

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

DEFINING THE GOOD CITIZEN: THE EDUCATIONAL IDEAS AND
ACTIVITIES OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

by

Iftikhar Ahmad

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Stephen J. Thornton, Sponsor
Professor Nel Noddings

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date SEP 11 2000

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

2000

UMI Number: 9989265

**Copyright 2001 by
Ahmad, Iftikhar**

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 9989265

Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

**All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346**

© Copyright Iftikhar Ahmad

All Rights Reserved

DEFINING THE GOOD CITIZEN: THE EDUCATIONAL IDEAS AND
ACTIVITIES OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

by

Iftikhar Ahmad

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Stephen J. Thornton, Sponsor
Professor Nel Noddings

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date SEP 1 1 2000

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

2000

ABSTRACT

DEFINING THE GOOD CITIZEN: THE EDUCATIONAL IDEAS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Iftikhar Ahmad

Since its formation in 1903, the American Political Science Association (APSA) demonstrated a sporadic interest in the pre-collegiate civic education. The level of the APSA's activities pertaining to civic education in schools directly corresponds with the teleological goals of the extant paradigms in political science discipline. Three dominant paradigms are noteworthy: Traditionalism, Behavioralism and Post-behavioralism. The three paradigms find expression in the APSA's eight reports, recommendations and statements on civic education issued between 1908 and 1999. The eight documents suggest political scientists' evolving conceptions of citizenship and civic education. Of the three conceptions, i.e. Traditionalist, Behavioralist and Post-behavioralist, Traditionalist conception has been most salient in the high school social studies curriculum in the form of a formalist and legalist approach to the teaching of government. The APSA fostered its Traditionalist conception during its formative phase when political scientists' primary concern was the study of government. The fostering of the teaching of government in schools was political scientists' strategy to expand the scope of their profession and to legitimize their proprietary control over political knowledge. In this effort, the APSA authorized several committees to re-define the subject matter of

government-related courses in schools. The committees' explicit mission was to secure a mandatory status for a government course in the social studies curriculum. After the Second World War, when Behavioralism replaced Traditionalism, the APSA's activities in the pre-collegiate civic education also plummeted, only to be revived under Post-behavioralism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	5
Literature Review	6
The Purpose of the Study	13
Political Scientists' Three Conceptions of Citizenship	13
Significance of the Study	16
Definition of terms	20
Methodology	23
Scope and Limitations of the Study	27
Summary of Chapters	29
II DEVELOPMENTS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE	32
Introduction	32
Overview of the Three Phases of Political Science	32
Traditionalism of the Founding Fathers of Political Science	37
Francis Lieber	40
John Burgess	43
Woodrow Wilson	46
Frank Goodnow	49
Burgess and Goodnow: Two Orientations in Early Political Science	51
Traditionalism, Citizenship and Civic Education	53
Political Science in Colleges	58
Economics and Sociology in Colleges	59
The APSA and the Teaching of Political Science in Colleges	63
Traditionalism, the APSA, and Pre-collegiate Instruction in Government	65
The Anti-Traditionalists in the APSA	68
The Behavioralist Phase	70
Behavioralism, Citizenship and Civic Education	80
The Fall of the Behaviorist Movement	83
The Post-behavioralist Phase	85
Women, Citizenship and Political Science	88

	Post-behavioralism. Citizenship and Civic Education	93
	Conclusion	95
III	POLITICAL SCIENTISTS' STRATEGIES FOR SCHOOLS	99
	An Overview	100
	Traditionalism. Citizenship and Civic Education	102
	Report of the Committee on Instruction in Government. 1908	102
	The CIG Recommendations	109
	Problems of American Democracy	114
	Report of the Committee on Instruction. 1916	120
	The Purpose of Instruction in Government	123
	Findings of the Inquiry	124
	Report of the Committee on Instruction in Political Science, 1922	128
	Report of the Committee of Five. 1924	134
	Report of the Committee on Cooperation with NCSS (CCNCSS), 1939	136
	The CCNCSS Report	139
	Behavioralism. Citizenship and Civic Education	142
	Report of the Committee for the Advancement of Teaching, 1951	142
	Defining Citizenship	148
	Report of the Committee on Pre-collegiate Education, 1971	155
	Post-behavioralism, Citizenship and Civic Education	163
	The APSA Task Force for Civic Education, 1996	163
	The Task before the Task Force	164
	From Value-Neutrality to Democratic Values	168
	Conclusion	171
IV	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	176
	Educational Implications	187
	Women and Citizenship Education	187
	Cultural Pluralism and Citizenship Education	190
	Questions for Further Research	194

Significance of the Study	198
Final Remarks	206
References	212

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

This is a historical study of the ideas and activities of the American Political Science Association (hereinafter referred to as the APSA) in the area of social studies education. The study follows the intellectual tradition of scholars, such as Merle Curti (1959) and Glen Kinzie (1965), who examined the social and educational ideas of American educators and historians. Like the American Historical Association (AHA), which played a crucial role in laying the foundation of the social studies curriculum, as an interest group, the APSA also advanced its agenda about civic education in schools. Kinzie's examination of the role of the AHA in the development of the social studies curriculum suggests that historians held certain worldviews or conceptions about citizenship and civic education. As a fusion of courses, social studies borrows ideas from social sciences, including history and political science. In the tradition of Kinzie's research, this study seeks to examine political scientists' conceptions about citizenship and civic education by addressing four questions: (1) what was the main objective of the APSA and political scientists in fostering the teaching of government in secondary schools, (2) how have the epistemological changes in political science affected its approaches to citizenship and civic education, (3) what specific proposals and recommendations have political scientists made for curriculum and instruction pertaining to instruction in government, and (4) what conceptions about citizenship and civic education did the APSA seek to share with schoolteachers, social studies educators, and curriculum policy-makers?

Answering these questions is important because most studies of the development of social studies have failed to account for the past APSA activities in the area of the social studies curriculum. Specifically, no one has systematically investigated which concepts, such as citizenship, civic participation, democracy, and the state-citizens relations in a democracy, used by political scientists, have, if at all, influenced social studies curriculum in the schools. Since political scientists and social studies educators may seek different goals, a systematic study is required to explore points of convergence and divergence between the missions and practices of these two fields. Such a research undertaking may have implications for civic education in high schools.

Whereas political scientists have always taken pride in being theoretical and empirical social scientists pursuing political inquiry, the overarching mission of social studies in secondary schools, on the other hand, has been civic education. Nonetheless, on several occasions, political scientists have paid serious attention to civic education in the pre-collegiate settings, expressed dissatisfaction with social studies courses, and lobbied for reforms (APSA, 1908; APSA 1916; APSA, 1925; Turner, 1978; Hertzberg, 1981; Jenness, 1990; Cherryholmes, 1990; Patrick & Hoge, 1991; APSA Task Force on Civic Education, 1996; Schachter, 1998; Leonard, 1999; Bennett, 1999).

Literature Review

Researchers in several areas of academic scholarship have recognized political scientists' ideas and the APSA's activities pertaining to curricula on government and civics. Some of those researchers are political scientists in colleges and universities:

others are either curricular historians or educators in the pre-collegiate settings. Although these groups may have divergent research interests, in some form, they attempt to establish a connection between political scientists and the teaching of government in secondary schools (Tryon, 1935; Pettersch, 1953; Quillen, 1966; Turner, 1971, 1978; Shaver & Knight, 1986; Patrick & Hoge, 1991). Nevertheless, it is mostly political scientists who have chronicled the history of the activities of the APSA in influencing the social studies curriculum in secondary schools. Unlike political scientists, the social studies educators have delimited the scope of their analyses to the instructional aspect of the course on government and thereby shied away from exploring the historical and political dynamics of political scientists' ideas that are embedded in this course.

Indeed, the literature on political scientists' educational ideas and activities in the area of pre-collegiate curriculum and instruction in government may be disparate—when synthesized, two competing arguments become apparent. The first argument is presented by those who hold a sanguine view of political scientists' contributions. They argue that political scientists promoted the teaching of government in schools to prepare good citizens; they would like to see political scientists continue working with the social studies educators. I call this group the Believers. The second argument is advanced by those who question the compatibility of political science and civic education. I call this group Skeptics. Skeptics argue that since the intellectual mission of political science has been mainly limited to academic research, it is impossible for its practitioners to achieve positive results in civic education. Although both groups acknowledge political scientists' educational initiatives in schools, they disagree on the appropriateness of the contribution

they may have brought to the preparation of democratic citizens. For instance, the Believers, including Jack Allen (1966), Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus (1967), Richard Brody (1989), Hindy L. Schachter (1998), Richard G. Niemi and Jane Junn (1998), and Stephen E. Bennett (1999) affirm the educational value of political scientists' contribution to civic education. On the other hand, Bernard Crick (1959), David Ricci (1984), Mary Jane Turner (1978), Cleo H. Cherryholmes (1990), and Stephen T. Leonard (1999) consider the teaching of political science material inconsequential for democratic citizenship.

The focal point of the Believers' argument is that although the APSA's efforts in schools did not fully succeed in preparing democratic citizens, its original mission included civic education (Somit & Tanenhaus, 1967; Schachter, 1998). More importantly, some of the Believers argue that political science research and civic pedagogy in schools were compatible (Bennett, 1999, p. 755). Citing the contributions of the two Behavioralist political scientists to civic education in the pre-collegiate settings, i.e. Charles E. Merriam and Kent M. Jennings, the Believers posit that political scientists could straddle both empirical and normative missions. On the question of the educational benefits that may be derived from the teaching of a course on government in schools, the Believers argue that such a course "palpably contributes to young people's understanding of public affairs" (Bennett, 1999, p. 756). Based on these arguments, the Believers urge political scientists to lobby the state legislators to strengthen standards for certifying teachers and to declare the teaching of government mandatory in high schools.

In contrast to the Believers' sanguine view, the Skeptics characterize the political scientists' efforts pertaining to the preparation of good citizens as no more than "pure futility and waste" (Leonard, 1999, p. 749). Indeed, this argument is as old as the APSA itself. Soon after the formation of the APSA as an independent learned society in 1903, political scientist Henry Jones Ford questioned the epistemological foundation of political science for good citizenship (Ford, 1905). APSA sought to integrate its three goals, that is, the study of the state and its organs, the use of empirical methods, and the preparation of good citizens. However, in Ford's view, these three goals were incongruent. Later political scientists, historians of political science, and philosophers of education, including John Dewey (1982), William B. Munro (1928), Louis Hartz (1951), Bernard Crick, (1959), Mary Jane Turner (1978), David Ricci (1984), Evron Kirkpatrick and Jeane Kirkpatrick (1962), Cleo H. Cherryholmes (1990), and Stephen J. Leonard, (1999) echoed Ford's skepticism in the succeeding decades of the twentieth century. In essence, these authors advance the proposition that the professional prestige and reward system in the field of political science come from empirical research and not civic education. In a sense, the Skeptics argue that political scientists could not make substantial contributions to civic education in schools because it required forsaking their primary goal, which was to conduct empirical research for discovering generalizations and explaining political phenomena.

Although the insights of both Believers and Skeptics contribute to our understanding of the connection between political scientists and the pre-collegiate civic education, both camps overlook two pivotal issues. First, the proponents of the two

approaches assume political scientists to be an undifferentiated group, and in so doing, they overlook the existence of theoretical cleavages on citizenship and civic education within the APSA. Second, both perspectives consider the APSA as a learned society--they discount the possibility that the APSA may also have behaved as an interest group promoting its members' ideological agenda rather than civic education. Political scientist James Q. Wilson (2000) defines interest group as "An organization of people sharing a common interest or goal that seeks to influence the making of public policy" (p. 441). Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language defines interest group as "A group of persons having a common identifying interest that often provides a basis for action." Both definitions point to two features in interest group: (a) common interest among its members, and (b) an organized action to bring about change. The learned society, on the other hand, has been defined as an "Association of people eminent in a particular field and promoting activities designed to advance knowledge in that field" (Page & Thomas, 1977, p. 202). In the context of the APSA's activities pertaining to the promotion of government course in schools, I argue that because in the Traditionalist phase, political scientists struggled to create independent departments in colleges and universities, their advancement of knowledge about government was inextricably linked with their own self-interest. As the evidence in chapter 3 shows, in 1924 the APSA authorized a committee to lobby the state legislative assemblies concerning policies on curriculum and instruction in schools. In the first three decades of the twentieth century, the APSA's behavior towards schools was more consistent with an interest group

politicking than a learned society. Hence, both Believers and Skeptics present a flawed historical picture of political scientists' role in civic education in schools.

I also argue that in spite of the internal disagreements among political scientists about the goals of their discipline, various officially-appointed APSA committees advanced their agenda, albeit intermittently, about the pre-collegiate curriculum and instruction in government. In addition, the evidence also suggests that throughout the twentieth century, as the APSA sought to influence the pre-collegiate curriculum pertaining to the course on government, it promoted certain normative conceptions about citizenship and civic education.

More importantly, the APSA's official record indicates that in the twentieth century political scientists' interest in the pre-collegiate civic education waxed and waned. When the discipline of political science was in its early phase, political scientists took a vigorous interest in promoting the teaching of a course on government in schools. This happened within a few years after political scientists founded the APSA in 1903. They were concerned about high school students' civic knowledge before they entered colleges (APSA, 1908; Prifold, 1962, p.1). Thereafter, in a sporadic fashion, the APSA organized more committees for studying and analyzing the problems of civic education in schools, especially high schools. Those committees produced several reports, issued statements, and made recommendations for reforms in the social studies curriculum. More importantly, over the decades, as political science itself underwent several paradigmatic shifts, political scientists' views on citizenship and civic education in

schools corresponded with those shifts. Their reports manifest the main thrusts of the extant political science paradigms.

Indeed, in its quest for enhancing the status of political science, the APSA and its members faced a dilemma: on the one hand, they behaved as a learned society, and on the other hand, they acted as an interest group promoting its own professional interest. The evidence indicates that in its formative phase, the APSA engaged in activities that were motivated by self-interest rather than altruism. During the formative phase, the APSA used a myriad of tactics, including moral persuasions, alliance-formations with social organizations, organizing conferences for social studies teachers, and lobbying in state legislative assemblies across the nation. As an interest group, the APSA's primary goal was to secure a mandatory status for courses on government in the high school social studies curriculum. In this quest, the APSA presented the course on government as a quintessential component of civic education. During the formative phase, political scientists' systematic politicking and other kindred activities for promoting their interpretations of citizenship and civic education in schools is an important phenomenon in the history of the social studies curriculum. However, in the succeeding two phases, the APSA behaved more as a learned society than as an interest group; its interest in promoting the course on government in schools was gradually but significantly waned. By the late twentieth century, the APSA showed an about-face on the recommendations that its precursors had made on citizenship and civic education. In other words, by the late twentieth century, the APSA's views on civic education were no longer hinged upon instruction in government.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify salient ideas on citizenship and civic education incorporated in the APSA's reports or statements issued between 1908 and 1999. These reports and statements represent the APSA's changing worldviews and official policies concerning pre-collegiate curriculum and instruction in civic education. Moreover, these documents contain crucial information and data on the APSA's agenda and related activities concerning the teaching of a government course in schools. In addition, these documents are important because other writers on the topic, including Rolla M. Tryon (1935), Cora Prifold (1962), Jack Allen (1966, 1993), Hazel Hertzberg (1981), David Jenness (1990), Hindy Schachter (1998), Stephen Leonard (1999), and Stephen Bennett (1999) have recognized them and cited them in their work. I analyze these documents to construct a historical narrative about the APSA's changing conceptions of citizenship and civic education in the context of the pre-collegiate settings.

Political Scientists' Three Conceptions of Citizenship

My hypothesis is that the main purpose of the APSA reports, recommendations, and other related activities, was to bring the high school social studies curriculum in conformity with political scientists' conceptions of citizenship and civic education. Those conceptions varied over time from the state-centric conservative or Traditionalist model to the Behavioralist model to the post-Behavioralist model. These three conceptions of citizenship and civic education emanated from the three leading traditions or paradigms in political science: Traditionalism, Behavioralism, and post-Behavioralism. The origins

of the three paradigms will be discussed in detail in chapter 2. However, it is important to provide an overview here.

The theoretical lineage of the Traditionalist model can be traced to the work of the founding fathers of political science including Francis Lieber, Woodrow Wilson, and John W. Burgess (Ross, 1991). Informed by Hegelian philosophy of the primacy of the state, the early political scientists underscored the pivotal role of government in society, which in their view constituted of a set of “formalistic and legalistic” structures (Cherryholmes, 1990, p. 4). Their mission was therefore not simply limited to the study of the state, they were also strengthening the state by preparing an efficient administrative class. Surely, such an enterprise was not without a cost. In their state-centric worldview, the countervailing forces of a civil society were to be kept at bay. Hence, they proposed a thin and restricted form of democracy rather than a Rousseauian model of majoritarian democracy. The proponents of this view fostered a conception of citizenship in which political power was not diffused but remained in the hands of the patrician class. That is to say, in the Traditionalist framework, civic education was two-tiered: one level addressed the preparation of competent government bureaucrats whose job was to strengthen the state, and the other level focused on ordinary citizens. The purpose of civic education for ordinary citizens was to inculcate in them the virtues of patriotism, obedience and loyalty to the social order, conformity, socialization, and respect for the institutions of the nation-state. Social studies educator John Haas (1979) terms this approach to civic education Conservative Cultural Continuity; Fred Newmann (1963) calls it Consent of the Governed approach to civic education. Of the three conceptions,

this one enjoys the relatively highest popularity and longevity in the social studies curriculum in the form of a capstone course on government for senior grades.

Political scientists' second conception of citizenship and civic education is based on principles embedded in Behavioralism. Behavioralism was a research paradigm in political science that was introduced by the Chicago School in the late 1920's and early 1930's. It flourished after the Second World War and lasted until the late 1960's. As a marked departure from the Traditionalist paradigm in political science, Behavioralism celebrated positivism stressing the use of value-free methods in pursuit of regularity and law-like generalizations. In the Behavioralist conception, civic education should transmit analytical skills enabling students to conduct scientific and objective inquiry. Affective goals were less important in Behavioralism than the nurturing of a value-neutral attitude. This conception of citizenship and civic education had limited success in the social studies curriculum during the 1960's, early 1970's, and thereafter.

Political scientists' third conception of citizenship and civic education was an eclectic approach embedded in post-Behavioralism, a protest movement in the APSA during the early 1970's that challenged the supremacy of the Behavioralist paradigm. Thus, the intellectual roots of the post-Behavioralist model can be located in the works of the nonconformist and non-traditional political scientists, including women, Leftists, and members of minority groups. The post-Behavioralist model emphasizes the socially critical aspect of citizenship; citizens in this model are conceived to be skeptical of the status quo and are expected to be engaged in politically motivated action. Unlike the Traditionalist and Behavioralist models the Post-behavioralist model stresses "civic

engagement” or citizens’ active participation in the democratic process. The overriding values celebrated in this conception are social equality, pluralism, or what John Dewey called “a mode of associated living” (Dewey, 1916, p. 87). Political scientist Benjamin Barber (1984, 1989) and educator Walter C. Parker (1998) also articulate the core principles of the Post-behavioralist model of citizenship and civic education.

Political scientists’ three conceptions of citizenship and civic education can be gleaned from the APSA’s reports and activities regarding instruction in government in high schools. Although prominent social studies historians, including Rolla M. Tryon (1935) and Hazel Hertzberg (1981), have recognized political scientists’ activities in the area of instruction in government in high schools, hitherto, no scholar has conducted a study that carefully analyzes the APSA’s reports in order to identify their conceptions of citizenship and civic education. Since there is a dearth of research on this topic, this study seeks to fill important lacunae. The findings of the study will be beneficial to five groups of stakeholders: curriculum policy makers, social studies historians, textbook writers, classroom teachers, and students.

Significance of the Study

First, the findings of the study will provide curriculum policy-makers an alternative explanation of the meaning, purpose, and context of civic education in high schools. Second, the study will generate new historical data useful for social studies historians in their investigation of the roots of civic education in schools. Third, the study will illuminate for textbook writers the points of convergence and divergence between the

pedagogical goals of political science and the aims of civic education in high schools. Fourth, the study will help those high school teachers of government and civics courses who did not have the opportunity to take graduate level political science courses to become knowledgeable about the genealogy of political ideas and concepts they teach in their government and civics classrooms. Fifth, this study will hopefully help social studies educators and classroom teachers appreciate the pedagogical value of teaching and learning about citizenship.

The above-mentioned five justifications deserve examination in the context of a broader discourse on education for democratic citizenship. As the literature on civic education suggests, it appears that currently the United States faces a crisis in the area of what has been referred to as “civic engagement” (Putnam, 1995; Hahn, 1998; Cogan, 1997). Empirical researchers indicate that among youth there is a dramatic rise of apathy, a lack of civic competence, and a distrust of governmental authority (Hahn, 1998). Certainly, many factors may have contributed to the present state of passive citizenship among young people, including the commodification of everyday life, an aggressive commercial culture, rapid technological change, globalization of the capitalist economy, the popularity of the post-modernist worldview, the degeneration of community life, and the disappearing of civic values. Nevertheless, it can also be argued that since schools operate within these social, political, and economic realities, their curricula and instruction play a significant role in shaping the youth’s attitudes towards the social order (Osborne, 1993). A look at the social studies educators’ ideas and influence is necessary here.

Social studies educators generally agree that their field focuses on the social, political, and economic aspects of society. The main professional journals of social studies, Social Education, The Social Studies, and the Theory and Research in Social Education, for example, publish articles on the importance of teaching civic participation, democratic citizenship, and active citizenship in the social studies classrooms. It would be reasonable to argue that, at least in their rhetoric, the social studies professionals consider democratic and civic participation an essential component of the social studies curriculum (Shaver, 1965; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Parker, 1998). So why has civic participation in American society declined? Does the field of social studies bear any responsibility for the contemporary apathy among citizens, especially young citizens? The purpose of these questions is not to over-stretch the scope and utility of social studies but to ferret out some valid answers concerning the implications of the social studies curriculum and instruction for the education of young citizens. Perhaps a direct correlation between civic education in schools and the citizens' participation in American political life may be difficult to validate. Indeed, social scientists recognize the role of a multitude of intervening variables that impinge upon the behavior of citizens in a democracy. Nonetheless, it seems pertinent to ask what democratic values and practices high school students learn in the government course and what are the sources of the academic knowledge that is embedded in the textbooks for such a course.

Moreover, more than half of the fifty states in the United States require high school seniors to take the government course before graduation (Patrick & Hoge, 1991). The course on government, incorporating materials on the structure and function of the

American nation-state and the principles of procedural democracy, were introduced to the twelfth grade social studies curriculum after the phasing out of the Problems of Democracy course in the 1940's and 1950's. But, in various forms, courses on Civil Government had been a part of the school curriculum even before the term social studies was officially included in the education lexicon in 1916. Conceptually, the government course contains some introductory political science materials. The authorship of the past and present high school textbooks suggests that most textbooks on government are written or co-authored by political science professors. Since political scientists canonized the concepts and methods of their discipline into the high school textbooks on government, it is necessary to know their implications. What are those concepts and methods, what may be their historical and theoretical precursors, and what are some of the conceptions of citizenship and civic education embedded in the course on government? Moreover, other important questions that deserve attention are: how did these conceptions find a fertile ground in the social studies curriculum? What evidence is there to support political scientists' assumption that learning about the machinery of government in the twelfth grade social studies classroom contributes to good citizenship? These questions are pertinent and this study seeks answers for some of them.

The last three justifications mentioned are thematically related to the first two. However, they also raise somewhat different and larger issues. These issues pertain to theoretical tensions between the scientific approach to the study of politics as it has been prescribed by political scientists and the schools' normative mission of political socialization. In other words, contradictions between the pedagogical missions of political

science and social studies are so great that they create serious theoretical and practical problems for civic education in schools. As I will explain in chapter 2 and 3, historically, the main mission of political science has been the scientific study of the state and its attendant institutions. However, this mission has been at odds with the mission of the schools. This study thus seeks to identify and critique political scientists' conceptions about citizenship and civic education as incorporated in the APSA's reports, recommendations, and statements between 1908 and 1999.

Definition of Terms

Social Studies: The social studies are understood to be those subject matter that relates directly to the organization and development of human society, and to man as a member of social groups (Nelson, 1994). The National Council for the Social Studies (1994) defines social studies as:

The integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence. Within the school program, social studies provides coordinated, systematic study drawing upon such disciplines as anthropology, archeology, economics, geography, history, law, philosophy, political science, psychology, religion, and sociology, as well as appropriate content from the humanities, mathematics, and the natural sciences. The primary purpose of the social studies is to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions

for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world (p. 3).

Civic Education: Civic education is that portion of the explicitly stated and implicitly expressed curriculum of educational institutions which socializes individuals to membership in their political community (Torney-Purta, 1992). Prominent scholars, such as John J. Patrick (1976), Mary Jane Turner (1978, 1981), and Judith Torney-Purta (1986, 1992), agree that in a liberal democratic culture, civic education curriculum and instruction must concentrate on the development of students' political knowledge, intellectual skills, attitude/values, and civic participation skills. These four components have also been used as a criteria for evaluating and assessing civic education programs in the United States as well as other countries.

Citizenship: Generally, the concept of citizenship refers to the membership in a political community. Recently, however, scholars have broadened the meaning of citizenship beyond the juridical framework. Three major models of citizenship, the Traditionalist model (Ravitch, 1990, 1995; Bloom, 1987), the Behavioralist model (Almond, 1996), and Post-behavioralist model (Putnam, 1995; Parker, 1998; Barber, 1984) are salient in the literature. The Traditionalist model, which has been in existence for the longest period, has also been known by other names, including the "warrior" model (Noddings, 1992) and "conservative" model (Haas, 1979). This model stresses a citizen's patriotism and respect for political institutions. The Behavioralist model of citizenship refers to the cognitive abilities of a person. It conceptualizes a citizen as an analytically competent person. However, this model pays little attention to a citizen's patriotism and his or her

duties and responsibilities to the political community in which he or she lives. The Post-behavioralist model is distinct from both the Traditionalist and Behavioralist models in that it stresses those aspects of citizenship that were hitherto overlooked by the former two models, such as ethnic and cultural identity and gender equality. This model redefines the meaning of citizenship by minimizing the juridical aspect and underscoring the incorporation of those constituent parts that are related with identity, community, and civil society.

Political Science: The definition of political science has changed with its evolution in the twentieth century. In 1962, the American Political Science Association, an official body of the discipline, defined political science as a “basic discipline in the social sciences.” In the same statement, the ASPA delineated the objectives of its field by stating that: “Political science has its own area of human experience to analyze, its own body of discipline and factual data to gather, its own conceptual schemes to formulate and test for truth” (American Political Science Review, June, 1962, pp.417-421)

Prominent political scientist David Easton (1968), defines political science as a theoretical and empirical discipline. Brendan O’Leary (1996) defines political science as an academic discipline, devoted to the systematic description, explanation, analysis and evaluation of politics and power. Political scientists trace the historical antecedents of their field in the works of Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, and Thomas Hobbes. Is political science a science? Political scientists consider themselves social scientists because they use scientific methods of research. However, there are disagreements within the profession on the scope and methods of science.

Democracy: Democracy is a highly contested term and has been defined from numerous perspectives. The literature on democracy suggests that about nine or more theoretical models of democracy exist (Held, 1987). Each model represents a distinct ideological perspective. However, there is a consensus among scholars that the American political system is based on the Lockean liberal democratic model (Bellah, et al. 1985). For the purpose of this study, I define democracy not as a majority rule but as a pluralist social order that respects and accommodates citizens' intellectual and cultural diversity.

Methodology

To construct a coherent narrative about political scientists' educational ideas and the APSA's activities pertaining to the high school course in government, this study uses the historical method as a research tool. Indeed, other methods, including descriptive and experimental, have also been used in educational research (Van Dalen, 1973). However, the historical nature of the research questions raised in this study, as discussed above, warrant interpretation and analyses. Neither descriptive nor experimental methods serve the purpose: the former is atheoretical and the latter requires testing. Thus, the historical method seems to be the most appropriate research tool for this study.

Eminent scholars, including Louis Gottschalk (1965) and Robert Jones Shafer (1980), define the historical method as an analytical procedure involving three steps: (a) the identification and collection of relevant printed, written, and oral materials, (b) the exclusion of unauthentic materials, and (c) the organization of the authentic materials into a plausible narrative (Gottschalk, p. 28; Shafer, p. 40).

The first step includes the collection of materials from both primary and secondary sources. In this study, the primary sources included the written works of contemporary authors who were eyewitnesses to events, and the secondary sources included those authors who were not eyewitnesses to the events of which they wrote.

In order to select documents for historical analysis, I used the Columbia University library catalogues, including JSTOR, an Internet archival resource, which guided me in finding books, journal articles, and scholarly monographs on the historical development of the discipline of political science and the APSA's activities in the twentieth century. An examination of these materials and their bibliographies and footnotes, pointed towards the reports, statements, and recommendations that I selected for this study. I also examined the records of the proceedings of the APSA's meetings that were published in the APSA's official journals, such as the Proceedings, the American Political Science Review, Political Science Quarterly, and PS: Political Science and Politics. Since my research was narrowly focused on political scientists' activities pertaining to pre-collegiate curriculum and teaching in government, I selected those materials, statements and reports that addressed my research questions. Although, since its inception in 1903, the APSA issued numerous reports and statements on various subjects of a political, social and economic nature, most of them were either tangential or irrelevant to my study of political scientists' role in the pre-collegiate civic education. Hence, they were excluded from analysis.

After selecting the documents, I verified their authenticity by a process called external criticism. By using external criticism, my goal was to ensure the accuracy and

credibility of the texts and also to prepare them for analysis. This task consisted of three steps: the identification of authorship of the documents, determination of approximate date, and the identification of the sources where the documents were published. First, to establish that the documents were prepared by certain APSA committee members, I verified the identities of those members in the official APSA journals as well as through their biographical data. Confirming the authenticity of authorship of the documents was uncomplicated because all committee members, who authored the APSA reports, were well-known professional political scientists from colleges and universities, and their names frequently appeared in the political science literature. The goal of the second test was to determine the approximate dates of the documents. To administer this test required the application of a process, namely the establishment of points or parameters. The internal evidence or clues within documents pointed to the periods in which the documents were written. The third test of authenticity pertained to the sources where the documents were published. Since the documents were issued by the APSA committees, I examined the APSA's official journals to authenticate their accuracy. However, I found that all documents selected for analysis, were not published in the APSA journals. The APSA published its voluminous 1916 report The teaching of government in a book form. Similarly, the APSA's report in 1951, i.e. Goals for Political Science, was also part of a book and was not published in the APSA's journals. Nonetheless, several review articles in the APSA journals cited and discussed these reports.

