail and helped to identify specific variables. The following survey of research will explore student attitude outcomes in relation to (1) teacher influence, (2) formal aspects of schooling, (3) classroom environment, (4) general school environment (5) other possible intervening variables, and (6) alternative schools.

Teacher Influence on Student Attitudes: A number of recent research efforts have explored the relationship between student attitudes and teacher influences. Research indicates that teachers can, to a certain extent, influence attitudes in young students (Hess and Torney, 1967, 1969). At the secondary level Jennings, Ehman, and Niemi (1974) found almost no relationship between teachers and students' attitudes. Other studies have reported slight and favorable variations on the question of teacher influence (Marker, 1970 and Levenson, 1972) and indicated that teacher credibility may have a positive effects on student attitudes (Goldenson, 1976 and
Williams, 1977). The extent and nature of teacher influence on student political attitudes remains an important research topic.

**Formal Schooling:** Another area of investigation has focused on the relationship between student attitudes and the formal aspect of schooling; e.g. curriculum, courses and classroom instructional practices. In general, formal school courses directed toward influencing students' political attitudes have produced rather meager outcomes. Langton and Jennings (1968) found courses in civics and government had little or no impact on student political attitudes. Studies since 1968 have largely substantiated the Langton and Jennings findings (Ehman, 1969; German, 1971; Farnen and German, 1972; Rodgers, 1973; and Baughman, 1975).

There are also a number of recent studies of concentrated curriculum efforts designed for the purpose of changing student attitudes. Sears (1972) Liebshultz and Niemi (1974) and Sherry (1976) found no changes in experiments with elementary children. Similar results were found at the secondary level by Litt (1963), Borg (1966) and Hoover (1967).

Studies of more targeted curricular efforts have been mixed. Goldenson (1978) found attitudes toward civil liberties could be changed in 12th grade students. Others found that value clarification (Ellison, 1974) and role involvement (Vogel, 1973) could have positive efforts on student attitudes under certain conditions. Studies of simulations (Alley and Gladhart, 1975) found no effects or mixed results (Boocock, 1968).

In general, it appears that student political attitudes are at best only minimally affected by school courses or shorter instructional units.

**Classroom Climate:** A third area of research is classroom climate. Classroom climate refers to how teaching is conducted and has usually focused on the degree of openness or closedness of classroom instruction. An open classroom is characterized by greater student involvement in classroom activities, procedures and discussions than that designated as a closed classroom.

With few exceptions, an open classroom climate seems to positively influence political attitudes and a closed classroom climate seems to have the opposite effect. In a study to measure students' political attitudes in relation to specific civic education practices, Torney, Oppenheim and Farnen (1975) found classroom climate to be the only consistent and positive influence on all the intended civic objectives. Ehman (1977) reported similar results. In a thirteen-school longitudinal study of classroom climate effects, Ehman found the open classroom climate had a positive impact on selected classroom variables. Likewise, Allman-Snyder, et al, (1975) in a study of elementary classrooms, found an open classroom facilitated democratic solutions to conflict situations. The open classroom has also resulted in positive outcomes when matched with classroom participation (Glenn, 1972), freedom of classroom discussion (Ponder and
Button, 1975), student initiation of learning activities and control of classroom structure (Dillion and Grout, 1976), and in relation to other classroom climate variables (Hawley, 1976; Hawley and Cunningham, 1975). Although there are studies which present conflicting data (Long and Long, 1975) or report minimal or no attitude changes (Baughman, 1975 and Meixel and Haller, 1973) there appears to be enough evidence to indicate that classroom climate is an important variable that demands continued attention.

School Environment: A few researchers have looked beyond the classroom learning environment to consider the total school environment. While little systematic research has been conducted in this area, there appears to be a growing assumption that the school environment is a significant variable that must be considered when investigating student attitudes. For example, social scientists, in their lack of success in finding effectiveness in formal courses, seem to have accepted the assumption “that any influence that the school might have upon political socialization emanates mainly from its prevailing climate of opinion and educational atmosphere rather than from its program of formal studies” (Patrick, 1969, p. 17). Unfortunately, “prevailing climate of opinion and educational atmosphere” have not been carefully defined.

Despite the problems associated with definition, some researchers have nevertheless hypothesized that there is a link between the school environment and political socialization:

“The school environment represents the first and, for many years of young people’s lives, the most salient form of external authority with which they have direct experience. The way in which teachers organize their classrooms, the extent to which students are allowed or encouraged to participate in decision-making about school rules, the quality of informal group activities and committee work students engage in all influence the students’ acquisition of knowledge, skills, and attitudes.” (Patrick, 1977)

One aspect of the school environment is the participation of students in the operation and activities of the school. A number of studies have found a positive relationship between school political participation and political attitudes (Lewis, 1962; Trenfield, 1965; Ziblatt, 1965; White, 1968; Struve and Snider, 1970; Burback, 1972; and Eyler, 1976).

Another aspect of the school environment which has received increased attention is the political organizational structure of the school. Although it is generally accepted that schools are bureaucratic and that they continue to move toward further bureaucratic consolidation, differences do seem to exist between schools, and it is these differences that are being explored to determine their relationship to student learnings. Perhaps the most
significant research in this area has been conducted by Ehman and Gillespie. Ehman and Gillespie (1974) developed a methodology for typing schools as political systems. Using five criteria--political leadership, political decision-making, political participation, and political communication and influence, they identified four school political systems. The four school systemic types identified were elite, participant, coalitional, and bureaucratic.

A second research thrust linked school structure to student attitudes. Ehman and Gillespie, using 13 midwest secondary schools and collecting data from 2,546 students, reported findings complimentary to other studies (Rafaledes and Hoy, 1971; Merelman, 1971; Levenson, 1972; Wittes, 1972; Jennings, 1974; Remy, Grove and Ziegler, 1974; and Siegal, 1977) verifying the relationship between school structure and student attitudes:

"The underlying characteristics of schools...seem to make a difference in the attitudes of students toward political participation and their political environment...students, like anyone else, need to share in the responsibilities and activities of an institution in order to establish important political attitudes which will support active citizenship." (p. 49-50)

Other studies have reported conflicting conclusions (Grossman, 1974 and Arkley, 1973) and some question the basic assumption that different political systems can be identified in public schools (Lamperes and Penna, 1978). This argument is based on a variety of research that questions the assumption of pluralistic educational structures. Several studies (Katz, 1968, 1971, Spring 1972; Kanier and Violas, Spring, 1973) report a pattern of unyielding pressure in the domain of public education toward the development of large scale managerial structures characterized by centralization of authority and functional differentiation. Yet while it seems that the rate at which schools have become large-scale formal bureaucracies has accelerated in recent years, a counter trend toward the development of alternative schools has likewise been documented (Smith, et al, 1976). The development of wide varieties of option, alternative and magnet schools with a variety of distinct learning environments appears to be occurring in the midst of the larger school bureaucracies (Estes and Waldrip, 1978).

*Other Possible Variables Affecting Student Attitudes:* It is also important to briefly describe other school variables which have been identified as possibly influencing student political attitudes. Levin (1961), Langton (1969), and Johnson (1972), reported that social status groups in schools affect students. More specifically, it is asserted that lower social class students attending schools comprised of a heterogeneous social class student population will develop higher class political norms.

