

378
54718

Appendix 2

"Approaches to Civic Education in the United States"

by

John S. Gibson

Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs

PNABT 475

JSN72348

Paper for the

Seminar on Civic Education and Development

Conducted by

The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy

and

The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and
Public Affairs

of

Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts

with the support of the

United States Agency for International Development

May, 1970

A.I.D.
Reference Center
Room 1656 NS

PN-ABI-475

Approaches to civic education in the United States

370 Seminar on Civic Education and Development,
S471b Tufts Univ., 1970.
Approaches to civic education in the
United States; paper for the seminar.
May 1-3, 1970. John S. Gibson.
31 p.
Sponsored by the Fletcher School of Law
and Diplomacy.

1. Civic education. 2. Popular participation.
I. Gibson, John S. II. Fletcher School of Law
and Diplomacy. III. Title.

Approaches to Civic Education in the United States

John S. Gibson

Introduction

In this paper, we explore a number of dimensions of civic education in the United States, with particular focus on civic education in the nation's schools. Following this introduction, we consider objectives for civic education, and then turn to various school services and processes for advancing students toward objectives. We then raise a number of questions about the efficacy of these services and processes. We turn to other facets of civic education, including its role in United States institutions of higher learning and some observations about civic education in other developed countries. Finally, we provide some implications of this paper for civic education in the less-developed countries. Citations are given at the end of the paper, as well as an annotated bibliography and commentary with respect to some of the findings and concepts used in the paper.

We view civic education as part of the broader socialization of the individual into the civic realm of society. That broader socialization, Hess notes, "is the process of transmitting stable patterns of behavior and values and of grooming the young for filling established adult roles in the society." ^{1/} Easton and Dennis view civic socialization as the way a national society transmits its civic orientations, including knowledge, attitudes, and values, from generation to generation. ^{2/} "National society" is, of course, an overarching conveyer of knowledge, attitudes, and values. Socialization agents include the family, church, organizations, peer groups, the governmental institution, and especially the school. Other transmitters of messages affecting the civic socialization of the individual include all kinds of media, the environment of the person, the quality of his society as he perceives it, and national policy itself. Varied and complex patterns of interactions between the individual on the one hand and socialization agents and transmitters of messages on the other mold the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor dimensions of his civic orientation toward the society in which he lives.

Many writers on socialization point to the importance of the early years of life as those in which socializing agents and transmitters of messages have the greatest impact on the individual. Tumin states that:

Dr. John S. Gibson is Director of the Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs and Lincoln Filene Professor at Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts.

... the kinds of explanation and hence of understanding of human behavior that one comes to favor are set rather early in life... once they are set, it is most difficult to upset them... these early and deeply set explanatory principles serve as the main guidelines to thinking about all subsequent social problems. 3/

Cammarota sums up considerable research on this point:

1. Children begin to learn about government and politics even before they enter school. The formative years in politics appear to be those years between the ages of 3 and 13.
2. Children's political attitudes and values are firmly established by the time they leave the eighth grade.
3. During the high school years, youth obtains much knowledge about government and politics, but this knowledge has little effect upon the values and attitudes previously formed. 4/

On the other hand, the political and activist behavior of many high school and college students suggests that the civic socialization process is continuous. Messages reaching young people with respect to the quality of society and the substance of national policy give them bodies of knowledge and shape values, attitudes, and behaviors in such a way as to alter previous learnings and the behaviors early schooling has sought to instill in them. Experiences of the turbulent 1960's, therefore, point toward revising conclusions of research that the ages of 3 through 13 are the most important ones in civic socialization. Studies made during the late 1960's tend to fortify the statement that civic socialization is continuous and that many agents and transmitters can and do provide significant inputs into the civic orientation of the individual. 5/

We are primarily concerned with the educational institution as a chief agent of civic education within the broader context of civic socialization. Most agents and transmitters do not have specific programs for civic socialization, while civic education in the schools includes school services and processes designed to advance students toward what is often called "good citizenship." To put it another way, civic education in the schools is the teaching and learning of bodies of knowledge and of clusters of values, attitudes, and behaviors considered necessary for support and strengthening of the civic structure and processes of the nation. Although Coleman and others express strong doubts about the impact of school services and processes on the child independent

of his environment and socioeconomic status, we agree with Dennis about the importance of the school as an agent of civic education:

Anyone who initiates an investigation into the essential forces at work in the transmission of a political culture from one generation to the next, and does this within the context of a national modern society, is almost forced to pay attention to the role of the school. The reasons for this lie in great part in the very definition of the goals of the school system in a modern society. The school normally represents the official, overt, deliberate attempt of a society to reproduce its characteristic patterns of behavior, as well as to provide future adaptiveness. . . . it is likely to be society's foremost official agency for inculcating supportive orientations toward the political community, the regime, the government, the political system as a whole and for defining the role of individuals within the system. 6/

Hess and Torney add that "The public school appears to be the most important and effective instrument of political socialization in the United States." 7/ (We tend in this paper to equate political socialization with civic socialization.) We have no doubt about the influences of out-of-school agents and transmitters on the civic orientation of the individual; however, our central concern is what the school does to, for, and with the child in socializing him into the civic realm of his society.

I. Objectives for Civic Education in the Schools of the United States

The broad goal for civic education is to mold a person so that he has a high degree of civic quality and efficacy. Specific objectives usually include bodies of knowledge (the cognitive domain), clusters of values and attitudes (the affective domain), and overt behaviors (psychomotor domain) considered necessary for civic quality and efficacy. The school thus declares that it seeks certain outcomes or outputs for the student as a result of school services and processes which will produce the "good" or "effective" citizen.

In the last three decades, many national organizations have listed a number of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor objectives for students, objectives which the compilers feel are vital for good citizenship. 8/ There is, of course, no authoritative national statement of what civic outcomes should be or a generally accepted curriculum containing bodies of knowledge which students should "know" for civic efficacy. At the state level, however, most legislatures mandate courses in the schools which presumably will advance good citizenship. A typical law may be found in Chapter 468 of the Acts of the General Court of Massachusetts:

In all public schools... the Constitution... and history and government shall be taught as required subjects for the purpose of promoting civic service and a greater knowledge thereof and of fitting the pupils morally and intellectually for the duties of citizenship. 9/

Such legislation, as well as course requirements by school accrediting agencies, say very little as to the actual content of the course or how it is to be taught. We shall cite studies shortly which strongly indicate that lofty assumptions about student civic outcomes with respect to required courses tend to be quite invalid.

About all of the 20,440 public school districts in the United States declare that a major goal of their educational processes is to produce good citizens or some comparable phraseology. When we examine school systems' objectives, however, we do not find any degree of specificity about cognitive, affective, and psychomotor outcomes. "Good citizenship" tends to be the central but vague objective.