Two of the eight documents were neither published in the APSA's journals, nor included in a book published by the APSA—I discovered them during my review of the

literature. Renowned scholars cited the two documents. One of those reports was issued by the Committee of Instruction in 1924 and was published in 1925 in Historical Outlook, a journal for the social studies professionals. The 1939 report of the Committee on Cooperation with NCSS was never published in any one of the APSA journals, or other professional journals, but was archived at the Rockefeller Archives Center, New York. I verified the authors, date, and the subject matter of the document and found them to be credible. Several members of the APSA, including Hindy L. Schachter (1998), also cited the 1939 report. The external criticism of the reports thus required steps, including the identification of the authors, the determination of the dates, and the verification of sources.

The language of the documents, the professional affiliation of the authors, the subject matter, and places where they were published, strongly suggest that the texts were written for those readers who were interested in pre-collegiate civic education. Such readers included curriculum policy makers, school administrators, social studies teachers, and authors of textbooks. It appears that, although, it were the APSA committees members who advanced their own professional agenda through the documents, it is not clear if their publication in the APSA journals would have accomplished their goal, which was to influence the views and opinions of the pre-collegiate education community. As discussed above, only one of the committee reports was published in Historical Outlook, a journal for social studies educators. The APSA reports and statements issued during the second half of the century were clearly intended for the political science community in universities. Although the reports and statements were on the subject of pre-collegiate

civic education, no indication is given by the authors with respect to engaging the pre-collegiate social studies educators in a dialogue. It is thus apparent that by discounting the instructional dimension of civic education, the APSA's reports and statements, issued during the second half of the twentieth century, would have hardly reached that audience whose contribution was vital for the pre-collegiate civic education project.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This historical study examines political scientists' educational ideas and the APSA's organizational activities in relation to the high school course on government. In doing so, the study uses the idea of education for democratic citizenship as a conceptual framework or an organizing principle. Within this framework, the study explores the points of convergence and divergence between the educational missions of political scientists and those of the high school social studies curricula. In the relevant literature, education for democratic citizenship is also known by other terms including civic education and citizenship education (Merriam, 1931; Butts, 1977, 1980; Torney-Purta, 1992; Patrick, 1976; Parker, 1998; Niemi & Junn, 1998). In essence, all these terms, in some form, point to one idea: the contribution of education to the development of those characteristics in a citizen that foster democratic values, such as respect for human dignity, respect for pluralism, gender equality, and what John Dewey (1916) called "a mode of associated living" (p. 87).

Indeed, there is a distinction between the concepts of citizenship and democratic citizenship. Whereas the former is a juridical concept and is closely identified with the

nation-state. the latter is a humanistic concept and transcends the boundaries of the nation-state. The concept of democratic citizenship underscores the significance of personal and identity-related dimensions of citizenship. The idea of democratic citizenship recognizes the realities and significance of the racial, ethnic, linguistic, and religious heterogeneity in American society. In relevant literature, the concept of democratic citizenship is used in the works of educators including John Dewey (1916, 1982, 1983), Benjamin Barber (1984), Iris M. Young (1989, 1990), Roberta S. Sigel and Marilyn Hoskin (1991), Walter C. Parker (1998), and James A. Banks (1997), among others.

This study thus examines political scientists' approaches to citizenship and civic education from the conceptual framework of education for democratic citizenship. An examination of the reports and statements of the APSA suggests that on several occasions in the twentieth century political scientists' articulated their conceptions of citizenship and civic education for the purpose of curricular reforms in social studies. Moreover, based on their interpretations of the needs of the society, political scientists made proposals and recommendations concerning curriculum materials, instructional methods, and teacher education for high schools. This study examines the effectiveness of those proposals and recommendations for the educational needs of students in a multicultural society.

The study concentrates on periods in which the APSA and political scientists were involved in promoting their agenda about civic education in schools. Some authors suggest that political scientists' activities in the area of civic education were at their peak

during the first three decades of the twentieth century (Tryon, 1935; Prifold, 1962; Schachter, 1998). Nonetheless, to take a full account of political scientists' educational ideas and activities, this study will analyze the APSA committee reports (eight in total) that were issued over a period of ten decades, i.e. between 1908 and 1999. All eight reports, recommendations, and statements contain political scientists' changing worldviews on citizenship and civic education. Since different APSA committees issued the reports in different historical periods, the study analyzes them against the backdrop of three specific developments in political science. Political scientists' changing educational ideas and activities concerning civic education reflect the three paradigm shifts in political science itself. The three main paradigms were Traditionalism, Behavioralism, and post-Behavioralism.

Summary of the Chapters

Chapter 2 presents the historical context by tracing the origins of American political science and chronicling its developments. The main goal of the chapter is to locate the theoretical antecedents of the three conceptions of citizenship and civic education, i.e. Traditionalism, Behavioralist and Post-behavioralism. The chapter argues that as research paradigms in political science changed, so did political scientists' conceptions of citizenship and civic education. The emergence of each conception in political science coincides with the extant paradigm of the discipline.

Chapter 3 presents the main evidence of the study, i.e. all the eight reports, recommendations and statements of the American Political Science Association issued

between 1908 and 1999. My search confirms that the APSA has not issued any other reports on pre-collegiate civic education except those that are mentioned in this chapter.

Chapter 4 provides the conclusion and two implications of the study. The chapter argues that the high school course in government represents political scientists' Traditionalist conception. Of the three conceptions, the Traditionalist conception prevailed in social studies curricula against other transient challenges. Some of the reasons for its continuity are addressed in the chapter. More importantly, the chapter suggests that the Traditionalists' insistence on the teaching of government in high schools undermined education for democratic citizenship rather than promoted it. It did so in two ways. First, in its theoretical orientation the state-centric government course has been anachronistic. By incorporating concepts and materials that are associated with the nation-state, it emphasizes the significance of the male image of autonomy, masculinity, and domination. Teaching about the primacy of such an image tantamount to promoting a paternalistic view of citizenship. Second, the Traditionalist conception of citizenship stresses the assimilationist model of civic education in a society that is culturally diverse. Indeed, the Traditionalist model is a uni-dimensional approach to civic education that certainly overlooks the social and political experiences of a large number of students attending public schools. The chapter argues that the Traditionalist component of the social studies curriculum, as it is represented in the high school course on government, is incompatible with the needs of a culturally heterogeneous society. Because the course attends to a minor aspect of citizenship, it makes an insignificant contribution to

“democratic living in a diverse society” (Parker, 1998, p. 72). The chapter also discusses the significance of this study and raises questions about future research.

Chapter II

DEVELOPMENTS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

Introduction

This chapter chronicles the developments in political science. It culls political scientists' ideas on citizenship and civic education in three historical phases: Traditionalist, Behavioralist, and Post-behavioralist. The chapter advances the proposition that although political science evolved through three historical phases in which political scientists proposed three separate conceptions of citizenship and civic education, it was the Traditionalist conception of the discipline's founding fathers that had the most enduring influence on civic education. More than the other two conceptions, Traditionalism manifested itself in the activities of the APSA that were focused on fostering government-related courses in both colleges and high schools. An examination of the trajectory of the discipline in three phases helps illuminate its pedagogical missions and elucidates political scientists' main objectives in fostering the teaching of government in schools, one of the main research questions (question 2, pp. 2-3) of this study discussed in the first chapter.

Overview of the Three Phases of Political Science

The history of American political science may be divided into three broad phases (Somit & Tanenhaus, 1967; Gunnell, 1990, 1991; Easton, 1991). The three phases are Traditionalist, Behavioralist, and Post-behavioralist. Each phase is characterized by

political scientists' assumptions about the social and political order in America. The Traditionalist phase was introduced in the late nineteenth century by the founding fathers of the discipline with the establishment of political science programs in colleges and universities (Haddow, 1939; Crick, 1959; Waldo, 1975; Gunnell, 1990, 1991). The most instrumental founders were those who studied in Germany and were influenced by the Prussian state-centered model of political science. Upon their return to the United States, the Prussian-trained American political scientists placed the nation-state "at the top as the consummation and culmination, and also the basis of all other institutions" (Dewey, 1982, p. 194). Dewey considered the rise of the state-centric approach to civic life an "industry" of which Hegel was "a striking example" (p. 194). Nonetheless, for Dewey, such deep commitment to state-centric approach was dogmatic on part of its adherents because they made the state to be "a supreme end in itself" (p. 196). Commenting on the Hegelian influence on American political scientists, John Dewey (1982) posits:

Naturally, inevitably, the students of political science have been preoccupied with this great historic phenomenon, and their intellectual activities have been directed to its systematic formulation. Because the contemporary progressive movement was to establish the unified state against the inertia of minor social units and against the ambitions of rivals for power, political theory developed the dogma of the sovereignty of the national state, internally and externally. (p. 195).

Hence, the Traditionalists' primary missions were the study of the state, the preparation of administrators for government, and the creation of a patriotic citizenry (Leonard, 1999, p. 750). Because of their innate interest in the state, they considered the teaching of

government in both colleges and school their central obligation. Moreover, the Traditionalists founded the APSA in 1903, which for several decades made systematic efforts to foster the teaching of government-related courses in schools. Describing the academic background of the APSA founders, Peter Manicas (1987) suggests that “almost half those holding positions in the American Political Science Association had been German-trained” (p. 219). The mission of the German-trained Traditionalist scholars was the “Americanization of political science” (Manicas, 1987, p. 219). It is particularly notable that the Traditionalist perspective in the APSA considered the teaching of government as political science education. Indeed, it was this legacy, which continued for decades in the high school social studies curricula of most states. Some critics identified the legacy as the “conservative cultural continuity” (Haas, 1979, p. 151).

Recognizing traditionalism as the core value of political science, historian Dorothy Ross (1991) argues that “The discipline of [political science] entered the 1920s with its conservative traditionalism still visible” (p. 448). Ross’s study suggests that, in comparison with other social sciences, political science was relatively slower in recognizing and embracing social and scientific change. The discipline of psychology, for example, was well ahead of political science in incorporating scientific methods in its research. It was therefore psychology that Charles E. Merriam of the University of Chicago emulated and urged his fellow political scientists to follow its methods. Merriam took over the presidency of the APSA in 1925. Merriam sought to steer the political science discipline away from Traditionalism and towards science. Nonetheless, since most APSA members were trained in Traditionalism, Merriam’s ascendancy to power did

not shake the old school entirely. Inspired by advances made in the sister social sciences, especially psychology and sociology, Merriam sought to introduce the social science research methods into political science; psychology was Merriam's "chief interest and his scientific Trojan horse" (Ross, 1991, p. 452). Merriam's insistence on the use of the social science research methods was a repudiation of the comparative-historical method heretofore used by Traditionalists.

In the mid-1920's, Merriam inaugurated the Behaviorist phase. However, the Behaviorist movement gained popularity only after the Second World War. Behaviorist political scientists parted ways with Traditionalism by curtailing their professional commitment to the study of the state and the fostering of the teaching of government in schools. Unlike Traditionalists, who emphasized the teaching of government, Behaviorists undertook the task of making political science a genuine science by emulating the methods of natural sciences. In their pursuit of achieving scientific rigor through empirical testing, Behaviorists' took a scant interest in normative activities, such as the education of democratic citizens. As a research paradigm, Behaviorism later gained a small amount of respect among the high school social studies textbook writers. Several textbooks for senior grades, including The American Political Behavior by Howard D. Mehlinger and John J. Patrick (1972), incorporated the Behaviorist conception.

By the late 1960's, the Behaviorist perspective was less appealing to certain dissident groups within the APSA. Leftists, feminists and members of the racial minority groups in the APSA challenged the positivist mission of the Behaviorist paradigm. This

internal revolt in the APSA ushered political science into an amorphous third phase, i.e., Post-behavioralism, which continued into the late twentieth century.

In the post-Behavioralist phase, i.e. from the early 1970's till the end of the century, the APSA took two positions with regard to civic education in schools. First, since 1975, due to the lack of consensus within the APSA, it decided to abstain from approving any specific curriculum standards or textbooks on civics or government (Mann, 1996, p. 47). Second, by the end of the twentieth century, a new and optimistic mood in the APSA emerged toward civic education. Unlike the century-old Traditionalists' pre-occupation with the teaching of government, the Post-behavioralists were raising a different set of questions about civic education. The APSA re-defined citizenship and civic education. The APSA Task Force on Civic Education for the Twenty First Century (hereinafter referred to as Task Force) declared that the teaching of the structure and function of government was no longer an effective tool for preparing democratic citizens. More importantly, unlike its predecessors, i.e. Traditionalists and Behaviorists, the Post-behavioralists emphasized a normative approach to civic education. This included the teaching of skills for civic engagement and respect for cultural diversity in American democracy. Indeed, of the three conceptions, the Post-behavioralist conception may be characterized as relatively more progressive and relevant approach to the preparation of caring, thoughtful, and democratic citizens.

Traditionalism of the Founding Fathers of Political Science

Traditionalism, a conservative theoretical framework, is concerned with the study of the state. Traditionalism is also known by other expressions, including realism, conservatism, and state-centeredness. In the late nineteenth century, four individuals with Traditionalist orientations set the stage for institutionalizing political science as an academic discipline: Francis Lieber, Woodrow Wilson, John W. Burgess, and Frank J. Goodnow. Each one of these luminaries contributed in a major way to the development of political science. Lieber was the first scholar who assumed a faculty position as a professional political scientist at Columbia College. Wilson was the first elected vice president of APSA in 1904, a position he declined, but served the same organization as its fourth president several years later. Burgess was a political scientist who founded the School of Political Science at Columbia College in 1880. Goodnow, a professor of Administrative Law at Columbia University, was elected as the first president of APSA in 1903 and was a close associate of Burgess at Columbia College.

A common passion of the four scholars was their commitment to the study of the state. Political science to them was *staatswissenschaft*, or the science of the state, an idea that Francis Lieber incorporated into political science and was also later discovered by American students in the late nineteenth century when they studied at German universities (Haddow, 1939; Brown, 1950; Crick, 1959; Somit & Tanenhaus, 1967, Ross, 1991). This idea reified the state into an entity that was higher than society and its members. In the state-centered conceptual scheme, citizens paid their allegiance to the state and in return derived from it their rights and privileges.

Moreover, all founding fathers of political science were academicians fascinated by the concept of the state. They all considered the state a historical reality warranting a careful and systematic study. They perceived their work to be more than an exercise in speculative philosophy—for them the study of the state was a scientific enterprise. Moreover, for them the subject matter and method of political science differentiated it from history and other social sciences; political science was a distinct field of study. Because they viewed human affairs from the prism of the state, their approach to social, political and economic issues may be called state-centric.

From their perspective, the state was an extraordinary and most vital institution. The historical and essential function of the institution of the state was to provide protection for citizens against external aggression. They considered the state to be a ubiquitous and an omnipresent creature worthy of adulation. Since, in their view, the state was a timeless entity, its significance transcended other transient human organizations or parochial interests. The government formed the nucleus of the state. They considered learning about the machinery of government essential for citizenship and civic education. It is evident from their ideas and activities that their intellectual energies were invested mainly in achieving one specific goal: the strengthening of the institution of the state. Indeed, theirs was a conservative enterprise.

At least two of these individuals, Lieber and Burgess, belonged to that class of American scholars who had studied political science in Germany (Merriam, 1925). This is not to suggest, however, that before the arrival of the German-trained American scholars the state had never been theorized about in a systematic fashion in the United

States. James Madison's "Federalist No.10." which proposed the theory of interest groups, may be designated as the seminal empirical approach to the study of the state in America. Madison's analysis of politics was empirical in that he stressed "the evidence of known facts" and jettisoned speculation by "theoretic politicians" (Madison, 1787). What was remarkable about the German-trained American political scientists, however, was their commitment to establish separate academic programs for the systematic study of the state. Initially, the goals of the programs included the preparation of bureaucrats for the government (Leonard, 1995, p. 77). Programs in political science at Johns Hopkins and Columbia Universities were two such examples.

In the late nineteenth century, the term political science was not very popular in the United States or elsewhere in the Western world (Crick, 1959). Perhaps one or two colleges may have offered political science as a course. Separate textbooks on political science were rarely published. In 1877, Theodore Dwight Woolsey, a disciple of Lieber, and the President of Yale University, authored a textbook, Political Science: Or, the State Theoretically and Practically Considered. It is probable that Woolsey's book may have been the first systematic study of the state by an academician that was used as a textbook. In Encyclopedia Americana, James Garner noted that Woolsey's textbook was a "systematic presentation of the principles of political science which has appeared from the pen of an American" (cited in Haddow, 1939, p. 241). This suggests that in the late nineteenth century, political science was a newly introduced academic discipline for the study of the state, having its own peculiar language, theories, principles, and methods that were different from fields like economics, history, or law (Somit & Tanenhaus, 1967;

Waldo, 1975). Leonard D. White (1993) maintains that “in 1900 there were in the United States not more than 100 men and women who would recognize themselves professionally as political scientists” (p. 223). White also suggests that “The hand of German scholarship was still heavy upon our ‘infant industry’” (p. 224). Indeed, this was not the case with other social sciences, such as sociology and economics. This point is discussed later in the chapter.

Francis Lieber

Of the four founding fathers, Lieber, a Prussian émigré, was the first scholar to introduce political science into the United States. Lieber arrived in the United States in 1827 and developed friendship with Whig Boston elites. In the early 1830s, when a young French aristocrat, Alexis de Tocqueville, visited the United States, Lieber was one of the scholars with whom he exchanged ideas about American democracy. The two held conflicting views about the American social order (Ross, 1991, p. 41). Whereas Lieber’s worldview was state-centric, Tocqueville’s Democracy in America documented the presence of a strong civil society in American political system.

Examining Lieber’s scholarly influence on academia, Ross (1991) argues that “Exploiting the resonances between German understanding of the state and American Whig culture, Francis Lieber forged a lasting link between the two in American political science” (p. 38). Hence, the construction of a seminal state-centric theoretical framework of American political science can be attributed to Francis Lieber. Lieber’s state-centricism fostered counter-majoritarian vision of citizenship in the political science

discipline. The focal point of Lieber's vision of citizenship was "the Whig tradition of limited democracy" (Ross, p. 258). Ross illustrates the prevalence of Lieber's counter-majoritarian conservative approach in political science by citing J. Franklin Jameson, a student at Johns Hopkins University. Jameson wrote in his diary that "Every political meeting I have attended has had the same effect, to shatter my rising respect for the people, in their political capacity, and make me despise them" (Ross, p. 259). Jameson's academic training in Lieberian political science shows the discipline's orientation toward limited public participation in the political process.

Lieber's Civil Liberty and Self Government (1853) earned him the Chair of History and Political Science at Columbia College in 1858. In his inaugural address, Lieber (1858) not only explained the purpose of political science in American society but also articulated his conception of citizenship, civic education, and social order from his state-centric Traditionalist worldview. Lieber stressed three points. First, he argued that self-government for citizens was derived exclusively from the state. Second, public schools should teach the young about liberty, justice, and political truth. And finally, Lieber declared communism and extreme individualism as utopian because they ignored the realities of the role of the state in the lives of citizens.

According to Lieber, "Man cannot divest himself of the state" (Lieber, 1880, in Farr and Sideman, 1993, p.22). The state was a reality; citizens owed their liberty and rights to the state. Rights and obligations did not exist outside the state. It was thus incumbent upon citizens to respect the supreme status and authority of the state. Citizens would do so by being patriotic. According to Lieber, patriotism was a positive virtue

entailing the love of one's country but not the hatred of others. Patriotism also required the fostering of individual liberty, justice, and truth in politics. Lieber asserted that it was thus necessary for public schools to teach children about the values of liberty, justice and truth. In other words, the essential components of Lieber's conception of citizenship and civic education were the values of liberty, justice, and truth. The notions of individual liberty and justice were, of course, not new concepts and had been part of the Western philosophical discourse for centuries. The idea of truth in politics was certainly a new addition to the discourse. Lieber defined "truth in politics" as statistical facts about political life; that is to say, citizens needed to be knowledgeable on political issues. For Lieber, the scientific analysis of politics demanded facts. Science was thus considered a tool for discovering truth about public life and hence for strengthening good citizenship. In order to preserve liberty and justice, citizens needed to know the truth. Lieber characterized political science as "the very science for nascent citizens of a republic" (Lieber, 1881, vol. 1, p. 343). According to Lieber, the teaching and learning of good citizenship values in schools were made possible by the use of the scientific approach to political life. By this, he meant that unless citizens were familiar with the statistical facts, they could not make intelligent political decisions. In other words, to achieve true individual liberty and justice, citizens needed to learn the principles of political science. Hence, for Lieber, the public school was the most important place for the teaching of political science.

John W. Burgess

John William Burgess founded the School of Political Science at Columbia College in 1880. The year 1880 symbolizes the formal birth of political science (Waldo, 1975). Burgess had studied law at the University of Berlin and was influenced by the Hegel's conservative philosophy. Under Burgess's leadership, the School of Political Science attracted some of the best scholars in political science. Historian James Harvey Robinson and political scientists William A. Dunning, and Herbert Osgood, were some of Burgess's colleagues at Columbia. By 1900, Columbia offered one of the most rigorous programs in political science in the United States, also sowing the seeds for the Traditionalist paradigm in the field. Ross (1991) suggests that "The atmosphere was especially conservative at Columbia, under John W. Burgess" (p. 259).

Burgess was a strong proponent of conservatism, nationalism, and the racism. Writing in the Hegelian tradition, Burgess sought to apply the German concepts of the state, sovereignty, and citizenship, to American conditions. According to Burgess, the state was a Western concept. It was the "product of the progressive revelation of the human reason through history" (Burgess, 1890, p. 50). This suggests that history had rendered the prior forms of human organization as obsolete. The state was an expression of human rationality and it was here to stay. In his Philosophy of Right, Hegel had defined the state as a "divine will as a present spirit" (Hegel, 1949, p. 240-241). Hegel's definition suggests that the state's will precedes the will of the people. The state was sovereign and had an absolute power that could not be challenged. In agreement with Hegel, Burgess posited that "...we must hold to the principle that the state can do no

wrong” (Burgess, 1890, p. 50). Burgess’s ideas favoring the hegemony of the state were certainly unrestrained. His vision of the state bordered on tyranny. He was an apologist for an uncontrolled Leviathan.

As an ultra-nationalist, Burgess advocated the superiority of the Teutonic race. In Burgess’s view, the Teutonic race was superior to the Slavonic and Roman races because it was “particularly endowed with the capacity for establishing nation states, and are especially called to work; and therefore, they are entrusted, in the general economy of history, with the mission of conducting the political civilization of the modern world” (Burgess, 1909, p. 22).

Burgess was a self-proclaimed racist and imperialist who argued that the state had the right to protect its distinctiveness by selecting its immigrants on the basis of race. He recommended that all immigration of Czechs, Hungarians, and Italians be cut off because they were inclined to anarchy and crime. In his view, the immigrants from South Eastern Europe were socialists and atheists and not suitable for the American society (Burgess, 1895). He suggested that America perfect its political civilization with a Teutonic population, and not “pollute” itself with non-Teutonic people. For Burgess, because the Teutonic race had the best mental attitude for democratic systems of government, it should colonize the rest of the world so that barbarians may be taught rights and duties (Burgess, 1896). Later in his Reminiscences of an American Scholar, Burgess (1934) admired Lieber’s Political Science and Comparative Law by noting:

I would say that the book represents the Teutonic nations—the English, French, Lombards, Scandinavians, Germans and North Americans—as the great modern

nation builders, that it represents the national State, that is, the self-conscious democracy, as the ultima Thule of political history; that it justifies the temporary imposition of Teutonic order on unorganized, disorganized, or savage people for the sake of their own civilization and their incorporation in the world society; that it therefore justifies the colonial system of the British Empire especially; that it favors federal government, and finally, that it extols above everything the system of individual immunity against governmental power formulated in the Constitution of the United States and upheld and protected by the independent judiciary. (pp. 254-55).

From the above statement, it appears that Burgess admired Lieber as a fellow imperialist. In Burgess's view, imperialism was not only desirable; it was historically inevitable and morally defensible. Indeed, according to Burgess, imperialism was the only panacea for saving the non-White populations of the world from self-destruction. Burgess's statement implies that since the non-White peoples of the world were barbaric, imperialism would bring about social change by introducing law and order through the administrative machinery of the nation-state.

Burgess's imperialist worldview about traditional societies contains erroneous assumptions, however. Both Lieber and Burgess formed their opinions about the non-European cultures on the basis of their Euro-centric perspective, rather than on some verifiable data. Moreover, one may raise the question: Is it the administrative structure of a state system alone that makes people civilized? In their reductionist framework, it seems that for Lieber and Burgess, the state was the sole civilizing agent and that, without

invoking the state and its attendant machinery, societies suffered from anarchy and chaos. They suggest that it was due to the absence of the state system that non-European societies were disorganized. In his statement, Burgess extols organized governments in European societies. He also prescribes the same for the non-European societies. Nonetheless, as Charles Tilly (1975) has argued, the creation of the nation-state system in Europe was a process of social transformation involving massive depredation, violence, and bloodshed. That is to say, the creation of the nation-state in Europe was hardly a picnic. Burgess failed to realize that as a European construct the notion of the nation-state system might not be universally applicable. Indeed, what appealed to Burgess in the idea of the nation-state was its organizational aspect, i.e. its core values of order and stability.

Nonetheless, it was on the basis of race that Burgess supported the idea of imperialism. In his view, American imperialism was justified because the higher civilization of the United States must be shared with the backward peoples. In short, Burgess Americanized Rudyard Kipling's theory of the White Man's Burden urging the European race to colonize non-European people and their lands. In his scheme, the nation-state was simply an efficient mechanism that facilitated the White Man's paternalistic domination over the indigenous population of the non-European societies.

Woodrow Wilson

Wilson held a prominent place in the political science community. He was elected as the fourth president of APSA. His works on "leadership" and the science of "administration" were seminal contributions to research on the study of the state (Wilson,

1885, 1887, 1889). By the late nineteenth century, Wilson's Congressional Government: A Study of American Politics (1885) was one of the most popular works in political science. It was reprinted eighteen times. Wilson's thesis was that government by Congress was a menace and therefore the President should be more powerful than a bunch of bickering politicians in the House and Senate (Wilson, 1885).

In Wilson's view, the public was unruly and incapable of governing themselves and, hence, their participation in the decision-making process had to be restricted. Wilson's restricted conception of American democracy and citizenship was thus at odds with the majoritarian nature of Jeffersonian democracy.

For Wilson, the most important purpose of political science was the strengthening of the state. Hence, he stressed the importance of the study of "administration" in political science (Wilson, 1887). Through the discipline of political science Wilson sought to create a class of professional civil servants who would conduct the affairs of the state in a business like manner and who were not easily swayed by their transitory passions. It appears that for Wilson, the American government was inherently a modern entity which was qualitatively different from other forms of governments, like monarchies. His argument was that the modern age was defined by specialization. The state, being a modern organization, needed a specialized and rational class of individuals for whom the state interest preceded other subjective interests. Conceptually, Wilson's perspective on the needs of a modern state was close to Hegel's ideas about the creation of a disinterested universal class. The members of the disinterested universal class are professional bureaucrats who dedicate their lives to the service of the state machinery.

Indeed, like other political scientists of his generation, Wilson's ideas were also shaped by the German idealist social philosophy whose teleological goal was "to provide a bulwark for the maintenance of the political *status quo* against the tide of radical ideas coming from revolutionary France. Although Hegel asserted in explicit form that the end of states and institutions is to further the realization of the freedom of all, his effect was to consecrate the Prussian [S] tate and to enshrine bureaucratic absolutism" (Dewey, 1982, p.188). Thus, Wilson justified a pivotal role for a strong bureaucracy that was committed to the strengthening of the state.

Indeed, the overarching theme in Wilson's writings is the primacy of the state. This is not to suggest that all of Wilson's writings centered on this theme. Nonetheless, as a political scientist as well as a contributor to the popular press, his undivided attention seems to be focused on questions related to the state and the concomitant issues of government and administration. It appears that by paying a disproportionate amount of attention to the interests of the state, Wilson inevitably, and perhaps deliberately, relegated a secondary status to fundamental values, such as freedom, democracy, justice and equality, in his political writings. As a politician and a world statesman, Wilson had unquestionably championed the liberal causes of democracy and self-determination for millions of people. However, his inordinate level of celebration of the state and an unwavering faith in it as a panacea for human progress certainly eclipsed his commitments to liberal causes. For Wilson, the state was represented by government and the essential characteristic of government was "force" (Wilson, The State, p. 29. [cited in Padover]). In Wilson's view, "Government, in its last analysis, is organized force" ([cited

in Padover], p. 29). The state was thus conceived in a masculine, dominant, autonomous, and intrusive form that was different from civil society which was conceived as having feminine characteristics. In contrast with the state, the civil society in this conception was understood to be holding a subordinate position that needed protection by the state.

Frank J. Goodnow

As the first elected APSA president, Goodnow's ideas represented the official mission of professional political scientists. In his inaugural address to APSA members in 1904, Goodnow articulated the organization's aims and agenda. He declared that political science dealt with a subject that other "American scientific associations" had ignored. That subject was the "state." According to Goodnow, "Political science is that science which treats of organization known as the state. It is at the same time, so to speak, a science of statics and a science of dynamics. It has to do with the State at rest and with the State in action" (Goodnow, 1904, p. 37).

Goodnow argued, "the American Historical Association had treated the state incidentally" (Goodnow, 1904, p. 36). Moreover, in Goodnow's view, the members of the American Historical Association who studied the state at all, had focused only on the states of the past and not the states in the contemporary era. Hence, the study of the state and its functions was the responsibility of the APSA members. Similarly, Goodnow argued that the members of the American Economic Association dealt with the state but only when it concerned the administration of the tax collection system. Professional economists were interested in the study of production and distribution of goods. They

hardly studied the organization of government, the policy-making process, and the distribution of power in various branches of government. Goodnow pointed out that, like the American Historical Association, the American Economics Association, other professional associations also did not study the structure and function of the state. Goodnow thus drew a line of demarcation between political science, history and economics, its two most formidable competitors in the academic marketplace.

An adherent of pragmatism, Goodnow was less interested in abstract theories than in their practical applications. He had carved out for himself a separate niche in the discipline of political science known as public administration earning for him the title of the founding father of the sub-field of public administration in political science. For Goodnow, the goal of political science was the study of the state in three aspects: (1) the expression of the will of the state, (2) the content of the will of the state, and (3) the execution of the will of the state. The first referred to political action by parties, the second the legal system, and the third was related to the enforcement of law (Goodnow, 1900). It appears that Goodnow had emphasized the primacy of the will of the state; little is mentioned in Goodnow's framework about the citizens' will. Perhaps he may have identified the citizens' will with the will of the state. On the other hand, perhaps, he did not see a conflict between the two because in law making, political parties represented the will of the people.