School size has also been linked to student attitudes. Rafaledes and Hoy
(1971) found student alienation was influenced by proportionately larger schools. In a similar context, Kleinert (1969) and Baird (1969) found student involvement in school political activities to be lessened in proportion to increased school size. An exception is offered by Sanstead (1974) who found school size to have a positive relationship to political support and efficacy. In the search for significant variables associated with the development of student political attitudes, these factors cannot be overlooked.

One other variable, that of community work, has been researched with mixed results. Jones (1974, 1975a, 1975b, 1976) found no consistent relationship between student community work as part of social studies classes and student attitude changes.

Alternative Schools: While the research of alternative schools is still extremely limited, two recent studies need to be reported which relates closely to student attitudes. Wilson (1974), in a study of an alternative community-based secondary school, investigated, in part, the effect of the school structure on political development. Political development was measured by two constructs--openmindedness and political efficacy. Wilson made the following conclusions about the students in the alternative school.

"The general conclusion is that...[alternative school] students did become more openminded and politically efficacious...Additionally, the evidence suggest that such changes are the result of altering organizational structure and of emphasizing student personal growth rather than a result of teaching...When the total learning environment is changed, and such change is characterized by direct attention being paid to the democratic growth of students...then student political development is apt to occur. (p. 224-225)

Siegel (1977) studied five Massachusetts High Schools, one of which was an alternative school. He found that the alternative school was characterized by more student participation than the other schools and a relationship was reported between this participation and the development of certain positive political attitudes in students.

Unfortunately there is very little systematic research available on alternative schools. The best available data is usually found in school evaluations and reports. What research has been done consists largely of doctoral dissertations using the case study method. Furthermore, with the exception of the Wilson and Siegel studies cited above, there is very little evidence linking alternative schools to student attitudes associated with political socialization.

Despite this lack of research, some hypothesis seem warranted when surveying alternative schools. One common characteristic of alternative schools seems to be increased student participation (Barr, 1976). However, increased student involvement, may in part, be due to the consistently
smaller school size (Siegal, 1976).

Recognizing school size as possibly being an influential factor in determining increased student participation, alternative schools nevertheless seem to consistently incorporate student involvement within the school political system. In a recent N.I.E. position paper (Barr, 1976) surveying available alternative school evaluations, it was found that students seem to have increased control over their own destinies, felt more secure and had a greater self-identity. Likewise, in a recent review of alternative school evaluation (Barr, Colston and Parrett, 1977) evaluating the effectiveness of six selected alternative public schools, it was reported that the student attitude levels increased with participation in the program. Although student attitudes referred less to political attitudes and more to self-concept and school morale attitudes, it may well suggest that increased student participation does result in positive attitude change.

Again, accepting the meager amount of research conducted related to alternative schools, it nevertheless seems that alternative schools may well be characterized by greater student participation in the school system and this could lead to positive student attitude changes. It is, in part, based upon this premise that an alternative school was selected to serve as one of the schools used in this study.

In conclusion, in spite of a variety of rather mixed research results, it appears that schools have an impact on the development of student attitudes and the area of school environment and/or political systems could well provide the most promising area for further investigation.

**PURPOSE**

The major purpose of this study was to identify two different school political systems and to determine the effects of these different political systems on student activities. Since some research has suggested that alternative schools may well be organized in order to encourage student participation in decision-making (Barr, 1976), a large comprehensive high school in Indiana which included an alternative school within a school was selected for this study. On the basis of available information, discussions with school staff and on-site observations, it appeared that two distinctly different political systems were being utilized side by side in the same school building. Such a dichotomy provided an interesting research opportunity.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of school political systems on selected student attitudes. Within that framework, the study tested the following hypotheses:

1. There is a significant difference between the political systems of the comprehensive school and the alternative school program as indicated by students' perceptions of their role in school participation, decision-making, communication, leadership, and influence.
2. Students within the alternative school program will be found to demonstrate more positive attitudes of trust, social integration, political interest and political confidence than will students in the comprehensive school.

3. Students having been enrolled longer in the alternative school will demonstrate more positive attitudes of trust, social integration, political interest and political confidence than will students just beginning in the alternative schools.

4. No differences in attitudes will be demonstrated by students enrolled for longer and shorter periods in the comprehensive school.

5. There is a positive correlation between students' school-related attitudes and their general society-related attitudes.

PROCEDURES

The alternative school-within-a-school selected for this study is based upon the concept introduced by Maurice Gibbons entitled the "Walk-about" (Gibbons, 1974, p. 596-602) which suggests a rather distinctive school political system. The alternative school is purported to represent a cross-section of the nearly 4,000 member student body in the larger comprehensive school. There were approximately 250 students enrolled in the alternative school at the time of the study of which nearly 200 were junior and senior students. Of that total about half were full-time students and another half were part-time students. Full-time students are enrolled for more than half of their credit hours in the alternative school and part-time students are enrolled for less than half of their credit hours in the alternative school. The following table (Table 1) shows the numerical breakdown for the alternative school students involved in this study and includes the total population of juniors and seniors in the alternative school program.
Table 1. Alternative School Student Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire School</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>1st Semester</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire School</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The totals do not include 10th graders.

The student sample in the comprehensive school consisted of juniors and seniors enrolled in required social studies courses. Since all students in the comprehensive school are required to take these courses, it was considered to be a representative cross-section sample. The following table (Table 2) shows the numerical breakdown for the comprehensive school sample.

Table 2. Comprehensive School Student Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>44(45.8%)</td>
<td>52(54.2%)</td>
<td>52(54.2%)</td>
<td>44(45.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire School</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,140(47.5%)</td>
<td>1,260(52.5%)</td>
<td>1,040(43.3%)</td>
<td>1,360(56.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The totals do not include 10th graders.
The primary method for obtaining data regarding student attitudes and the identification of the political systems at work in the two schools being studied was a questionnaire. Nearly all of the 200 junior and senior students enrolled in Learning Unlimited were given questionnaires and 106 responded. Since Learning Unlimited students were involved in independent studies, community-based projects, taking courses in the comprehensive school, and involvement in a variety of activities, a high rate of return was not expected. This process of data collection may well have led to some selection bias that could have influenced the findings in this study. Just over 100 questionnaires were administered to students in the comprehensive school and 96 were returned completed. The high return of questionnaires resulted from the questionnaires being completed during class time.

In addition to the questionnaire, systematic on-site interviews were used to support the identification of the political systems of the two schools being studied. Fifty students were formally interviewed. Of the fifty students interviewed, twenty were comprehensive school students and thirty were Learning Unlimited students. Students interviewed were selected by their availability as a result of class scheduling and other time constraints. None of the students declined to be interviewed. Each interview lasted a minimum of ten minutes and a maximum of twenty minutes.

Description of the Instruments Used

The survey questionnaire used in this study, with minor alterations, was an instrument devised and tested by Ehman and Gillespie (1974). The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section gathered information on a number of student characteristics. A second section of the questionnaire was aimed at gathering information so that a comparison could be made of the two school political systems—the independent variable. Five criteria were used to define the school political systems: influence, decision-making, communication, participation, and leadership. The five criteria were represented by two questions each.