A number of school systems do have objectives, such as knowledge about the history of the United States (presumably designed to advance national loyalty), knowledge about governmental and political processes (presumably to equip the student to be an effective civic participant), and enlightenment with respect to other nations so as to understand the differences among human beings and nations. In the affective domain, many schools feel it important that students should value democracy as the desired form of the governing process and should have positive attitudes in the area of intergroup relations. Schools consider it necessary that students should "behave" in a democratic manner, abide by school and governmental rules and laws, and not overtly discriminate against others.

Objectives, however, whether explicit or implicit, are usually stated as vague but desirable outcomes or as specific school rules. They rarely are formally presented as specific objectives in terms of the fundamental interrelationships among the three domains of civic education. Most schools assess student achievement almost exclusively in the cognitive domain, through standardized testing, and consider the task of civic education well performed if the student abides by the norms and rules of the school and society.

At the state and national levels, however, there is a distinct movement toward the articulation of specific objectives and toward assessing student advancement toward those objectives. States such as Pennsylvania, Colorado, and New York are well along in this respect. The National Assessment Program

based in Denver, and having strong support throughout the nation, has published a set of citizenship objectives and is currently developing measures to assess student advancement (or nonadvancement) toward those objectives. In the absence of articulation of objectives and development of assessment programs by most school systems, the state and national programs may well be the wave of the future with respect to providing specific objectives and assessment procedures. 10 /

Many feel that the objectives-assessment route is essential, particularly when we view the quality of the civic realm of our society today, student attitudes toward authoritative officials, and a feeling among many young people of impotence with respect to traditional political and legal procedures for bringing about change. Of equal importance are projections for the future and their implications for the civic quality of the democratic society in the years ahead. Present projections with respect to population, social mobility, science and technology, race relations, urbanization, and other societal issues and areas are not necessarily compatible with sustaining and strengthening the structure and processes of democracy and the open society. Given what we think we know about the future, much consideration must be given to what student outcomes of the educational processes of the schools should be so that what we do today can help to produce more and better democratic citizens tomorrow. 11 /

II. School Services and Processes in Civic Education

School services and processes are the means to advance students toward certain objectives. Services include teachers, instructional materials, curriculum (structure and content), libraries, educational technology, audio-visuals and other media, administration, guidance and counseling, and others. The most important school process is the teaching-learning process, or curriculum interactions between teachers and students. Other processes include class scheduling, organization of classes in terms of size and grouping of students, team teaching, organizing students into learning levels (or tracks), and testing and grading. Our concern in this section of the paper is with direct curricular school services and processes in civic education, cocurricular activities and programs, and non-curricular school activities which affect in some ways the civic orientation of students.

A. Direct Curricular Services and Processes

School services and processes which are direct civic education inputs for students include the curriculum, teachers, teaching, and instructional materials. Some other services and processes relate in many ways to civic education outcomes.

1. Curriculum: Structure and Content

It is the social studies curriculum, from kindergarten through grade 12, that has the basic responsibility for civic education in the schools. Social studies include history, political science (usually civics and government courses), geography, economics, and, to a lesser extent, philosophy, psychology, and sociology. Social studies concepts are found in the kindergarten, and each grade from then on includes social studies subject matter for students. United States schools have no formal civic education curriculum as such, although certain units of subject matter, taught in four or eight weeks or longer, might focus upon some specific civic problem, such as intergroup relations or political participation. 12 /

Most schools and teachers say that the purpose of the social studies curriculum is not only to give the student an understanding of man and society, past and present, but also to convey knowledge about and values toward matters affecting democratic citizenship. Thus the social studies program is designed to be the formal service and process for advancing students to whatever civic objectives the school has in view. In general, the first-grade social studies program focuses on the family and the child's understanding of the family and how members of families should behave toward one another. The second grade proceeds on to the neighborhood; and we reach the city in the third grade in this "near to far" curriculum, presenting knowledge about the city, its authoritative officials, its laws, and good citizenship in the city. States and regions come in the fourth grade, while we advance to United States history in the fifth grade and possibly to the Western Hemisphere in the sixth.

Usually in the seventh grade, students study geography, return to United States history in the eighth, and go on to civics or ancient history in the ninth. The last three grades, high school, deal consecutively with world history, United States history, and either problems of democracy or some electives. It is a rare school and teacher that conducts these courses for academic content only. Each program or course contains specific bodies of knowledge, value and attitudinal orientations, and hopes for good behavior dealing with citizenship. Most schools and teachers emphasize the cognitive domain of civic education and hope that desired civic values, attitudes, and overt behavioral orientations will be by-products of knowledge about areas affecting good citizenship. The basic assumption about courses in United States history is that an understanding of this nation's past will give the student what he needs to value his country and to behave as a good citizen. The Massachusetts statute on page four expresses this wish.

Few schools realize that civic values and attitudes are imbedded in literature, music, art, and other segments of the curriculum. Little attempt is generally made to draw from short stories, novels, or poetry concepts and lessons relating to civic behavior. One almost never sees an articulation of civic objectives for courses and programs other than those in the social studies.

2. Teachers

Teachers are the most important school services with respect to pupil performance. 13 / They are the decision makers with respect to what happens in the curriculum and in courses such as United States history. They make the critical choices in selecting instructional materials, organizing courses, and assessing pupil performance. Decisions about objectives and school services and processes can be made from on high, but what really happens in schools is what teachers do vis-à-vis students. Teachers should, therefore, be the key service to students for advancing young people toward civic objectives.

Preservice education of teachers almost never touches on civic education as such, and there is very little in any inservice program that really equips the teacher to perform well as an agent for qualitative civic education. 14 / Teacher certification is related to the civic realm only with respect to "moral standards" and "loyalty." Hiring, promotion, and retention of teachers is never related to civic education unless the teacher as a person, in some drastic manner, violates what rights students have, introduces into the classroom content matter considered subversive, violates laws, or otherwise conducts himself in the community in a manner not compatible with the interests of the school system.

3. Teaching

We refer to teaching as the teaching-learning process to suggest interactions between what teachers do and how they are received by students. In the grade school years, there are many kinds of interactions between teachers and students; however, at the secondary level, teachers generally lecture to students taking the academic courses in the curriculum. Teaching more often than not is expository, and usually the student is not given much opportunity to participate in the teaching-learning process through discovery, inquiry, simulation, and other participatory learning activities. 15 / In brief, teaching processes and styles usually have little to do with civic objectives.

4. Instructional Materials

Here, we turn to textbooks, monographs, films and other audio-visuals, instructional television, educational technology, and so on. The textbook, of course, is crucial to the curriculum and to the teacher. The text-

book often determines how a course is organized and what content matter is delivered to students. For many teachers, the contents of the textbook determine how the course is structured from September through June, or for shorter periods. There are many supplements to the textbook, such as paperback books and pamphlets, but in most schools, the textbook is the course. 16 /

Textbook authors present a lot of information about what they think students should know in the civic realm. But their scholarship is tempered by the publishing houses which sell books to the schools, and at vast profits. Consequently, we tend to find flattering narratives about the United States for use in U. S. history courses and see almost no content matter that would offend sectional interests or the majority culture in this nation. Controversy and different views concerning public issues and balanced treatments of minority groups are rarely found in the textbooks.