Burgess and Goodnow: Two Orientations in Early Political Science

John William Burgess and Frank Johnson Goodnow, the two major founding fathers of American political science, represented divergent orientations in the discipline. Dorothy Ross (1991) classifies the two orientations as “Hegelianism” and “realist historicism” respectively (pp. 71, 274-275). Hegelians were those who believed that the state was the product of the progressive revelation of human reason through history and that liberty could be attained only through the institutions of the state (Ross, 1991, p. 71). From his Hegelian perspective, Burgess had declared that the modern nation state was the creation of Teutonic political genius and that social change could not affect this fundamental principle (Ross, p. 72). For Burgess, the American political system was simply a historical continuation of the legacy of the Teutonic races. Goodnow refuted Burgess’s thesis of Teutonic nations’ contributions and instead focused his attention on the study of the technical realities of municipal government. Goodnow was a “historical realist” in that he studied the role of political parties, administration, and city government...issues that older political scientists considered less significant for study (Ross, 1991, P. 274). Like other historical realists, Goodnow was interested in the realistic analysis of public institutions and not in idealistic speculation.

Goodnow was Burgess’s student at Amherst and Columbia, but developed major ideological disagreements with his teacher on fundamental theoretical questions. The two also worked as colleagues at the Faculty of Political Science at Columbia University. John D. Millett (1955) posits that Burgess and Goodnow were giants of American scholarship in the early development of graduate study in the field of government; they

gave Columbia its distinctive reputation (p. 259). Although the two scholars were Traditionalists in that they studied the state, Goodnow's worldview was also influenced by the Progressive movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Unlike Burgess, who stressed the continuation of the Anglo-Saxon heritage in political and social values, the future-oriented Goodnow sought to bring about reforms in municipal and national governments. Whereas Burgess's Hegelian approach to political science stressed historical analysis, Goodnow sought to draw political scientists' attention to the need for municipal reforms. Moreover, while Burgess's theoretical perspective emanated from his historicist thesis about the reconstruction of the past, Goodnow moved beyond the "gentry conception of fixed American principle," and argued his case for making political science relevant to political realities of the time (Ross, 1991, p. 283).

On the question of women's education in universities, whereas little is known about Goodnow's views, Burgess was quite vocal on the subject: He vehemently opposed women's enrollment in the department of political science at Columbia. In his view, women caused distraction for men and therefore did not belong in the political science classrooms. Because Burgess disliked coeducation, on one occasion, he also clashed with Seth Low, the president of Columbia University (Hoxie, 1955, p. 64). When President Low allowed women to audit courses, Burgess wrote a letter to Low noting that "the admission of ladies would be a disturbing element" (Burgess, 1892, in Hoxie, et al. 1955, p. 65). He did not, however, oppose the establishment of a separate college for women.

Unlike Burgess, who repudiated social change, Goodnow's ideas and work may be characterized as progressive in orientation. Goodnow was also an activist reformer

who worked closely with revisionist historian Charles A. Beard. In 1903, when Goodnow launched the American Political Science Association, Burgess ignored Goodnow's efforts and the activities of the new organization.

Traditionalism, Citizenship and Civic Education

It is evident from the writings of the four founding fathers of political science that they espoused a state-centric Traditionalist political philosophy. Indeed, in the context of liberal democracy, such conception had implications for citizenship and civic education. That is to say, the Traditionalists' ideological influence over the APSA's activities in the pre-collegiate settings manifested itself in the form of curricular recommendations for the government course. In addition, because their Traditionalism echoed the past state-centric conservative voices of Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, and Hegel, they considered the state to be the highest form of human organization. This meant that they emphasized the conflictual dimension of human nature. In other words, Traditionalists celebrated the state because it ensured social order, a value that seemed to have outweighed their other values. Because for an extended period the APSA continued the state-centric legacy, it promoted a paternalist conception of citizenship and civic education. Such a conception portrayed stereotypical gender images, including "toughness, courage, power, independence" (Tickner, 1992, p. 6). Feminist political scientist J. Ann Tickner (1992) suggests that these virtues essentially valorize "hegemonic masculinity" and hardly convey the women's experiences (p. 58). Susan Moller Okin (1998) posits that political scientists' traditional theories about citizenship stressed the public virtues of citizens and

ignored the domestic virtues of civic life (in Philips, 1998, p. 117). That is why, Traditionalist political science not only ignored women's role in the political community, they also excluded them from the academic profession (Ross, 1991, p. 102). Indeed, such a conception of women found a green pasture in schools in the form of the APSA's support for a course on government. It would be safe to assume that when education philosopher Nel Noddings (1991) characterizes traditional civic education curriculum as the "warrior model," she refers to the ideological framework of social studies that includes the state-centric high school course on government (p. 69).

Furthermore, the political scientists' over-emphasis on the state and state organization, the government, bureaucracy, and administration, presented a prescription that was antithetical to the American values of equality, cultural diversity, and a traditional commitment to civil society. In the Traditionalist conception of citizenship and civic education, respect for the state and its organs loomed large. In their conception, the interests of the state overshadowed the interests of individuals, families and communities.

Like Machiavelli and Hobbes, the founding fathers of political science conceived man as quarrelsome, untrustworthy, greedy, and incapable of living in cooperation with others. Their antidote to this problem was that man must be managed, controlled, and made beholden to an entity that was sovereign, efficient, and secular. This entity would use "force" to purge dissent and ensure social order. In essence, then, this entity was to be no other than the Hobbesian Leviathan or what Richard F. Biesel (1990) has called the Yankee Leviathan. Thomas Hobbes, the first English political philosopher of the

seventeenth century, had argued that in the state of nature, life was nasty, brutal, and short. Dissatisfied with the state of nature, men surrendered part of their liberty to a sovereign in exchange for peace and order. Hobbes called this sovereign the Leviathan. This is not to imply that the founding fathers of political science espoused totalitarianism or authoritarianism. They had simply operationalized their state-centric framework within liberal democracy. However, their ideas can be located on the conservative side of the ideological continuum because they favored a thin or restricted model of democracy in which citizens would enjoy limited access to decision-making and decision-makers. In their theoretical framework, citizenship is inconceivable without the state. That is to say, the citizens must accept the authority of the state as an overarching power and an inescapable reality.

Indeed, in their juridical interpretation of citizenship, there probably would be no place for what John Dewey called “a mode of associated living, a conjoint communicated experience.” (Dewey, 1916, p. 87). Unlike the Traditionalist conception of citizenship, Dewey’s humanistic conception of citizenship transcended the territorial boundaries of the state. Although Dewey did not reject entirely the significance of the political dimension of citizens’ lives, he found the state-centric approach to citizenship education less effective. Dewey refutes “the idea of the subordination of the individual to the institution” of the state (p. 99). In this context, Dewey (1983) argued that, “We think of the citizen in a political capacity, and sometimes we restrict the idea of being a good citizen to the political relations, duties and responsibilities of the person, his relations to the government of the country as a whole and to his local government. I think that is only

a part of good citizenship” (p. 158-159). Surely, learning about the “simple paper knowledge of the government” is “a just a paper preparation” for citizenship (Dewey, 1983, pp. 160-161). For Dewey, the idealization of political institutions diverts students’ attention from understanding the forces that operate behind the functioning of the government. In other words, it is erroneous to assume that instruction about the “machinery” of government produces good and intelligent citizens. Dewey was highly critical of limiting civic education to instruction in American Constitution and the machinery of government. Dewey (1983) noted that, “So we think when we have given information to the students about the structure and workings of the government, we have somehow done our part as educators in preparing them to be good citizens when they enter into public life: to become actual citizens when they go out from the school in the future” (p. 160).

For Dewey, democracy, or citizens’ “associated living” is a countervailing force against the coercive qualities of the state. In educational context, Dewey’s “associated living” is a concept that rejects paternalism, cultural hegemony of one ethnic group or gender over the others; it respects social heterogeneity and pluralism (pp. 87, 94).

Indeed, the founding fathers of political science held a thin or restricted view of democracy. Their view of democracy was one that put less emphasis on “associated living,” “conjoint communicated experience” and the “breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory” (Dewey, p. 87). They considered such activities and ideas as perilous for the American republic.

Whereas the Deweyan idea of “associated living” stresses civic participation and community life as the Rosetta stone of democracy, the restricted or thin view of democracy limits peoples’ true participation in civic life. Wilson had suggested in 1887 that political thinkers had spent two thousand years addressing the problem of who should make basic decisions for society. In Wilson’s view, such decision-makers were not the citizens but the administrative class of the state. According to Wilson (1887), “administration is the most obvious part of government; it is government in action; it is the executive, the operative, the most visible side of government, and is of course as old as government itself” (p. 198). Referring to this framework, Dewey (1983) argued that, we “leave the students with a feeling that they really did not have to solve problems; that the problems were solved by the officers of our government and the makers of our Constitution; so that all they have to do is to vote for a good man and attend, perhaps, caucuses” (p. 160). Hence, in Wilson’s state-centric conception of democracy, citizens seem to play a minimalist role in political decision-making.

The writings of Traditionalist political scientists hardly offer any prescription pertaining to the benefits of citizens’ active participation in civil society or how citizens could realize the good life in a participatory democracy. More importantly, it is the Traditionalist conception of the founding fathers of political science that provided the epistemological foundation to the APSA, which guided its campaign for canonizing the teaching of government in the high school social studies curriculum.

Political Science in Colleges

Most historians agree that political science was first formally introduced in academia in 1880 by John Burgess (Merriam, 1925; Haddow, 1939; Somit & Tanenhaus, 1967; Waldo, 1975). In addition to Burgess's School of Political Science at Columbia College, soon, the Johns Hopkins University and the University of Michigan also began offering advanced level courses in political science. The Columbia and Johns Hopkins programs became leaders in political science instruction, however. The two programs emulated the German university model by stressing independent research and discouraging philosophical speculation. Moreover, for research, both schools had borrowed the historical-comparative method from German Universities. Although this method was not empirical, it was still considered scientific. The historical-comparative method was used in the study of foreign governments, especially European governments.

The period between 1880 and 1920 was a formative phase for political science in that its identity as a discipline was shaped. During this period, the American Political Science Association was organized as a professional body. During this period, major research publications including the APSA's Proceedings and The American Political Science Review were launched in which scholars in political science published their research (William Anderson, in Haddow, 1939).

By the turn of the century, the number of colleges and universities offering political science and the number of students enrolled in such courses were unknown. However, since the discipline itself was new, it may be assumed that few colleges offered political science as a course. In 1900, the number of "individuals recognizing themselves

as professional political scientists hardly exceeded one hundred" (White, 1950, p. 13). In 1903, all those who parted ways with the American Historical Association and formed the American Political Science Association as a separate entity, were not necessarily professional political scientists (Proceedings, 1905). Fifty years later, there were four thousand political scientists teaching in colleges and working in other fields and most of them were APSA members. In the 1950's, about ten regional political science associations had been founded.

From 1902 to 1910, 54 degrees were conferred by six leading American graduate schools. Between 1911 and 1920, approximately 125 Ph.D. degrees in political science were granted by 13 graduate schools. In the 1920's, 296 Ph.D. degrees were granted. Most of those who earned Ph.D. degrees sought positions as instructors in colleges. The rapid progress in graduate studies in political science suggests a growing demand for courses in political science. Leonard White indicates that in the 1950's, political science was taught in secondary schools (White, 1950). Three factors point to the growth in college enrollment and demand for political science faculty: (1) the influence of progressivism, (2) the role of government in public life, and (3) faith in science.

Economics and Sociology in Colleges

A brief comparative historical analysis of the developments in social sciences suggests that by the late nineteenth century, when industrialization and modernization were making inroads into American society, liberal and secular ideas were also taking hold. It was during this period that social sciences, mainly political science, sociology and

economics, also flourished in academia. Bellah, et al. (1985) argues that developments in the social science disciplines were triggered by the new model of higher education that grew “contemporaneously with the rise of the business corporation” (p. 299). Because the social science disciplines focused on the study of government, the economic system, and society, they were not immune from the major social questions of the time. Hence, the ideological polarization in society also found a fertile ground in academia. Ross (1991) characterizes this development as “the threat of socialism” (p. 98). Of the three disciplines, economics, formerly known as political economy, was already an established academic discipline in American colleges (Tryon, 1935; Ross, 1991). For many decades, political economy was mostly taught as moral philosophy. However, as the demands of the industrial-corporate society were increasing, traditional curricula in colleges were no longer considered adequate. Bellah, et al. (1985) suggests that the “educational institutions were transformed in ways comparable to the transformation of other institutions” (p. 298). In other words, developments in industrial organizations corresponded with developments in social sciences in academia. Hence, the task before the social sciences was to provide a “useful knowledge about an increasingly complex society” (Bellah, et al. 1985, p. 299). The advancement in industry created a need for verifiable data and information that social sciences could produce in research universities. This socio-economic reality sowed the seeds of specialization and professionalism in social sciences. In view of the social, political, and economic transformations that necessitated the creation of the modern social sciences, it was inevitable that the social science specialists and professionals held certain conceptions of American society and

citizenship. Whether they were economists, sociologists, or political scientists—social scientists raised normative questions and applied research methodologies for addressing them. Because social sciences were essentially about the study of people and their behavior, one could argue that their assumptions and findings had serious implications for society.

Although as scientific academic disciplines, political science, economics, and sociology, emerged during the Progressive era, economics had the longest presence in American colleges. Manicas (1987) points out that the first chair in political economy was established at King's College, now Columbia University, around 1786. In 1869, the Harvard president Charles William Eliot ended the teaching of political economy as moral philosophy by introducing economics as a social science. Eliot appointed Charles F. Dunbar as head of the economics department who transformed economics into an empirical science. Thereafter, the students of economics studied policy issues on currency, banking, taxation, labor unions, and international tariffs. Economists were also actively involved in industry, commerce, and government. In 1883, the American Economic Association (AEA) was founded that "boldly engraved on its shield the devices of science rather than the dogmas of any static concepts" (Beard & Beard, 1930, p. 431).

Nonetheless, not all professional economists were positivists. As research universities offered courses on the benefits of the free market principles, a few mavericks highlighted the question of conflict between labor and capital. For example, economist Richard T. Ely, who taught at John Hopkins and the University of Wisconsin, emerged as

“the most radical spokesman” for social justice (Ross, 1991, p. 109). Ely’s caustic criticism of the gospel of *laissez-faire* economic theory made a furor. Similarly, a non-conformist academician and economist, Thorstein Veblen, attacked the entire economic system stressing the contradictions of American capitalism. Nonetheless, it was sociology and not economics that raised the specter of socialism.

Ross (1991) suggests that sociology was the “last developed of the social sciences” (p. 122). As a social science, sociology found respectability in academia when liberal and secular ideas of the Progressive era became popular. The early growth of American sociology took place at the University of Chicago in 1890s when it created a new chair and appointed Albion Woodbury Small. Three years later, Small founded the American Journal of Sociology. Small also authored the first textbook of sociology (Manicas 1987, p. 224). Between the First and Second World Wars, the reform-minded Chicago School of Sociologists focused its research on the study of communities. In 1905, about fifty professional sociologists from twenty-one educational institutions met at the John Hopkins University and founded the American Sociological Society (ASA). In 1959, the ASA was given a new name, i.e. the American Sociological Association. The ASA’s mission was the scientific study of society. Over the course of the ASA’s history, it has fostered the teaching of sociology in elementary and secondary schools. In the 1980, the ASA developed a teaching services program focusing on curriculum and classroom instruction.

In one important respect, sociology was much more progressive in its orientation than economics and political science: “Sociologists also recruited significantly more

women” (Ross, 1991, p. 391). According to Ross (1991), in the Progressive era, more women majored in sociology courses than they did in political science and economics (p. 158). Women who studied sociology were interested in “charitable and reform activities” (Ross, 1991, p. 102). Moreover, because university programs in political science and economics were usually of conservative orientations, they were not hospitable places for women. Ross maintains that the late nineteenth and early twentieth century social scientists projected a “masculine image” because they were seeking to “achieve realism, science, and professional standing” (p. 102). Some studies show that women made a higher degree of scholarly contribution in sociology than they did in political science and economics. For example, Shulamit Reinharz (1993) of Brandeis University identifies about two dozen women sociologists who, between 1800 and 1945, made scholarly contribution to the field of sociology. Reinharz’s list of women sociologists includes Frances Wright, Jane Addams, and Margaret Mead. Indeed, both Traditionalist political science and positivist economics were much behind sociology in opening their doors to women.

The APSA and Teaching of Political Science in Colleges

The formation of the APSA in 1904 signified that political scientists were surely determined to secure a separate status for political science course(s) in colleges. Indeed, by introducing political science as an autonomous discipline, they were determined to legitimize Traditionalism as a systematic approach to the study of the state. In its first official meeting in 1904, one of the APSA’s founders and first Treasurer, W. W.

Willoughby (1904), announced that the formation of the APSA was “undoubtedly the most important event which has occurred in the history of the scientific study of matters political in this country” (pp. 107-11). For Willoughby, the formation of the APSA was a turning point for political science in that the new learned society would promote the professional interests of its members. Willoughby and his associates had understood the pulse of time, were inspired by the advances science had made in other walks of life, and were willing to emulate methods from the natural sciences for the study of the state. At this point, it seems that political scientists had prepared to dissociate themselves from the moral sciences and moral philosophies of the late nineteenth century. Subsequently, their new sources of inspiration and insight included the modern theories of evolution via Darwin and Herbert Spencer as well as developments in psychology via Sigmund Freud and William James.

All this on their part seemed rational because new discoveries in science commanded respect and, therefore, by practicing science political scientists sought respectability for their trade. Of course, in 1904, what Willoughby meant by “the scientific study of matters political” by no means carried an identical meaning two or three decades later. For example, in the late 1920’s and 1930’s, when the Chicago School emerged as a formidable intellectual force in political science, it simply parted ways with the work of APSA’s founders. Whereas the APSA founders’ focus was the systematic study of the state and its organs, in the Behavioralist approach of the Chicago School, the state was nowhere to be seen in their equations. Political scientists’ time-honored enthusiasm for and commitment to the study of the state had simply vanished. Describing

this change in focus, in 1939, political scientist William Anderson, then a professor at the University of Minnesota wrote. "American political science stands today reoriented somewhat away from the contemplation of the state and its sovereignty, and toward the actual political processes and the political behavior and motivation of man" (Anderson, in Haddow 1939, p. 265). As a subject of study, the state was losing its allure for political scientists.

The APSA and its member body made the demand that political science be made a separate department in colleges and universities. By 1914, after one decade of the APSA's existence and struggle for a separate identity in academia, the number of separate departments of political science in 300 institutions had gone up to 38 (Anderson, 1939). In 89 institutions, political science was combined with history and economics. In 45 institutions, political science and sociology were combined. In 21 institutions, it was combined with history, economics, and sociology. Nonetheless, the process of separation between political science and other disciplines continued in later years. By the time of the First World War, political science was widely taught in colleges and universities (Waldo, 1975).

Traditionalism, the APSA, and Pre-Collegiate Instruction in Government

In 1903, due to "diverging interests, compounded by rising professionalism," Traditionalist political scientists departed from the womb of the American Historical Association (AHA), and founded the APSA as an independent learned society (Ross, 1991, p. 283). Traditionalist political scientists followed the footsteps of their mother

organization. With their strong state-centered orientations, they set out to do for teaching of political science what historians had been doing for instruction in history: they sought to popularize instruction in government in schools. This is not to suggest that the APSA introduced the government-related courses in schools. Indeed, as Rolla M. Tryon (1935) suggests, by 1900-1901, about 20% of all students in both public and private high schools in the United States were enrolled in government-related courses (p. 284). The government-related courses and textbooks carried a variety of labels, including Civics, Community Civics, and Government, were in use. Nonetheless, most of these textbooks contained materials from political science. Some of the APSA's prominent officials, such as W.W. Willoughby, had also authored textbooks on civics and government. Tryon mentions twenty high school textbooks containing political science material, which were in use at the time of the birth of the APSA. Nonetheless, as the APSA appeared on the horizon, like the AHA, it also wanted clients in the pre-collegiate environment to promote its Traditionalist conception of citizenship and civic education. As an independent learned society, the APSA wanted to secure its monopoly over the construction of knowledge beyond college campuses by firmly defining the parameters of curriculum and instruction in government in schools.

The APSA's conception of citizenship and civic education was in conflict with the historians' conception in that the former "were centrally concerned with contemporary politics, most historians, whether descended from the belles-lettristic tradition or simply engrossed in the demands of the Rankean reconstruction of the past, were not" (Ross, 1991, p. 283). Neither of the two presented an activist and participatory conception of

citizenship, however. The APSA considered the schools as places where a diluted version of political science could be taught to students so that upon arrival to colleges as freshmen, they would face little difficulty in understanding the advanced disciplinary concepts. That was one reason, as Tryon argues, the APSA paid “considerable attention to political science in schools below the college” (p. 39).

Starting in 1903, under Goodnow’s presidency, the APSA appointed a Committee of Instruction in political science. The Committee was replaced by a section on Instruction in Political Science in 1904. William A. Schaper was appointed as the section chair. The section administered a test in various colleges to find what students knew about their government (Proceedings, 1905, pp. 207-28). In 1905, Schaper presented his report “What Do Students Know About Government Before Taking College Courses in Political Science?” at the APSA annual meeting. Indeed, this was political scientists’ first organized foray into the business of civic education in schools. Schaper’s report was seminal in the APSA’s decision to take an active part in fostering the teaching of government in schools. As the APSA reports discussed in chapter four indicate--in different decades of the twentieth century, the APSA made several more attempts to influence school curricula with respect to the teaching of government. However, gradually, the APSA’s enthusiasm in this matter was watered down. By the end of the Second World War, as Traditionalism was in retreat in the APSA, so was the APSA’s organizational interest in instruction in government in schools.

After the second World War, the APSA continued its residual school-related activities by setting up committees, sub-committees, task forces, and holding conferences,

for the purpose of examining school curricula, instructional materials, teacher training, and making recommendations for improving instruction in government. Several philanthropic agencies, such as the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, funded the APSA activities, which included collaboration with the National Council for the Social Studies to produce guides for the social studies teachers. As Traditionalism slowly faded away as a dominant paradigm, the APSA's verve for the teaching of government in schools also ended.

The Anti-Traditionalists in the APSA

In the early days of the APSA, some voices in the Association dissented from Traditionalism. One such voice was that of political scientist Henry Jones Ford. Only two years after the APSA was formed, Ford critiqued Traditionalism as a self-serving and misguided ideology. In his "The Scope of Political Science," Ford challenged Traditionalists' core assumptions about the significance of the state for citizenship and their claims of scientific study of the state (Proceedings, 1906, pp. 198-206). Ford argued that Traditionalists restricted the scope of political science either by giving a technical meaning to the term "political" or to the term "the state" (Ford, 1906, p. 198). He criticized the work of the founding fathers of political science for being cultural-specific in their definitions of "political" and "the state." He asserted that since the epistemology of political science was the product of European experiences, it could not have a universal validity. In Ford's view, the state was conceived and created under special European historical developments and represented only a particular phase in European

history. Hence, the state could not be a concept that had an all-encompassing temporal and spatial application.

Ford's critique of John Burgess was that Burgess held the state to be the permanent and universal condition of human nature, but that he restricted the definition of the state to a selected area of the world, i.e. Europe and North America, and excluded non-European states. According to Ford, this meant that the scope of political science could not extend to all times and places. Hence, political science was not a science. Moreover, Ford argued that political scientists' claim that their field represented objective laws "may be transitory" (p.201). Ford raised the pertinent question that, according to history, "every succeeding form of political structure has seemed final to the people who lived under it. how can we be sure that the form which political science now takes as its objective reality is an exception to the rule? May it not be transitory like the rest?" (p. 201). Ford concluded that the most salient fact of modern history was the instability of political systems. He argued that in Europe, since 1814, every state had changed either in its political or social organization. Thus, Ford noted, "upon my broad survey of events the national, popular state itself is found to be in a condition of metamorphosis" (p. 201). In other words, Ford challenged the Traditionalists' use of the state as a unit of analysis in their methods of investigation. He argued that political science was race-specific and not a universal science by arguing that "we have come to realize that when we speak of the principles of political science, what we really mean is general observations based upon the race-experience of a group of peoples whose culture rests upon the Greco-Roman foundations" (Ford, 1905, p. 203). Moreover, he suggested that political scientists

gathered their concepts from the “mental deposits of our own race experience” (p. 201). By this, Ford meant that since the historical political development in Europe was unique, the experiences of its people were also different from the experiences of peoples living outside Europe.

Ford’s scathing critique came at the time when Traditionalists had just founded the APSA and were thinking about launching a movement for the advancement of their state-centered perspective by promoting instruction in government in schools. Ford’s dissentious criticism of the epistemology of political science was insightful: he questioned the core assumptions of the discipline. It appears that his critical article in The Proceedings, the first official journal of the APSA, drew little interest from Traditionalists. Nonetheless, about six decades later, a similar but more effective revolt in APSA, i.e., the Caucus for New Political Science, echoed Ford’s prescient voice that undermined the supremacy of Traditionalism.

The Behavioralist Phase

Political scientists who received their education in American universities before the Second World War received instruction in traditional political science. Working in the traditional paradigm, these political scientists paid more attention to description and the collection of information about political processes than to constructing over-arching theories. The most popular method in the discipline was the historical-comparative method. In political scientists’ view, the historical-comparative method was a scientific method in that it selected variables from historical cases and compared them. However,

the discipline could not remain oblivious to the changes that were occurring in other social sciences and in politics itself. The historical-comparative research method was increasingly becoming an inappropriate tool for explaining the complex political systems at home and abroad. Rapid industrialization and urbanization had introduced new vocabularies to academia. Other disciplines, such as sociology and economics were far ahead of political science in rigor, data collection techniques and analyses. Thus, the forces of change influenced the ways political scientists worked. Of all the forces, perhaps, it was the development in natural sciences and social psychology that most influenced political science. Behavioralism in political science can be attributed to psychology.

Political scientists borrowed the term “Behaviorism” from social psychology and modified it into “Behavioralism.” Political scientists’ model of science was the natural science, such as physical and biological sciences (Waldo, 1975, p. 58). Because as a social science, psychology had followed the natural science model and shown good results, political scientists followed the same route. In political science, Behavioralism refers to the scientific method of observing and measuring the political behavior of individuals, groups, and organizations. Behavioralists claimed that their method was scientific and that they could explain, predict, and control political phenomena more accurately. More importantly, Behavioralism was not “a clear and firm creed, an agreed-upon set of postulates and rules” (Waldo, 1975, p. 59). Some political scientists who preferred empiricism to speculation became known as Behavioralists. This did not mean that Behavioralists agreed with each other on matters other than method. Nonetheless, in

the 1950's and 1960's, a larger consensus was achieved by empiricists in the discipline shifting the core of political science from a normative to an empirical approach, and thereby relegating competing approaches, such as Traditionalism to the periphery.

When, where, and how did the Behavioralist movement in political science originate are questions that have been debated by disciplinary historians. In his The American Science of Politics, British historian Bernard Crick indicates that "the path of political behavior research was, indeed, staked out by Charles Merriam in his Presidential Address to the American Political Science Association in 1925" (Crick, 1959, p. xiv).

Evron Kirkpatrick (1962), the Executive Director of the APSA noted that:

Between World War Two and the mid-fifties, the term political behavior represented both an approach and a challenge, an orientation and a reform movement, a type of research and a rallying cry, a "hurrah" term and a "boo" term. Debate about Behavioral techniques and methods was often accompanied by vituperation; discussions were aimed at vanquishing adversaries than at clarifying issues. (p. 11).

However, the consensus among the proponents of Behavioralism is that Behavioralism emerged as a stimulating intellectual force after the Second World War (Almond, 1996; Dahl, 1961). Because the Behavioralist movement's birthplace was the department of political science at the University of Chicago, it has been called the Chicago School. Its founders included Professor Harold Lasswell and a group of graduate students, such as Gabriel Almond, V.O. Key, Herbert Simon, and David Truman.

These early proponents of the Behaviorist approach linked their intellectual genealogy to Charles E. Merriam. In the 1920's and 1930's, Merriam, then a professor at the University of Chicago, was a strong advocate of the use of the scientific method for political analysis (Merriam, 1923, 1925). For Merriam, the use of the scientific method for the study of politics was closely associated with democracy and education in modern age. In his view, every age had its own method of analysis. Merriam argued that Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, and Hobbes, belonged to different historical stages of human progress and, hence, they used appropriate methods and metaphors that were available to them (Merriam, 1925). For example, the Greeks used philosophical language, the Romans legal, and Thomas Aquinas in the Middle Ages used religious language to explain social and political relations. Although Merriam's categorization may seem simplistic, it conveys a sense that the nature and complexities of political relations among peoples in every age demand appropriate intellectual tools for understanding them.

For Merriam, in the modern age, the language of politics was science. Merriam's main concern was with the development of scientific thinking among the general population in consonance with the demands of the twentieth century. Merriam noted, "Without the development of a higher type of political science in the fields of secondary education, in the organization of public intelligence, and of the technical knowledge of human nature, we may drift at the mercy of wind and waves or of the storm when we might steer an intelligent course. Social science and political science are urgently needed for the next great stage in the advancement of human race" (Merriam, 1923, p. 295). For Merriam, the political life was measurable and hence predictable and controllable.

In his Civic Education in the United States, Merriam (1934) recognized science as a source of power in the hands of big corporations. In Merriam's view, the use of scientific methods of investigation by ordinary citizens in a democracy would empower them against the powerful private economic interests. Thus, citizenship education necessitated the teaching and learning of scientific methods. Dwight Waldo argued that Merriam's "belief in science was ardent and his understanding of it, in context, sophisticated. But above all, he was interested in democracy, and what he sought was to put science into the service of democratic principles. He felt no inconsistency at all in trying simultaneously to forward science and democracy" (Waldo, 1975, p. 49).

Although Merriam's scholarly contributions were highly respected among political scientists in his own lifetime, he had not been able to marshal enough support for shaking the strong hold of the traditional approaches used in political science. Nonetheless, he had established an intellectual infrastructure for what would soon come to be known as Behavioralism, or the study of political behavior.

As Merriam sought to foster the use of scientific methods for the study of politics, there were equally powerful critics in academia who considered the scientific method for the study of politics "pretentious and unTraditionalistic ambitions" (Waldo, 1975, p. 49). One of those critics was Merriam's colleague Charles A. Beard (1912, 1932). Beard, who had written important books, including An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution, and A Charter for the Social Sciences, also played a prominent role in the American Political Science Association and participated in several of its committees. Beard had a historical perspective and studied contemporary American problems in the context of past

developments. Beard contended that political science could not be value-free, a position that conflicted with Merriam's. Indeed, Beard recognized that knowledge was power, and therefore, if political science gained the status of a neutral science, the powerful social groups in American society would use it for social control.