A third section of the survey questionnaire measured the social and political attitudes of students in the two schools—the dependent variables of the study. The political attitudes examined were trust, social integration, political interest, and political confidence. These social and political attitudes were measured by 64 items that were generally divided into the four attitude dimensions. Each of these four attitude dimensions was then further divided into items associated with school-related attitudes and general society-related attitudes. School-related and general society-related items were identified by the inclusion or absence of the word “school.” Example items of each orientation and two referents are as follows:
Trust
What people tell me and what they actually do are two completely different things.
If a student were in trouble, people in this school would help that student out.

Social Integration
I can't always do exactly what I want because my actions affect others. There are a lot of people in this school who I care about.

Political Interest
I think I would enjoy participating more in political groups.
I enjoy talking with friends about decisions that are made in my school.

Political Confidence
I am the kind of person who can influence how other people decide to vote in elections.
I can get people at school on my side when I want to.

Reliability for each of the attitude scales were reported by Ehman and Gillespie and further substantiated in this study (Table 3).

Table 3. Reliability Scores* for Attitude Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.78†(.75)</td>
<td>.85(.71)</td>
<td>.90(.85)</td>
<td>.80(.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>.90(.78/.84‡)</td>
<td>.80†(.85)</td>
<td>.90(.83)</td>
<td>.85(.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cronbach's Alpha was used in determining reliability estimates.

**Ehman and Gillespie's reliabilities in parens for comparison.

‡Ehman and Gillespie determined that school trust was divided between trust in students and trust in administration—hence the two sets of reliability figures under school trust.

†These scores resulted only after deleting item 34 (Trust) and items 29 and 43 (School integration). These items were eliminated because they were found to have low factor loadings.
Data Analysis

The first hypothesis concerned establishing that the alternative school and the comprehensive school did, in fact, represent different types of political systems. Since the questions on the questionnaire solicited responses that were both Likert-type responses and categorized responses, it was necessary to use both parametric and non-parametric statistical procedures. Both chi-square and T-tests of mean differences were used in the analysis of hypothesis one.

The second hypothesis, that the differences between the two schools' political systems would affect student attitudes, was tested using an analysis of covariance of mean differences between the two groups on the eight criterion measures. The preliminary analysis of student profile data revealed two potentially confounding variables—that of GPA and SES used as covariates. Prior to using the covariance analysis, a check was made on the assumption of homogeneous regression coefficients. This preliminary test indicated that the assumption of equal regression slopes was tenable, thus permitting the use of the conventional analysis of covariance. Hypotheses three and four were concerned with student attitude differences. It was expected that students who had been enrolled over a period of time in the alternative school program would demonstrate more positive attitudes than students just beginning, while for the comprehensive school there would be no such difference. Analysis of covariance was used.

The fifth hypothesis, regarding the relationship between school-related attitudes and general society-related attitudes, was tested by an analysis of Pearson product-moment correlations between the measurement of student attitudes as they relate to the school socio-political environment and to the general society socio-political environment.

Selection Bias

Since it was not possible to use either random samples or a control group, the initial concern of this study was to determine the similarities and differences between student samples in the two schools. Responses on the student profile section of the questionnaire were used to provide data for investigation of possible differences between the two school samples. The two major criteria used were grade point average and parents' education. Using student profile data on the two criteria of Grade Point Average (GPA) and Socio Economic Status (SES), an analysis of covariance was performed to help determine whether or not hypothesized differences discovered might be invalidated or minimized. In addition, fifty applications of the over 200 students who were declined admittance to Learning Unlimited were arbitrarily chosen from the school files to determine and compare GPA.
Learning Unlimited students were divided into first, second, and third year enrollment groups. In addition, newly admitted students and full-time and part-time students were identified as separate groups. To help minimize the effect of selection bias—attempting to discover whether or not students entering the program were different—a sample was taken from those students not admitted to the program. Fifty applications of students not admitted to Learning Unlimited were arbitrarily chosen from the files. The files contained grade point averages, information related to their personal interests and activities, and their reasons for wanting to enroll in the alternative school program. In addition, interviews with the principal, staff and students were used to help in determining if selection bias existed. In an effort to further examine the possible existence of selection bias, groups mean scores on attitude responses were compared between first semester alternative students and the comprehensive students.

The student responses on the student profile section of the questionnaire revealed some differences between students in the two schools. Grade point average tended to be higher for Learning Unlimited students than for the comprehensive students. Likewise, students in Learning Unlimited reported their parents had more years of education than the comprehensive school students. The GPA for the group rejected by Learning Unlimited was found to be 2.43 (high C). This average score tended to be slightly lower than the low B reported on the questionnaire by the first semester Learning Unlimited students. Student interviews revealed nothing significant to contradict or support these “slight” differences, although students interviewed “seem” to think there were no differences between students in Learning Unlimited and students in the comprehensive school.

While GPA and SES differences between the two school groups were slight, both of these two variables have been recognized as extremely powerful influences. For this reason, analysis of covariance was used to compare the attitude outcomes of the two groups so that corrections could be made for the influence of GPA and SES.

SCHOOL POLITICAL SYSTEMS

A major focus of the research consisted of determining whether or not the two schools had distinctly different political systems. Five criteria were used to identify school political systems: participation, decision-making, communication, leadership and influence. The questionnaire and student interviews were used to gather data on each of these variables.

*Participation:* Participation, one criterion used in identifying school political system differences, was a construct concerned more with involvement than influence. Four different groups—students, teachers, administrators, and parents—were identified as groups potentially participating in the school political system. The students were asked which
of these groups they believed participated in school decision-making and how they, the students, personally participated. The results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4. Mean Student Response: Participation—Who Is Involved in School-Wide Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Alternative School</th>
<th>Comprehensive School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Never Participate | Participate | Half the Time | Always Participate

*p < .01

**p < .05
Students in the alternative school program perceived participation as being equally shared among students and teachers and more equally shared with administration than was reported by students in the comprehensive school. Although students in the comprehensive school also perceived themselves as participating somewhat equally with teachers, they reported that both were considerably less involved than the school administration. Parents seem to be relatively excluded from participation in both schools.

Interviews further substantiated the differences in participation. Alternative school students reported a wide variety of participation including committees, ad hoc activities, and the “town meeting” - a weekly forum for all students to discuss activities, problems, and make policy decisions. Comprehensive students reported that the major avenue of involvement was the student council, and this was limited to a few student representatives.

**Decision-Making:** When students were asked about their actual involvement in school decision-making, students in the alternative school perceived that they have a greater decision-making role than students in the comprehensive school. The means, on a scale of from 1 to 9, were 6.4 for the alternative school and 5.4 for the comprehensive school, and the difference is significant at the .01 level.

Student responses to decision-making were further investigated by interviews. Students in the comprehensive school were unanimous in recognizing that their role in decision-making, regardless of its importance, was secondary to the administration. The vast majority of students interviewed accepted this hierarchy as legitimate. Although this finding was occasionally duplicated by alternative school students, a majority of the alternative school students interviewed saw their role in decision-making as more of a partnership with the administration. Perhaps more important, students in the alternative school consistently reported being involved in decisions which were seemingly more related to policy issues than the decisions reported by the comprehensive student.