Most of the instructional materials used in schools in the United States are designed for national sales and for the broadest spread of students. What civic education content one might find in the textbooks deals with knowledge about this and other nations, structures of governments, and the formal aspects and structures of politics and legislative and judicial procedures. Questions at the end of textbook chapters deal with knowledge about what was covered in the chapter, and this is usually the extent to which textbooks make a contribution toward skills of critical thinking, inquiry, and discovery. The preaching teacher and the didactic textbook do not make distinctive contributions to civic education.

5. Other School Services and Processes

There is not much in educational technology, libraries, or other services that significantly contributes to civic education. Some classroom processes are calculated to promote loyalty and favorable attitudes toward the nation, such as the pledge of allegiance and singing the "Star Spangled Banner." But there is no longitudinal evidence to relate these processes to civic efficacy.

B. Cocurricular Programs

Most schools, especially high schools, offer a wide variety of cocurricular activities which relate to civic objectives and behavior. Student governments provide means for some student participation in decisions affecting school life. Student governments, however, are usually comprised of students who are at the higher levels of academic achievement and thus are not likely to be representative of the entire student body. Most student governments have no real authority with respect to major issues affecting the school, such as curriculum, administration, and teachers.

Many school organizations and clubs have a civic focus, especially those dealing with current events or political affairs. Some organizations provide specific services to those in need in the community and others study community problems and issues, such as ghettos and urban renewal. Intramural and interscholastic athletics probably have some civic value, notably good sportsmanship and the process of competition. Some cities and states sponsor student government programs when students assume the roles of governing officials and deliberate public issues. Many kinds of conferences for students that relate to political matters are held throughout the nation, and student trips to Washington, D. C. , and the United Nations are also sponsored by many school systems. 17 /

C. Noncurricular School Services and Processes

Too often it is assumed that the sole contribution by the school to the civic development of the student is curricular or cocurricular. Many other segments of the school transmit to students messages that relate directly to civic life. They include the school facility itself and the condition of the building. Administration, including processes for maintaining order in the school and punishing offenders, certainly has civic significance to students. School personnel, such as guidance officers and those providing counseling, are important, as are coaches, janitors, and bus drivers. School policy in dividing students into tracks or learning levels relates to self-image, motivation, and the congealing of peer groups. In brief, the student learns much more in the school than through the classroom teaching-learning process; and in the area of civic education, the whole school is, for better or worse, an exceedingly important socializing agent.

III. Questions Concerning Objectives and School Services and Processes in Civic Education

Many of the questions we raise in this section of the paper are critical of the civic education functions of the school. They are based on a number of studies and reports about citizenship education in the schools, student unrest, and serious questions by students and others with respect to contemporary public school education.

A. School Personnel and Objectives

School personnel are adults at varying age levels who explicitly or implicitly establish civic education objectives for students. The adults seek to use school services and processes to orient young people toward the civic dimensions of the society considered desirable by the adults. Many students raise serious questions about the civic society into which school personnel attempt to bring them, and they also often express doubts about the capacity of the adults

(school personnel) to perform the educational tasks. Thus we have a gap between the adult socializers and civic objectives on the one hand, and student perceptions about the adults and the objectives on the other.

Many black students present a case in point. They see numerous inconsistencies between their situation and the society into which adult educators seek to bring them because that society, idealistically presented to them in the school, often is not very hospitable to them after they leave school. There is a gap between their objectives and the kinds of people they want as school personnel on the one hand and the reality of civic objectives and school personnel on the other. Many white students who express a distaste for the civic society and national policy of the United States are often turned off with respect to a school's articulation of civic objectives and the nation's virtues, and by school personnel who are miles away from student interests, problems, and expectations. These kinds of observations are impossible to quantify, but anyone toiling in the vineyards of civic and public school education for decades would find such views quite extensive.

B. Objectives and School Services and Processes

Let us assume that the school considers objectives for civic education to include knowledge about the United States and its governing and political structures and processes; the valuing of national loyalty, democracy, and democratic procedures for making policy and bringing about change; and behavior which reflects democratic processes, democratic human relations, responsibility for one's economic and social well-being, and other common behavioral objectives. Let us also suppose that the school assumes that the standard social studies curriculum in terms of content and structure will advance students toward those objectives, as will school personnel, orthodox teaching procedures, standard textbooks, and other services and processes. We contend that these "business as usual" services and processes are doing very little as means toward ends and may, indeed, operate in such a way as to impede student advancement toward desirable civic objectives.

A simple case in point is developing in students a facility for democratic participatory procedures as a goal, while the school through its services and processes offers students very little opportunity to participate in shaping decisions of any kind. This is as true with respect to the widespread absence of student participation in the classroom teaching-learning process as it is to students' not having opportunities to shape other kinds of school decisions. Hess comments on this point:

In contrast to its emphasis on compliance, the school curriculum underemphasizes the rights and obligations of

a citizen to participate in government. The school focuses on the obligation and right to vote but does not offer the child sufficient understanding of procedures open to individuals for legitimately influencing the government. Nor does it adequately explain and emphasize the importance of group action to achieve desirable ends. 18 /

Democracy values individuality; however, schools tend to treat students as members of "classes" or groups of young people who are lectured to, programmed, tested on the basis of group averages, and so on. Democracy talks of conflict and reconciliation of differences, but the conflictive aspects of political processes are generally not found in the curriculum.

Let us take democratic human relations as an example and the presumed objective of the school to orient the child into an integrated society. School services and processes are rarely equipped to perform this service. Democratic human relations, and especially race relations, raise controversial questions that teachers and instructional resources would prefer to avoid so far as the classroom teaching-learning process is concerned.

There are many studies, for instance, demonstrating how textbooks by commission of error or omission of fact grossly mistreat the black experience in United States history. 19 / Teachers are rarely trained for coping with issues that might arise in the school about race relations. They do offer students more and more information about black history, but they usually don't want to get into class discussions about race relations. Democratic human relations are deeply entrenched in the affective domain, and yet affective processes dealing with student interactions, values, attitudes, emotions, and sensitivities are not common classroom procedures. Larry Cuban points out that highly factual accounts of Negro history, which now are interlaced in student textbooks, are welcome, but they really do not deal with emotions and action. "What is missing. . . is the meaning of the Negro experience in America. . . points of view /which/ can disturb. " He notes that the new "integrated" books lack the "elasticity to treat these /emotional issues/ and other questions in depth." 20 / On this point, Hess observes that "the teaching of social and political interaction omit both the components of emotion and of action--the two elements that are most likely to effect change. " 21 /

Citizenship education in the schools is most closely related to courses in political science. 22 / These include the standard ninth-grade civics course and the twelfth-grade problems of democracy and government courses. Considerable research in recent years focuses upon these courses and their objectives for students with respect to providing knowledge about United States government, developing loyalty and positive attitudes and values, and

other common civic objectives. A number of studies find that these courses hardly are worth their effort if one assumes that the students are progressing toward the objectives for these courses. Most of these courses lack relevancy and action. They are structural (students must memorize the "twenty-two" steps by which a bill becomes a law) and generally are devoid of the realities of legislative procedures or practical politics. The ideals of democracy in the United States are not balanced, for the most part, with such stark realities as discrimination, poverty, and urban blight. 23 / Hess summarizes his findings about public school civic education:

In short, much of the political socialization that takes place in elementary and high school levels is lacking in candor, is superficial with respect to basic issues, is cognitively fragmented, and produces little grasp of the implications of principles and their applications to new situations. 24 /

In brief, for many students, what happens to them (or does not happen) often does not square with the objectives and goals schools set before them.