During the 1920's and 1930's, Merriam's influence rested upon three elements which he juggled with considerable skill: exhortation, organization, and money (Karl, 1970). Although Merriam applied few scientific methods in his own work, his writings urged fellow political scientists to apply the rigor of scientific techniques in the analyses of politics (Merriam, 1921). In terms of organization and money, Merriam's achievements were substantial. As president of the APSA and later as chairman of the powerful Committee on Political Research, Merriam used the Association's pulpit to promote the idea of science in politics. At the University of Chicago, Merriam had founded the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), a body that soon became one of the most prestigious research organizations and an incubator for Behavioralism. In addition, Merriam managed the Spelman Fund of the Rockefeller Foundation. This position of power confirmed his leadership skills in the political science profession (Karl, 1970). In short, as Herbert A. Simon, a Nobel Laureate and one of the pioneers of Behavioralism, suggests, "behavioralism flowered in the Chicago school during Charles Merriam's chairmanship there" (Simon, 1993, p. 49).

After the Second World War, with change in the social and cultural milieu, and a combination of other factors, most importantly, the generous endowments from philanthropic foundations, the Chicago School prepared the groundwork for launching the

Behavioralist movement. Robert Dahl (1961), then a professor at Yale University, a strong proponent of Behavioralism, and the president of APSA in 1967, identified six factors that contributed to the emergence and success of the Behavioralist approach in political science. According to Dahl, the first factor was Merriam's influence. The second factor was the arrival of European scholars after the Second World War who introduced the sociological analyses of Weber, Marx, Durkheim, Freud, Pareto, Mosca, and Michels. Third, in the mid-1940's, the Social Science Research Council at the University of Chicago, had established the Committee on Political Behavior. The committee was headed by an influential professor, Pendelton Herring, who later became APSA president. Herring's committee expanded research on political behavior. The fourth factor was the rapid growth of the survey method as a tool for studying voters' behavior. The Committee on Political Behavior used the survey method to test hypotheses about how people behaved in making political choices. The fifth factor was the Second World War itself. Political scientists were frustrated about the inadequacies of the traditional methods of explaining and predicting events. A scientific method was needed for learning about trends in people's attitudes. The final factor in encouraging the Behavioralist approach was the generous financial support from philanthropic foundations like the Carnegie Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Ford Foundation. The Ford Foundation had contributed a million dollars as seed money to the Committee on Behavioral Research. Academic recognition and prestige have always been associated with grants. The Behaviorlists had received more funds than any other research program or group in

the APSA. Young scholars came in droves to the Behavioralist camp searching for green pastures.

In the beginning, the movement was characterized as a “protest” and a “mood.” but by the early 1960’s. Behaviorists declared victory and called their movement a “revolution.” (Dahl, 1961, pp.763-72). Behavioralism was designated as the paramount development in political science’s entire history. Herbert A. Simon argued that “the Behavioralist revolution in political science was a celebration, not of reason but of real human behavior, as earlier described in The Federalist and by such commentators as de Tocqueville and James Bryce. It was closely allied with American progressivism” (Simon, 1993, p. 49). Clearly, Simon has traced the genealogy of the concept of Behavioralism to three historical antecedents: James Madison’s “Federalist No 10” in (1789). Alexis de Tocqueville’s Democracy in America (1831, 1945), and James Bryce’s American Commonwealth (1888).

The proponents of the Behavioralist research program made three main claims. First, the proper subject matter of political science was political behavior of individuals, groups, and institutions, which could be studied by using the principles of the scientific method. Second, since democracy, freedom, equality, and justice, were normative concepts, they could not be verified as true or false by using scientific methods of testing. Hence, they were beyond the scope of political science. Third, the American political system was based on the principle of “liberal pluralism.” All three claims were subject to criticism within the discipline.

Behavioralists jettisoned history, moral philosophy, studies of the state, and the historical-comparative method (Farr & Seidelman, 1993, p. 201). Behavioralists claimed that traditional political scientists studied the wrong subject matter and used "impressionistic methods" for studying them (Easton, 1991, p. 283). For example, they argued that traditional political scientists treated theory in a metaphysical sense which lacked explanatory power. Normative theories about the just state or the good life were simply not verifiable and therefore did not explain the reality of politics. The Behavioralists asserted that theory had to be value-neutral and therefore should be able to explain the world as it was, not as it ought to be. Moreover, since Behavioralists considered their work a scientific enterprise, they quantified everything. They concerned themselves with matters that were observable such as polling data and survey questionnaires. Behavioralists looked for regularities in political behavior that could be empirically demonstrated and serve as the basis for probabilistic generalizations. They insisted that such empirical research should be preceded by the formulation of explicit hypotheses and then be used to test and refine them. They also argued for interdisciplinarity.

Behavioralists claimed that their research findings had shown the underlying principle of the American political system to be liberal pluralism. Liberal pluralism was a grand unifying theory, a theory that sought to explain how the American political system operated. Embedded in the theory were a set of assumptions about the consensus among people on certain basic values, such as individualism, rationality, openness, and tolerance for the opposite viewpoint. Moreover, those unique values, with some variations,

supported a political system within which social, economic, and political interest groups were accommodated to compete for power. Behavioralists maintained that because most citizens in the United States subscribed to those liberal values, the political system here was stable.

Since the Behavioralists considered themselves scientists, they claimed that their own approach to politics was value-free. As such, they argued that their theory of liberal pluralism was deduced from facts and did not reflect any unsubstantiated assumptions. In the liberal pluralist framework, the state was nowhere to be seen. Unlike the Traditionalist conception in which the state had an anthropomorphic existence, in liberal pluralism the state and its organs were treated as neutral agencies without any interests.

As Behavioralism was becoming a popular mantra, its leading proponents were assuming leadership positions in the APSA. The revolutionaries became the establishment. Easton, one of the most prominent Behavioralists, was elected APSA's president in 1950. After that, throughout the 1950's and early 1960's, seven leading Behavioralists were elected as APSA presidents. These scholars were, V.O. Key, David Truman, Robert Dahl, Harold Lasswell, Herbert Simon, Gabriel Almond, and David Easton.

In their pursuit of rigor, the Behavioralists not only borrowed the scientific method, they also borrowed language and metaphors from the hard sciences as well as other social sciences. The pre-War traditional political scientists had used special terms like sovereignty, social contract, pressure groups, lobbying, state of nature, and natural law. Some of these terms had found their way from political philosophy into the study of

politics. Traditionalist political scientists, such as Hans J. Morgenthau (1948) used a philosophical language to explain the causes of world conflicts. However, the Behavioralists declared the traditional terms obsolete for their scientific enterprise. Instead of looking to Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau, for inspiration, the Behavioralists embraced contemporary scientific language used by mathematicians, statisticians, economists, psychologists, sociologists, and engineers. New terms and metaphors, including Guttman scaling, cognitive dissonance, factor analysis, multiple regression, multivariate analysis, non-parametric, prisoner's dilemma, game theory, and input-output model, became popular in the political science discipline. By borrowing language from other fields, Behavioralists transformed political science into an interdisciplinary field.

Behavioralism, Citizenship, and Civic Education

Because the Behavioralists considered their work a positivist enterprise, they shied away from grappling with the vital normative questions like equality, patriotism, freedom, justice, participation, democracy, and diversity. Although there is hardly any evidence to suggest that Behavioralists took deliberate measures to promote education for democratic citizenship in schools, as part of socialization research, they studied the role of schools in the political socialization process of adolescents and gathered scientific data on the cognitive skills schools taught to prepare knowledgeable citizens. In any event, it was not the APSA that funded or sponsored the Behavioralists' research on socialization in schools--individual Behavioralist political scientists conducted the research. Indeed,

some of their studies were seminal in the theoretical literature on political socialization in schools that enhanced educators' awareness about civic education.

The Behavioralists' first report on the role of school in political socialization was prepared by Kenneth Langton and M. Kent Jennings in 1968 and published in the American Political Science Review. This was the period when Behavioralism was at its zenith. The authors obtained self-reports from students on the overall number of social studies courses taken, such as American Government and History. After analyzing the course work, they found almost no relation between the social studies courses and students' civic knowledge. Langton and Jennings concluded that their findings gave no support to the belief that the social studies curriculum was "even a minor source of political socialization" (p. 865). Many years later, Patrick Ferguson confirmed one aspect of Langton and Jennings's findings by noting that the social studies instruction was "more instrumental in promoting knowledge...[than] participatory attitudes and skills" (Ferguson, 1991, p. 392). That is to say, there was no correlation between instruction in social studies and the development of democratic attitudes in students. However, by the end of the twentieth century, political scientists Jane Junn and Richard Niemi (1998) found that Langton and Jennings's research was narrowly focused and had not taken into account other important variables that contribute to students' civic knowledge and participation skills (p. 148). Niemi and Junn's research indicated that the social studies classrooms were one of several contributory factors in preparing knowledgeable citizens with instruction in social studies accounting for only 4 percent on students' overall political knowledge (p. 148). However, in their view, this impact was significant when it

is combined with other educational activities in the school. Moreover, Niemi and Junn found that variables outside the school were also important in influencing students' civic knowledge. In essence, the Niemi and Junn's findings refuted the Langton and Jennings's findings on the role of schools in political socialization that they conducted in the Behavioralist phase.

In addition to the Behavioralist's research on political socialization, they also used their positivist assumptions in writing high school textbooks on American government. An example of this was a high school textbook American political behavior by Howard D. Mehlinger and John J. Patrick (1972). American political behavior used Behavioralist concepts, such as culture, socialization, status, and social class, to facilitate students' investigations of political problems. The Mehlinger and Patrick textbook emphasized the collection of empirical data for testing hypotheses and constructing explanations of political phenomena. The objectives of the textbook were to provide political science tools or a Behavioralist framework to students for developing their cognitive skills. Since the textbook stressed the development of cognitive faculties, it overlooked the normative aspect of civic education, i.e. the transmission of democratic values, including participation skills or social skills for functioning effectively in a pluralist democracy.

The Mehlinger and Patrick textbook was perhaps one of the few textbooks that were written from the Behavioralist perspective containing contemporary political science materials. In the Behavioralist phase, most high school textbooks on government were written under the Traditionalist paradigm stressing the primacy of the state and its organs. In 1971, John Patrick of Indiana University complained that "most civic courses are still

devoid of the perspectives of modern political science. They tend to stress legalistic descriptions of governmental institutions and ethical prescriptions about political behavior” (Patrick, 1971, p. 2). Indeed, Patrick’s critique of the textbooks was in reality a critique of the anachronistic Traditionalist approach lingering in civic education. His complaint was valid because Traditionalism, a pre-Second World War state-centric theoretical framework, could not address the challenges of the 1970’s. The textbooks did not reflect the reality of American democracy or its conflicts and controversies. Neither were textbooks written for developing skills of inquiry; “the standard textbooks emphasized rote-learning of discrete facts about governmental institutions” (p. 2). Thus, the conservative Traditionalist conception of citizenship and civic education remained intact during the Behavioralist phase.

The Fall of the Behavioralist Movement

As an approach to the study of politics, Behaviorism could not sustain its dominance beyond the 1970’s. It was faced with both external criticisms and internal revolts. The Behaviorists’ three claims of (1) commitment to science, (2) value-neutrality, and (3) liberal pluralism, were coming increasingly under assault. The criticisms came in from all directions, disciplinary historians like Bernard Crick (1959), and power theorists like Theodore Lowi (1993). The earliest and most acerbic criticism was launched by Bernard Crick who criticized the vanguards of the scientific method in the study of politics. Attacking political scientists’ claim to objectivity and value-neutrality, Crick argued that Behaviorism was at odds with American liberal tradition.

For example, Crick characterized the ideas of Harold Lasswell, one of the members of the Chicago School, as having “totalitarian” implications (Crick, 1959). Crick argued that there was a “recklessness” in Behavioralism, and that its proponents had a “willingness to repudiate or to neglect the best in the political tradition of America” (p. 208). Crick’s criticism was further amplified by David Ricci (1984) who blamed Behavioralists for abandoning the great western traditions in political philosophy: Ricci called this The Tragedy of Political Science.

Most of the critics were from the left. The leftists argued that Behavioralists had overlooked the role of money, class, and race in American politics, and that they had packaged liberal pluralism as an official ideology to be used by the capitalist forces for social control (Connelly, 1969). The argument was that Behavioralism was “shot through with ideology” (Easton, 1991, p. 282). And that the ideological premises of Behavioralists were at one with those of the establishment and their false objectivity served the interests of the status quo. Power theorists, such as Theodore J. Lowi, one of the APSA presidents and a professor at Cornell University, argued that Behavioralists had put science at the service of the state bureaucracy (Lowi, 1993, p. 52). In PS: Political Science & Politics, an official journal of the APSA, Lowi debated with Herbert A. Simon, a founder of the Chicago School; Lowi attacked Simon for having been in cahoots with the government and for serving anti-democratic causes. Lowi stated, “Mr. Simon, I hate to tell you this but you are a product of the state. It’s a bit of a lottery, I suppose in the same sense that natural selection is” (Lowi, 1993, p. 52). Lowi was implicitly holding

Simon and his colleagues in the Chicago School responsible for aiding and abetting the state in its mechanism of social control.

According to the proponents of the power perspective in political science, political power was congealed behind the structural levels of American society, and the Behavioralists' scientific method of investigation scratched only the surface. Moreover, the state-centered political scientists disagreed with the Behavioralists on the ground that their method had not incorporated the role of the state into the equation. Their argument was that the state was an entity with its own interests in contradistinction with the interests of society. Since the Behavioralists' assumed a level playing field for competing interest groups without taking into consideration the role of the state, their perspective was therefore inadequate for explaining reality.

The Post-behavioralist Phase

By the early 1970's, Behavioralism was in retreat. Due to social unrest, the positivist version of Behavioralism had suffered a serious blow. Within the profession, anti-Behavioralist forces inveighed against the reigning paradigm by arguing that the scientific approach had failed to deliver because it could not anticipate the massive social unrest in the 1960's, including riots in black communities. In addition, the anti-Behavioralist insurgents argued that the leaders of APSA had ignored their social responsibility in the Civil Rights movement, and were insensitive to the needs of young citizens during the Vietnam War (Easton, 1991). The anti-Behavioralist political scientists pointed out that, in their political orientation, the proponents of Behavioralism

were conservatives, who had chosen to remain silent spectators while the nation faced serious social and political challenges. Sheldon Wolin, a political philosopher noted that political science was about moral and ethical values, but that Behavioralist enterprise offered “apolitical” theories for explaining political phenomena (Wolin, 1969, p. 1063). Lowi argued that APSA should have a strong stand against the Vietnam War and racial discrimination and that it should have actively supported the “war on poverty programs of the Johnson Administration” (Lowi, 1972, p. 12).

Dissatisfied with the role APSA played as a political platform for political scientists, several hundred members of the APSA organized the Caucus for a New Political Science (hereinafter referred to as CNPS) during the APSA annual conference in Chicago in 1967. In its by-laws, the CNPS stated that the APSA had consistently failed to study, in a radically critical spirit, either the great crises of the day or the inherent weaknesses of the American political system. It declared that the Caucus stood for a new concern in the Association for great social crises and that one of the primary concerns of the Caucus was to stimulate research in areas of political science which had been ignored, but were of crucial importance.

The CNPS considered politics and research as one. Therefore, as David Easton summed it up in his presidential address, the CNPS sought to incorporate three main changes in political science: first, substance must precede technique; second, research must not lose touch with reality; and third, knowledge must be implemented (Easton, 1969).

The CNPS contended that APSA's annual conventions recognize and encourage research on pressing public concerns including race relations, poverty, women's rights, the environment, and the Vietnam War. APSA responded affirmatively to the CNPS's demand by inviting papers on subjects that were heretofore considered unsuitable. Moreover, the CNPS nominated its own candidates to run against the APSA leaders who had been picked by the nominating committee of the organization. The CNPS urged the APSA to create a committee to deal with structural rigidities inside political science. Consequently, by 1971, several committees were created including the Committee on the Status of Women in the Political Science Profession, the Committee on Political Science in the Secondary Schools, and the Committee on the Status of Blacks in the Political Science Profession. In short, the CNPS was influential in introducing crucial intellectual and organizational changes in the APSA.

With the insurgency of CNPS, Behavioralism lost its paradigmatic relevance and respectability to the extent that it became outdated. In the late 1960's, political science had entered into what came to be known as the "Post-behavioralism" era, a term coined by David Easton in his 1969 essay "The New Revolution in Political Science" published in the American Political Science Review. Easton argued that Post-behavioralism constituted a "pervasive intellectual tendency" to rethink the nature of the discipline (Easton, 1969, p. 1051).

Post-behavioralism was neither a unified research program nor a common political agenda of dissenting political scientists. The CNPS that had led the revolt consisted of scholars with eclectic research interests and political agendas. Some of the

prominent members of the CNPS were Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Leo Straus, Alan Wolfe, Michael Walzer, and Howard Zinn. Post-behavioralism, then, arrived not as a new paradigm in political science but as something that defined the beginning of diversity in the field. The core of political science, i.e. Behavioralism, which had dominated the profession and research for two decades, lost its former prestige. With the emergence of several splinter groups, no one knew what direction the discipline would take.

In the Post-behavioralist phase, the discipline of political science was dispersed. There was a proliferation of new approaches to and perspectives on the study of political phenomena. Deconstructionism, post-modernism, post-positivism, and neo-Marxism were some of the views that found proponents in the discipline. Nevertheless, the galvanizing core of the discipline had lost its appeal. There was nothing left that could claim to be the hegemonic approach in political science. On the absence of this unity in the discipline, David Easton later observed, "Indeed, there are now so many approaches to political research that political science seems to have lost its purpose" (1991, p. 283). In short, then, as Naomi Lynn notes, Post-behavioralism left a noticeable mark, but it did not produce enduring basic changes in political science's intellectual and methodological underpinnings (Lynn, 1983, p. 97).

Women, Citizenship, and Political Science

An important and related aspect of the challenge raised by the CNPS was the situation of women in political science. In 1969, about 5 percent of the APSA members were women. About 8 percent of the faculty members in the field were women. In 1969,

APSA adopted a resolution supporting equal treatment for women (APSA, 1969a, p. 671). In addition, the Committee on the Status of Women was established (APSA, 1971, pp. 3, 10). In the same year women's concerns were organized through the establishment of the Women's Caucus for political science (WCPC). Like the Caucus for a New Political Science, the Women's Caucus hoped to promote both intellectual and organizational change. In the 1970's, the Women's Caucus ran candidates for APSA offices. Efforts to combine slates with the CNPS for a New Political Science were rarely successful because many women who were concerned with feminist issues did not share the New-Left ideology of the CNPS.

The 1970's saw some percentage increase in the proportion of women in the field of political science. Anne Hopkins notes that in 1970-1971, women earned 12% of the Ph.D.'s awarded in political science; by 1984-1985, more than 26% of all Ph.D.'s in political science were awarded to women (Hopkins, 1993, p. 562). According to the APSA department survey, in 1990-1991, 19% of all teaching faculty in political science were women (Brintnall, 1992, cited in Hopkins, 1993, p. 562). The APSA's survey of its members in 1998 indicated that women's proportion in the field was still small. In late 1999 and early 2000, the APSA announced on its website APSANET that 27% of its members were women. Compared with other learned societies, it was the lowest number.

In 1974, a handful of feminist political scientists began to provide the first structural critique of Behavioralist political science from a feminist perspective. Bourque and Grossholtz (1974) and Elshtain (1974) challenged the idea of value-free research by attacking the sexist interpretations of women's political behavior in some of

Behavioralism's most influential texts. More importantly, these essays also exposed the male political norm that lay behind the discipline's purportedly gender-neutral categories of analysis. Political science's definition of "the political," which focused primarily on governmental institutions, formal political processes, and public policy, was especially rejected. These feminist scholars challenged the discipline to broaden its definition of "the political" to include "the personal" and the "private" (Sapiro, 1998, p. 70). In general terms, the feminist research agenda suggested an examination of the sexual division of labor in the family and reproductive issues. By introducing new categories for analyses into the discipline, feminists rejected the status quo political science.

A second and much larger group of women began to lay the terms of a compromise between feminism and political science. These women explicitly embraced Behavioralist assumptions and methods and sought to turn them to new, feminist ends. These feminist political scientists partially departed from the research tradition established by their male predecessors. Nevertheless, their methodological continuity with post-war Behaviorists was most striking.

In the 1970's, 1980's, and 1990's, feminist scholars in political science mainly questioned the theoretical and epistemological foundation on which the discipline was built. Feminists pointed their fingers at the ways in which normative theory and empirical research in political science had excluded women as political actors and rendered them either invisible or apolitical. More importantly, they questioned the validity of the frameworks, definitions, and assumptions of political science. In a sense, then, they asked for the reconceptualization of the entire discipline (Carroll & Zerilli, 1993, p. 55).

The feminist political scientists produced a rich but critical corpus of literature. They attacked their male colleagues for perpetuating a tradition in political theory that had excluded women as political actors and had made them invisible. The feminists' main argument was based on women's citizenship rights that had been denied in the literature from Plato to Hegel. The feminist scholars showed that political theory, a sub-field of political science, had portrayed women as not fully human, or fully rational, or full political beings (Brennan & Pateman, 1979; Phillips, 1998). They pointed out that the classical (Greek) theorists had projected women as incapable of becoming citizens of the city-state. Yet, the classical theories of citizenship were eulogized in contemporary political science.

Citizenship was the central issue for feminists like Susan Moller Okin (1998), Carole Pateman (1988, 1989), and Mary Dietz (1998). Okin suggested that the whole theoretical edifice of political science was defective because it had treated women either as equal to slaves or a subordinate class suitable only for serving men's needs. Moreover, Okin argued that what a political theorist said about women was crucial to how he conceptualized the terms of citizenship. For example, she argued that when political scientists theorized about the basic values, such as justice, rights, and consent, they invariably exclude women from their articulation.

In addition to the feminist critique of the classical theorists, they also criticized the treatment of women in empirical or Behavioralist political science. From their examination of the classic works written under the Behavioralist paradigm, feminists found that political surveys on voting behavior seldom mentioned women. They argued

that important texts in political science, such as Robert Dahl's Who Governs? Angus Campbell, et al.'s, The American Voter, Gabriel Almond & Sidney Verba's The Civic Culture, and Hans J. Morgenthau's Politics Among Nations, had not presented a clear and coherent picture of women (Bourque & Grossholtz, 1974; Tickner, 1992). It was argued that whenever the empirical research in political science portrayed women, they were portrayed as apolitical or politically incompetent. Feminists showed that some Behavioralist literature had claimed that women lacked interest in politics (Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee, 1954, p. 25). Others had suggested that they lacked conceptual sophistication (Campbell et al. 1960).

A prominent feminist political scientist at the University of Chicago, Jean B. Elshtain (1974, 1979, 1981), went as far in her criticism as to assert that the problem of Behaviorism lay with its epistemology that separated facts and values. According to Elshtain, Behaviorism had adopted a framework that excluded much of what women did from political analysis and relegated most women to a private realm outside of politics. Elshtain argued that "within mainstream political science, what has been described traditionally as politics tends to factor women out of the activity and has excluded for many years the questions raised by feminists. Such questions are relegated to a sphere outside organized political activity and are dismissed as private 'troubles'" (Elshtain, 1979, p. 243).

Post-behavioralism, Citizenship, and Civic Education

Like Traditionalism and Behavioralism, Post-behavioralism was not a research paradigm. During the Post-behavioralist phase, a unified perspective on citizenship and civic education did not exist in the APSA. Moreover, because political scientists lacked a consensus on what knowledge was of most worth, numerous epistemic groups emerged. Moreover, political scientists had contending perspectives about the content of the school curriculum on government and civics as well as about the values and objectives of civic education. Therefore, they and their Association distanced themselves from schools. That is why, since 1975, the APSA adopted a policy of not endorsing any specific curriculum standards or textbooks on government and civics (Mann, 1996, p. 47). Nonetheless, in 1996, after a lull of about twenty years, Post-behavioralist political scientists began to take a serious interest in citizenship and civic education. It is important to note that during this period the main theoretical framework of civic education in high schools was Traditionalism in that the curricula underscored learning about the structure and function of government (Hahn, 1999, p. 591). Carole Hahn's study on civic education showed that in 36 states, a course on government was required for graduation (Hahn, 1999, pp. 589-590). Since the Post-behavioralists were interested in the building of a strong civil society rather than a strong state, they declared that teaching about government was less effective in preparing democratic citizens. In their view, because the level of citizens' participation in the democratic process had substantially declined, democracy in America was in danger. Their response to the problem was the re-definition of citizenship and the renewal of civic education in both schools and colleges. Unlike the Traditionalists, Post-

behavioralists considered civic education as something more than patriotism or service to the state. Conceptually, they distanced themselves from the Traditionalists' "cardboard model of citizenship" (APSA Task Force, 1996, p. 756). In response to the rapidly changing ethnic diversity in America, the Post-behavioralists underscored the significance of diversity, tolerance, and inclusion (APSA Task Force, 1999, p. 2). Regarding its concrete objectives for civic education in schools, the Task Force suggested that it would develop instructional designs, resources, and even specific lessons (APSA Task Force, 1996, p. 757). Moreover, the Task Force decided that during 2000-2002, it would disseminate its instructional materials so that they could be available for widespread use in 2003.

Two events motivated Post-behavioralists to foster citizenship and civic education in schools: a wave of democratization around the world and the declining civic culture in America. In the late 1980's and early 1990's, the Communist regimes in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe collapsed. The Cold War came to an abrupt end. In the early post-Cold War period, democracy had become a new buzzword. American literati, philanthropic foundations, and learned societies became pre-occupied with the concept of transition to democracy in the former totalitarian societies. Political scientists were also observing the social and political transformations. In his The End of History and the Last Man, political scientist Francis Fukuyama (1992) offered the proposition that with the disintegration of the Soviet Union, liberal democracy won the race against other ideologies, especially communism. Fukuyama's thesis echoed the prevailing mood in the APSA about citizenship and civic education. In 1996, the APSA president-elect Elinor

Ostrom submitted a proposal to the APSA council for creating the Task Force on Civic Education for the Next Century. Ostrom was the second woman in almost one hundred years of the APSA's history, who was elected president. Ostrom's rationale for promoting civic education was that "civic engagement" had fallen, citizens' political efficacy had declined, and civic participation had plummeted (Ostrom, 1996). In Ostrom's view, American democracy could not be sustained without a strong civic culture. Thus, the APSA undertook the task of strengthening civic education in both colleges and schools.

Conclusion

Political science evolved through three broad phases: Traditionalist, Behavioralist, and Post-behavioralist. During the three phases, political scientists and their professional organization, namely, the APSA, proposed three separate and contradictory conceptions of citizenship and civic education. Of the three conceptions, Traditionalism, which was introduced by the founding fathers of political science in the late nineteenth century, had the most enduring influence on civic education. Traditionalism was a state-centered conservative approach to citizenship and civic education seeking to strengthen the organs of the state. It was during the Traditionalist phase that the APSA showed the highest degree of enthusiasm for fostering the teaching of government in schools. During the Behavioralist and Post-behavioralist phases, political scientists' interest in the study of the state declined. Their declining enthusiasm for the study of the state also resonated in their concern with the teaching of government-related courses in schools.

The founding fathers of political science, including Francis Lieber, John Burgess, Frank Goodnow, and Woodrow Wilson, fostered a patriarchal or Traditionalist conception of citizenship and civic education. Traditionalism postulates the primacy of the state; it is a conservative approach emphasizing uniformity, nationalism, and respect for national political institutions. Traditionalism underemphasizes the value of participatory democracy and cultural pluralism. As an ideology and a worldview, Traditionalism has had an enduring influence in political science as well as civic education in schools. In civic education, Traditionalism underscored teaching and learning about the primacy of government and its institutions.

The American Political Science Association legitimized the Traditionalist perspective by rewarding those scholars who shared its assumptions. Regarding political scientists' interest in civic education in schools, the APSA's activities suggest that they initiated their systematic efforts towards influencing the social studies curriculum when it was organized in 1903 as an independent learned society. During the first several decades of the twentieth century, political scientists' main educational agenda for schools was to introduce their Traditionalist worldview into the social studies curriculum by gaining a mandatory status for a high school course in government.

In the 1920's and 1930's, Charles E. Merriam, resisted Traditionalism, as it was understood by the founding fathers of political science. He introduced into political science what came to be known as Behavioralism. Behavioralists claimed that they used the scientific method for the empirical study of political behavior of individuals, groups, and organizations. After the Second World War, in collaboration with the United States

government and philanthropic foundations, the Chicago School catapulted Behavioralism to the status of a dominant paradigm in political science. During the 1950's and 1960's, Behavioralism became so popular in political science that APSA elected seven members of the Chicago School as its presidents. By the early 1970's, however, feminists and other dissident groups in APSA questioned the validity of the assumptions embedded in the Behavioralist paradigm. The main criticism against the dominant Behavioralist paradigm was its indifference to the real political problems of the time, such as the students' protest against the United States's involvement in the Vietnam War, the Civil Rights Movement, and women's movement for equal rights. In a sense, Behavioralism was held responsible for supporting the political and economic status quo in the country. A successful intellectual insurgency within APSA weakened the Behavioralists' grip on the construction of knowledge. With the collapse of Behavioralism, the core of political science was lost. In political science, the period after the early 1970's is known as the Post-behavioralist phase. Most Post-behavioralists jettisoned their discipline's claim to the use of the scientific method. Instead, they embraced the normative techniques for the study of political phenomena.

The feminist critique of Behavioralism primarily focused on the public-private dichotomy. Prominent feminist political scientists stressed that both Traditionalist and Behavioralist analyses excluded women from politics and citizenship. Feminists argued that, by excluding the private and personal from political analyses, most of the traditional political science lacked explanatory power, and was therefore, inadequate as an academic discipline. The feminists and other insurgents in the APSA sought to create a new

political science. Their goal was to foster a Post-behavioralist conception of citizenship and civic education. Post-behavioralism was not a paradigm: it was an inchoate movement within the APSA seeking to include non-Traditional perspectives in the discipline. The Post-behavioralist conception was a major departure from both the Traditionalist and Behavioralist conceptions.

The next chapter analyzes the primary evidence of this study, i.e. the APSA's reports, recommendations, and statements, issued between 1908 and 1999, which specifically pertain to citizenship and civic education in schools. The different conceptual thrusts of the reports manifest the changing internal dynamics of the APSA and the conceptions of its leaders towards citizenship and civic education.

Chapter III

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS' STRATEGIES FOR SCHOOLS

This chapter analyzes the APSA's reports, recommendations, and statements pertaining to civic education in schools. The chapter argues that the APSA's main goal in issuing these reports, recommendations, and statements as well as its related activities in the area of pre-collegiate civic education, was to bring the social studies curriculum into conformity with its conceptions of citizenship. These reports contain the APSA's official policies and approaches to the problem of citizenship and civic education in America. More specifically, embedded in the reports are three distinct conceptions of citizenship, i.e. Traditionalism, Behavioralism, and Post-behavioralism. The Traditionalist conception stressed the teaching and learning of the structure and function of government, the Behavioral conception underscored the teaching of analytical skills, and Post-behavioralism emphasized civic participation in community and the strengthening of civil society.