**Communication:** A third criteria used in determining differences in school political systems was communication. Having access to information concerning school issues and decisions seems essential to school participation. As shown in Table 5 differences were found between the two schools concerning how students find out about school issues. In general, it appears alternative students perceive communication as being more “shared” among groups than the comprehensive students.
Table 5. Percentage of Students Responding: Communication*—How Different Groups Find Out About School-Wide Issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Channels</th>
<th>Comprehensive School</th>
<th>Alternative School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One group makes a decision about the issue and announces it to the school.</td>
<td>31% (N = 29)</td>
<td>15% (N = 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information in your school goes through a &quot;funnel&quot;—for example, administrators tell teachers about the issue and they tell the students.</td>
<td>36% (N = 33)</td>
<td>27% (N = 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different groups share information about issues that interest them, but they share it among themselves and not with others.</td>
<td>11% (N = 10)</td>
<td>23% (N = 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most groups talk with a lot of other groups.</td>
<td>23% (N = 21)</td>
<td>35% (N = 36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chi-square - 14.10  
p < .01

Student interviews with the two school groups were similar in that each group consistently mentioned a primary although different source for their access to school-related information. The comprehensive school students identified homeroom (student council representation) and the alternative students identified their town meeting. Again, size of school may well have a bearing on this. However, students in Learning Unlimited spoke in the first person when referring to the town meeting while students in the comprehensive school continually referred to student council as "they."
Although the school differences are not as dramatic in relation to school communication access, it does seem students in the alternative school see "themselves" as having more access to information concerning school issues and decisions.

Leadership: A fourth criterion used for identifying school political systems differences was leadership. As indicated in Table 6, students in the comprehensive school perceived students and teachers as more closely aligned in holding leadership positions, while viewing administrators as taking leadership positions more of the time. Alternative school students, on the other hand, saw leadership as being somewhat more evenly distributed among students, teachers and administrators. Parents were perceived by both groups as having little leadership in school issues and decisions.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Comprehensive School</th>
<th>Alternative School</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.41**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

1. Never are Leaders 2. Are Leaders 3. About Half the Time 4. Always are Leaders

*p < .01  **p < .05
There were also differences based on questionnaire responses in "how" students perceived these designated leaders pursuing their goals. Students in the comprehensive school saw administrators as primarily using power, pressure or force in getting others to get things done. Comprehensive school students saw administrators as using the importance of their position, status or rank in getting things done and perceived themselves as using their position and their ability to bargain when trying to get things done.

Alternative school students saw administrators as less likely to use power or pressure and more likely to use their position and status in combination with their earned respect. Alternative school students saw their own leadership efforts derived from bargaining with and earning the respect of the teachers and administrators.

Influence: How students responded to questions concerned with "influence" in decision-making, a fifth criterion, appears to be the strongest indicator of differences in the two school political systems. When presented with a number of decision-making examples, e.g. how students are assigned to classes, school paper censorship, rules for students, evaluation of teachers and students, discipline, school club expenditures, and what courses and materials are taught, students reported significant differences. Following the previous pattern, students in the alternative school perceived themselves as having more influence in school decisions than did the comprehensive school students. Further evidence was found when students responded specifically to how much "final" say they felt they had in influencing school decisions. As shown in Table 7, the alternative students saw themselves as having more influence in school decisions and, at the same time, being more closely aligned with the teachers and administrators. On the other hand, comprehensive students perceived their degree of influence a little more than that of parents--both having minimal influence in the making of final school decisions.
Table 7. Mean Student Response: Influence—How Much Final Say the Different Groups Have on Decisions Made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Comprehensive School</th>
<th>Alternative School</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>t = 4.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>t = 4.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>t = .58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>t = 2.45**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale = None have any Final Say | Some have Final Say | Everyone interested has Final Say

* p < .01
** p < .05

The students' response on the questionnaire concerned with influence was further supported by comments during the student interviews. Comprehensive students felt they did have influence in initiating concerns and issues but little if any influence in the final decision. A number of students made remarks similar to this one: "When the administration says no, that's it, the issue is closed." It should be remembered here that many of the comprehensive school students, as reported earlier, saw this authority as legitimate.

Quite differently, the alternative school students consistently saw themselves as having considerable influence in final decisions. In only one issue (attempting to secure more rooms—a decision that had to go to the comprehensive high school administration) did several students feel they had less than considerable impact on the final decision.

*Conclusion*: In conclusion, recognizing the limitations of this study, it seems clear that the comprehensive school and alternative school were significantly different in their governing procedures. With few exceptions, students identified distinctly different school political systems. Furthermore, the school political systems can be classified according to the
Ehman-Gillespie typology discussed earlier. On the basis of student perceptions, the comprehensive school most clearly resembles an "elite" system, although there were some underlying characteristics typical of a "bureaucratic" system. On the other hand, alternative school students perceived their school quite differently. Their responses suggested that their school most clearly related to a "participant" political system. Overall, the alternative school students seem to participate in more of a sharing relationship in the political system and were less dominated by teacher and administrative groups than the students in the comprehensive school. These findings were consistently supported by both the questionnaire and interviews. It was concluded, therefore, that two distinctly different types of political systems existed in the two schools.

**STUDENT POLITICAL ATTITUDES**

The second major aspect of this research study focused on student political attitudes. It was hypothesized that there would be a relationship between school political systems and student political attitudes. More specifically, it was hypothesized that the students in the alternative school program would demonstrate more positive political attitudes than students in the comprehensive school. Student responses on the attitude questionnaire items clearly showed this to be the case. The four attitude dimensions were: trust, integration, political interest and political confidence. These four attitude dimensions were conceptualized as having two referents—the students' own school and society in general. Analyses of covariance, using as covariates GPA and SES, were performed on the mean scores shown in Table 8. Results of these analyses demonstrates significant relationships between school political systematic types and student attitudes.
Table 8. Mean Student Response: School-Related and Society-Related Attitudes And Report of Analysis of Covariance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Dimension</th>
<th>Comprehensive School</th>
<th>Alternative School</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Political Interest</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>F(1,155) = 4.62</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Integration</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>F(1,155) = 2.27</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Trust</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>F(1,155) = 14.17</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Political Confidence</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>F(1,157) = 16.03</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Interest</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>F(1,157) = 5.53</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>F(1,155) = 7.54</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>F(1,155) = 4.47</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Confidence</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>F(1,157) = 17.86</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

strongly disagree | disagree | uncertain | agree | strongly agree

Students at both schools demonstrated generally positive levels of interest in school political affairs. This may, in part, have resulted from the student population as a whole represented from a relatively high socio-economic background. Nevertheless, the alternative school students demonstrated a higher interest mean score. Both schools reflected positive mean scores associated with school integration. However, the alternative school students scores were once again higher than those of the comprehensive school students scores.
On the dimension of school trust, students in the alternative school showed a significant positive difference from the comprehensive school students. This may reflect the cooperation and partnership among students, teachers, and administrators that the alternative students reported. Not only did the alternative school students feel they were working with the other groups, they also have more opportunity to work closely with the administrative staff and teachers.

On the political confidence dimension students from the alternative school reported above midpoint level scores while students from the comprehensive school fell below the midpoint. School political confidence would seem to be enhanced when students are more involved in the school political structure. This was clearly the case as reported by alternative school students in response to identifying their school political system. Comprehensive school students, on the other hand, did not report such cooperation or sharing in decision-making. They seem to view themselves as a group competing with administrators—a contest they reported usually resolved by the administration.