C. The Student's Out-of-School Life and the School

"Relevancy" is, perhaps, a word that is overused these days in discussions about what students would like to have in their schools. It is generally true, however, that most school services and processes are as solid as a mausoleum and about as deadly. The out-of-school life of the student is his real world, and too infrequently do we see that real world joined with the world of the school. The school seeks to socialize the child into an ideal civic life, but often it is by procedures which are not considered the best form of pedagogy. Time and again the student recites the pledge of allegiance, but this rote procedure may well have little impact on him. He also may see profound inconsistencies in "liberty and justice for all" when he and his family are not included in the "all. "

A vital learning environment for the student is his peer group, which is largely an out-of-school entity. Much of his civic behavior revolves around that group, and this may be good or bad. Media have a profound impact upon him. He enters kindergarten with about 4,000 or 5,000 hours of television viewing under his belt and usually picks up about 1,000 hours a year through high school graduation. 25 / What he sees and hears on television seems often far more of a reality (and is more smoothly presented) than the civic inputs of the school. The press and other media give him the realities of politics, student activism, societal problems, and other issues in the civic domain, while the

school generally ignores these matters in its services and processes related to civic education.

These questions, therefore, present some rather critical perspectives on the school as a prime agent of civic education in the United States. We also could raise questions about inadequate teacher preparation and inservice training, autocratic school administrative officials, poor assessment of student achievement, and the almost total lack of significant civic education programs at the grade-school level where the cognitive and affective development of the child is highly important. But we feel we have made our basic point that civic education in United States schools leaves much to be desired, and that before American models are emulated in the less-developed countries, these and other serious questions should be raised about the structure and content of civic education in this nation's schools.

We have, of course, raised these concerns about United States civic education in the schools with the prime focus on students. Schools are for students, after all, and these issues are being questioned by students all across the nation. There are many good things taking place, on the other hand, and we commend them to the reader. The book, Promising Practices in Civic Education, cited in note 17, page 9, presents many fine programs in civic education in our schools, especially ones of a cocurricular nature. Papers, such as the writer's "Needed: A Revolution in Civic Education," set forth school services and processes which can make significant contributions to student advancement toward desired objectives. 26 /

Recommendations are fairly obvious. Better teacher preparation and inservice training; relevancy in the structure and content of the curriculum; more individualized instruction and classroom options for students; engagement of the students in the teaching-learning process; using the real world as a classroom and bringing that real world into the school; cocurricular activities which delve into the realities of civic life; using affective processes, such as emotions and sensitivities, to touch on affective development in values and attitudes; flexibility and primary materials in instructional resources; making the school a democratic institution; reduction or elimination of tracks or learning levels; and a strong thrust on civic education in the grade-school years--these are only a few recommendations among many.

People have been saying these things for years. They are desirable and they point toward what can and should be done in civic education programs in the developing countries. The trouble is in getting translated into action what research and experience have shown can really advance students toward objectives. Therefore, school services and programs of civic education in the less-developed

countries should be formulated on the basis of attainable objectives and school procedures which United States research and experience indicate have high promise for student achievement. It is to be hoped that by drawing on this research and experience to an appreciable degree, school programs in those countries can be launched or improved without going through protracted periods of inadequacy and ineffectiveness.

IV. Other Agencies and Institutions Engaged in Civic Education

The school, of course, is not the only agent of civic education or the sole transmitter of standards in the cognitive, affective, or psychomotor areas of civic education. We have pointed repeatedly to the impact of the person's environment, his family, the media, and many other out-of-school agents as transmitters. It may be of value, however, to take note of three other facets of civic education that are frequently overlooked in studies of the civic socialization of the individual. They are student and adult groups, institutions of higher learning, and the adult nature and life of the citizen.

A. Student and Adult Groups

Here we refer to organizations that are directly or indirectly concerned with civic knowledge, values, and action. Those that reach millions of young people are the Boy and Girl Scouts, churches and church groups, the Young Mens and Young Womens Christian Associations, Boys Clubs, Girls Clubs and many others. Few of these groups are related to the school and its curriculum. They seek in many ways to impart an understanding of aspects of the national society and to encourage positive values with respect to that society; and they have many kinds of programs designed to translate ideals into action.

As an example, take the national Boy Scout organization. Boy scouting begins with the "Cubs" at the age of eight, and there is really no ending to scouting, as adults may participate in the organization in many ways. From the age of eight on, boys learn about various aspects of government, are oriented toward the values of an open society, and are engaged in many programs seeking to advance community and civic welfare. Given what we believe we know about desirable patterns of social studies and civic education, however, the value of organizations like the Boy Scouts may be much greater than has been realized. Some comparisons with the structure and processes of scouting on the one hand and the schools on the other may be useful.

In the first place, one advances up the ranks in scouting by competing with himself (or herself, in the Girl Scouts). He advances at the rate he desires and by the excitement he receives from passing certain tests. The basic objectives

are the higher ranks of scouting and almost limitless opportunities to earn merit badges and other symbols of achievement, even after the highest rank of Eagle is attained. The value of achievement and the honor accorded to the Scout are thus the principal stimuli. The school of course, measures gradations of student achievement by means of standardized testing and confers promotion correspondingly. Competition is with others and, in many cases, competent and talented young people are lost in the morass of tests, grades, and unfair assessment of accomplishment. Actual or psychic dropouts from the schools are often the result.

Secondly, the Boy Scout sees a tangible relationship between what he learns, what he values, and what he does. The gaps among these three dimensions of the educative process in the social studies and civic education are often barriers to making that process meaningful to the civic life of the person.

In the third place, the Scout constantly participates in the process of learning. He is not lectured to or forced to do homework he does not like. He comes to know the value of participation in shaping decisions in his patrol or his troop or in broader groupings. He knows his views count, and he always has an opportunity for leadership available to him. In the schools, participating in the teaching-learning process too often is the exception and not the rule.