By presenting the APSA's reports, recommendations, and statements as evidence, the chapter addresses the research questions (1, 3, and 4), raised in the first chapter (pp. 1-2). The first question focuses on the APSA's objectives in promoting the teaching of government in high schools. The third question deals with the APSA's specific proposals about the teaching of government in high schools. The fourth question addresses the APSA's conceptions about citizenship and civic education, which it sought to share with teachers. These reports, recommendations, and statements are selected for examination on

the basis of three considerations: (a) they represent the APSA's official policy concerning the high school curriculum and instruction in government and were published in the APSA journals and other publications, (b) the APSA has not issued any other official reports and statements or published documents containing its policy pertaining to the instruction in government in high schools, and (c) some of these reports have been widely cited by scholars, including Rolla M. Tryon (1935), Sheila Mann (1996), Hindy L. Schachter (1998), Stephen T. Leonard (1999), and Stephen Earl Bennett (1999). The following are examined in the chapter:

- 1) Report of the Committee on Instruction in Government, 1908
- 2) Report of the Committee on Instruction, 1916
- 3) Report of the Committee on Instruction in Political Science, 1921
- 4) Report of the Committee of Five, 1925.
- 5) Report of the Committee on Cooperation with the National Council for the Social Studies, 1939
- 6) Report of the Committee for the Advancement of Teaching, 1951
- 7) Report of the Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, 1971
- 8) The APSA Task Force on Civic Education Articulation Statement, 1999

An Overview

A quick overview of the reports indicates that the Traditionalist conception of citizenship and civic education is incorporated in the APSA reports issued in 1908, 1916, 1921, 1925, and 1939. The 1951 and 1971 reports contain the Behavioralist approach to

citizenship and civic education. In addition, the Post-behavioralist conception is embedded in the agenda statements of the APSA Task Force issued between 1996 and 1999. Since the reports, recommendations, and statements were issued in different phases of the evolution of political science, they reflect the APSA's changing and inconsistent perspectives on what knowledge was of most worth for citizenship.

The conceptual thrusts of these documents suggest that political scientists introduced the state-centric Traditionalist approach to citizenship and civic education early in the twentieth century when they extricated themselves from the hegemony of the American Historical Association and launched the APSA as an independent learned society. This conception may also be called the juridical conception because it defined citizenship strictly in the framework of the state and its organs. Traditionalist ideas held sway until the end of the Second World War. After the Second World War, Behavioralism replaced Traditionalism as the dominant paradigm in political science. Since the Behaviorists were interested in doing empirical work, they paid little attention to the schools' normative mission of citizenship and civic education. Nonetheless, their empirical studies on political socialization illuminated the critical role of schools in building a democratic culture (Almond & Verba, 1963; Langston & Jennings, 1968; Jennings & Niemi, 1974).

As the Behavioralist epistemology influenced political science instruction in colleges, it found its way, albeit in a limited form, into the high school textbooks on government. Moreover, like Traditionalism, Behavioralism also stipulated paternalistic assumptions about citizenship and civic education, thereby excluding women and other

disenfranchised social groups from their research on political socialization. By the early 1970's, Post-behavioralists replaced Behavioralism. Paradoxically, for a quarter of a century, the Post-behavioralists showed inertia on citizenship and civic education in schools. Finally, in the aftermath of the Cold War, the Post-behavioralists proposed a promising program for citizenship and civic education for schools in the form of the APSA Task Force for Civic Education in the Twenty-first Century, a ten-year project addressing a myriad of issues on civic education in schools, including curriculum, teacher education, and research. The following is an analysis of the eight documents issued by the APSA between 1908 and 1999.

Traditionalism, Citizenship, and Civic Education

Report of the Committee on Instruction in Government, 1908

When the APSA was organized as an independent learned society in 1903, its founders did not explicitly indicate their interest in the teaching of government in the pre-collegiate settings. However, within a few years of its inception, the APSA began paying close attention to the secondary school social studies curriculum and instruction. Indeed, its focus was on government-related courses in social studies. The person who sparked his colleagues' enthusiasm in the APSA about the issue of instruction in government in schools was William A. Schaper. Schaper was a professor at the University of Minnesota, who had administered a test to a class of seniors enrolled in a short course in political science. The purpose of the test was to evaluate students' knowledge of government. The test consisted of five essay questions about the structure and function of

national, state, and local governments. The results of the test showed that students' basic knowledge about government was limited. In 1905, Schaper's test was administered to 238 students in fourteen different universities. The test results were consistent with the result of the first test urging Schaper to generalize that students' knowledge of government was limited across the nation. Based on the test results, Schaper presented his paper at the APSA's annual conference. Schaper's paper "What do our students know about American government before taking college courses in political science?" motivated the APSA to form the Committee of Five with its official title Committee on Instruction in Government (hereinafter referred to as CIG) to explore further the status of instruction in government in schools. In 1908, the CIG presented its final report. The 1908 report laid the foundation for the APSA's sporadic future activities during the rest of the twentieth century concerning high school curriculum and instruction in government.

The CIG included William A. Schaper (Chairman) of the University of Minnesota, Isidor Loeb of the University of Missouri, Paul S. Reinsch of the University of Wisconsin, James A. James of Northwestern University, and James Sullivan, Principal of the Marcy Avenue Boys High School, Brooklyn, New York (Proceedings, 1908, p. 221). The task before the CIG was to investigate instruction in government in high schools, the preparation of teachers for teaching government, the quality of textbooks, and the availability of instructional materials. Three separate investigations were conducted in three parts of the country: the East, the Mid-West, and the South. States in the three regions were divided among the members of the CIG. The members decided to

collect statistical data directly from secondary schools. A survey questionnaire was sent out to 1627 high schools with a letter to superintendents, administrators, and teachers, requesting their cooperation in the survey. In the cover letter, the CIG introduced the APSA and tried to make a case for fostering instruction in government in secondary schools. The CIG argued that political leaders who came out of public schools were generally handicapped and unfit for careers in politics because their knowledge of American government was limited. The CIG letter raised the question, "are the schools perhaps to blame for the lack of interest in politics shown by our educated men until the recent exposures arrested the attention of the entire nation?" (Proceedings, 1908, p. 221). It was the CIG's view that reforms should begin at the secondary school level because it prepared both political leaders and future citizens. It appears that CIG made a clear distinction between leaders and citizens, each category playing a specific role in the polity. However, there is no explicit or implicit indication in the CIG report suggesting that leaders and citizens were to be educated in separate schools.

The CIG received 661 replies revealing a dismal picture of instruction in government in secondary schools. Because the CIG was not satisfied with the flimsy information it received on enrollment, it relied on the data collected by the United States Commissioner of Education for the years 1902, 1905, and 1906. The information revealed a lower enrollment in high school government courses than in American history, algebra, and Latin.

Based on the low level of enrollment in government, the CIG concluded that the amount of energy invested by high school students in learning about ancient Romans was

three times higher than learning about their own political system. It was also discovered that some large city high schools did not offer courses in American government at all.

The CIG found that high school policies on the American government course were divergent. In some schools, American government was given as a freshman subject, in some as senior subject, and in others, it was offered to sophomores. Generally, the course on government was offered either in eleventh or twelfth grade. In some schools, a course on government was given for more than one year. Schools customarily gave about five recitations a week in government in the form of a lecture.

On the question of requirement for graduation, policies on American government varied from state to state. In most states where government was taught, it was a prerequisite for graduation. However, a substantial number of states offered the course as an elective. The tendency was that in small schools where American government was offered as a course, more often than not, it was a requirement for graduation. In larger schools, where more courses were offered, American government was offered as an elective course.

The CIG also examined the place of American government in the scope and sequence of the curriculum. Schools were divided on the question of status for American government—whether to offer it as an independent course or to combine it with history. The data showed that the majority of schools offered government or preferred to offer government as a separate course. The CIG was pleased with the responses it received from teachers and principals on this matter. There appeared to be a consensus among school educators that government should be taught as a distinct subject. Nonetheless, the

CIG recognized a sizeable constituency in the teaching profession that favored teaching government and history as a combination course. Those who argued for combining government with history based their case on four points. First, since the American government was largely an outgrowth of American history, both should be studied simultaneously. Second, the study of the federal Constitution belonged in the history course: a separate course in civics or government was thus a repetition of the history course. Third, the subject of government was abstract and uninteresting. And fourth, since the AHA's Committee of Seven had recommended in 1898 that government should be taught as part of the history course, the matter was already resolved. The CIG also received arguments for teaching local government. It had been argued that courses in history generally addressed the national experience and excluded the affairs of the state and local governments. The argument was that since teaching about the state and local governments was essential for civic education, it was appropriate to teach these subjects as separate entities.

The CIG responded zestfully to the arguments made in favor of combining government and history. In response to the first point, the CIG pointed out that it was a "pedagogical fallacy" to think that because government was an outgrowth of history, both should be studied together (Proceedings, 1908, p. 232). The CIG argued that there was a vast amount of history that had little relation to government. Conversely, there were many features of government that could be taught more effectively by comparing them to foreign governments. The CIG declared, "in fact, history and government are two very extensive and entirely distinct fields of study" (Proceedings, 1908, p. 236). Moreover,

since the two fields had separate existence in most universities, they should also remain separate in high schools. History and political science were two distinct sciences with their own methods of inquiry, subject matters, and aims. The CIG suggested that in the high school environment, the goals of the two subjects were quite different. Whereas the teaching of history was about the past events, the teaching of government was about the contemporary political life of the country. The materials in the government course dealt, among other things, with the facts and practice of voting, political parties, and the judicial system. According to the CIG, it was more relevant for students to learn about the judicial system, the electoral system, and the legislative process of their own country than to learn about the political life of ancient Greeks and Romans. In response to the argument that a separate course in government was a repetition of the history course, the CIG suggested that repetition was rather useful for learning the subject in different contexts. Responding to the third argument, the CIG argued that students found government uninteresting for three reasons. First, the extant practice of teaching government was limited to the memorization of the United States Constitution. Teachers were not prepared to present the day-to-day working of government in light of the provisions of the Constitution. Second, old-fashioned manuals were used in the classrooms.

On the last point, namely, that the Committee of Seven had recommended the combination course and that no further discussion on the issue was necessary, the CIG asserted that “the language of the report on this subject is hesitating and apparently contradictory” (Proceedings, 1908, p. 236). The CIG argued that the AHA’s Committee of Seven was not interested in solving the problem of the course in government in the

school curriculum--the AHA's Committee of Seven adapted materials on government to fulfill the needs of teaching history. Nonetheless, the CIG maintained that the Committee of Seven did not intend to discourage a separate course in government. Many history teachers and curriculum policy-makers gained an inaccurate impression from reading the report of the Committee of Seven. The CIG argued that the views expressed by the Committee of Seven on combining history and government as one course were perhaps not supported by the majority of members of the American Historical Association.

The CIG received hundreds of responses from teachers on the need for trained teachers of government. The CIG found that history teachers who taught government had the tendency to make the subject unduly historical, and hence, it argued that it was not possible for a teacher trained in history to teach political science, i.e. government. Nevertheless, the CIG was pleased that the situation was slowly changing and a new type of teacher was appearing who was competent in teaching government. This was seen as the result of the courses universities had begun to offer in political science which benefited some teachers of government.

The CIG also examined textbooks for the course in government. Four types of textbooks were in use. The first kind of textbook was a manual of the Constitution, which mentioned little about the government in action. The second type of textbook was a "threadbare" account of national government overlooking the realities of day-to-day political problems of citizens. The third type of textbook combined history and government. The fourth category of textbooks presented the actual operation of government; the CIG favored this category.

The CIG Recommendations

After having collected and examined the data for several years, the CIG held two conferences in 1907 and 1908 in Madison, Wisconsin. In a unanimous decision, the CIG declared that the status of instruction in government in high schools was woefully low. To rescue instruction in government from obscurity and to gain a measure of dignity for the subject warranted changes in three main areas: curriculum, teacher education, and textbooks. The CIG's recommendations focused on these three areas.

First, the overarching theme of the recommendations concerned the securing of a separate status for a course in government in the high school curriculum. The CIG's explanation for a separate course was that understanding of the working of government was a "vital element" in the education of citizens (Proceedings, 1908, p. 244). In CIG's view, the history curriculum focused on the study of the past events and accomplishments, the study of government was about the current working of the organs of government that affected the lives of citizens. It argued that instruction in government prepared students to become intelligent and efficient citizens. According to the CIG, the study of government was the study of a living thing whose pulse could be felt in citizen's day-to-day lives. The purpose of instruction in government was to strengthen students' relations with their government, to create in them the awareness about the political conflicts, and to instill in them an understanding of their rights and obligations as members of the polity. The CIG argued that the course in government was so important in its content and scope that it deserved a prominent position in the curriculum.

The CIG therefore recommended that a distinct course in government should be required for high school graduation. The course on government should have five recitations per week for one-half of the fourth year, or three recitations per week for that entire year (Proceedings, 1908, p. 252). It also recommended that the course should be offered to the greatest number of students, even if it had to be offered in earlier grades.

In terms of the scope and sequence for the government course, the CIG recognized two extant models. The first model arranged the material in a sequence in which local government was taught first, followed by the state government, and ending with the national government. The second model began with the national government and proceeded to the state and local governments. The CIG suggested that either one of these models was suitable for the high school classrooms.

The CIG posited that since government and political science were the same, teachers who taught government needed a vigorous training in the political science departments of recognized universities. Government was not a subject that could be properly taught by teachers equipped with training in the discipline of history or other fields in the same manner as teachers who were trained in political science were not equipped to teach history. Both government and history were specialized fields with their own goals, methods, and subject matter, and therefore deserved separate attention in the high school curriculum. The CIG noted that schools of education in several states mandated prospective teachers of government to have a substantial knowledge of the subject to qualify for a teaching position.

Regarding textbooks on government, the CIG suggested that the proper textbook for a course on government in high school was one that had two parts. The first part should be devoted to state and local government and the second part to national government: this meant that every state was required to adopt its own textbook. A good textbook was one that presented government not as a static thing but a dynamic force involved in citizens' lives. Students should learn from textbooks about the realities of their own environment and communities. According to CIG, a good textbook was therefore one that "...aroused the interest of the youthful citizen and prepares him for future duties and responsibilities" (Proceedings, 1908, p. 256).

The CIG explicitly pointed out that certain kinds of books should be avoided at all costs. First, textbooks that were in large part historical or related history with government were not suitable for the course on government. Second, textbooks that covered all social sciences, including economics, sociology, statistics, and government, were not suitable for use as a textbook for the government course. Textbooks that focused on the Constitution and presented interpretations of its clauses were not suitable. Finally, textbooks that allocated a disproportionate amount of space to the description of the structure and function of national government and paid little attention to state and local governments were also unsuitable.

Surely, the CIG preferred textbooks on government that incorporated an undiluted state-centered Traditionalist perspective. The members of the CIG were professional political scientists representing the interests of the APSA and pursuing a specific ideological mission. The APSA's interests were to legitimize political science as a

scientific endeavor in academia, broaden its scope, and expand its membership. Their mission in schools was inextricably linked with their mission in higher education. In colleges, one of their primary missions was to prepare a bureaucratic class for serving the state. In schools, they aimed at gaining a mandatory status for instruction in government so that they could create a bigger pool of adherents for their state-centered Traditionalist worldview. Indeed, their state-centered approach to citizenship and civic education may be characterized as an ideology, a *Weltanschauung* that needed new followers.

By recommending textbooks for a government course that excluded materials from history, sociology, and economics, the CIG sought to avoid potential epistemological confusion. Thus, it wanted to introduce political science in schools as the study of the operation of the state and its organs, albeit in a version that suited the adolescents' needs. To justify instruction in government in schools, the CIG conveniently equated such activity with civic education. The CIG's claim that learning about the operation of governmental institutions was indispensable for and the sole route to good citizenship was, in effect, its strategy for achieving two goals. First, the CIG sought to affirm a separate identity for the discipline of political science. Second, since the contending disciplines, including sociology, economics, and history, were concerned with matters other than the operation of the governmental institutions, the APSA sought to discredit their claim to civic education in schools. Hence, the CIG's recommendation for textbooks on government drew a sharp line of demarcation between political science and other disciplines. Indeed, the APSA's battles against other social sciences were played out in an arena in which political scientists had little experience.

This arena was the pre-collegiate education, a distinct field with its own sets of principles, values, and goals. Surely political scientists were educators, but the scope of their instructional experiences was limited to higher education. More importantly, their mission in higher education was essentially research-oriented. Certainly, they believed that by promoting instruction in government in schools, they were making a valuable contribution to civic education. However, they lacked the wherewithal to make a strong case for the teaching of government in schools. Consequently, like other social science learned societies, the APSA also found itself at a loss when in 1916, the NEA prepared its seminal report on the secondary school social studies curriculum: the NEA report did not recommend a separate course on government arguing that political science materials were inadequate for pre-collegiate students. Instead, the 1916 report introduced a brand new course for the high school seniors, namely, Problems of Democracy—Economic, Social, and Political (hereinafter referred to as POD). The POD was the school educators' "answer to the rival claims of the social sciences, none of which, in the Committee's view, was adapted to the requirements of secondary education" (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 28). Ironically, the state-centered Traditionalist perspective in the form of a government-related course for high school seniors outlasted the POD. What contemporary social, political, economic, and ideological factors prompted school educators in 1916 to ignore political science materials and introduce the POD into the secondary school social studies curriculum is a question that requires some analysis.

Problems of American Democracy—Economic, Social, Political

In the second decade of the twentieth century, struggle for the high school social studies curriculum intensified. Because social scientists were competing for the recognition of their respective disciplines in colleges and universities, their professional rivalries also trickled down to the high school curriculum. This was a period when educators were considering reforms in civic education in secondary schools. Like social scientists, the school educators were also concerned about the exigencies of modernity, the influx of the rural population into the cities, and the socialization of immigrant children into the American social system. Thus, in response to rising social problems, some educators, including Thomas Jesse Jones, found a panacea in the theory of “social efficiency” (Nelson, 1994, p. 9). The theory of “social efficiency” was society-centered in that it postulated a strong connection between skilled citizens and the efficient functioning of the social order. Indeed, it was a euphemism for social control. This was a Taylorist model; its goal was to eliminate waste (Kliebard, 1986, p. 28). Frederick Winslow Taylor, an industrial management expert, had introduced scientific techniques to improve workers’ productivity on the factory shop floor. Whereas Taylor’s techniques were intended to maximize corporate profits, they prescribed little for work-place democracy or the workers’ well being. Nonetheless, in early twentieth century industrial capitalism, the Taylorist paradigm extended its scope beyond the assembly-line production: it was used as an ideology for social engineering. In other words, ideas pertaining to efficiency, embedded in Taylorism, affected most facets of the modern American society.

Having proved its utility on the factory shop floor, Taylorism also found a niche in the pre-collegiate education. Influenced by the Taylorist ideology, Jones and his Committee on Social Studies of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association (hereinafter referred to as CSS), prepared a seminal report in 1916 on the social studies curriculum. In the introductory section, the report asserted that “for the key note of modern education was [“social efficiency,”] and instruction in all subjects contribute to this end” (CSS, 1916: in Nelson, 1994, p. 9). Underscoring social efficiency as a theoretical framework for social studies, the report asserted that “whatever their value from the point of view of personal culture, unless they contribute directly to the cultivation of social efficiency on the part of the pupil they fail in their most important function” (CSS, 1916: in Nelson, 1994, p. 9). Thus, the ideological orientation of the authors of the 1916 report was Taylorist. They viewed the world from the Taylorist lenses and promoted social efficiency as a guiding principle for the mission of public education. Indeed, the Committee members’ approach to civic education was functionalist: they conceptualized a course that, in their view, met the needs of millions of young citizens who ended their formal schooling in secondary schools. R. O. Hughes (1922), one of the earliest authors of textbooks on the POD, posits in his foreword:

The last opportunity that millions of our citizens will ever have to consider some of these problems in a formal way is in the secondary school. Here education for the many ceases. And even for the smaller number who go to college it is well that at the age when they begin to form positive opinions a definite opportunity

should be afforded to consider the great questions of society, industry, and government. And so we have in many schools, and shall have in many more, a course known as Problems of Democracy. (p. iii).

Thus, the primary goal of the POD curriculum was to prepare an efficient, punctual, compliant, and productive workforce, which would socialize into a stratified, complex, industrial capitalist social order. Indeed, by teaching academic disciplines, including political science, educators could not have accomplished their objective of social efficiency. By inventing the POD, the educators not merely resisted meddling from the learned societies, they exercised a *carte blanche* over the curriculum for civic education.

Two individuals played a pivotal role in the preparation of the 1916 report. Thomas Jesse Jones, who had established a program in social studies at the Hampton Institute, chaired the CSS Committee, and Arthur William Dunn (1916) of the United States Bureau of Education, who compiled the report. The CSS did not include social scientists. More importantly, because the Report had explicitly excluded political science materials from the recommended curriculum for the senior grades in secondary school, it was devastating to the APSA's mission.

Although, the Report recognized the significance of social sciences, it declared them unsuitable for high schools. In the case of political science, the report argued, "the traditional courses in civil government are almost inadequate for the last as for the first year of the high school" (CSS, 1916, in Nelson, 1994, p. 50). In the CSS's opinion, a course in government was an "attempted simplification of political science" which did

not meet the students' needs (CSS, 1916, in Nelson, 1994, p. 50). Moreover, in the CSS's view, "the purposes of secondary education and not the intrinsic value of any particular body of knowledge should be the determining consideration" (CSS, 1916, in Nelson, 1994, p. 53). Indeed, the main purpose of secondary education included the "securing of a more intelligent and active citizenship" (CSS, 1916, in Nelson, 1994, p. 49). In other words, the CSS deemed social sciences unsuitable for the high school curriculum and instruction because they were developed and organized for college students and not adapted to the immediate requirements of students in secondary schools.

Surely, the CSS members were convinced about the mission of the public schools in a rapidly changing society; this mission was none other than the preparation of efficient citizens to be socialized into the social, political and economic system of America. The CSS did not believe that the teaching of political science furthered the schools' mission of preparing efficient citizens. Hence, the Committee excluded the course on government from its recommended list. Instead, the Report introduced a new "culminating" course, namely, *Problems of Democracy—Economic, Social, Political* for the twelfth grade (CSS, 1916, in Nelson, 1994, p. 49). The POD was a conglomerate course consisting of materials borrowed from the course on *Community Civics* that dealt with current social, economic, and political problems of society. Since the POD lacked the structural rigidity of academic disciplines, it had an amorphous character. It was a course that under-emphasized the use of social sciences—it did not repudiate their application in the understanding and solving of complex social problems, however.

A few years after the 1916 report was issued, the departments of education in different states began to recommend it to school districts. During the 1920's, high schools warmly received the POD course. The states of New Jersey and Pennsylvania took the lead in outlining the contents of the POD. By 1929, twenty-three states were recommending it to school districts. Nonetheless, different states adopted the course under different names, including, the Problems of Democracy, American Problems, Problems in American Democracy.

Since the POD was a society-centered course, it included materials on contemporary social, political, and economic issues. It borrowed themes from almost every facet of American life. A typical POD textbook contained topics on public education, banking, transportation, business, economy, crime, politics, healthcare, religion, and communities. The authors discussed these topics without any thematic organization or disciplinary structure. The chapters were arranged without any logical sequence. David Jenness (1990) points out that “between the 1920's and the 1960's, there is considerable evidence that what were meant to be POD courses, employing discussion and the analysis of problems and issues, were in fact directed reading courses—that is, courses playing to the special topical interests of students or, often, teachers” (p. 178). In other words, the teacher in the POD classroom played a role that Stephen J. Thornton (1991) calls “curricular-instructional gatekeeper,” who made decisions about the scope and sequence as he or she saw fit (p. 237). This suggests that teachers teaching the POD needed to be knowledgeable about the current local, national, and global events. Jenness also supports the proposition that the “current-issues format”

necessitated “too much teacher preparation each year” (p. 179). Because the subject matter of the POD course was about the rapidly changing contemporary social, political, and economic trends, one may assume that textbooks, which generally embodied the curriculum, would have been of little help in the classrooms. Thus, a teacher’s autonomy in what to include and what to exclude in the scope and sequence would have been crucial.

By introducing the POD, perhaps more than political science, the 1916 report undermined the entrenched hegemony of history in the secondary school curriculum. The “revisionist” members of the Committee, such as James Harvey Robinson and J. Lynn Bernard sought to make instruction in history relevant to students’ immediate needs so that they could understand and analyze “the most vital problems of the present” (Robinson, in Nelson, 1994, p. 39). In a sense, Robinson and other proponents of the social efficiency paradigm steered the secondary school social studies curriculum away from the AHA’s “one-dimensional” traditional approach that emphasized learning about the nation’s past experiences (Singleton, 1980, p. 90) As it was expected, the AHA moved to block the adoption of the POD course (Singleton, 1980, p. 91). The APSA also opposed the POD, but its opposition was for a different reason: it believed that the POD was replacing the civics course (Tryon, 1935, p. 419). The APSA considered civics to be a government-oriented course, which, in its view, required the disciplinary structure of political science. Hence, civics came under the APSA’s sphere of influence. In relative terms, the CSS’s recommendations caused less harm to the APSA’s interests in the secondary school curriculum than it did to the AHA’s mission.

Report of the Committee on Instruction, 1916

The CIG had submitted its report in 1908. From what transpired in the aftermath of the CIG report, it seems probable that APSA was not satisfied with its findings. It took the APSA a very short time of only three years to commission another all-encompassing study, involving more professors, to investigate the status of the course in government in secondary schools.

The Report of the Committee on Instruction (hereinafter referred to as CI), also known as the Haines report, was completed in 1916, the year when the CSS published its own landmark report on social studies in secondary schools. The chairman of CI was Charles Grove Haines, a professor of government at the University of Texas. In addition to Haines, the other CI members were: James A. James, professor of history, Northwestern University; Mabel Hill, Associate Director, Garland school, Boston, Massachusetts; Frank E. Horack, professor of political science, State University of Iowa; Edgar Dawson, professor of political science at Hunter College, New York City; Walter L. Fleming, professor of history, Louisiana State University; J. Lynn Bernard, professor of history and government, School of Pedagogy, Philadelphia. Mabel Hill was the first woman who served on one of the APSA's committees. Hill had authored school textbooks on civics. James had also served on CIG. The CI was appointed in 1911 at Buffalo, New York.

The task before the CI was to extend the scope of investigation, which the CIG had already completed. In this respect, the new Committee also focused on instructional methods in government pursued in high schools. It set out to suggest means of enlarging

and improving the prevailing instructional methods. What is noteworthy about the working of the CI is that it devised a new strategy to highlight the significance of instruction in government in schools: it studied the role of other similar professional associations and organizations that may have had a stake in instruction in government in schools. Because the CI's political goal was the strengthening of instruction in government, it was moving toward a collision course with the status quo, namely the American Historical Association, whose Committee of Seven had successfully secured a dominant space for history courses in the secondary school social studies curriculum. In its influential report of 1898, the Committee of Seven of the American Historical Committee had recommended a combination of history and civil government courses in senior years. The recommendations of the Committee of Seven were widely accepted and implemented (Committee on Instruction, 1916).

The question before the CI was how to separate courses on government from those on history in the high school curriculum. Being a fledgling organization with a proportionately small membership pool, the APSA badly needed allies to popularize its cause. Initiating a systematic public relations campaign, the CI reached out to make alliances with powerful lobbies including the National Municipal League and National Education Association. The CI was undoubtedly single-minded in its mission. It demanded an independent course on government in the high school social studies curriculum. In the CI's view, its vision of citizenship, democracy, and civic education were clearly at odds with the vision of the American Historical Association. This by no means suggests the APSA's anti-history disposition—the APSA was simply asserting its

perspective on what the secondary school students needed to learn to become good citizens. The APSA's conciliatory position on the presence of history courses in the scope and sequence indicated that the APSA did not seek the replacement of history--it only asked for sharing the much sought after real estate of the social studies curriculum.

On the subject of civic education, it appears that the CI had familiarized itself with the thoughts of leading contemporary educators, such as G. Stanley Hall, a professor at Johns Hopkins University, David Snedden, Commissioner of Education in Massachusetts, and Charles Eliot, the former President of Harvard College. Of the three, the CI seemed to be in agreement with Hall, who had taken a strong position on the question of civic education in schools. Hall's conception of civic education revolved around public "service" (Committee on Instruction, 1916). According to him, service was the "supreme goal of all pedagogical endeavor, the standard by which all other values are to be measured" (p. 31). Hall had identified two important developments in American society which he thought warranted immediate attention from educators: first, the "influx of foreigners" who knew little about the workings of the American political system, and second, the "vast multiplication of agencies" of government (p. 31). In Hall's view, the solution for both these problems was to be found in fostering civic education in public schools. The critical aspect of Hall's observation was his recognition of the historical changes that buffeted the public school system. According to Hall, the agrarian patriotism of the post-Constitutional days had become outdated--modernization in the form of industrialization and urbanization made new demands on schools and democracy. According to Hall, in the new milieu, the foremost function of schools was to give an

intelligent basis to government of, by, and for the people, and since the governmental machinery had become more complex, the need for teaching about government had further increased. Because Hall argued in favor of an active role for governmental institutions in addressing the social problems of the modern age, the CI considered Hall an ally in their mission of popularizing instruction in government in schools.

The Purpose of Instruction in Government

At the outset, the CI specified its interpretation of the aim of instruction in government. More importantly, the CI equated the teaching of government with civic instruction. Both expressions were therefore used interchangeably. In the CI's view, civic instruction had two aims. The first aim was to create awareness among citizens about the significance of the laws under which they lived. The second aim of civic instruction was to educate citizens about the structure and function of governmental agencies. How could high schools achieve the two aims? They could be accomplished by teaching students about the activities of governmental agencies. One method of doing this was to teach students how to search for significant facts in government reports. For example, if students wanted to measure the efficiency of the health department, they could collect data on the infant mortality rate, measles, and the number of school children treated for illnesses, and compare those figures with the data from previous years. (Committee on Instruction, 1916, p.27). In short, in the CI's view, the purpose of instruction in government could be best achieved by conducting political inquiry through political science methods. Learning about government thus required the learning of the use of

proper intellectual tools. The source of such tools was, in its view, none other than political science discipline. However, at this stage of its evolution, political science itself was in its infancy and lacked disciplinary sophistication and rigor.

Findings of the Inquiry

As part of its investigation, the CI collected important data on the status of instruction in government, textbooks used in secondary schools for civic instruction, time allotted to civic instruction, and the education of social studies teachers. Based on the findings, the CI made several recommendations for improvement. It found that instruction in civics was given to high school students in the third or fourth year. The general practice was that civics was taught in the fourth year. Most high schools devoted a full year of four or five hours a week to instruction in civics. This was indicative of the significance public schools attached to civic education. Some teachers of civics favored teaching this subject for one-half year in the first year of high school. The same teachers favored teaching a course in government in the final year of high school. The responses received by the CI indicated a favorable inclination among high school teachers towards teaching government or a government-related course for one full year.