Although, school-referenced attitudes were with one exception more positive than the corresponding societal-related response scores, the two general society-related attitudes, confidence and integration, were roughly equal to school-related attitudes. Trust and interest, however, reflected wider differences between school-related and general society-related mean scores. One possible explanation for these differences seems likely. The alternative school requires core students to take part in learning experiences outside of the school in the surrounding community. Many alternative students became involved in government-related experiences. This may, in part, help explain the high general society-related scores in the alternative school associated with trust and political interest. Working with and learning from adults in the community, especially if the experiences are positive and politically oriented, would seem likely to cause an increase in political interest and trust. It seems possible and should be noted here that community involvement could well be intersecting the influence of the school political system. Although this aspect is beyond the scope of this research study and not supported by research reported in an earlier section of this paper, it nevertheless seems a valid area for further investigation.
DEMONSTRATED ATTITUDE DIFFERENCES

Another indication of whether the alternative school program was affecting student attitudes was to observe attitude response scores of students who had been in the alternative school over an extended period of time. Likewise, in an effort to gain comparison scores, student attitude response scores from juniors and seniors in the comprehensive school were analyzed. It should be noted here that these are not true comparison scores. The breakdown in the alternative school into first semester, first year, second year and third year includes both juniors and seniors. Therefore, comparisons will be based on the individual school differences. Table 9 shows the mean scores for the two age levels in the comprehensive school and Table 10 compares first semester alternative students to experienced alternative students by collapsing first year, second year, and third year alternative students into one group.

Table 9. Mean Student Response: Comparison of Attitude Differences of Junior and Senior Comprehensive School Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Dimensions</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Political Interest</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Integration</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Trust</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Political Confidence</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Interest</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Confidence</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Mean Student Response: Comparison of First Semester Alternative School Students with Experienced Alternative School Students and Report of Analysis of Covariance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Dimensions</th>
<th>First Semester Alternative School Students</th>
<th>Experienced Alternative School Students*</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Political Interest</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>F(1,80) = 3.43</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Integration</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>F(1,86) = .000</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Trust</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>F(1,86) = .911</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Political Conference</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>F(1,80) = .970</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Interest</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>F(1,80) = 3.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>F(1,86) = .498</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>F(1,86) = .797</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Confidence</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>F(1,80) = 3.95</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First year, second year and third year students combined.

It was hypothesized that students who had been enrolled over a period of time in the alternative school program would demonstrate positive differences in attitudes and that students in the comprehensive school would demonstrate no differences in attitudes over time. The data shown in Table 11 and 12, appears not to substantiate the former, but is in support of the latter hypothesis. Although alternative student mean responses consistently demonstrate positive incremental differences these differences were attenuated when GPA and SES were entered as covariates. (GPA was actually found to have a negative correlation with alternative school enrollment time). However, comprehensive students clearly show no positive differences from the junior to the senior grade level. With the exception of school political interest the opposite trend is shown.
SCHOOL-RELATED AND GENERAL SOCIETY-RELATED POLITICAL ATTITUDES

The fifth hypothesis stated that there would be a positive correlation between students' school-related attitudes and their general society-related attitudes. Using a Pearson product-moment correlation, the results (Table 11) demonstrate a strong relationship between students' school-related and society-related political attitudes.

Table 11. School-Related and Society-Related Attitude Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Political Confidence</th>
<th>School Interest</th>
<th>School Trust</th>
<th>School Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Political Confidence</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Political Interest</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Trust</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Integration</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, distinctly different political systems were identified in the two secondary schools. The political system in the alternative school was found to be characterized by more student participation in decision-making than in the political system of the comprehensive school. Likewise, students in the alternative school were found to have more positive social and political attitudes than students in the comprehensive school. Although experienced alternative school students showed positive attitude mean differences when compared to entering alternative school students, these differences were attenuated when using GPA and SES as covariates. Comprehensive students, however, failed to demonstrate any consistent positive attitude differences from the junior to the senior grade level. In
addition, school-related attitudes were found to be highly correlated with general society-related attitudes.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recognizing the limitations of this study, the findings support the contention that school environment is an important factor influencing student learning outcomes. Also the data supports the findings of earlier research by Ehman and Gillespie that different political systems could be identified in schools, and that the different school political systems seem to have varying influences on student political attitudes. It appears in this case that a school involving students in the governing procedures leads to the development of positive political student attitudes. Clearly, students who have been involved in the alternative school demonstrated the most positive political attitudes. Furthermore, the evidence suggests that if schools are to be effective in developing positive political attitudes, they must be concerned with far more than formal classroom activities and courses.

Several questions for future research emerge from the results of this study. Foremost is perhaps the need for further investigation into the identification and understanding of the school environment. What impact do the various activities and routine of daily school life have on students' learnings? Is the school environment a significant variable in citizenship education and/or political education?

A second focus emerging from the findings of this study concern alternative school environments. Are alternative school environments generally representative of participant political systems? Previous studies investigating school political systems have found differences. However, the differences have been slight and probably reflect the growing centralization of authority in our schools. However, in this study distinct differences were found. It appears alternative schools deserve further investigation concerning school political systems.

Despite evidence that appears to validate the hypotheses of this study, additional research is needed. Other variables must be explored which may well have contributed to this study. Foremost in importance may well be school size. It is possible that to effectively implement shared decision-making, a school must be small in size. Logic certainly supports this contention, yet further investigation must be conducted.

Another influential factor may be the community experiences of the alternative school. In spite of research cited earlier (Jones) it seems likely such experiences could influence positive student attitudes. With external-school experiences becoming more prevalent within the growing alternative school movement it would seem to offer an opportunity for needed research.
In addition, these findings suggest that social studies must alter or expand its role in public education. Social studies must no longer limit its scope to course content and formal instruction and innovations within the confines of individual classrooms. In order to influence students in the realm of politics, the social studies may well be forced to concern itself with the political life of the school. Instead of the emphasis on "preparation" for citizenship, social studies may well have to take the lead in encouraging schools to assist students in participating more actively. Could it be that schools have been pursuing goals and objectives largely unrelated to the development of effective citizens? It seems possible that schools may be working at cross-purposes with both themselves and society in the attempt to develop effective citizens. Perhaps the adage "participation without power is a ritual" is being experienced in its fullest and most pejorative sense by students throughout high school in this nation. To meet their instructional goals relating to citizenship education, it appears educators must consider the re-organization of school environments in order to encourage increased student participation in decision-making.

In conclusion, this study supports previous research indicating that the school environment in general, and the school political system in particular, is significant in influencing student social and political attitudes associated with effective citizenship.
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To the Editors:

In the August, 1977 issue of *Theory and Research in Social Education*, Michael E. Siegel reported the research of his "Citizenship Education in Five Massachusetts High Schools" study. Although Mr. Siegel presented a number of findings, several flaws appear in his conceptualization of schools as political systems and in his research methodology. These flaws cause us to doubt the validity of his conclusions. First, Mr. Siegel fails to adapt the categorization of schools as political systems (Gillespie and Ehman, 1974) to reflect more closely historical and recent trends in school (district) consolidation and governance. This uncritical acceptance of an existing conceptual scheme has lead to confusion in the classification of school types. Second, if Mr. Siegel had attended more carefully to data collection and reporting considerations and utilized more refined qualitative and quantitative strategies, his research would have contained more accurate and compelling conclusions.