Of great importance also is the fact that the Scout is dealt with on an individual basis. Data are constantly coming to us today about the positive relationship between individualized instruction and student achievement, and scouting emphasizes this principle. Positive self-concept and individual achievement give one a feeling of value in the lonely crowd of society. Added to this is the fact that the individual attention the Scout receives comes from adults and older boys who earnestly seek to help him progress toward higher goals. Compare this process with the role of many teachers in our schools and what significance this may have for young attitudes toward authority.

We have no definite measures of the relationship between scouting and such things as civic values or political efficacy. The only point being made here is that scouting and many other organizational programs offer significant processes in civic education, and their value for the development of effective citizenship certainly should not be underestimated.

In all probability, many patterns of religious life of young people and the churches and church groups with which they are affiliated deal with relevant and vital societal issues. At least, this is the writer's impression. Boys Clubs in many cities throughout the United States offer recreational and civic programs for boys who frequently are economically disadvantaged, while such service organizations as Rotary, Lions, and Kiwanis Clubs have a number of programs for young people dealing with community life, scholarship aid, and civic issues.

We could spend considerable time on groups and organizations that relate in different ways to education for citizenship. The writer knows of no study that embraces the positive contributions of these groups in civic education or that provides any measures of their effectiveness in this area. There is no doubt whatever that such studies should be undertaken, as these groups may well be doing far more in civic education than the schools, especially in the affective and psychomotor domains. 27 /

B. Institutions of Higher Learning

Most colleges and universities do not proclaim that one of their central goals is civic education. Presumably, higher education is designed to broaden the liberal perspective of the student on himself and his society, to equip him for a vocation or a profession as well as for a satisfying adult life. Higher education generally shies away from affective or psychomotor objectives, and it encourages students to develop their own values and attitudes, especially with respect to civic life. Higher education tolerates about all points of view with respect to government and politics, especially today. Content matter in civic education is usually found in the social sciences, although as is the case in the schools, the potential for advancing civic values in other course work is enormous.

One might infer from this that institutions of higher learning have little to do with civic education. One phenomenon of our times, however, is student activism on the campus and in society, and the values they are expressing as well as their civic action suggest that they are not pleased with what civic education they have received prior to entering colleges and that they are dissatisfied with the civic realm of society into which they have been socialized. Many of the writer's students point to the uselessness to them of civic education in the schools, and how they feel that their activist thrust reflects to a considerable degree the barriers to enlightened participation in the process of education and in society in general which they encountered prior to entering the groves of academe.

Furthermore, many college students are rightly demanding a curriculum that is relevant to their lives and one that fills in the omissions of fact and commissions of error with respect to much of the past and present history of the United States. The rush toward establishing black-studies centers on our college campuses is an obvious manifestation of this fact. Students today want not only to be meaningful participants in the teaching-learning process but also to help in shaping the broader decisions of college or university administration.

In brief, they, and high school students too, are telling us that if they really are to be educated so that they can be effective participants in a democracy, the educators and institutions of learning must enable them to participate in a significant manner well before they reach voting age. They are saying that knowledge about participatory democracy will not really help them to value effective participation. They seek a healthy and vigorous linkage among the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of civic education.

Yet many students seek rights without accepting responsibilities as citizens. They protest the police on the campus, even in a situation of non-violative behavior. This was the case at Tufts University recently when the Tufts administration collaborated with the police in a raid on students suspected of selling or using drugs. Tufts Dean Alvin R. Schmidt pointed out:

We consider that students are also citizens. As such, they have all the rights of citizens. They also have all the responsibilities of citizens in addition to the responsibilities associated with being members of the University.

Certainly it is the obligation of a university to be as concerned with responsibilities as with rights, and this is true of all concerned with civic education in a democracy. The problem is, of course, that many students feel that their rights for too long have been denied them (including the right to participate in shaping decisions affecting them) and thus they feel that "responsibilities" are not at the top of their own agenda. It is the obligation of any viable program in civic education to maintain a balance between rights and responsibilities and to help young people realize that neither can exist without the other. It is to be hoped that the civic educators at all levels will realize and honor this fact.

C. The Adult Citizen

Very few American adults receive formal civic education. They are constantly barraged, however, with messages of a civic nature from all kinds of transmitters, and they participate in organizations that are concerned with political or governmental matters. Media, especially the press and television, regularly deal with public issues. Although the average adult's attitudes and values with respect to politics are not likely to be altered by the media, his knowledge about public affairs in general, and day-to-day issues as well, expands by this means. Participation in organizations that provide civic services or that consider public matters is another example of protracted civic socialization. Members of trade unions are influenced politically by the organizations' various political policy positions and also are in many cases vigorous participants in the political machinery of the organizations.

Adults are influenced in varying degrees by statements of candidates in political campaigns and by pronouncements of authoritative governmental officials, as well as by national policy itself. One's economic and social condition has a distinct impact on one's political life. Parents are affected in a civic sense by their children's political education and orientation toward civic life. Certainly many parents today are being re-educated to some extent by the political activities and interests of their children. In brief, although formal civic education tends to diminish as the young person enters college, informal civic education continues for practically all adults in their postschool years, whether or not they go to college. What is needed is some serious inquiry into adult civic education and the impact of messages of civic significance and of various organizations and agencies on the total political orientation of the adult.

V. Civic Education in Other Developed Nations

A brief commentary on civic education in some other developed nations may help to provide perspective on civic education in the United States. The literature in this area is extensive, and the bibliography to this paper contains citations that will give an interested reader guidelines for further study.

Like all nations, developed countries have programs of civic education in the schools designed to develop among young people supportive attitudes for national civic structures and values. When a developed country has a totalitarian governing process, the civic education program will tend to be one of strict political indoctrination for support of the ideology and will also preclude objective examination of political processes and styles of governing that conflict with the prevailing myth. The many studies of education in Nazi Germany or contemporary "civic" education programs in the Soviet Union, and especially in Communist China, abound with examples of programs for ideological indoctrination.