The CI found that a “great variety of textbooks” were in use for instruction in government, but that two kinds were most popular (p. 51). The first kind dealt exhaustively with the federal government and, in a cursory way, with local and state governments. Often these books began with local issues and moved on to national politics. The CI identified some of those textbooks to be: Garner’s Government in the

United States, Ashley's American Government, Beard's American Citizenship, Moses's The Government in the United States, Guitteau's Government and Politics in the United States (p. 51)

The second type of books used in high school government classrooms were those that supplemented the main textbooks. The supplementary books contained material focused exclusively on the individual states in which they were adopted. Such books discussed issues of local interest. Some of the supplementary books were: Willoughby's Rights and Duties of Citizenship, Reinsch's Readings in American Federal and State Government, Goodnow's Municipal Government, and Munro's The Government of American Cities, among others (p. 52).

The findings revealed the social studies teachers' negative opinion about textbooks. They found textbooks on government and civics to be dry and uninteresting. Teachers noted that textbooks gave inadequate treatment of problems that were of immediate interest to citizens. In their view, very little emphasis was given to local government, and matters concerning community life were treated in a cursory manner. In teachers' opinion, textbooks could be improved provided they included more material concerning local problems.

On the question of time allotment to civics, the CI found that generally a one-half year was given to the subject. However, a large number of teachers suggested doubling the amount of time. In places where a full year was given to civics or government, teachers appeared to be satisfied. In schools where less than half year was given to civics, teachers showed dissatisfaction.

The findings showed that most teachers gave the national government most attention, using anywhere from 30% to 75% of the time to teach about it. The most common practice among teachers was that they devoted 50% of the time to national government and 50% to state, local, and municipal government (p. 54). In school districts where instruction in local government was emphasized: about 25% of the time was given to national government. From the collected data, the CI generalized that most teachers favored teaching about Community Civics.

The CI found that unprepared teachers often taught civics in high schools. However, the situation was changing and teachers were getting qualifications from universities and colleges in the field of political science, economics, and history. The CI noted that the schools of education provided training for the teaching of mathematics, languages, and sciences but lacked training facilities for the teaching of civics. The CI criticized the opinion of those educators who considered the teaching of civics suitable only for men. In the CI's opinion, it was not the gender of the instructor but adequate training that qualified him or her for teaching civics.

Based on the findings, the Committee offered eight recommendations for improvement of instruction in civics. The recommendations were of a broad nature ranging from time allotment to teacher education.

- 1) A year of social science (exclusive of history) should be taught in senior high school of which at least a half year shall be devoted to the study of government, and four or five hours per week shall be given to this subject.

- 2) Pressure should be brought to bear on colleges to accept a full year of social science for entrance when the subject is effectively taught. High schools are much more likely to do justice to this branch of study as long as colleges either accept no work in civics or give credit for only a half unit.
- 3) Better preparation of teachers. Courses in normal schools, colleges, and universities designed to prepare teachers of government.
- 4) More emphasis on local affairs.
- 5) Better materials. Collection of a civics library with reference works, government reports and pamphlets literature illustrating all phases of government work.
- 6) Instruction should be more practical. Particularly recommended are observation of local government departments, surveys of local conditions and talks to classes by officials and others interested in governmental problems.
- 7) Put civic instruction into practice by such devices as self-government in school, by organizing classes on the model of government departments, by the formation of civic leagues and community clubs.
- 8) Cooperation with local government and local civic bodies. Invitations to city officials to speak before classes and encouragement of students to visit city departments. Cooperation between chambers of commerce can be secured through the formation of junior civic leagues and the development of the schools as community centers. (pp. 60-61).

After tabulating the responses it received from school superintendents and state authorities, the CI concluded that a “deplorable deficiency” existed in concrete plans for courses of study in civics (p. 61). In most cases, civics was lumped together with history and had no independent existence. Wherever civics was mentioned, it was not supported with bibliography or literature. There could have been several reasons why school boards and state authorities omitted to include instruction in civics in their courses of study. One of them could be that the matter was never brought to their attention. Since the state and city boards of education guidelines mentioned civics only incidentally, teachers and administrators using such guidelines for curriculum were hardly expected to take the subject seriously. Indeed, according to the CI, civics was a school subject, which in some form should have included materials on government. Thus, the CI contemplated exercising its exclusive intellectual control over civics. It also contemplated excluding other social sciences from civics because, in its view, they were unsuitable for civic education. However, the APSA had to wait for several more years to appoint a new committee to address questions about civics. That committee was called the Committee on Instruction in Political Science (hereinafter referred to as CIPS).

Report of the Committee on Instruction in Political Science, 1922

The task before the CIPS was “to define the scope and purposes of a high school course in civics and to prepare an outline of topics which might properly be included within such a course” (CIPS, 1922, p.116). The chairman of the CIPS was Professor W. M. Munro. Other members were Edgar Dawson, Clyde King, B. F. Shambaugh, and J.

Lynn Bernard. In 1922, CIPS published its report “The Study of Civics” in the American Political Science Review as well as in Historical Outlook. Around the country, fifty-eight professors of political science, history, and other fields, including Charles A. Beard and Charles E. Merriam, gave their general approval, but not an “unreserved endorsement” to the report (CIPS, 1922, pp. 124-125). It is important to mention that, although ideologically, both Beard and Merriam belonged in opposite camps, the two shared an anti-Traditionalist stance. Whereas Beard was a revisionist political historian, Merriam espoused Behavioralism. Thus, the two could not endorse a document that contained conservative recommendations about citizenship and civic education. Merriam’s own work on civic education, including Civic Education in the United States, hardly mentioned the study of government.

The CIPS’s report reflected the APSA’s state-centered Traditionalist worldview in that it declared that “in the field of social studies all roads lead through government” (CIPS, p. 117). Indeed, the report articulated in unambiguous terms the central tenets of a Traditionalist framework for citizenship and civic education in schools. In CIPS’s view, the extant unified civics course for high schools with themes from all fields of social science was “superficial and ill-organized” (CIPS, 1922, p. 116). By this declaration, however, CIPS did not suggest, “that the scope of a school course in civics should be strictly confined to the structure and functions of government” (p. 117). Nonetheless, it was CIPS’s view that since government played a central role in all social, economic, and political activities, it was to be treated as a core and unifying concept in civic education. Hence, learning about the structure and function of governmental institutions was a sine

qua non of civic education. But civic education, the report noted, also included learning about “civic duty as well as civic rights” (p. 117). In other words, learning about the ideals of citizenship required more than the memorization of facts about government--good citizenship required translating thought into action. However, the process of teaching students to translate thought into action was not elucidated in the CIPS’s report. Thus CIPS’s ideas about the relationship between classroom lessons and the realities of the rough and tumble world of political life seemed devoid of any solid examples and thereby could only be characterized as sentiments rather than a feasible proposition.

The central theme of the CIPS report concerned the revival of the earlier definition of the term “civics.” The sub-themes of the report included criticism of the civics textbooks used in high schools and the Committee’s proposal for the outline of a civics curriculum for high schools.

Making a case for government in the subject of civics, CIPS argued that historically instruction in civics had always been about government and government-related themes. It lamented that other subjects, such as economics, sociology, and ethics, had been introduced into the civics curriculum, resulting in the shrinking away of government-related themes. Thus, the original meaning and purpose of civics, which was instruction in government and government-related subjects, had been relegated to the periphery. The CIPS posited that by incorporating a *mélange* of subjects, mostly from social sciences, into the civics curriculum, the high school instruction in civics had become superficial, and thereby, lost its original content. Under the rubric of civics, several unrelated subjects were poorly organized and taught without sufficient

thoroughness. Hence, the report argued, it seemed that a unifying theme was missing from the civics scope and sequence. In the CIPS's view, the disintegration of traditional civics had been carried too far and the subject's "outside boundaries" needed re-establishment so as to preserve its dignity and also protect it from foreign encroachments.

Regarding the quality and use of textbooks on civics, the CIPS observed three weaknesses in this area. First, the CIPS noted that schools, which offered civics as a course had the tendency to minimize the use of textbooks in classrooms and maximize field trips and other outdoor activities. The CIPS considered the use of textbooks to be an essential component in civic instruction and argued that no amount of students' visits to public institutions could replace the effectiveness of textbooks. The second weakness the CIPS noted in civics textbooks concerned the subject matter. It was found that textbooks often gave a disproportionate amount of attention to themes related to local and state affairs while ignoring important national issues. And finally, the CIPS found that some school authorities were replacing the study of civics with a course on Problems of Democracy. It was CIPS's view that "no effective instruction in the Problems of Democracy could be imparted to high school pupils unless they are given an adequate background through the study of governmental organization and functions" (pp. 118-119). It is probable that, in principle, the CIPS did not oppose the course on Problems of Democracy for the senior year in high school, which was proposed in the 1916 report of the Committee on Social Studies of the Commission on the Reorganization of secondary Education of the National Education Association. However, it disagreed with the organization of the course. In CIPS's view, the Problems of Democracy was a

hodgepodge course with material borrowed from every social science without integrating them to an organizing concept. For the CIPS, the organizing concept for civic education was no less than the study of government: it considered other subjects less significant.

The CIPS's report recommended a curriculum outline that divided the scope and sequence in civic education in high school in three parts: the American environment, the American government, and civic activities. According to this plan, the first part would include themes, such as man and society, the American society, racial problems in the United States, the American home and community life, and the economy. The second part would constitute the foundations of government, the structure and process of American government, the election mechanism, party organizations, local and state governments, the Constitution and national political institutions, such as the Congress, the Presidency, and the Judiciary. The third part in the sequence would focus on civic activities including discussions about the conservation of public resources, the regulation of commerce, the management of public health, welfare problems, and public education, among others. The final part would include materials on the role of the United States as a world power, the functions of the League of Nations, and other global issues.

The CIPS's agenda for civics was clearly Traditionalist and state-centric. It equated the civics course with a government course. By assigning a central position to the study of government in civics, the CIPS sought to expand its sphere of influence into the social studies curriculum. The CIPS's report was issued at a time when the POD was already making inroads into the secondary school curriculum and had been welcomed in New Jersey and Pennsylvania (Tryon, 1935, p. 419). After losing its battle against the

POD. the APSA found another opportunity in the course on civics, which included a limited amount of materials from political science. The CIPS's report was the APSA's articulation of its Traditionalist approach to citizenship and civic education. By endorsing the CIPS's report, most political scientists validated their juridical and paternalist conception of citizenship. However, a small number of political scientists who did not endorse the report, or endorsed it with reluctance, showed their disagreement with Traditionalism. Charles Beard and Charles Merriam were two such maverick scholars.

The APSA did not limit its crusade of disseminating the Traditionalist mission to simply redefining civics, however. Since its members were specialists in the field of politics, it was familiar with the concept of political power and its effective use for achieving desirable results. Moreover, as a national organization the APSA had little regional and local presence in the states. Therefore, it was ineffective in bringing about change at the local level, especially when education was the responsibility of the states. Hence, the APSA realized that it could accomplish better results by persuading each state legislative body to assign a mandatory status for the course on government in secondary schools. Considering this reality, one year after the CIPS's report was issued in 1922, the APSA authorized the appointment of the Committee of Five (hereinafter referred to as COF) in 1923 to study the possibility of legislative action for mandating instruction in government in secondary schools in the states. The COF submitted its report in December 1924. It is important to note that as the APSA was considering the political route, some states had already enacted laws requiring the students to take a course in government for graduation. Moreover, a myriad of social and philanthropic organizations, including the

American Legion, the American Bar Association, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Metropolitan Life Insurance, and the National Security League's Committee on Constitutional Instruction had already taken political measures towards enacting laws mandating the teaching of government in schools. However, the goals of the social and philanthropic organizations in the teaching of government in schools were different from the APSA's goals. Those organizations were interested in inculcating patriotism in millions of American citizens, whom they thought were not "devotedly loyal to the United States" (COF, 1925, p. 207). The APSA's interest in the matter was not related to patriotism--it sought to carve out a niche for political science in the pre-collegiate educational arena under the garb of civic education. In addition, the APSA considered itself the sole authority on the contents of a government course; its interest in a government course was markedly separate from other organizations' normative missions.

Report of the Committee of Five, 1924

Considering the critical role of the state laws in bringing about curricular change, and to explore the possibility of influencing those laws by a learned society, the APSA authorized the formation of the COF in its Columbus meeting in 1923. The COF had five members: Roscoe L. Ashley, F.E. Horack, T.J. McCormack, W. B. Munro, and P. Orman Ray. The five members were selected by president, James Garner.

The first task before the COF was to study the status of the state laws. It discovered that in the aftermath of the First World War, the National Security League's Committee on Constitutional Instruction had played a pivotal role in organizing local

citizens in different states to lobby for enacting laws concerning instruction in government. Because of the National Security League's efforts, more than half of the states passed the legislative bills. The COF found that in total, there were forty-six laws in the states concerning instruction in government in secondary schools. However, the laws lacked uniformity about the scope and sequence. Moreover, in some states, the course on government was required for graduation, and in other states, it was offered as an elective subject. In some states, teachers were required to take a course on government for teacher certification. A few states went even further: "the laws of these states make the willful neglect of such requirement by school authorities a sufficient cause for their dismissal or removal" (COF, 1925, p. 208).

The COF also found that only one third of the states prescribed the amount of time set apart for instruction in government. In addition, the COF noted that the state laws were vague on who would determine the contents of the course on government. In other words, this matter was left to the discretion of the local school authorities. About half of the states clearly authorized the state superintendents and the board of education to determine the time and content of the course (COF, 1925, p. 208).

For the COF, the key concern in the state laws was their lack of uniformity. It noted that the state laws were dissimilar and hence subject to different interpretations. For example, the COF feared that to fulfill the requirements of the vague state laws, schools taught civics, but civics excluded materials on the structure and function of government. Such "educational fads" were not acceptable to the COF; it sought to restore the integrity of the course on civics as a course on government (COF, 1925, p. 208). To address the

uniformity problem in the state laws on government course, the COF decided to submit a draft of a model law to the legislators in all states. The draft suggested that the proposed model law be made a mandatory law with two key provisions: (a) the law would require all students to take a course in government for graduation, and (b) it would require all new teachers to pass an examination in government before receiving certification (COF, 1925, p. 209).

Report of the Committee on Cooperation with NCSS, 1939

Throughout the 1930's, the APSA was active on several fronts promoting its agenda on the teaching of government in high schools. The APSA Committee on Policy, a permanent standing committee of the Association, had a sub-committee known as the Sub-Committee on Political Education. It was the responsibility of the Sub-Committee to advance the teaching of government in schools. The Sub-Committee on Political Education held a series of joint conferences for school administrators, high school social studies teachers, and political science professors. The first conference in the series was held at Indianapolis with about 100 participants. The conference gave birth to a committee whose goal was to emphasize the inclusion of materials on government in the civics course. Two subsequent conferences on the themes of instruction and curriculum in civics and government were held at Columbus, Ohio, and Upper Montclair, New Jersey. Some of the active and well-known participants in these conferences were Professors Edgar Dawson, J. Lynn Bernard, and Earle W. Crecraft, all professional political scientists and authors of textbooks and other curriculum materials on

government and civics for secondary schools. Of the three, Crecraft's work was of special importance because he had served as one of the directors of the APSA. In his article, "The Place of Government in the School Curriculum," which was published in Education in 1932, Crecraft (1932) criticized the education community for being "...responsible for the decadence in the study of civil government in the schools of their state" (p. 545). Crecraft presented a snapshot of the condition of instruction in government and his theory of citizenship in a succinct form. Crecraft maintained, "time was when civic education in the schools meant the training of pupils in the principles and practices of civil government. At the present time, civic education may mean nearly everything except the study of government. Today, there are many civics courses, so-called, in which the study of government is nowhere in sight" (p. 542). Crecraft's findings showed that there was a "decided trend away from teaching the principles and practices of civil government in schools" (p. 542). Crecraft posited that the main cause of disrepute of the government course in social studies was the public's lack of support for the subject. Since both government and politics had lost credibility, people did not favor teaching about political ideas in schools (p. 543). Once the government course lost its eminence, the struggle among other groups intensified to "crowd out" each other from the high school social studies.

Creecraft's observation reflected the national mood during the 1930's.

Nonetheless, the APSA continued its struggle to regain public support for instruction in government. In its efforts to secure a permanent place for the teaching of government in schools, the APSA had always been prepared to join hands with teachers and

administrators. Making alliance with the National Council for the Social Studies was part of the APSA's calculated strategy to continue collaboration with the education community. Because the mission of the National Council for the Social Studies (hereinafter referred to as NCSS) was the development of curriculum and instruction in social studies for the purpose of promoting citizenship, it became the most appropriate candidate for alliance with APSA. Hence, in the late 1930's, the APSA authorized the Committee for Cooperation with the National Council for the Social Studies (hereinafter referred to as CCNCSS). Members of CCNCSS were Roscoe C. Ashley of Pasadena Junior College, Philips Bradley of Queens College, David Kneeler of Mississippi State College for Women, Harrison C. Thomas of the New York City Board of Education, and Howard White of Miami University. The CCNCSS's main objectives concerned the examination of the legislation, administrative actions, and judicial decisions relating to the teaching of social studies (Priford, 1962, p.5). In addition, the CCNCSS also examined the procedures for teacher certification in social studies. The CCNCSS's work was funded by a grant of \$2300 from the General Education Board. The CCNCSS completed its report in 1939.

In 1940, the name of CCNCSS was changed to the Committee on the Social Studies, whose new members included Mer Cohen, Robert E. Coney, Henries Ferreting, O. Garfield Jones, Lane W. Lancaster, and Warner Moss. Consultants to the committee were Charles A. Beard, Edgar Dawson, Erling Hunt, Walter Mayer, and William A. Carr.

The CCNCSS Report

The CCNCSS report was divided into four sections. The first section formulated the problem concerning civic education in schools. The second section explained the APSA's professional interest in the problem. The third section described the origin and activities of the CCNCSS. And, the final section presented the CCNCSS recommendations.

First, the CCNCSS asserted that civic education was a direct function of the state (APSA Report, 1939). It argued that in democratic systems, citizens' participation in the political process was essential for the preservation and promotion of democratic institutions. In the American context, it was the responsibility of public schools to impart "effective civic education." This was so because a large number of future citizens attended elementary and secondary schools, notwithstanding the eighty five percent of students who ended high school before graduation. Implicit in CCNCSS's argument was the assumption that public schools, not colleges and universities, offered a suitable environment for the making of citizens. In other words, colleges and universities were places of higher learning in specialized fields attended by a select few, and therefore, were not appropriate places for civic education.

Second, the report noted that the APSA was concerned about the quality of civic education in schools for two reasons. The first reason was pedagogical in that instruction in government in colleges and universities would be further enhanced if the status of instruction in government at the high school level was improved. Second, since instruction in government held a central place in social studies, the APSA made an

alliance with the NCSS, an organization concerned with social studies education, to promote instruction in government in schools.

Third, the APSA president Charles Grove Haines appointed the CCNCSS for the purpose of cooperating with NCSS in the area of civic education. In response to the APSA's initiative, the NCSS also created its own two-member committee, the NCSS Cooperative Committee (hereinafter NCSSCC), to cooperate with the CCNCSS. Leonard S. Kenworthy of the Friends Central school, Philadelphia, was the chairman and Erling M. Hunt of Teachers College, Columbia University, the member.

Unlike the former APSA committees, the CCNCSS did not conduct surveys concerning the status of curriculum and instruction for civic education. However, the CCNCSS argued that more than ever before, it felt the "...direct responsibility for cooperating actively in the task of developing more effective training for citizenship at the secondary-school level" (APSA Report, 1939, p.3).

The CCNCSS claimed that it was the APSA that had first investigated civic education in schools, and that the APSA's activities of thirty-five years in this field had directly spurred changes in the social studies curriculum and instruction. Referring to the former APSA investigations about the status of instruction in government in schools, it argued that improvements in social studies were made due to the APSA's contributions. However, many questions raised by the CIPS in the 1920 report remained unanswered by the CCNCSS report. Some of those questions were concerned with the usefulness of new materials and instructional methods in social studies for civic education.

Finally, the CCNCSS recommended to the APSA three areas in which it could cooperate with NCSS: (1) the content of a senior high school course in government, (2) teacher preparation and certification in social studies, and (3) articles on the teaching of government in *Social Education*. In its first recommendation, the CCNCSS observed that due to the introduction of new subjects in social studies, instruction in government had declined. In addition, it argued that a wide disagreement existed among social studies teachers and other educators about the purpose and procedure of instruction in government. Considering those two factors, the CCNCSS recommended that a survey be conducted among teachers and administrators concerning the extant practice of instruction in government.

In its second recommendation, the CCNCSS suggested that a study of teacher education be conducted focusing on the state requirements for teaching social studies, certification requirements for teachers in social studies, and the curricula of education colleges in teacher training in social studies. According to the CCNCSS, "...the quality of training for citizenship depends on the character of the training available to the teachers of social studies" (APSA Report, 1939, p. 4).

The CCNCSS's third recommendation pertained to its cooperation with NCSS in the form of contributions to Social Education on the theme of politics. Social Education was the official journal of the NCSS whose editor in that period was Erling M. Hunt. Hunt had solicited the CCNCSS for contributions to his journal beginning with the September 1940 issue. The CCNCSS asked the APSA for authorization to arrange for articles in Social Education.

Behavioralism, Citizenship, and Civic Education

Report of the Committee for the Advancement of Teaching, 1951

After the Second World War, political scientists abandoned the state-centric Traditionalist approach to citizenship and civic education. Instead, they embraced the Behavioralist paradigm. Two factors contributed to the advancement of Behaviorism: the availability of generous financial support from the United States government and philanthropic foundations for survey research and a general trend toward rigor and empiricism in social sciences. It was against this backdrop that the APSA Executive Council appointed a seven-member committee, namely, the Committee for the Advancement of Teaching (hereinafter referred to as CAT) to study the state of teaching political science in colleges and universities. The CAT was composed of Harold M. Dorr of the University of Michigan, Claude A. Hawley of the United States Office of Education, E. Allen Helms of Ohio State University, Andrew E. Nuquist of the University of Vermont, Ruth G. Weintraub of Hunter college, Howard White of Miami University, and Marshall E. Dimock (Chairman) of Florida State University. The CAT assignment also included the study of the relationship between political science departments and the social studies programs in high schools throughout the nation. More importantly, its report elucidated in concrete terms the APSA's Behavioralist perspective on citizenship and civic education. The CAT sent out a fifteen-page questionnaire to 286 institutions that offered courses in political science. The questionnaire included questions about collaboration between colleges and social studies teachers in high schools. The study was

funded with a grant of \$10,000 from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The CAT submitted its report to the APSA Executive Council in 1951 under the title Goals for Political Science. In the specific context of the teaching of the government course in high schools, the CAT focused its investigation on college-school relations, the nature of the relationship between political science professors in colleges, social studies teachers, and teacher educator, among other issues. On the question of college-high school relations, the report concluded, "Our relationship with the secondary schools is one of the weakest parts of total performance to date; hence, an immediate goal for political science should be to improve this relationship as well as to improve our teaching process" (CAT, 1951, p. 220). The CAT expressed its disappointment over the ineffectiveness of the APSA's committees and individuals, both past and present, to have had any "significant effect in increasing the rapport between the two groups of teachers" (p. 221).

What were the hurdles impeding collaboration between college professors of political science and social studies teachers? The CAT report recognized three main hurdles. First, it was the "...low regard in which college political scientists hold the efforts of their colleagues at the secondary level" (p.229). Second, "the lack of communication between political science professors and social studies teachers keeps the two groups apart" (p.221). Third, the "educational objectives at two levels are sharply different" (p.229).

In the first instance, the CAT readily rejected political science professors' fallacy that social studies instruction in high school involved little political science. Referring to the content of high school textbooks on government, the CAT declared that they contained a substantial amount of political science material. Moreover, the CAT argued, "the secondary schools appear to have made far more progress in developing newer and better methods of teaching than have the colleges" (p.229). Regarding the possibility of communication between political science professors and social studies teachers, the CAT made several recommendations, including political scientists' membership in the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). On the question of divergent educational objectives of schools and colleges, the CAT argued that education for citizenship was one of the most important goals of American political science. This goal did not mean merely the education of college students, but the education of all citizens. The political science knowledge should therefore trickle down to the school level.

Since the CAT was mainly concerned about college students' knowledge of government, it examined the problem from a narrow perspective. The college professors were frustrated over their own lack of information about the freshmen's intellectual level in the subject of government. They wanted to know how much the freshmen learned in high school about American government so that duplication in instruction and materials could be avoided in college classrooms.

The CAT discovered that less than twenty five percent of the departments of political science that had responded to the questionnaire had someone on the staff responsible for being familiar with the content of social studies instruction in high

schools. A small number of political science departments confirmed their efforts towards preparing their first year courses in consonance with the high school social studies programs. Similarly, the CAT also found that a few political science professors were closely involved in the preparation of the state social studies curriculum. Some political science professors conducted summer workshops for social studies teachers. The CAT also discovered that in some instances political science professors served on college admission committees which interviewed applicants about their knowledge of government. These professors had kept themselves abreast of the social studies syllabuses and approved textbooks on American government used in their states' high schools.

The CAT confirmed political scientists' interest in teacher education. Sixty percent of the political science departments responded that they "regularly encourage some of their able students to enter secondary education as social studies teachers" (p.225). These departments reported that the majority of their students earning master's and doctoral degrees were destined to be teachers. Forty percent of the departments of political science also confirmed their "cooperative arrangement" with schools of education preparing social studies teachers (p. 225). The CAT found this to be an encouraging aspect of the political science profession. On the question of what political science professors themselves could learn from social studies teachers in the area of teaching methods, some CAT members indicated that they attended teachers' conferences and found them to be rewarding for their pedagogical practices.

The CAT members realized that if they were to stay in the business of teaching teachers, they needed to learn about teaching methods that professional educators had

developed. Likewise, the CAT suggested that social studies teachers teaching the government course in high schools were required to stay abreast of the trends in political science so that their knowledge of the subject matter remained current.

The CAT noted, "Probably the basic single function of public education in the United States is in the area of citizenship training" (pp.230-231). However, the CAT pointed out that political scientists were probably not familiar with the mission of public schools. Moreover, the CAT argued that had political scientists known about the mission of public schools, they would have made extra efforts towards establishing collaboration with social studies teachers. Without mentioning in specific terms what the public schools' mission was, the CAT implied that it was civic education for all students in the system.

In terms of political scientists' contribution to the training of high school social studies teachers, the CAT concluded that political scientists' accomplishments in this area were limited. This was so because the requirements of teacher certification remained generally in conflict with the sequences and prerequisites of the departments of political science. The political science curriculum was developed for students who took one or two courses in fulfillment of the 120 hours' requirement for the Bachelor of Arts degree, or students who majored in political science and took 24 to 36 semester hours. In contrast, the high school teacher was required to satisfy the usual requirements for the degree, earn 15 to 25 hours in education and supervised teaching, and put together one or two majors and /or one or more minors (CAT, 1951, p. 233). The most common teaching position specified one or more history classes and other work in social studies. Since history, and

not government, generally made the core of social studies, political science departments were ill-equipped to “provide the necessary background” (p. 233). However, the CAT appealed to the APSA and the departments of political science to “give attention to problems of teacher training and the development of course sequences designed to facilitate that training” (p. 234).

The CAT concluded its report with four noteworthy recommendations. First, it declared, “We should make every conscious effort to extend our influence in all directions where the goals of political science might be achieved, and, in turn, we shall be able to take advantage of the experiences, observations, and lessons that our new associates will have to give” (p. 245). Second, in order to “extend our influence in all directions,” the CAT recommended that the APSA form alliances with other national educational organizations for the purpose of creating “means by which more political science and other social science subject matter may be introduced into the high school curriculums” (p. 244). Third, the APSA members should participate in discussion groups of those national and regional organizations which were “devoted to the cause of furthering knowledge about government” (p. 244). Finally, the CAT recommended that “...every department of political science should have at least one member who is familiar with the content of social studies instruction in the secondary schools and will work to articulate the instruction at the two levels, taking part regularly in institutes or workshops designed to aid teachers of the social studies in secondary school” (p. xx).

The core ideas in the CAT report were a marked departure from the state-centric perspectives of the former four reports that the APSA committees had prepared under the

Traditionalist paradigm. Indeed, the CAT report represented the onset of the Behavioralist era in political science. This was one of the two reports that Behaviorists had prepared on citizenship and civic education in schools.

Defining Citizenship

The CAT report elucidated the APSA's Behaviorist perspective on the meaning of citizenship and the goals of civic education in schools. The CAT's interpretation of citizenship was deduced from the empirical work of one of its members, John A. Vieg, a professor at Pomona College, who had conducted research on instruction at high schools in the states of Oregon, California, and Washington. Vieg had drawn four conclusions. First, he found that leading high school teachers in the three states defined citizenship in terms of an individual's active interest in the welfare of human society and belief in democracy and cooperation. Second, the social studies teachers had suggested that civic education, as it was understood by them, was not their exclusive responsibility. High school teachers of other subjects had mentioned that civic education was a part of their responsibilities too. Third, from the interviews with high school teachers, Vieg had concluded, "...the social studies accounts for only a part of the total contribution to civic education made by the high school. Other courses and extracurricular activities are of equal if not greater importance" (p. 30). Fourth, good citizenship required political knowledge and communication skills. However, Vieg found that a large number of high school students lacked political knowledge and verbal skills. Vieg suggested that high schools could prepare better citizens by giving students instruction in civics.

The CAT focused on Vieg's second and third conclusions and argued that political scientists' studies of civic instruction at the college level validated Vieg's findings. The CAT concluded that civic education was the responsibility of all high school teachers simply because it required the development of democratic attitudes. It also argued that the students' entire school experience, and not just instruction in government, engendered democratic attitudes. The classroom instruction contributed less than half of the students' civic education experience. The CAT maintained that an effective civic education had a practical dimension which lay outside the classroom. Endorsing the laboratory method of the Civic Education Project (CEP) at Teachers College, the CAT argued that this was a good model of civic education because it included teaching about civic participation skills.

The CAT elucidated that although political scientists emphasized the political dimension of citizenship, politics was only a part of the whole concept of citizenship. Since teaching about government was about politics, such instruction covered a minor part of civic education. Moreover, the CAT argued that civic education was fundamentally concerned with the development of civic attitudes. The CAT asserted that formal knowledge of the governmental institutions was not sufficient to inculcate democratic attitudes. In a sense, by not stressing instruction in government, the CAT repudiated the state-centric Traditionalist conception of citizenship and civic education.

The CAT offered two definitions of citizenship developed by political scientists. The first definition was that of Clinton L. Rossiter, a professor at Cornell University. In 1950, Rossiter had published an article in Social Education on the broad characteristics of

a democratic citizen. According to Rossiter, a good citizen had several characteristics, including having a working knowledge of the facts of American government, a good sense of American history, respect for American democracy, a compromising disposition, and a sense of public duty. The second definition was that of Professor Robert A. Walker of the Kansas State College, who proposed four basic elements of citizenship.