Mr. Siegel hypothesizes "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." (page 32) He further postulated, "that such attitudes will be reflected in reference to the school as well as in reference to the society at large." (page 32)

The author used the work of Ehman and Gillespie (1974) as a model to adequately assess schools in political terms. The focus of Ehman and Gillespie's research stresses the allocational activities of political decision making, political leadership, political participation, political influence, and political communication. (1974:2) These variables assisted the researchers in identifying five kinds of school political systems: elite, bureaucratic, coalition, participant, and directed participant. (1974:1-10)

In our view, the use of these categories creates numerous problems for the researcher. The categories assume the existence of pluralistic educational structures in modern America. Such an assumption ignores recent research by educational historians who have traced the gradual erosion of alternative educational forms from the mid-nineteenth century to the present day (Katz 1968, 1971, Spring 1972; Karier, Violas, Spring 1973). Their work reveals a pattern of unyielding pressure exerted during the last century upon smaller
voluntaristic and democratic educational structures by reformers determined to impose values of efficiency and control upon public education. Early in this century, large scale managerial structures which exhibited the necessary characteristics of modern bureaucracies, namely centralization of authority, functional differentiation, and certification as an occupational qualification had become the modern American educational structure. The rate at which the schools have become large-scale formal bureaucracies has accelerated in recent years at an alarming pace. For the period from 1948 to 1970, the number of school districts has declined from 94,926 to 18,000 as smaller administrative units are consolidated and larger school buildings replace the early twentieth century version of "the little red school house" (Lortie, 1975).

The Ehman and Gillespie categories seem quite arbitrary in light of this one-directional trend in American education. In particular, their classification of schools as elite, coalitional, bureaucratic and directed-participant collapses under the heavy structural and functional weight of advanced bureaucratic forms. Nor can they be intellectually differentiated by identifying the idiosyncratic behavior of persons in positions of power, as is attempted in the case of distinguishing between elite and bureaucratic systems in the Ehman and Gillespie paradigm. Regardless of minor differences in behavior, the bureaucratic code of conduct undergirds all important human interactions. As a result, Mr. Siegel's use of these categories, which are of questionable value, causes confusion about data gathered to detect different behaviors among various student populations in schools which in four out of five cases are similar in structure and function.

Siegel used both qualitative methods and quantitative techniques in his research. The findings indicate either a lack of accurate reporting or improper statistical procedures. Conclusions reached by the author cannot be accepted without further clarification of the research methodology used in the study.

One of the major flaws in the investigation focuses on the entire method used in gathering qualitative data. The author stated that he spent over a year visiting the schools in the study but fails to include precise, comparable data in his report. For example: What are the median years of schooling for people over 25 years old in the school D community setting? What are the school policy attitudes of students in schools D and E? What is the decision making process in schools B and D?

Another caveat exists with the administration of the questionnaires. When were these questionnaires administered? How did the author control for possible contaminants? For example, did the time of the year, current school issues, students' grade level in school, students' experience with authority, or students' home backgrounds have an influence on student responses?
Further, the author did not assure the reader that he used a scientific approach to make subjective statements like “Changing the smoking policy was like running into a pillow” (school B, page 38), or “there is more trust regarding students and less of the ‘keep them in line’ mentality” (school B, page 38), or “students, like their parents, are not oriented to political activism” (school D, page 40). These statements beg the questions: How was sufficient data gathered to reach such conclusions? What qualitative techniques did the author use to summarize attitudes of schools with student populations of two to six thousand?

A qualitative study needs to be employed in order to ascertain the attitude and social-authority structure of a school. Judgments can only be made after careful record keeping plus a thorough accounting of interviews, school work, and records of continual conversations before such generalizations can emerge with any validity. The careful procedures noted in the participant observer ethnographic studies conducted by Smith and Geoffrey, (1968), Cusick, (1971), Good and Brophy, (1973) attest to the importance of accuracy, time, and continual validity checks before reaching conclusions.

The quantitative evidence cited indicates three major deficiencies. First, the sampling procedure used does not reflect consideration to the law of large numbers. If different students were selected to take both surveys (N = 143, N = 168), the percentage of the school populations polled would be 1-2% for schools A, B, D, and E, and a huge 46% for school C. Are the opinions expressed in the small percentage for schools A, B, D, and E truly representative of the entire school? The author should have calculated the mean and standard deviation of the sample in order to ascertain if the sample size was large enough and reflected a 95% probability of accuracy.

Second, by using such a small N, transposing answers into percentages becomes misleading. It is especially detrimental when the percentages do not always add up to 100% (see school A, Table 3; school B, Table 3) or exceed 100% (see school A, Table 4; teachers, school C, Table 2). The change or inclusion of missing percentages could significantly alter the findings presented in this study.

Third, the way percentiles were used to determine the correlation of political trust, political interest, social integration, and political confidence with school structure violates acceptable design and analytical procedures. Too many unidentified variables (such as...years of schooling over 25 years of age, school B; school administration structure, school E; policy attitudes at school D and school E;) are present to attempt to claim that one factor influences the other. Adequate control of internal and external validity factors, namely history, maturation, interaction with authority, and reactive arrangements respectively need to be taken into account.
More accurate conclusions could have been reached if the researcher ran bivariate and multiple regressions using political trust, political interest, social integration, and political confidence as dependent variables. Independent variables could have included answers to individual items on each of the questionnaires, economic background, or years of schooling, etc. A higher correlation between these sets of independent and dependent variables could have explained a percentage of the supposed influence of one on the other. A general questionnaire, isolating one factor without taking others into account, can never produce valid or acceptable results.

The question of the impact of the school structure on student citizenship presents an important issue for investigation. The questions of inquiry initiated in this study ask about the effects of the interaction between the latent (hidden) curriculum and social studies courses that influence student political efficacy. The answers are very important, but they must be secured by using a more rigorous methodology. In this study, Mr. Siegel may have been better served if he had developed a series of null hypotheses and used statistical procedures to reject or substantiate his ideas.
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CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND THE HIGH SCHOOLS:  
A REJOINDER

To the Editors:

As a result of research that I conducted in five high schools in the Greater Boston area during the years 1974-1975, I was led to three general conclusions: (a) that the authority patterns experienced by students in their high schools are probably more important for citizenship education than are the nature, pacing, and delivery of social studies courses; (b) that the development of political efficacy seems to be related to the availability of participatory experiences among students; and (c) that although most schools approximate a similar, bureaucratic paradigm in their management style, there are variations, some of which matter and some of which do not in terms of citizenship education.

Professors Penna and Lamperes have criticized my methodology and questioned the validity of my conclusions. I feel that a response is called for on both counts.

Qualitative aspects of my research are criticized, because I accept statements such as "changing the smoking policy was like running into a pillow" or "students, like their parents, are not oriented to political activism." The authors question the sufficiency of data to support such statements when, in fact, the statements appear in a section of the paper classified as "impressionistic conclusions of the author" reached through "talks with teachers, students, and administrators."

As well, the authors themselves embrace the qualitative work of others, such as Cusick, but implicitly question the care with which I kept records or recorded interviews or counted responses. Let me say on all counts that I was as careful as the constraints of time and the pressure of completing a doctoral dissertation allow any human beings to be. The statements quoted were not "pulled out of a hat", but were chosen carefully because of the cogent matter with which they express important ideas, and because they seemed to be confirmed by the quantitative data in later sections of the paper.