In the democratic nations of Western Europe, civic education is rather similar to the United States approach. French education tends to be more chauvinistic than that of other nations and also somewhat more rigid. Most of these nations go through patriotic rituals in the classrooms, incorporate civic programs in social studies courses, and sponsor student government organizations and student organizations in various areas of civic life. Great periods in national history are set forth in the textbooks, and hard times, defeats, and disastrous national events receive little attention. With the exception of the Federal Republic of Germany and, to a lesser extent the United Kingdom, students in the European schools receive daily lectures, have extensive homework assignments, and have little opportunity to engage in classroom discussions with the teacher or among themselves. French colleagues of the writer are always aghast at educational conferences when American participatory styles of classroom activity are described,

along with other flexible patterns of American education, such as team teaching, simulation procedures, inductive teaching, student inquiry, and para-professionals in the classroom. One gets the impression that students should not question any event in the history of a nation and that the course of schooling must be completed before the student has the maturity to discuss or question contemporary political issues. Accordingly, one has to be firmly educated to be prepared for effective participation in the civic life of the state, and "educated" usually means indoctrinated along the lines of the national social studies curriculum and the policies of the Minister of Education. 28 /

The Federal Republic of Germany is probably the most progressive nation in Europe as far as civic education is concerned; however, it still has a long way to go. West Germany has particular problems in civic education owing to the long years of Nazi control and a consequent grave apprehension held by many German adults about the extent to which the schools should engage in any kind of educational program dealing with government or politics. Furthermore, all the German Länder, or states, have their own ministers of education: there is no Federal minister or office of education in West Germany. There is, however, much sharing among the Länder with respect to innovative and promising educational programs and a common concern that the processes of education in the schools should definitely focus on helping students to know about, value, and support democracy in West Germany. Totalitarianism of any kind is to be opposed. A directive for teachers in the Land of Hamburg puts it this way:

The emphasis is to be laid upon the contradictory forms of democratic and totalitarian government. . . . parallels between National Socialist and Communist authority are suggested. The guilt of National Socialist policy for the present situation of Germany, also dealt with in contemporary history, must be mentioned in this connection. It is obvious with these themes that the German problems are to be incorporated in a discussion of the world wide east-west conflict. 29 /

The constitutions of the German Länder contain specific provisions in the area of civic education. For instance, Section 1 of Article 26 of the Constitution of the Land of Bremen reads as follows:

Children should be brought up in a community spirit based on respect for the dignity of all men and on desire for social justice and political responsibility, and should be taught to regard the opinions of others with objectiveness and toleration and work peacefully with other people and nations.

Operationally, the German schools incorporate civic content matter in the social studies classes in the elementary school, while courses on government and civic issues are offered in the middle school and in the Gymnasium. As is the case in nearly all European schools, however, social studies at the secondary level are usually only for those going on to the university, and consequently most European adolescents receive little of what we would call formal civic education after the elementary school years.

It is the writer's impression that more contemporary history and current events are taught in Germany than in the other European countries, many of which feel that the here and now of national and international affairs cannot be studied in an objective manner in the schools. Also, German students at the secondary level have much more opportunity to participate in the teaching-learning process. German educators are genuinely interested in the more progressive approaches to civic education found in the United States as well as in educational technology and other innovative approaches to schooling. Of particular importance is the fact that student government is established by law in the German Länder. In Bavaria, for instance, the law states that:

The students are to feel responsible for the life and organization of their school and cooperate in the formation of both. They are to be supported in this respect by the school administration. Numbered among the tasks of the students inside the school are especially attention to a good school and class community, the representation of the student body, the cooperation in student activities, the assumption of supervisory, organizational, and administrative duties.

In Hesse, the student government:

... serves the task of educating the students to be independently thinking and acting, cooperative, responsible members of a society based on a democratic way of life. It is not limited to student participation in services; its essence is much more in the independent common attention to tasks which result from the community life, the organization, and the atmosphere of the school... the promotion of the student government is a common affair of the entire teaching staff. 30 /

Students elect representatives to the student government (Schulevertretungen), and school administrations provide extensive support for the government in terms

of time, space, and backing of policies. There is some feeling, however, that student governments are not closely related to formal civic education in the classrooms, and many educators are reluctant to see these governments undermine in any way their authority or responsibility for the civic orientation of their students. The picture is mixed; however, the Federal Republic of Germany is particularly concerned about advancing democracy through education and about keeping the schools from preaching chauvinism along the lines one reads about in All Quiet on the Western Front or particularly in the record of German education under the Nazi regime.

There are a number of studies of civic education in Europe and also an assessment program of civic education in European countries conducted by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Attainment. Almond and Verba's The Civic Culture provides many important insights into civic education in the developed countries. Such organizations as the Atlantic Information Centre for Teachers in London conduct conferences and research projects on social studies and civic education in Europe and the United States. Nevertheless, one has an impression that the broad critique of civic education in the United States set forth in Section III of this paper could be applied to all European states, and this critique would probably be more severe with respect to Europe than to the United States. 31 /

VI. Some Implications of Civic Education in the United States for the Less Developed Nations

It is presumptuous to give some judgment on how this analysis of civic education in the United States may relate to present or prospective civic education programs in the less developed countries. Each nation is different, with its own history, problems, educational structures, and educational objectives. The American experience, however, may provide some possible guidelines for civic education programs in the less developed countries if we assume that a prime focus of those programs is to develop civic knowledge, positive attitudes and values, and meaningful civic action through the process of education. Civic education does have a common purpose in all nations in that it is a fundamental and necessary means for developing support among future citizens for the basic unity, the stability, and the integrity of the state. This being the case, the American experience may point toward at least eight ways by which a civic education program could strengthen the civic realm of the less developed countries.

A. Objectives

It would be well to develop a set of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor objectives for civic education programs. This might be done by governing

officials as well as members of the attentive public. What, in other words, do civic education programs seek to do in the areas of knowledge, attitudes and values, and patterns of overt behavior? There never will be full agreement on any set of civic education objectives anywhere. However, the content of civic education programs, educational strategies or means toward ends, and measures for evaluation of student progress will be considerably advanced if considerable attention is given to objectives. We assume, of course, that there is a basic compatibility between objectives of civic education in the democracies and those of the less developed countries. We thus are talking about civic education which advances a participatory political culture and not one which seeks to sustain in the long run an autocratic regime. We are talking about education and not indoctrination.

B. Curriculum

A highly centralized government may wish to mandate a specific civic education curriculum but we hope this will not be the case. Broad cognitive, affective, and psychomotor objectives for implementation at regional and local levels would be preferable to a curriculum created by legislation. National standardized testing could be the weapon to enforce a curriculum at the regional or local level but again we feel that this would not be advisable. The curriculum should relate to the broad objectives and it should reflect not only national issues (security, unity, history, and culture) but also the diverse cultures and problems in all less developed countries. The curriculum, in brief, should have a national thrust but ample room for sub-national development and for sub-national issues, problems and cultures.

C. Content

In terms of content, the curriculum should be relevant to young people and should be balanced in the sense of presenting the realities of the pre-colonial period, the colonial experience, the struggle for independence, and contemporary civic issues. This balance is only now emerging in civic education in the United States and we would hope that the process of civic education in the less developed countries would seek to avoid the recent and current struggles in the United States to make the curriculum relevant and reflective of all dimensions of national life and its many cultures.

D. Teacher Education

Resources must be allocated toward effective preservice and inservice teacher education. Teacher education programs should focus on knowledge about the past and present civic realm of the society, a sensitivity to the many kinds of

differences among students in the schools, and a pedagogy that will enable students to participate in the teaching-learning process. Civic education in the United States has gravely suffered from totally inadequate teacher education.