According to Walker, a good citizen had the ability to inform and express himself, knew how to think, was familiar with the political and social heritage of the nation, and applied moral standards.

Based on these definitions and characteristics of citizenship, the CAT concluded that citizenship was not something that could be taught by teaching only about government. Moreover, citizenship in a democracy was not indoctrination. Teaching citizenship required the teaching of analytical and critical skills so that students could differentiate between public and private interests. Students became good citizens by “motivation, preparation, application, participation, and balance” (CAT, 1951, p. 42). Moreover, the CAT suggested that students learn these values from their teachers. Teachers needed to show students by personal examples and not by preaching. The CAT’s report proved to be less than popular, thereby stirring a passionate debate among the APSA members, which was reported in the association’s official journal, the American Political Science Review. Three reviews of the report are noteworthy.

Critiquing the report, James Fesler of Yale University, argued that the CAT had avoided the use of specific language for describing the role of political scientists in civic education (Fesler, 1951, p. 997). Fesler suggested that political scientists did not know

what distinctive role they played in civic education. Moreover, in Fesler's view, the umbrella of civic education was so broad that everyone claimed to be in this business. Fesler stressed that the CAT's report had focused on the development of students rather than the subject matter of political science. Therefore, in Fesler's view, the idea of civic education was some political scientists' rationalization for preaching. Indeed, Fesler was a Behavioralist political scientist, who saw little role for political science in civic education. Like most Behaviorists, Fesler too considered civic education a normative activity and inconsistent with the mission of their discipline. In the Behaviorist era, political scientists were more enthusiastic about their positivist mission; civic education seemed to be an activity that hardly earned academic laurels for them. It is not to suggest that Behaviorists did not have a perspective on citizenship and civic education. The Behaviorists simply emphasized the development of cognitive abilities of citizens.

According to Louis Hartz, the author of the The Habits of the Heart, on the question of civic education, the CAT's report was self-contradictory. It was so because on the one hand, the CAT wanted to produce good citizens through the teaching of cognitive skills, but on the other hand, it wanted to avoid indoctrination. Since the CAT failed to offer a clear definition of the two terms, it left readers with the impression that indoctrination was about the inculcation of values and analysis had to do with the exploration of fact (Hartz, 1951, p. 1002). Hartz argued that citizenship was essentially about holding certain values. Without indoctrination it was impossible to promote the idea of citizenship.

Hartz posited that the job of a political science teacher was not to produce a good citizen but to produce an intelligent man (p. 1003). It was not to give students values but to develop their talent for valuation. If education instilled civic virtues, then it did so indirectly, and not as the central goal of its effort.

According to Hartz, there are two models of teaching in the civic education classrooms: liberal and illiberal. In both models, the teachers espouse certain values. However, what differentiates one model from the other is how a teacher divulges his or her values. In the first model, the teacher presents his values to students in a dispassionate and neutral fashion. In the illiberal model, the sole aim of a teacher is to impose his or her own point of view on students. Hartz calls the second teacher an indoctrinator and a propagandist. Thus, the liberal teacher is concerned with the intellectual development of his or her students. On the other hand, the illiberal teacher is engaged in proselytizing students. According to Hartz, of the two teachers, the liberal teacher made more contribution to citizenship than his or her non-liberal counterpart (p. 1004).

Hartz's argument underscored the significance of the liberal model of civic education. In his view, the liberal civic education is qualitatively different from the transmission of values. However, one may argue that Hartz's liberalism itself is a set of values. One may extrapolate from Hartz's proposition that civic education is not about the transmission of values, including democratic values. Indeed, Hartz's premise is fallacious, because civic education in any political system seeks to reinforce the values that support the social, political, and economic system. In the United States, since the political system is based on the principles of representative democracy, or so it is

claimed--it requires citizens to sustain this system. Both Benjamin Barber and Walter C. Parker suggest that democracy needs democrats (Barber, 1984; Parker, 1998). But democrats are not born: people learn to become democrats. To build a democratic society is to accept and cherish democratic norms. Indeed, it requires both affective and cognitive skills. But without citizens' subjective commitments to the well-being of the community, no amount of cognitive skills would sustain a democratic culture. Hartz's liberalism thus postulates a civic education that prepares value-neutral citizens. Such citizens learn superior cognitive skills. Indeed, cognitive skills are necessary but are not sufficient for democratic citizenship.

For political scientist John H. Hollowell, the CAT report suffered from two weaknesses. One was the method it had employed and the second was the use of platitudes in its recommendations (Hollowell, 1951, p. 1006). Hollowell questioned the CAT's assumptions about education for citizenship and ordinary education. He argued that the CAT made an explicit distinction between ordinary education and civic education, but it failed to define the two in concrete terms. In addition, although the CAT warned the readers about the difference between indoctrination and education, it did not define indoctrination.

Hollowell disagreed with the CAT's assertion that in the United States the mission of political science was to prepare intelligent citizens (p. 1006). He suggested that political science was primarily an intellectual discipline and a body of knowledge. The proper function of political science was to impart knowledge about politics, not to give practical training in politics. Moreover, for Hollowell, participation was not

necessary for understanding politics. Essentially, Hollowell and Hartz advanced the Behavioralist framework that political science was a value-neutral discipline whose mission was to impart a dispassionate knowledge about politics, but not to motivate students to participate in politics.

Nonetheless, by stressing value-neutrality in civic education, Behaviorists were taking an intellectual position that was far from neutral. It was a conservative position of a different variety. Indeed, like the Traditionalists, who, by stressing the primacy of the state in civic education, behaved like a counter-intellegentia, the Behaviorists achieved similar goals by ignoring societal conflicts altogether. The Behaviorists presented a worldview in which the state was a neutral agency playing the role of an umpire; citizens were considered as rational individuals making free choices. This was an atomistic view of citizenship. The Behaviorist paradigm celebrated the micro-economic view of citizenship in that it overlooked the citizens' need for community life. In this perspective, achieving cooperation among citizens was impossible because each citizen was engaged in his or her utility maximization. Morality and ethics did not figure in this equation because these values were non-rational. Hence, the idea of good and bad was irrelevant. A good citizen was self-centered, rational, and autonomous. It is this conception of citizenship that is embedded in both APSA reports, i.e. 1951 and 1971. The two were prepared during the Behaviorist phase and therefore mirror the Behaviorist world view.

Report of the Committee on Pre-Collegiate Civic Education, 1971

In 1970, after about twenty years of inertia, the APSA once again formed a committee to study the status of curriculum and instruction in the area of “political science education” in secondary schools. The committee was called Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education (hereinafter referred to as CPE) whose members included Richard C. Snyder, (Chairman) of Ohio State University, Paul R. Abramson of Michigan State University, David Easton of the University of Chicago, Fred I. Greenstein of Wesleyan University, Robert E. Lane of Yale University, Howard D. Mehlinger of Indiana University, and Jewel L. Prestage of Southern University. Most of these individuals were distinguished political scientists. Howard D. Mehlinger was the head of the Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University, who, with John J. Patrick, had co-authored a popular high school social studies textbook, namely, American Political Behavior. The CPE was assigned two specific tasks: to make an assessment of the relationship between political scientists and the K-12 education system, and to develop and implement a long range strategy for mobilizing APSA’s resources towards reforming “political science education” in schools. After working for a year, in 1971, the CPE issued its landmark report “Political Education in the Public Schools: The Challenge for Political Science.”

The report was divided into four parts. The first two parts provided the background and analysis of civic education in schools, the third part proposed strategies for curricular and pedagogical reforms, and the fourth part summarized the report.

Taking stock of the relationship between political scientists and social studies teachers, the CPE conceded that the two groups lived in a state of "two socio-cultural system that largely co-exist in mutual isolation of one another" (CPE, 1971, pp. 432-433). Political scientists had isolated themselves from the K-12 education system because they considered it a "primitive" and "unhappy place" (CPE, 1971, p. 433). For this reason, political scientists had remained "uninterested, ill-informed, and contemptuous" of schools (p. 433). In a sense, in relation to pre-collegiate education, political scientists had been ethnocentric in their behavior. Similarly, social studies teachers and administrators kept themselves isolated from the political science profession because, in their view, the political science discipline offered them little in terms of teaching methods, curriculum designing, and school management techniques. The two groups were like foreigners who spoke different languages and, therefore, did not communicate. Whereas political scientists studied political phenomena, teachers taught children and managed schools. Thus the volume of interaction had been very low between professional educators and political science professors. Whatever interaction took place between the two, it was superficial at best because it hardly affected each other's attitudes and cultures. Moreover, the mutual apathy on both sides was so strong that cross-membership in professional associations of the two groups, the American Political Science Association and the National Council for the Social Studies, was very limited. Such mutual isolation had harmful consequences for both groups.

The CPE suggested that instruction in political science in both elementary and secondary schools should achieve eight particular goals. First, it should transmit to

students knowledge about the “realities” of political life as well as exposing them to the cultural ideals of American democracy. Second, it should transmit to students a knowledge about political behavior and processes. Third, it should transmit knowledge about political systems other than the American system, and particularly knowledge about the international system. Fourth, it should develop within students a capacity to think about political phenomena in conceptually sophisticated ways. Fifth, it should develop within students an understanding of and skill in the process of social scientific inquiry. Sixth, it should develop within students a capacity to make explicit and analyzed normative judgments about political decisions and policies. Seventh, it should develop within students an understanding of the social psychological sources and historical-cultural origins of their own political attitudes and values, and a capacity to critically analyze the personal and social implications of alternative values. And eighth, it should develop within students an understanding of the capacities and skills needed to participate effectively and democratically in the life of the society (pp. 434-437).

The CPE observed that the status quo in pre-collegiate civic education fell short of the above-noted eight goals. The CPE’s observation was based on the research conducted by the Political Science Education Project (PSEP) which had examined elementary and secondary school social studies curriculum materials and also compiled reviews of those materials by Bruce R. Joyce (1967), James P. Shaver (1965), Byron G. Massialas (1967), and Robert J. Goldstein (undated). In addition, the PSEP staff had held extensive interviews with social studies teachers, students, and curriculum specialists.

Based on the findings of the research of PSEP, the CPE made five generalizations. First, it posited that much of the current political science instruction in elementary and secondary schools transmitted a “naïve and romanticizing image of political life which confuses the idea of democracy with the realities of politics” (p. 437). Second, “On the whole, instruction about civics and government places undue stress upon historical events, legal structures and formal institutional aspects of government and fails to transmit adequate knowledge about political behaviors and processes” (p. 439). Third, “On the whole, instruction in civics and government reflects an ethnocentric pre-occupation with American society and fails to transmit to students an adequate knowledge about the political systems of other national societies or the international system” (p. 440). Fourth, “On the whole, instruction about civics and government fails to develop within students a capacity to think about political phenomena in conceptually sophisticated ways; an understanding of, and skill in the process of social scientific inquiry; or a capacity to systematically analyze political decisions and values” (p. 442). And fifth, “On the whole, instruction in civics and government fails to develop within students an understanding of the capacity and skills needed to participate effectively and democratically in politics” (p. 443).

On the question of how the status quo was to be changed, the CPE suggested that the American Political Science Association target three specific areas in which it could make contributions: curriculum reforms, teacher education, and the social organization and culture of schools. These three areas encompassed the whole school system which needed improvement.

On curriculum reforms, the CPE was of the opinion that political scientists were not interested in “establishing a beachhead in the schools or carving out for itself a new piece of curriculum real estate” (p. 454). Since themes from political science were represented in the traditional sequence of courses in civics, government, and Problems of Democracy, there was hardly a need for introducing a separate course on political science into the social studies curriculum. The CPE expressed satisfaction about the fact that political science, in some form, was represented throughout the K-12 social studies curriculum. However, it noted that the deficiency lay in the instructional materials used for the courses. New and appropriate instructional materials explaining political concepts in different social and cultural contexts were needed. The CPE argued that political scientists should not pursue a nationally uniform K-12 curriculum in civic education because it was undesirable as well as impossible. Students’ experiences, different educational practices in school districts, and above all, the autonomy of local communities prohibited the adoption of a uniform curriculum policy. However, the CPE suggested that political scientists could contribute to the social studies curriculum by writing various types of instructional materials consisting of short units. The units could be used in two ways. First, the proposed units could be combined to form new courses of various lengths. For example, a six-week course could be designed on the subject of War and Peace, or a semester course on Political Change (p. 454). Second, the units could be used as supplementary materials in courses on civics, government, and problems of democracy.

On teacher education, the CPE suggested that the education of social studies teachers should be superior to the education of other groups of undergraduate and graduate students. Teaching about politics to young citizens required several skills, including the skill to explain and communicate complex political concepts, and to cultivate the skills of critical inquiry in students. Accomplishing these tasks warranted the provision of an excellent education for teachers. The education of social studies teachers could therefore not be left to chance. Nonetheless, the CPE regretted that this was the case in colleges and universities. Because courses were randomly structured in colleges, it was impossible for prospective teachers to develop a coherent understanding of political science. The lack of linkage between social science courses and instructional strategies in K-12 classrooms made it difficult for prospective teachers to build a solid background in political science. It was recommended that political science departments throughout the nation offer special courses specifically tailored to the needs of teachers of civics and government. In addition, political scientists should prepare instructional materials suitable for teacher education in social studies.

According to the CPE, schools were not simply places in the social environment where children interacted with instructional materials and teachers. Schools were social institutions with structure, culture, and pattern of governance (p. 455). This aspect of schools, according to the CPE, was of special interest to political scientists because schools were undergoing structural changes. The roles and authority relations among administrators, teachers, curriculum consultants, and para-professionals were being added to the school system (p. 455). The organization of the curriculum was shifting away from

the traditional pattern of 30 to 50 minute blocks dominated by a single teacher and a single textbook.

The CPE's report was an attempt by the APSA to promote its Behavioralist perspective of citizenship and civic education in schools. It pointed out deficiency in the Traditionalist approach by arguing that, "on the whole, instruction about civics and government places undue stress upon historical events, legal structures and formal institutional aspects of government and fails to transmit adequate knowledge about political behaviors and processes" (p. 439). Whereas the report avoided stressing the need for instruction in government, it clearly suggested the themes a government course should include (p. 438). The report conceded that materials from political science were incorporated in sufficient quantity in the social studies curriculum and additional materials were not required.

Since the Behaviorists prepared the CPE's report, it seems that they wanted to share their new paradigm of civic education with the social studies education community, and perhaps, attempt to persuade them to abandon the Traditionalist approach. However, the CPE's report was published in one of the APSA's journals, PS: Political Science and Politics, and not a journal for the social studies educators, such as Social Education or Theory and Research in Social Education. Indeed, there is no evidence to suggest that social studies educators may have responded to the CPE's report. It may therefore be concluded that the CPE's report failed to establish a meaningful dialogue between political scientists and educators. This lack of communication between the two was, in part, the result of political scientists' lack of commitment to and enthusiasm for the

normative mission of the schools. That is to say, since 1951, the Behavioralists had shown interest only in studying empirically the phenomenon of political socialization in schools--they did not show interest in the instructional aspect of preparing democratic citizens. The Behavioralist perspective on this subject was best illustrated by Evron M. Kirkpatrick and Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, the two leading Behavioralists in the APSA who argued that it was an erroneous notion that the objective of school instruction in political science was the preparation of patriotic citizens (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 1962, p. 100). Commenting on the teaching of government in schools for citizenship, the two Behavioralists strongly opposed the idea by positing that, "it was a distorted conception of how citizens are made...a distorted conception of democracy; and...a misconception of political science" (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 1962, p. 100). In their view, it was the responsibility of the school to inform students about the complexities of political problems as well as the existence of political science as a field of inquiry for explaining those complexities. Nonetheless, in spite of some Behavioralists' indifference towards the preparation of democratic citizens in schools, the Behavioralist perspective still found collaborators among school educators. Several textbooks for the high school government course were written from the Behavioralist perspective--Howard D. Mehlinger and John J. Patrick's American political behavior (1972) is one example.

For one quarter of a century after the CPE's 1971 report was released, the APSA remained silent on the issue of instruction in government or civic education in schools. The Behavioralist revolution that was triggered by Charles E. Merriam in the mid-1920's had lost its intellectual appeal. As argued in chapter two, the Behaviorism had become

increasingly under attack from the leftists, feminists, and members of the disenfranchised groups within the APSA. During this period, individual political scientists may have written books and articles on some political aspect of education, but at the organizational level, the APSA showed an absolute lack of interest in pre-collegiate civic education. No committees were appointed, no funds raised, nor were research reports produced on civic education or the teaching of government. In short, during the 1970's, 1980's, and early 1990's, APSA remained quiescent towards schools.

Post-behavioralism, Citizenship and Civic Education **The APSA Task Force on Civic Education, 1996**

The protracted lull was interrupted in 1996 by the then APSA president-elect, Elinor Ostrom, who submitted a proposal to the APSA Council for creating a Task Force on Civic Education for the Next Century. Ostrom was the second woman in almost one hundred years of the APSA's history, who was elected as president. APSA's first woman president was Judith Shklar in 1990.

Elinor Ostrom explained her rationale for involving the APSA in promoting civic education in schools, and hence the establishment of the proposed Task Force. The thrust of Ostrom's argument was that "civic engagement" had fallen, citizens' political efficacy had declined, and citizens' participation in the political process had plummeted (Ostrom, 1996). The term, civic engagement, was borrowed from the Harvard professor Robert Putnam's article titled "Bowling Alone: Civic Disengagement in America" published in 1995. Civic engagement was defined as citizens' participation in civic affairs. Putnam had marshaled empirical evidence showing a decline in citizens' participation in politics.

Supporting Putnam's generalization, Ostrom argued that civic engagement stood at the core of what was known as democracy. The way people related to each other in ordinary life was much more important for democracy than voting and other formal processes. A democratic society was about the citizen-to-citizen relationship for solving societal problems. Several factors fostered the culture of civic disengagement and apathy among youth. Schools were one of the major culprits. Schools presented a "cardboard model of citizenship" to students with little emphasis on teaching inquiry and organizational skills (Ostrom, 1996, p. 756). The purpose of civic education in schools was to teach young citizens how to organize themselves for the purpose of challenging authority. However, the education establishment was erroneously engaged in preparing "helpless pawns" in public schools, which led to dire consequences for democratic living (p. 756). It can be argued that like other critics, such as William Bennett and Diane Ravitch, Ostrom was also taking a convenient route: blaming public education for the ills that had besieged American democracy.

The Task before the Task Force

Ostrom suggested that the problem of reviving a democratic culture was so enormous that the Task Force would not be able to address it in a short period of time. Ostrom proposed to accomplish some results in civic education in schools in about ten years. The final report of the Task Force was scheduled for release in the year 2005. From Ostrom's statement, it appeared that the APSA had proposed some fresh ideas about the problems in American politics and society that had germinated out of the empirical

research in the early 1990's. What was missing from Ostrom's initial statement, though, was an unambiguous analysis and understanding of the linkage between American democracy and the instructional component of civic education in schools. In one sense, Ostrom's assumptions about the public school system and teachers were paternalistic at best. This was so because, on the one hand, Ostrom presented strong empirical evidence of the problem of deterioration in civic culture. On the other hand, she did not present any empirical data on how public schools handled civic education and what impediments teachers and administrators faced in that area. Hence, Ostrom's assumptions and solutions about the extant practice of civic education in public schools may have been unverifiable, presumptive, and unsubstantiated, if not altogether spurious.

Ostrom's presidential statement suggested that the Task Force would learn from the APSA's experiences in the area of civic education. She also outlined several broad solutions for enhancing civic engagement through civic education in the eleventh and twelfth grades. The statement presumed that students needed to learn both the short-term and long-term costs and benefits of civic engagement and the risks and rewards of diverse kinds of civic engagement. Moreover, the statement also suggested that learning effective skills of citizen involvement and responsibility were critical to a fully representative democracy. High school students could learn and practice those skills in the classroom and in their own communities. The first step in this direction, therefore, was that the Task Force would develop "instructional designs, resources, and even specific lessons" (Ostrom, 1996, p.757). Second, it was proposed that the Task Force would develop political science research tools that students could use in their own immediate

communities for identifying social and political problems and find solutions for them. The sub-committees of the Task Force would develop materials for traditional social studies courses taught in high schools. Also, the Task Force would collaborate with other organizations, such as the NCSS to organize workshops and conferences on civic education.

The Task Force was created with an initial membership of eleven political scientists. Unlike the former APSA committees, which occasionally included representatives from other fields, each one of the eleven members of the Task Force was a professional political scientist. Unlike the former all-male committees, except for the 1916 committee, which had included a female member, there were six women scholars on the Task Force. The inclusion of women in the Task Force epitomized a vital attitudinal change within the APSA: it showed that women's voices were being heard in the association. This is not to suggest, however, that all women political scientists spoke with one voice: women members had different research agendas and espoused diverse worldviews. Two of the women members were recognized as the most distinguished scholars of political theory in American academia; Professor Elinor Ostrom was a political scientist at Indiana University and president of APSA from 1996 to 1997. Ostrom also served as president of the Midwest Political Science Association. Among her many publications, Governing the commons (1990) was viewed as a modern classic. Professor Jean Bethke Elshtain of the University of Chicago was the Co-Chair of the Task Force. In 1998, the membership of the Task Force was expanded to sixteen adding two more women scholars to the list. Three of the scholars who joined the Task Force in

the second round had already made commendable contributions to civic education. Richard G. Niemi of the University of Rochester had been a renowned scholar on civic education since the early 1970's. His latest book Civic education: What makes students learn?, co-authored with Professor Jane Junn of Rutgers University, was published in 1998. Richard Brody of Stanford University had served on a National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools in 1989 and contributed an article on political science education to Charting a course: Social studies for the 21st century, the final recommendation of the said Task Force. In addition, in 1994, Brody had also authored Secondary education and political attitudes: Examining the effects on political tolerance of the *We the People*...curriculum, a study that examined the effects of curriculum on high school students' political tolerance. Professor M. Kent Jennings of the University of California, Santa Barbara, was known for his seminal empirical research in the 1960's and 1970's on the political knowledge and character of adolescents and he had co-edited several books with Richard Niemi on civic education. Two members, Lief H. Carter of Colorado College and Jean B. Elshtain of the School of Divinity, University of Chicago, articulated the statement of purpose of the Task Force by stating that it would:

- 1) Provide and widely disseminate the clearest possible empirical description and analytical understanding of the depth and breadth of the "civic engagement" problem.
 - 2) Provide and widely disseminate the most specific possible descriptions of how, at every level of political education, we teach or fail the craft and practice of politics.
 - 3) Articulate concrete curricular and extracurricular steps that educators can take to teach an understanding of the craft of politics. These descriptions must detail why and how these efforts successfully reinvigorate the motivation and skill to engage effectively in political life at every level.
- (Carter & Elshtain, 1997, p. 745)

In 1997, the Task Force organized a conference at Colorado College to develop working papers identifying civic education activities in high schools. The Task Force decided that it would limit its activities to four areas. The first activity of the Task Force was the establishment of a discussion list on the World Wide Web. The main purpose of the discussion list was to facilitate the instant exchange of opinions and information among scholars and researchers on civic education. Second, it was decided that the Task Force would review the research concerning the course on "government that was required for high school graduation in 17 states" (APSA Task Force, p. 744). The third activity was about teacher education. The Task Force was of the view that high school teachers were an important constituency for the civic education program and proposed that the Task Force members were involved in developing workshops for in-service teachers. In addition, it was decided that "the Task Force will promote the importance of political science training in the preparation of high school civics and government teachers" (p. 744). Finally, the Task Force expressed its interest in producing guides and resources for teachers at all levels of education to help link their experiences in volunteering, participation in civic associations, and service learning to democratic principles of political participation.

From Value Neutrality to Democratic Values

In the spring of 1999, the APSA's ideological approach to civic education swung towards an unanticipated direction. For the first time in its history, the APSA was couching civic education in a new language. The APSA's new language deviated from

the jargon heretofore used in the APSA's perspectives on civic education. In a sense, the new message was that both Traditionalism and Behavioralism were no longer useful concepts for the preparation of democratic citizens. This meant that political scientists' time-honored tradition of a state-centered approach to civic education came to an end. The Task Force on Civic Education had issued the "Articulation Statement" minimizing the value of instruction in government for civic education. The core message of the statement, which probably reflected a culmination from the deliberation and exchanges of ideas among political scientists, stressed the teaching of basic democratic values in civic education. A fresh vision about American society, democracy, citizenship, and education was presented. Considering the Task Force's assumptions about American democracy, it may be fair to suggest that its Articulation Statement was certainly an effort to build a case against the teaching of the structure and function government in schools. The question is: why did this about-face suddenly occur in the APSA's policy? The answer to the question may perhaps be gleaned from the community-oriented world-views of the most powerful and respected members of the Task Force, such as Ostrom, Putnam, and Elshstain. The contribution of these members to democratic theory had been enormous, and therefore, their views were highly respected by their colleagues in the APSA. In the end, it was their community-oriented world-view that not only prevailed, but also shaped the APSA's vision of civic education for the twenty first century.

When members of the Task Force were asked in an in-house survey to express their opinions about the most important single civic lesson that citizens must learn in a democracy, eight different answers were received. The answers were: (1) "learn to lose

gracefully.” (2) “know that democracy is an ongoing and very much unfinished drama about the struggle to make peace.” (3) “capacity to access and critically assess governance-related and issue-relevant information.” (4) “why we must have rule of law.” (5) “tolerance of diverse opinions.” (6) “the efficacy of collaboration.” (7) “exposing students to central and political traditions of the nation.” (8) “play up the dignity and standing of the category ‘citizen’” (Task Force, 1999). Robert Putnam, a professor at Harvard and member of the Task Force, reduced the responses to four categories: (1) teach tolerance, (2) teach collaboration, (3) teach analysis, and (4) teach our traditions. Finally, a consensus was reached among the members on reducing the four categories to one: “Teach the motivation and competence to engage actively in public problem-solving” (APSA Task Force on Civic Education in the 21st Century, 1999, pp.1-3). Nonetheless, the Task Force was interested in eliciting reactions from the wider circle of the APSA membership to the final category that it had concluded with consensus among its twelve members. In other words, it appeared that the Task Force may have been willing to modify its final position on how civic education should be defined.

The Articulation Statement pointed out that teaching about government “...will not itself provide the political education we need” (Task Force, 1999, p. 1). Moreover, the statement suggested that “In sum, we believe that the factual political knowledge we do and must teach can only become meaningful in political practice when presented within a valuational framework. We believe we must therefore teach the specific virtues on which effective political practice depends” (p. 3).

The in-house discussion of the Task Force had generated two propositions about civic education and none of them included the teaching of government. The first proposition stressed the teaching of liberal values, such as individual liberty and freedom. The second proposition emphasized the learning of organizational and participation skills in non-governmental forums. The Task Force realized that both propositions, if incorporated in the K-12 curricula, would have far-reaching consequences for those APSA members who were involved in civic education. In a sense, the Task Force was aware that its new concept of civic education was a timely and a revolutionary one, which had the potential to shake up the century-old traditional foundations of the discipline itself. The Task Force conceded that political scientists' emphasis on teaching about government in civic education may have contributed to the engendering of "unhealthy cynicism and political disengagement" in American polity (Task Force, 1999, p.2). The statement conceded in unambiguous terms that civic education was about the teaching of democratic values, such as tolerance; hence, it was imperative for political scientists to situate their analytical, scientific and empirical studies in a moral framework. The century-old Traditionalism and the mid-century Behavioralism were no longer considered appropriate paradigms for explaining the political problems of the twenty-first century.

Conclusion

The APSA's three conceptions of citizenship and civic education, i.e. Traditionalism, Behavioralism, and Post-behavioralism, embedded in the eight reports,

recommendations, and statements manifest the changing goals and paradigms of political science in the twentieth century. More importantly, the APSA's reports, recommendations, and statements provide tangible evidence validating political scientists' systematic efforts towards influencing the pre-collegiate civic education. A plausible explanation of why the three conceptions emerged must consider at least three factors. First, the specific historical phase in which the conception was advanced; second, the world-views of the APSA committee members; and third, the social and political milieu in which the APSA proposed its conceptions.

The APSA advanced its Traditionalist conception of citizenship and civic education soon after its inception when professional political scientists were in the process of divorcing themselves from the American Historical Association and seeking a separate disciplinary identity for their field. It was a period in which the sole purpose and goal of political science was the study of the state and its organs. Professional political science was in its infancy. Traditionalism or the state-centered conservative approach was the only paradigm known to political scientists. Most leading political scientists were educated in the state-centered tradition in Germany. As Gabriel Almond (1990) has suggested, "In the first decades of the professional political science in the United States, the substantive focus of the discipline was on governmental institutions and processes. A Ph.D. in political science was assumed to be knowledgeable about these institutions and processes—in the descriptive and historical sense, in the real sense, and in the philosophical sense" (p. 35). Moreover, in their struggle to be recognized as a legitimate field of knowledge, political scientists threw a wider net beyond colleges and

universities—they aligned with schools. They did so because they had challenged an entity that was much more established than they were, i.e. the American Historical Association, which had already shown a deep and visible interest in citizenship and civic education in schools. Moreover, although the government-oriented courses were not new to schools in the first decade of the twentieth century, political scientists insisted on securing an independent status for them in the curriculum. For political scientists, learning about the government and its institutions became an end in itself.

The APSA's reports of 1908, 1916, 1921, 1925, and 1939 incorporate the state-centered Traditionalist conception of citizenship. In these four reports, the APSA outlined its policies on teaching government in the senior grades. The primary purpose of these reports was to stress upon the education community the significance of instruction in government for good citizenship. During this period, the APSA defined citizenship in the context of the state. In its view, the schools' mission of civic education could not be accomplished without instruction in government. The APSA also sought to re-define civics because it did not consider the inclusion of other social sciences in civics as civic education. Hence, it demanded their removal from the civics curriculum. By doing this, the APSA drew a clear line of demarcation between political science and other social sciences. It is not to suggest that the APSA necessarily succeeded in every one of its efforts. During the Traditionalist period, it faced serious disappointments. The NEA report of the 1916 excluded materials from political science; instead, it invented a new course, the POD. The NEA Committee did not consider the Traditionalist conception of citizenship suitable for secondary schools. It was a great disappointment to the APSA.

Nevertheless, in the long run, the Traditionalist conception proved to be more persistent than many educators at the time realized.

After the Second World War, Behavioralism ascended as a paradigm in political science. During the Behavioralist phase, the APSA issued two reports, i.e. the 1951 report and the 1971 report. Political scientists, who wrote the two reports, espoused the Behavioralist world-views. The 1951 report incorporated Rossitor's definition of civic education that had, among other things, underscored the cognitive dimension of good citizenship. Similarly, the 1971 report proposed the eight-point agenda for what civic education should constitute. Most of the eight points insist on the development of intellectual and analytical skills. There were only few suggestions in terms of the application of those intellectual and analytical skills, however. It is important to note that the 1971 report was issued in a time when the nation had just experienced a historical period of social ferment in the areas of women's struggle for equal rights, the civil rights movement, and the students' protest against the Vietnam War. The report was an important critique of the prevailing practices in schools in the area of civic education.