As to the possible contamination of data, which is another criticism of my qualitative data, I tried to "control" for students' home background by drawing a socio-economic profile of the community. Realizing that this does not necessarily locate each individual student in terms of his or her home environment, I had to be satisfied, given the unlikelihood of obtaining socio-economic profiles for each student. I tried to "control" for the grade level by interviewing and surveying students from the same grades. And I tried to deal with the question of "current school issues" by describing recent events which seemed to shape the present school
situations. Other variables mentioned by Penna and Lamperes are, in my opinion, impossible to measure ("experience with authority"), or probably irrelevant ("time of year").

On the quantitative aspects of the data analysis, it is my feeling that the authors make some very good points. Unfortunately, my methodological proficiency is not as well developed as theirs, and advice I solicited from others was, apparently, ill-founded. Accordingly, the conclusions ought to be offered with modesty and I hereby do so.

On the other hand, I strongly disagree with the unsubstantiated attack on my conclusion that pluralistic educational structures exist in our society. That the trend since the late nineteen-century has been centralization of decision-making, is a fact and no one would question its validity. Yet to conclude that the evolution of centralized school bureaucracies has proceeded unchallenged and unchanged is to ignore, in effect, the 1960's. During this tumultuous decade, centralization of educational decision-making was challenged not only by the New Left and college students all over the country, but by blacks and other minority groups in several American cities. And it is a fact that both challenges were met with responses. In higher education, students were given an increased role in terms of representation on faculty committees and, in some cases, on boards of trustees (McGrath, 1970). In New York, Detroit, and other large cities, experiments in school decentralization were undertaken, even though the final extent of re-locating decision-making power disappointed the most ardent "community control" advocates (Walzer, 1976; Cronin, 1973; Fantini and Gittell, 1973; Fein, 1971; Levin, 1970).

Obviously, some of these changes have been more durable than others, but it is irresponsible to dismiss them as irrelevant. In my research, I attempted to assess the precise impact of such structural changes as involving students in decision-making on the development of their political attitudes. I did not intend to suggest that participatory schools are more common than bureaucratic schools, and, in fact, my conclusions state precisely the opposite. What I did find—and deemed worth reporting—was that there are benefits to be derived for democracy from involving adolescents in school democracy.
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By 1972 textbook analysts were beginning to praise American history textbooks for their treatment of Black Americans while admonishing them for the weaknesses in their attention to other ethnic minorities. They began to recognize the limitations of criteria which concentrated on presence and quantity of information about ethnic minorities in assessing textbooks and other instructional materials, and suggested greater use of qualitative criteria and content analyses instead. The increasing concerns for ethnic consciousness and revitalization, the women’s liberation movement, and the growing emphases on cultural pluralism in education since 1972 have further endorsed the feasibility of these recommendations relative to the most appropriate orientations and methodologies to use to achieve the most comprehensive, useful assessments of textbooks and their treatment of racism, sexism, and cultural pluralism.

In 1977 the Racism and Sexism Resource Center for Education, a division of the Council and Interracial Books for Children, undertook a study to analyze the content of American history textbooks on the issue of oppression and exploitation of third world peoples and women. The results are reported in *Stereotypes, Distortions and Omissions in U.S. History Textbooks*. The study is consistent with recent trends in textbook analysis to concentrate on specific content issues rather than generalized overall reviews.

The Council should be applauded for its courage in undertaking such a momentus task—that of creating a comprehensive set of criteria for assessing the content of U.S. history textbooks on the exploitation of ethnic minorities and women, and providing factual information to fill the voids frequently created by omissions and/or distortions. Such a mission is a laudable one indeed! It is consistent with the Council’s long-standing commitment to developing awareness of racism and sexism in textbooks, tradebooks, story-books, and other educational materials, and making available to teachers techniques, tools, and resources for the eradication of these practices from instructional materials and processes. Unfortunately, the study is plagued with some serious methodological problems which cause the validity and utility of the results to be questionable at best. As a result, *Stereotypes, Distortions and*
Omissions in U.S. History Textbooks fails to measure up to the reader's expectations, or to the quality of previous efforts of the Council on Interracial Books for Children in the analysis of books and materials for racism and sexism.

This study makes no claims to being a comprehensive analysis of U.S. history textbooks relative to their general treatment of third world peoples and women. Rather, it focuses on the relations of ethnic minorities and women with the male dominated Anglo-Saxon centric society of mainstream America. Twelve U.S. history secondary school textbooks, published between 1970 and 1975, are examined for their treatment of the racism and sexism that have characterized many intergroup interactions in the United States, and for their discussions of how different groups have resisted oppression and exploitation. One book published prior to 1970 is included in the critique because of its widespread use and favorable reputation for being "advanced" and "sensitive" in its presentation of materials on controversial issues. Blacks, Asian Americans, Mexican Americans, American Indians, Puerto Ricans, and women constitute the referent groups of the analysis. The report includes a general introduction to each referent group's experiences with oppression, the instruments used for critiquing the textbooks, the reviewers' general observations and conclusions, alternative ways of viewing historical events pertinent to each group, and a bibliography of resources for further information on third world peoples and women in U.S. history. A chart of "grid" format is used to present the primary data of the study.

The Council on Interracial Books for Children concludes its analysis of U.S. history textbooks with the observations that while textbooks are generally more sympathetic to minorities and women, "heightened visibility...does not necessarily assure an accurate depiction of reality." Even when included in textbooks discussions of racial and sexual oppression and exploitation lack sufficient substance and detail to do justice to the magnitude of the problems, or adequately portray the full significance of their impact upon the lives of minorities and women in U.S. society. Realities about racism and sexism are obscured by the tendency of textbooks (a) to be Eurocentric in perspective and to present materials about minorities and women from the viewpoint of upper class white males; (2) to emphasize the contributions of the exceptional few "greats" among ethnic minorities and women, while under-representing the activities of the masses of working-class people; (3) to concentrate on contemporary protest activities in the experiences of third world peoples and women without providing adequate historical contexts; (4) to perpetuate a basic assumption in the inherent goodness of democracy as a political system, without giving due recognition to the significance of class interest conflicts in shaping social group interactions and societal policy priorities, both domestic and
foreign; and (5) to refuse to relate sexism and racism to economic exploitation, and to blame the victimized, through implication, for their own oppressed conditions. The critic reviewers summarized their findings with the observation that “to the extent that discrimination, racism, and sexism are dealt with in textbooks they are treated as aberrations, as isolated mistakes of the past...[and] even these isolated ‘mistakes’ are treated in a simplistic, casual manner which downplays their significance.”

Given the historical character of race relations and the allocation of resources and rewards across ethnic, racial, and sexual groups in the United States, one is inclined intuitively to accept the findings of Stereotypes, Distortions and Omissions in U.S. History Textbooks without question. However, when the study is considered as a total entity it becomes problematic. Questions arise as to whether the findings are the logical results of systematic analyses of textbooks content, or if they are conclusions established a priori and the textbooks included in the investigation are critiqued in such a way as to substantiate these foregone conclusions. Several methodological problems prompt this skepticism. Why did the critics choose to use a different set of criteria with each different group? Wouldn’t it have been more logical, scientific, and defensible for the reviewers to develop a single set of criteria applicable to all targeted groups, and use it in the analysis of all thirteen textbooks? Might such an approach diminished the occurrence of criterial inconsistencies across groups which characterized the instrumentation? Would it have helped the researchers to avoid some of the problems of reliability that occur because the evaluative criteria are specific and differential according to each referent group? The use of a single set of criteria also could have strengthened considerably the integrity of the conclusions derived from the reviews, increased the utility of the technique in situations beyond this particular investigation, and improved the generalizability of the findings. Although the authors do generalize from the results, this behavior seems totally inappropriate given the nature of the instrumentalization and the data collection process. Methodologically, the Council is guilty of one of the same faults for which it accuses textbook authors--that of being particularistic, rather than universal, in their approaches to materials, and fragmenting the treatment of ethnic groups by discussing them separately instead of interactively.