E. Pedagogy

To emphasize point D, teachers should be encouraged to study American and other participatory teaching styles so that students can really be engaged in the classroom teaching-learning process. In the 1960's, American teachers have made many advances in participatory teaching-learning, and these styles should be integrated into civic education programs in the less developed countries. This is only to say that data indicate how little impact the standard lecture has with respect to advancing students toward civic education objectives.

F. Instructional Resources

We recommend a great flexibility in using all kinds of instructional resources in civic education programs, including films, instructional television, audiotapes, newspapers, magazines, pictures and, of course, well-organized textbooks. Effective use of all kinds of media must be employed, especially since the transistor radio and television programming via communications satellites will greatly expand messages young people will receive in the less developed countries. Hopefully, the radio and television will be used more effectively in the classroom.

G. Student Government

We feel that relevant and well-organized student governments which give students an authentic voice in the making of some school decisions should be encouraged. United States programs have much to offer in this respect.

H. Out-of-School Student Life

Again, we caution educational decision-making authorities to recognize that so much of civic education takes place outside the school. We, therefore, urge that all possible steps be taken to use the community at large as a civic education classroom and to bring that community and its representative members into the classroom. If a civic education program can join the classroom world with the real world, students will have a far greater opportunity to advance toward the goals of that program.

We have no doubt whatever that effective civic education programs can have a profound impact on the development of a citizenry which can advance national security, unity, stability, and importance in the international system. In

fact, there is no alternative to such programs if the quality of civic life in the less developed countries is to be furthered. This assumes, of course, that we are concerned about a civic life which provides many opportunities for citizens to contribute toward the common good. Jefferson put the matter this way in 1820:

I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of a society but the people themselves, and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education. 32 /

If, however, objectives for a civic education program point toward a long-term support by citizens and future citizens for an authoritarian or totalitarian society, then civic education programs from nations other than the democracies would have to serve as models for such programs. We naturally hope that this is not the case and that the less developed countries will draw upon the positive aspects of civic education in the United States and in the other democracies to advance the values and attributes of the open society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Introduction

1. Political Socialization

Herbert Hyman's Political Socialization (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959) paved the way for the serious inquiries into this area in the 1960's, and Fred I. Greenstein's Children and Politics (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965) provided keen insights into childhood political socialization. The summer, 1968, edition of the Harvard Educational Review, entitled "Political Socialization," contains many excellent articles and discussions by outstanding experts. A valuable recent study is that by Richard E. Dawson and Kenneth Prewitt, Political Socialization (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1969). Perhaps the best bibliography on political socialization is that prepared by Jack Dennis and Associates, Recent Research on Political Socialization: A Bibliography of Major or Proposed Studies (Medford, Massachusetts: Lincoln Filene Center, Tufts University, 1967).

2. Civic Education

Pioneering studies in civic education as a more specific dimension of political or civic socialization are the following: Charles E. Merriam, The Making of Citizens (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931); Howard E. Wilson, Education for Citizenship (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938); and John J. Mahoney, For Us the Living: An Approach to Civic Education (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945). Stanley E. Dimond's Schools and the Development of Good Citizens (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1953) gave civic education a new perspective in the 1950's, and works by Franklin K. Patterson of the Lincoln Filene Center introduced the inquiry of the 1960's. Among his most important works are The Adolescent Citizen (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960); and High Schools for a Free Society (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960); and he was editor of Citizenship and a Free Society: Education for the Future (Washington, D. C. : National Council for the Social Studies, 30th Yearbook, 1960). Two recent studies are James S. Coleman (ed.), Education and Political Development (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), and John S. Gibson, Citizenship (San Rafael, California: Dimensions Publishing Company, 1968). See also Helen M. Werneth, Educating for Citizenship: An Annotated Bibliography (Medford, Massachusetts: Lincoln Filene Center, Tufts University, March, 1969). We should also take note of the brilliant study by Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1965), which examines the political cultures of five democracies on a comparative basis and provides many insights into the implications of a political culture for civic education, and vice versa.

CITATIONS

Introduction

- 1/ Robert D. Hess, "Political Socialization in the Schools," in Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 38 (1968), p. 528.
- 2/ This definition is drawn from David Easton and Jack Dennis, "The Child's Image of Government," in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 351(1965), p. 40.
- 3/ Melvin Tumin in Roy D. Price, ed., Needed Research in the Teaching of the Social Studies. Washington, D. C. : National Council for the Social Studies, 1964, p. 46.
- 4/ Gloria Cammarota, "Children, Politics, and Elementary Social Studies," Social Education, April, 1963.
- 5/ See M. Kent Jennings and Richard G. Niemi, "Patterns of Political Learning" in Harvard Educational Review, op. cit. , pp. 443-467, and John J. Patrick, Political Socialization of American Youth: Implications for Secondary Social Studies. Washington, D. C. : National Council for the Social Studies, 1967.
- 6/ Jack Dennis, The Study of the Role of the School in Political Socialization. Medford, Massachusetts: Lincoln Filene Center, Tufts University, 1965. The reference to Coleman relates to his massive study for the United States Office of Education, Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D. C. : United States Government Printing Office, 1966.
- 7/ Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967, p. 213.

I. Objectives for Civic Education in the Schools of the United States

- 8/ A major compilation of citizenship objectives is available at the Lincoln Filene Center.
- 9/ Three other reference works setting forth provisions in state laws directly or indirectly relating to civic education are as follows: Statutory Requirements for Teaching United States History and Principles of the

United States Constitution (Chicago: American Bar Association, 1960); Citizenship Education: A Survey of Requirements for Citizenship Education Among the 50 States (New York: Robert A. Taft Institute of Government, 1963); and High School Graduation Requirements Established by State Departments of Education (Washington, D. C. : United States Office of Education, 1964).

- 10/ At the state level, see Paul Campbell, et al. , Phase I Findings: Educational Quality Assessment (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Department of Public Instruction, 1968). More than five years ago, Pennsylvania established ten goals for quality education in that state, as demanded by the Pennsylvania legislature. . Goal V is as follows: "Quality education should help every child acquire the habits and attitudes associated with responsible citizenship. " Responsible citizenship is then defined on page 45 of Phase I Findings. Measures were developed to assess student advancement (grades 5 and 11) toward this goal. With respect to the National Assessment Program, see National Assessment of Educational Progress: Citizenship Objectives (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education, 1969). The cognitive, affective, and psychomotor objectives are set forth in this monograph for the following age levels: 9, 13, 17, and adult.
- 11/ Following are some studies dealing with education in the decades ahead. Edgar L. Morphet and David L. Jesser, Designing Education for the Future, No. 5 (New York: Citation Press, 1968); Morphet (ed.), Prospective Changes in Society by 1980 (New York: Citation Press, 1966); Morphet (ed.), Implications for Education of Prospective Changes in Society (New York: Citation Press, 1967); Don Fabun, The Dynamics of Change (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. , 1967); and Projections of Educational Statistics to 1977-78 (Washington, D. C. : United States Government Printing Office, 1969).

II. School Services and Processes

- 12/ For an analysis of recent developments in the social studies curriculum, see Benjamin C. Cox and Byron G. Massialas, Social Studies in the United States. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. , 1967, and John S. Gibson, New Frontiers in the Social Studies, (two volumes). New York: Citation Press, 1967.
- 13/ On this point, see James W. Guthrie, et al. , Schools and Inequality. New York: Urban Coalition, 1969. Guthrie and his associates fully document the point that student services and processes directly relate

to student achievement, and thus to student postschool opportunities. The most important school service with respect to student achievement is the teacher and the most important process is teaching. Some may not find this point new or startling; however, it is good to have hard data on the matter.

- 14/ See John S. Gibson, "The Social Studies Teacher and Curriculum Change," in Dorothy McClure Fraser (ed.), Social Studies Curriculum Development: Prospects and Problems. Washington, D. C. : National Council for the Social Studies, 39th Yearbook, 1969.
- 15/ See Arno A. Bellack, The Language of the Classroom. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1966. By using a tape recorder in many social studies classes, Bellack found that the teacher's voice predominated as far as the language of the classroom was concerned. Students' voices were rarely heard.
- 16/ See John S. Gibson, "Selecting and Developing Social Studies Instructional Materials," Fraser, op. cit.
- 17/ For an extensive description of civic education programs which appear to be well-organized and directed to advancing students toward desired civic objectives, see Donald W. Robinson, et al., Promising Practices in Citizenship Education. Washington, D. C. : National Council for the Social Studies, 1967.

III. Questions Concerning Objectives and School Services and Processes in Civic Education

- 18/ Hess and Torney, op. cit., p. 218.
- 19/ See Hillel Black, The American Schoolbook. New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc., 1967, and Irving Sloan, The Negro in American History Textbooks. Chicago: American Federation of Teachers, 1966.
- 20/ Cuban, Harvard Educational Review, op. cit., pp. 614-615.
- 21/ Hess, ibid., p. 534.
- 22/ See Donald H. Riddle and Robert S. Cleary (eds.), Political Science in the Social Studies. Washington, D. C. : National Council for the Social Studies, 36th Yearbook, 1966, especially Chapter One, "Political Science in the Social Studies."
- 23/ See the following: Kenneth P. Langton and M. Kent Jennings, "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the United States,"

American Political Science Review, September, 1968, pp. 852 ff. ; M. Kent Jennings and Richard G. Niemi, "Political Socialization," Harvard Educational Review, op. cit. ; Lee H. Ehman, "An Analysis of the Relationships of Selected Educational Variables with Political Socialization of High School Students," American Educational Research Journal, November, 1969, pp. 559 ff. ; and John J. Patrick, Political Socialization of American Youth: Implications for Secondary School Social Studies. Washington, D. C. : National Council for the Social Studies, Research Bulletin No. 3, 1967. See also Edgar Litt (ed.), The Political Imagination. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1969.

24 / Hess, Harvard Educational Review, op. cit. , p. 532.

25 / See Wilbur Schram, et al. , Television in the Lives of Our Children. Palo Alto, California: Stanford University Press, 1961.

26 / Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, May, 1969, pp. 49 ff.

IV. Other Agencies and Institutions Engaged in Civic Education

27 / For some other kinds of non-curricular programs in civic education, see Franklin Patterson, High Schools for a Free Society (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960) and Algernon D. Black, The Young Citizens: The Story of Encampment for Citizenship (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1962). The latter volume contains one of the rare examples of solid evaluation of a citizenship education program (pp. 292-317).

V. Civic Education in Other Developed Nations

28 / In his Village in the Vaucluse (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press), Laurence Wylie notes how French children are lectured to about the ideals of French history and civic life but how they also hear parents disparage the French government and politicians. He adds that "This is a picture of incongruity, in which the content of the formal school curriculum is probably superseded by informal learning experiences. " Although this phenomenon is hardly restricted to France, in all probability the "incongruity" between the formal curriculum and political realities is greater than in other developed countries which have basically democratic governing systems.

- 29/ See Robert F. Lawson, "Developing Democratic Attitudes in German Schools," The Journal of Education, Faculty of Education, Vancouver University, May, 1967, p. 73.
- 30/ Ibid., p. 75, 76.
- 31/ A brief bibliography of selective studies dealing with aspects of civic education in some developed countries may be of value to the reader. Paul Abramson, "The Differential Political Socialization of English Secondary School Students," Sociology of Education, Summer, 1967, pp. 246-269; George A. Beauchamp, Comparative Analysis of Curriculum Systems (Wilmette, Illinois: Koggs Press, 1964; Dennis W. Brogan, Citizenship Today: England, France, the United States (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960); John F. Cramer and George S. Browne, Contemporary Education: A Comparative Study of National Systems (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1965, 2d ed.); Willis Dixon, Society, Schools and Progress in Scandinavia (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1965); Nigel Grant, Soviet Education (Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1964); _____ Schools and Progress in Eastern Europe (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1969); W. D. Halls, Society, Schools and Progress in France (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1965); Robert J. Havighurst, Comparative Perspectives on Education (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1968); Robert D. Hess, "The Socialization of Attitudes Toward Political Authority: Some Cross-National Comparisons," Journal of International Social Science, 1963, pp. 542-559. B. Hodgetts, "Teaching of Canadian History and Civics," Canadian Educational Research Digest, December, 1967, pp. 305-311; Michael Edward Hutchinson, Education in Britain (London: H. Hamilton Press, 1966); James D. Koerner, Reform in Education: England and the United States (New York: Delacorte Press, 1968); Anthony A. Scarangelo, Progress and Trends in Italian Education (Washington, D. C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964); Walter Stahl (ed.), Education for Democracy in West Germany: Achievements, Shortcomings, Prospects (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1961); Ole D. Thompson, Some Aspects of Education in Denmark (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967); R. F. Tomasson, "From Elitism to Egalitarianism in Swedish Education," Sociology of Education, Spring, 1965, pp. 203-223; and Charles H. Whiting, "Religion and Politics in German Schools," Education Forum, November, 1967, pp. 93-96. A paper was presented to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development at the ASCD annual meeting in Chicago in March, 1969 on a major project dealing with civic education studies and assessment in seven developed countries. Its title is "A Report on the International Assessment of Civic Education and Political Socialization Patterns in Seven Nations: A Cross Cultural Survey of Political Knowledge and Attitudes,"

and its authors were Russell F. Farnen, Jr. , Sixten Marklund, and A. N. Oppenheim. The Assessment is sponsored by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Attainment, located in Hamburg, and the project is concerned with assessment in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains among students at the age of 10, 14, and 17 in the seven nations. Studies and findings under this project will yield valuable information on civic education programs in these nations.

VI. Some Implications of Civic Education in the United States for the Less Developed Nations

32 / Saul Padover (ed.), Thomas Jefferson on Democracy. New York: Mentor Books, 1946, pp. 89-90.