A second methodological problem with this study is its “definition” of criteria. What are presented as criterial guidelines for reviewing textbooks for their quantitative and qualitative treatment of the oppression of minorities and women seem to be more like a combination of generalizations, “established facts,” and conclusions than criteria. If this observation is a valid one and the textbook authors happened not to share the same “conclusions” or “referential contexts” as the reviewers, then it
becomes questionable whether this is a defensible technique to use in textbook analysis. The results are predetermined—the textbooks would automatically receive unfavorable ratings. How one perceives the cognitive field of socio-political phenomena (in this instance, racial and sexual oppression) and chooses to arrange the "facts" of the issues are the results of that person's value priorities. Textbooks which did not share the intensity of the Council on Inter-racial Books for Children value commitment to the elimination of racism and sexism would, necessarily, be judged negatively.

It would have been wiser for the Council to use more "categorical" kinds of criteria (such as depth, scope, balance, comprehensiveness, etc. of materials) than the specific "factual and/or situational" ones (i.e., "the development of the Southwest was not achieved solely by Anglos"; "Filipino workers have a long history of struggling for their rights"; "women were essential for the 'settlement' of the West"; etc.) it chose. The study could then be more easily defended as a serious investigation of how U.S. history textbooks treat the topic of the oppression of minorities and women. By allowing its value commitments to dictate the content of its instrumentation the Council committed the same "sins" and "distortions" caused by limited perspective-taking which it found in the textbooks. While commitment to the elimination of racism and sexism is an honorable and admirable one, the way it is used in Stereotypes, Distortions and Omissions in U.S. History Textbooks has a disastrous impact upon the validity of the study. Thus, the report come across more as a position statement perpetuating a particular mind set and propagandizing a certain value commitment than it does as an honest attempt to determine what and how textbooks are addressing the issues of racial and sexual oppression and exploitation.

A third weakness of the study is its differential use of the thirteen textbooks in the analysis. In one instance the authors indicate that the analyses will concentrate on thirteen books, which leads one to assume that all books will be reviewed, and that the same approach will be employed in the review of each book. In the next instance, the authors explain that the use of one book will be minimized since it predated the other samples. If this book did not meet the primary selection criterion, and the reviewers knew beforehand that it would not be treated the same as the others in the investigation, why risk contaminating the sample by including it at all?

A more serious problem related to the use of the selected sample of textbooks in this study is the failure of the reviewers to indicate how each book scored on the evaluative rating scale. The reader is left to infer overall ratings of the individual textbooks from the excerpted quotes which appear throughout the report. Excerpts from the books in the sample are used to illustrate the kind and quality of treatment being given to racism and
and sexism, and to substantiate the point that this coverage, on the whole, is inadequate. This technique, in and of itself, is a strong device for use in content analysis studies of textbooks. However, in this particular study, the data are misleading. A natural expectation is to assume that as readers examine the various sections of the report they will find excerpts from all of the books being used to document and substantiate observations. This is not the case. Some textbooks are excerpted frequently while others are hardly used at all. This pattern of “differential references to sample textbooks” prevails across the six referent groups. For example, America: Its Peoples and Values, The Impact of Our Past, and The Pageant of America are referenced frequently across groups, while The Shaping of America, In Search of America, and The Free and the Brave are hardly referred to at all. Distortions and omissions are thus created.

A general reading of Stereotypes, Distortions and Omissions in U.S. History Textbooks gives the impression that the conclusions are equally applicable to all books included in the analysis. A more careful examination of the report suggest that the critics may have found some books “guilty by association” (since none or very few comments specific to them were made in the course of reporting the data). The major weaknesses of a few books were arbitrarily generalized to all, and the overall conclusions of the study, likewise, were founded on the content of a few textbooks. Admittedly, these are impressionistic interpretations of how the data may have been skewed, and there is no way to substantiate their accuracy. This however, is not the major point of contention. Because the way the data are reported creates ambiguities and questions in the minds of critical readers attests to the fact that there are some major flaws in the research design of this study.

A fourth difficulty which limits the utility of Stereotypes, Distortions and Omissions in U.S. History Textbooks, both as a model for further research in the area and as a source of new information on racism and sexism in American society, is the absence of sufficient bibliographic documentation on the “alternative ways of viewing past and present events” presented to counterbalance textbook presentations. These “alternative interpretations” are interesting, informative, and insightful reading, but it is unclear whether the new information were selected from the specific sources, or is merely the interpretations of the team of critics. The intent of this observation is not to cast doubt on the capabilities or integrity of the critic team; nor is it to argue with the validity of the “alternative interpretations.” Rather, it seems only reasonable to expect the research study to have internal consistency, and for the reviewers to impose the same standards of performance upon themselves that they expected of the textbooks under examination. Therefore, since specific page-referenced quotations were used to illustrate textbook content, a similar technique should have been employed in presenting alternative, counter-balancing viewpoints. Frequently, the
“alternative view materials” went beyond the presentation of factual information to the inclusion of interpretations and valuative comments. Admittedly, this is an author’s prerogative, but when inserted in the midst of the data reporting section of a research report it seems totally inappropriate. Such judgmental comments and valuative interpretations should have been reserved for a section of the study so designated for that purpose.

Although *Stereotypes, Distortions and Omissions in U.S. History Textbooks* is plagued by some serious methodological flaws, this is not to say that it is entirely devoid of any value. It is probably true, and other textbook critiques would support this contention, that textbooks tend to over-simplify and over-generalize controversial issues, over-emphasize contributions of super heroes and heroines while ignoring the plight and achievements of the masses, and develop materials from perspectives other than those of the groups being discussed. This point is well-established by the Council on Interracial Books for Children in its study. The separate parts of the study, in and of themselves, are very informative for classroom teachers and students of racism and sexism. The background information about each of the six referent groups is extremely helpful for orientation and awareness to the issue of racial and sexual oppression in the history and life of the United States. Problems occur when one tries to put all the separate pieces of the study together and consider it as a single entity. Then such weaknesses as inconsistencies, inappropriate methodologies, value impositions on data reporting, and questions about the content reliability of the instrumentation begin to surface. These are serious research problems. Any one of them can jeopardize the validity of a research study.

It is indeed unfortunate that the Council was unable to pull off the task of analyzing U.S. history textbooks for their treatment of the oppression and exploitation of minorities and women such that it resulted in a coherent, readily comprehensible, and easily useable document. Readers are advised to be conscious of the limitations of this study and to consider its findings and conclusions within the context of those limitations. They should remember, though, that this document is not necessarily indicative of the quality of all materials produced by the Council on Interracial Books for Children. The Council has been very active in the field of eliminating racism and sexism, and has done some admirable work to these ends, both in terms of materials production and dissemination and field services. It would be an extreme injustice for readers of *Stereotypes, Distortions and Omissions in U.S. Textbooks* to judge the quality of all the Council’s efforts and materials solely on the basis of this one document.
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