Why did the APSA and its members jettison Traditionalist and Behavioralist conceptions and embrace the Post-behavioralist conception of citizenship and civic education? This may be explained in the context of three factors. First, unlike the previous committees, the Task Force was initiated by an APSA president who was a feminist. Moreover, the Task Force included members, such as Robert Putnam and Jean B. Elshtain, who were neither Traditionalists nor empiricists--they were philosophers committed to the study and fostering of "civic engagement." Their frame of reference was

neither Hegel nor Hobbes, but Alexis de Tocqueville's seminal concept of civil society. Second, the political science discipline itself had moved away from the Behavioralist phase into the Post-behavioralist phase. This means that the discipline had lost its unifying core and embraced diverse approaches thus allowing new and unconventional ideas to flourish. Third, and perhaps the most important factor was that the United States had entered into a post-Cold War domestic and global environment in which the trend towards democratization had intensified. As political scientists were studying the phenomenon of transitions to democracy in the former Communist countries and elsewhere, they also became interested in the loss of democratic values in America. They noted that citizens' participation in the democratic process was at an all-time low. Whereas everywhere else people were throwing off the totalitarian shackles and embracing democracy, "Democracy in America" was in danger. Hence, the APSA's leadership in the mid-1990's launched a new movement for revitalizing citizenship and civic education in America. The new movement promoted a conception of citizenship and civic education that may be characterized as Post-behavioralist.

Chapter IV

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents the main findings of the study, suggests its significance, discusses the implications of the Traditionalist framework for civic education, and make suggestions about further research pertaining to the relationship between instruction in government and civic education in schools.

My examination of the development of political science in chapter two indicates that in the twentieth century this discipline evolved through three broad historical phases, namely Traditionalist, Behavioralist, and Post-behavioralist. Moreover, in each phase, the APSA, an official body representing political scientists' views and interests, sought to promote the three distinct conceptions of citizenship and civic education among the pre-collegiate education community. The three conceptions, namely Traditionalism, Behavioralism, and Post-behavioralism, are embedded in the APSA's eight reports, recommendations, and statements, issued between 1908 and 1999.

The Traditionalist conception fostered a state-centric and paternalist approach to citizenship and civic education. The Behavioralist conception prescribed the positivist method to the study of politics and thereby stressed value-neutrality in the teaching of government. The Post-behavioralist conception repudiated both state-centrism and value-neutrality by highlighting the significance of civic engagement through the teaching and learning of democratic values. The textbooks for the high school government course and other curriculum materials suggest that, of the three conceptions, it is the state-centered

Traditionalist conception that has been canonized in the high school course on government.

Political scientists introduced their Traditionalist conception of citizenship and civic education to the pre-collegiate education community soon after they seceded from the AHA in 1903. They formed an independent learned society, namely the American Political Science Association (APSA). The APSA was founded during a period when political science was still in its infancy and Traditionalism was the dominant paradigm in the discipline. Under Traditionalism, political scientists' chief missions were state-building, the systematic study of governmental institutions, and the preparation of a universal administrative class. The APSA sought to promote instruction in government in colleges. However, in 1905 a survey revealed that college freshmen had a limited knowledge of government. This triggered the APSA's interest in strengthening the government course in high schools.

The APSA also discovered that whereas the enrollment in the high school history course was over 40%, it was less than 20% in the American government course (APSA, 1908, p. 225). Indeed, history in the school curriculum received strong support from the AHA. More importantly, in 1899, the AHA Committee of Seven downgraded the significance of the study of government to civic education. Commenting on the AHA's views on the government course, curriculum historian Hazel W. Hertzberg (1989) posits that, "But the Seven believed that while the study of civil government was essential, it was not sufficient; it was too static, ['too presentist,'] too concerned with existing

institutions” (p. 78). That is to say, the AHA considered history more dynamic, and therefore, a more relevant subject for civic education than government.

Because political scientists were in competition with historians, from whose hegemony they had recently extricated themselves, accepting a lower status for their discipline in the high school social studies curriculum was detrimental to the development of their profession. Hence, motivated by self-interest rather than altruism, the APSA extended the scope of its activities into the high schools. Towards this end, the APSA followed the footsteps of the AHA by seeking to secure an independent and mandatory status for the government course in high schools. Under the leadership of Professor William A. Schaper of the University of Minnesota, in 1905, the APSA authorized the Committee on Instruction in Government (CIG), which conducted a survey of the status of government-oriented courses in schools and issued its report in 1908.

The APSA report of 1908, namely “Report of the Committee of Five of the American Political Science Association on Instruction in Government in Secondary Schools,” contended that learning about the structure and functions of governmental institutions was the *raison d’etre* of civic education in schools. The report argued that citizens should “become aware of the [s]tate and of its organization, the government” (p. 245). Moreover, the report declared categorically that political scientists in universities were “The specialists who are offering these courses are in many cases in very close touch with the practical administration of the government. In numerous instances, in recent years, the government has called upon these men for expert services and advice” (p. 248). It was the first time that political scientists publicly affirmed their proprietary

control over the school curriculum on government, citizenship, and civic education. With its extensive report, the APSA launched a state-centric, bureaucratic, and paternalistic worldview of citizenship and civic education to be put into practice in the pre-collegiate settings. In the succeeding decades, the APSA organized numerous committees and issued seven more reports on pre-collegiate curriculum and instruction in government.

Indeed, the periodicity of the eight reports, recommendations, and statements, discussed in chapter three, suggests that throughout the twentieth century, professional political scientists' interest in pre-collegiate civic education was not only sporadic, they consistently overlooked the cultural exigencies of schools. More importantly, because in their profession, as Mary Jane Turner (1978) and Stephen J. Bennett (1999) suggest, political scientists generally preferred academic research to classroom instruction, their recommendations for the high school government course overlooked the centrality of pedagogy in the social studies classrooms. Hence, it may be concluded that, although in different historical periods political scientists asserted their proprietary control over the pre-collegiate civic education, their proposals not only fell short of meeting the socialization needs of adolescents, but they were also pedagogically inadequate for the historical mission of the social studies education.

Since more than the other two approaches, Traditionalism persisted as an essential component of the curriculum and instruction in government, it had implications in two important areas: (a) women and civic education, (b) cultural diversity and citizenship education. A detailed discussion on the two areas follow later in the chapter.

Educators and textbook analysts, including James P. Shaver (1965), Byron G. Massialas (1967), Karen Wiley (1977), John Haas (1979), Mary Jane Turner (1978), and *People for the American Way* (1987) recognize the continuity of the Traditionalist conception in the social studies curriculum. Some of the high school textbooks on government were written by the proponents of the Traditionalist approach, including political scientists Edgar Dawson, William B. Munro, William A. McClenaghan, and Thomas H. Reed. Indeed, in their own capacity as textbook writers, and as members of the APSA, political scientists contributed to the institutionalization of Traditionalism in the high school social studies curriculum.

Over the years, political scientists exercised their proprietary control over knowledge in the high school course on government. It is evident from the APSA's early reports and its activities that between 1905 and the beginning of the Second World War, this Association invested time and organizational resources into building a case for securing a mandatory status for government courses in high schools. To strengthen instruction in the structure and function of government, the APSA also aligned with the National Council for the Social Studies. Cora Prifold (1962), the APSA director for the Social Studies Project, noted that during the late 1930's and early 1940's, the two bodies, the APSA and the NCSS, organized dozens of joint conferences on the teaching of government in schools and collaborated on a variety of social studies projects, including curriculum revision and teacher education (p. 5). In their joint activities with teachers, political scientists were single-minded; their primary aim was the insemination of the

main assumptions and methods of their discipline into the social studies curriculum. Those assumptions embodied a state-centered conservative conception of citizenship.

As a caveat, and because of the limited literature on the subject, it can be argued that it is difficult to quantify the exact outcome of political scientists' influence on mandating the course on government for high school graduation. Before the Second World War, perhaps, other social forces may also have been promoting the teaching of government or political science in schools, but little research has been conducted on this issue. With regard to political scientists' role in promoting instruction in government in schools, a substantial amount of primary and secondary data (see Tryon, 1935; Prifold, 1962; Schachter, 1998) support the premise that during the first three decades of the twentieth century, their pedagogical mission in this matter was clearly defined and their efforts were indeed unsurpassed (Patrick & Hoge, 1991, p. 427).

Both Rolla M. Tryon (1935) and C. A. Pettersch (1953) recognized that by the end of the first three decades of the twentieth century, political science materials were being widely used in high schools. It is not to suggest that, by then, political scientists were completely satisfied with the progress their discipline had made. Indeed, in spite of the APSA's political manipulations of the state legislative assemblies in the mid-1920's towards mandating the government course as a requirement for high school graduation, as indicated in the 1925 report, it appears that all states did not respond favorably. Nonetheless, political scientist Howard White (1946) found that the APSA's struggle on the legal front produced some results. White argues, "At the same time, it is quite clear that there would probably have been less teaching of American government in high

schools during the past two decades had not such teaching been required in several jurisdictions by state law” (p. 971). By the early 1960’s, the course on government or pre-collegiate political science had become a legitimate and vital component of the high school social studies curriculum (Hahn, 1965, p. 86). In 1963, 76.6 percent of the high school students were enrolled in courses on American government. In 1963, a survey by the Robert A. Taft Institute of Government found that “47 of the 50 states participating in the survey had made some statutory provision for required instruction in the teaching of government” (Hahn, 1965, p. 87). In 1996, the Council of State Social Studies Specialists (CSSSS) conducted a survey, known as the National Survey of State Requirements, Course Offerings and Assessments in Social Studies. The CSSSS survey showed that government was taught as an independent course in senior year in almost all fifty states and that in most states it was required for graduation. This evidence suggests that, as far as the course content is concerned, by the end of the twentieth century, political scientists’ Traditionalist conception of citizenship was firmly established in the high school social studies curriculum.

Indeed, there is no historical evidence to suggest that, once introduced, the teaching of government in high schools, a Traditionalist component of the social studies curriculum, ever faced a serious challenge from other interest groups. The upshot of this interpretation is that as political science developed into a full-fledged discipline gaining a prestigious academic status, simultaneously, the teaching of government in schools also gained popularity and legitimacy. Thus, instruction in government as part of the high

school social studies curriculum developed contemporaneous with the development of political science in colleges and universities.

The high school government course was in reality a preparatory course for the political science course in college, as it was proposed in the CIG report of 1908. This does not suggest, however, that in some form, political science materials were not included in the social studies curriculum before the APSA emerged as an interest group. The assertion here is that once the APSA joined the battle over school curriculum, it was probably the most active, persistent, and systematic supporter and promoter of instruction in government in school. Indeed, the APSA's tenacious behavior was understandable because it faced an antagonist, i.e. the AHA, which was bigger in size and resources, and had closer historical ties with the education community. It was therefore apt for some eminent scholars of social studies to assert that, "The ancestry of today's secondary school courses in civics and government can be traced directly to activities of the American Political Science Association and the National Education Association during the early years of the century" (Patrick & Hoge, 1991, p. 427).

Tryon (1935), Hertzberg (1989), and the CIG (1908) and CI (1916) reports indicate that by the end of the nineteenth century materials from political science had been included in history courses and a separate course on government was not supported by the AHA's influential Committee of Seven in 1899. Political scientists' own splintering from the AHA in 1903 was the first momentous step in their two-pronged strategy to liberate instruction in government from the hegemony of history in colleges as well as in schools. William Anderson (1939) argued that during the early period of the

twentieth century, political science in colleges was taught in the departments of history. However, as more students enrolled in colleges, separate departments of political science were created.

Pioneered by the School of Political Science at Columbia College in 1880, independent political science departments sprouted in most colleges offering courses on government. Generally, college students took courses in government to qualify for employment in bureaucracy. Both David Jenness (1990) and Stephen Leonard (1995) posit that the “training of elites for government service” had been one of the early missions of the political science discipline (Jenness, p. 183; Leonard, pp. 74-76). The discipline’s goal in preparing a professional bureaucratic class was to strengthen the administrative structure of the state. Thus, the discipline of political science in the early twentieth century propounded a novel conception of the American polity in that it eulogized the institutions of the state. According to historian Bernard Crick (1959), such a conception was at odds with the American political culture and traditions (pp. 73-74).

The historical antecedents of the Traditionalist conception of citizenship may be traced to the arrival of the German-trained professional political scientists in the late nineteenth century (Merriam, 1927; Crick, 1959; Gunnell, 1991) As chapter two indicates, the Traditionalist assumptions were introduced into the political science discipline by its founding fathers, including Francis Lieber, John Burgess, Frank Goodnow, and Woodrow Wilson. However, some observers found those assumptions to be untenable in the American civic culture. For example, Crick (1959) argued that the idea of the state was German in origin, “alien to American experience and institutions,”

and therefore, had no “organic relationship to American politics” (p. 96). In contrast, much earlier, Alexis de Tocqueville’s Democracy in America validated the existence of a ubiquitous civil society in the United States. The civil society in America was stronger in its influence than the Hegelian state, as the German-trained Traditionalists proposed. Tocqueville argued in the early 1830’s that the state played a limited role in the daily lives of American citizens. In contrast, voluntary civic associations, the basic elements of a civil society, played a more vital role in citizens’ lives. The essence of Tocqueville’s thesis was that in the context of state-citizen relations, it was the unobtrusiveness of the state, which defined American democratic culture. Tocqueville’s observation suggests that citizens’ active participation in the community politics was a prominent feature of American democracy. That is to say, there was an imbalance of power between state and civic society in that the latter was less encumbered by the former. In this regard, political scientist Theodore Lowi (1993) argues, “The American state until the 1930’s was virtually an oxymoron. The level of national government activity was almost as low in 1932 as it had been in 1832” (p. 384). As the state power and organization expanded in scope, it ineluctably intruded on civil society. Indeed, as the APSA report of 1908 indicates, political scientists provided “expert services and advice” to the state on issues pertaining to social control (p. 248).

Moreover, on the role of the APSA in strengthening the state in the early twentieth century, Lowi (1993) suggests, “One could say, however, that the early APSA was a kind of [*counterintelligentsia*] formed in defense of a state that did not yet exist” (p. 385). Hence, as a counter-intelligentsia, one of the Traditionalists’ missions was to create and

strengthen the administrative structure of the state through teaching about government both in colleges and schools. In other words, as the letter of the APSA Committee on Instruction in Government to teachers and administrators in 1908 suggested, the APSA members were not only engaged in the scientific study of the state, they were also steering the state. Thus, the teaching of the course on government in schools became a pedagogical ingredient of the Traditionalist enterprise of building an ethnically and racially homogeneous nation-state. The writings of John Burgess, the founder of the first department of political science at Columbia College, provide ample evidence to confirm that Traditionalists' worldviews were Eurocentric, conservative, patriarchal, and in Burgess's case, utterly "racist" (Gunnell, 1991, p. 15). Therefore, the APSA's idea of fostering the teaching of government in the pre-collegiate setting was essentially triggered by an academic tradition that extolled masculinity, social stability, racial homogeneity, and above all, state-building.

In addition, it can be argued that political scientist's unremitting commitment to the promotion of instruction in government in schools was an ideological as well as a professional undertaking. As Ross (1991) argues, it was the "rising professionalism" in social sciences that separated academic disciplines in early twentieth century (p. 283). Hence, political scientists' organized efforts between 1905 and 1940 catapulted the Traditionalist conception of citizenship to a permanent niche in the discourse on civic education curriculum. As the contents of the reports (for example, 1951, 1971, 1999) suggest, the later generations of the APSA leadership showed a relatively lesser degree of enthusiasm towards instruction in government in schools. For example, during the last

three decades of the twentieth century, the APSA leadership abandoned Traditionalism as an over-riding principle of citizenship and civic education. Such blunt repudiation both from Behaviorists and Post-behaviorists notwithstanding, the state-centric conception continued as an integral component of civic education in schools in the form of a government course. Surely, as Post-behaviorists in the late twentieth century argue, such an enterprise had broader societal implications, especially for the civic education of women and the non-White population.

Educational Implications

Women and Citizenship Education

In the Traditionalist framework, citizenship was conceived in a male image. Traditionalists considered citizens as masculine and autonomous decision-makers having republican virtues. By implication, then, this conception excluded those groups that were feminine, dependent, and operating in the private sphere. Women were associated with emotion and sentiment, characteristics that had a subordinate place in the public sphere. Furthermore, since citizenship was defined in political terms, it was considered to have been derived from the state. That is to say, Traditionalists considered citizenship, first, a juridical status. Citizenship was not defined in moral, personal or subjective terms, i.e. the practice of good neighborliness, caring for one's community, looking after one's family and children, and showing tolerance and respect for those who are culturally different. Hence, such a model of citizenship contained the attributes of what education philosopher Nel Noddings (1991) refers to as "warrior model" (p. 69). For Noddings,

citizenship is more than the law-related negative conception that the “traditional view” had articulated (p. 68). In Noddings’s framework, citizenship in a “truly democratic society” is based on the voluntary participation of individuals in the well being of communities (p. 68). Her view of citizenship epitomizes the same flavor as Dewey’s notion of “associated living.” Indeed, Noddings also echoes the theme identified by Alexis de Tocqueville in the early nineteenth century that diverges substantially from state-centeredness. Thus, the state-centeredness of Traditionalism embodied those values that glorified the conflictual dimension of civic life, but ignored the value of individuals’ private and voluntary contributions to civil society including those that “mothers have long tried to inculcate in their children” (Noddings, 1991, p. 68).

In Traditionalism, the private sphere is incompatible with citizenship activities. Since most of the women’s duties, including being caring mothers, were performed in the private sphere, it may be safe to assume that for all practical purposes they were excluded from the patriarchal construction of citizenship. In short, women were viewed as non-participants in the public mission of the body politic. Such a conception of citizenship undermined the status of women as equal citizens. As was discussed in the first two chapters, for many decades in the twentieth century, this conception of women was embedded in textbooks and other curricular materials on government.

Moreover, the Traditionalist conception permeated the organizational culture and values of the APSA itself. The internal political dynamics of the organization of APSA suggests the presence of a patriarchal culture in the profession. Historically, women have played a relatively minor role in the profession of political science in general, and in the

APSA in particular. Between 1903 and 1999, the APSA elected two women presidents, both in the 1990's. Women made up twenty eight percent of the APSA membership in 1998 (APSA Survey, 1998, p. 351) In contrast, other learned societies had a better record of accomplishment. For example, the American Historical Association (AHA) had five women presidents. The first one, Nellie Nelson, was elected as early as 1943. In addition, by 1999, women made up forty percent of the AHA membership. Moreover, the American Sociological Association (ASA) had seven women presidents: the first woman president, Dorothy Thomas, was elected in 1952. ASA's women members were more than forty six percent of the total membership. As a learned society, it seems that APSA was a less hospitable place for women than AHA and ASA.

Perhaps, the persistence of a patriarchal culture in the APSA enhanced the fostering of the Traditionalist world-view. This means that the professional reward system in political science depended on members' adherence to Traditionalism (Turner, 1978; Leonard, 1999). As a consequence, and as it is evident from the recognition given to the founding fathers of political science, most political scientists received scholarly credentials by embracing the state-centered approach to social issues, including the civic education of citizens. One aspect of this arrangement was that, as a dominant paradigm, Traditionalism promoted a truncated conception of citizenship in that it overlooked women's contributions to nurturing of the political community. It was this imprudent conception that consistently remained the central theme in the high school textbooks on government.

Cultural Pluralism and Citizenship Education

The Traditionalist conception of citizenship was based on the Western canon of knowledge seeking to achieve national unity. Such canonical knowledge represented the assumptions and experiences of Western male scholars, from Plato to Hegel to Hans J. Morgenthau to Allan Bloom to E. D. Hirsch, Jr. to William J. Bennett. The experiences of non-Western social groups were either ignored in the Traditionalist conceptual framework or regarded as extraneous. The proponents of multiculturalism referred to this phenomenon as “political hegemony” (Banks, 1997, p. xiii). Hence, since the turn of the century, the proponents of Traditionalism in political science had sought to impose national unity on culturally diverse populations by inculcating in them respect for the national political institutions. The Traditionalist conception faced little opposition as long as the audience remained White European immigrants. However, with the influx of a non-European and non-White immigrant population, the Traditionalist conception lost its moral authority and legitimacy. Recently, education researchers found that “The majority of children in the schools of 25 of the 30 largest cities are people of color, many of whom are living in poverty” (Orfield, Bachmeier, James & Eitle, 1997, cited in Hahn, 1999, p. 584). Thus, the teaching of a traditional state-centered perspective, essentially, an atavistic approach, through the government-oriented courses in culturally diverse classrooms must be seen as inconsistent with and inadequate for civic education in a culturally pluralist democracy.

On the surface, focusing exclusively on the Western experiences in the textbooks may not seem very harmful. Nonetheless, it may be harmful to those who do not identify

themselves with White males and would prefer to revere their group differences. Indeed, it may be oppressive, undemocratic, and unethical when textbooks with a Traditionalist conception are used in ethnically diverse social studies classrooms. The pedagogical goals of such textbooks are the assimilation of all citizens into universal citizenship or *Unum*. However, such aims are utopian and will not foster democratic living if they overlook the realities of cultural differences of citizens (Young, 1989).

Textbooks on government contain knowledge about the American political system, and indeed, all citizens must be knowledgeable about the political system under which they live. However, as civic education researchers Jane Junn and Richard Niemi (1998) have argued, curriculum and instruction on the rules and processes of a distant national government may not be as effective in enhancing civic knowledge as the curriculum “that speaks more directly to the experiences of a diversity of students” (pp.154-156). Junn and Niemi formulated the thesis that the Traditionalists’ “emphasis in high school on the Constitution and the national government may simply reinforce the notion that government in general is distant and not closely connected with daily lives” (p. 154). In other words, in a rapidly changing ethnic composition of American society, curriculum and instruction in government-oriented courses must focus on two inter-related realities: the cultural contexts of students and enhancement of all students’ civic commitment to the well being of the communities in which they live. By recognizing pluralist perspectives and incorporating a community-oriented approach, Junn and Niemi’s scheme suggests not only the deconstruction of the Traditionalist conception, but

resurrects the Deweyan conception of citizenship proposed in Democracy and Education in 1916.

Indeed, the institutionalization of the Traditionalist conception of citizenship in textbooks on government made little contribution to civic culture. Perhaps, it may have coerced cultural assimilation. This is so because, on the one hand, political science in high school fostered the scientific study of politics, and, on the other hand, it overlooked the participatory dimension of “associated living” (Dewey, 1916, p. 82). First, the scientific study of politics or the disciplinary approach to the study of government is something that Dewey (1929) had called a “reclusive behavior.” By using this method, students in the government course become detached and objective observers of politics. They may learn the scientific methods to explain the complexities of political life, but they may not necessarily learn to practice the values essential for living in union with those who are ethnically different from them. Second, and this is related to the first aspect, the question of what civic participation skills new citizens, non-White students, and students from the low socio-economic status groups need to learn in order to participate fully in the political life of the communities in which they live, is generally overlooked in textbooks and state curriculum recommendations. For example, in its three curriculum recommendations, A Look at Our Town (1983), Learning Standards for Social Studies (1996), and Towards Civic Responsibility (1997), the New York State Education Department hardly mention what specific social skills children needed to learn to function harmoniously in an ethnically diverse society. Similarly, Magruder’s American Government (1990), a state-centric Traditionalist textbook for the senior grade

government course that first appeared in 1917. totally overlooks the subject of cultural pluralism. The 70th edition of Magruder's authored by political scientist William A. McClenaghan of the Oregon State University, begins the first chapter with discussion on the origins of the state and sovereignty. Nowhere does the book discuss how diverse ethnic groups may relate to government, however. Turner (1978) noted that, "Magruder's is without question the most widely sold government textbook in the United States" (p. 227). In Turner's view, Magruder's was so popular with educators that other publishers imitated its "style, content, and approach to assure that 'traditionals' are what are out there in greatest number" (p. 227).

On the question of the development of civic participation skills through instruction in government in culturally diverse schools, it is clear that the basic premise of the Traditionalist conception is flawed. Scholars, such as Patrick and Hoge (1991), Turner (1981), and Niemi & Junn (1998), concurs that, in practice, instruction in government constitutes the core of civic education in schools. In addition, the theory of civic education, as it is formulated by John Patrick (1976) and Judith Torny-Purta (1992), postulates that one of the central precepts of preparing democratic citizens is the development of civic participation skills of all students in their own social contexts. It is through civic participation that citizens exercise their equal rights in a pluralist democracy. However, as mentioned above, the extant Traditionalist conception of curriculum and instruction in government defines participation in juridical and constricted terms. In the Traditionalist conception, used in the above-mentioned curriculum guidelines, participation is defined as voting for the selection or election of government

officials. This definition of participation is procedural, technical, and ceremonial, at best. Hence, the hegemonic Traditionalist conception of citizenship education is inadequate for strengthening “civic engagement” among diverse ethnic groups and for building a strong civil society.

Questions for Further Research

This study addresses four questions about political scientists’ educational ideas and activities in the pre-collegiate setting. However, several important questions were set aside in the study, which surely deserve investigation. If looked into, these questions may further enhance our understanding of civic education in pre-collegiate settings.

The first question pertains to the historical trajectory of two courses in the high school social studies curriculum. The question should focus on the causes of the continuation of the government course and the decline of the Problems of Democracy course. As this study shows, for the most part of the twentieth century, the government course has been holding a capstone position in the secondary school curriculum and is likely to continue holding this position in the foreseeable future. The continuation of the government course in the twelfth grade is conceivable because during the last two decades new influential interest groups, such as the Center for Civic Education (CCE) and the Close Up Foundation, among others, have picked up the cudgel on behalf of the course. A recent study by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) found that there were “approximately 100 organizations” in the United States, which, in some form, supported civic education (Hahn, 1999, p. 587).

Moreover, the study identified the CCE's We the People Program, a state-centric Traditionalist curriculum guideline for the high school government course, as the "widely used" curriculum guideline (Hahn, 1999, p. 589).

In contrast with the government course, the Problems of Democracy, which was introduced by educators in 1916, has not been able to marshal sufficient political support for its existence, and consequently has been elbowed out of the high school curriculum. Was there a zero-sum relationship between the government course and the Problems of Democracy? A comparative-historical study may illuminate the factors that contributed to the expansion of one course and the elimination of the other course. More importantly, the study of the question may also illuminate power-relations between the pre-collegiate education community, interest groups, and the learned societies.

The second question concerns the causes of the long periods of inertia in the APSA about civic education in the pre-collegiate setting. My investigation of the APSA activities shows that between 1905 and the onset of the Second World War, political scientists actively promoted the government course in high schools. However, after the War, the APSA remained indifferent towards schools between two historical periods, i.e., 1951-1971 and 1971-1996. The question is: what specific factors may have restrained the APSA's activities in schools during these periods? My findings show that four factors may be responsible for diverting the APSA's attention from promoting instruction in government in schools. First, after the Second World War, the paradigm shift from Traditionalism to Behavioralism was a sea change in the discipline. Behavioralists were not as much committed to the study of the state and its institutions as their predecessors

had been: "Behavioralism provided a salutary emphasis upon political factors other than the governmental forms" (Macridis & Brown, 1990, p. 5). Hence, with paradigm shift instruction in government or the promotion of it in civic education became a less important goal. Second, new sub-fields, including comparative politics and political philosophy, evolved in the discipline that were relatively less state-centric than the sub-field of government. Third, political science departments in colleges and universities had increased in number; the discipline of political science secured a prestigious status like other social sciences, such as psychology, sociology, and anthropology. More importantly, funding was also a significant factor: Due to the global ideological conflict in the Cold War, the United States government provided grants to political scientists' to promote the American model of democracy in developing nations. Leading Behavioralist professors in prominent universities, including Gabriel Almond, Sidney Verba, Samuel P. Huntington, and Karl W. Deutsch, focused their research on political development in other countries. These are just some of the external and internal factors that may have diverted the APSA's attention from civic education. Nonetheless, it is possible that other factors may also have contributed to the APSA's inertia.

The third question is related to the second question: why is the pre-collegiate civic education a recurring theme with the APSA when some of its former leaders categorically renounced the preparation of democratic citizens in schools as an objective of political science? By addressing this question, we may be able to clarify the ambiguity that exists around the definition of civic education itself. In addition, as the APSA's eight reports in chapter three suggest, the bulk of political scientists' energies were invested on the

subject of civic education in high schools; they gave a tangential treatment to civic education in elementary schools. Political scientists' indifference to elementary schools evokes concern among the social studies educators. That is why, Cleo H. Cherryholmes (1990) aptly asks: "What explanations can be offered for the fact that political scientists have not addressed elementary civic education? This disciplinary quietude is an anomaly when compared to the attention given to elementary education by professors of history, geography, mathematics, and English" (p. 7). Perhaps examining the question on political scientists' recurring, albeit, intermittent interest in civic education may also shed light on the constraints they faced in elementary schools.

The fourth question that future researchers may investigate pertains to the sociology of classrooms. In order to learn how students benefit from the government course, we need to ask: how do students from diverse socio-economic backgrounds relate to the government course? This is a critical question because perceptions about the role of governmental institutions may vary in different ethnic and cultural contexts. An examination of the question becomes more urgent when textbooks for American government courses "do not seem to treat our society as a pluralistic system" (Chesler, 1967, p. 280). For example, in some neighborhoods, a police officer may be viewed as a guardian of constitutional rights; in others, he or she may symbolize state oppression. Similarly, students' views on government may differ in classrooms. Some students may perceive government to be a benevolent agency, or a Santa Claus, while others may view it as a coercive institution. In addition, while some students may be able to identify with governmental agencies, for others, the same agencies may be distant, complex, and

impersonal bureaucratic structures. Hence, the reality of context and relevance creates a serious challenge for the teachers of a government course.

Indeed, by definition, the course on government must address complex issues of power-relations in an ethnically diverse and economically stratified society. Therefore, it is imperative to find how the curriculum and instruction in government influence adolescents' attitudes in different ethnic and cultural contexts. Moreover, although the Traditionalist conception in the government course advances the centrality of a formalist, legalist, and juridical approach to citizenship by portraying an idealized picture of *Unum*, it would be instructive to compare the students' attitudes towards government on the basis of their gender, color, ethnicity, class, and religion. The findings of such a research may guide the state curriculum policy-makers in addressing the concerns of young citizens from diverse socio-economic backgrounds. The findings may also help the social studies educators in their mission to prepare competent citizens by designing culturally relevant and effective lesson plans.

Significance of the Study

As I discussed in the first chapter, the findings of this study should be useful in five areas. First, the findings could be used as a guide for contemporary and future curriculum policymakers in recognizing the forces struggling for ideological supremacy in schools. Because this study identifies the APSA as a major interest group seeking to promote its own conceptions of citizenship and civic education, it suggests that the curriculum policymakers and educators learn about the motives of interest groups. The

APSA's official record indicates that during the formative phase of political science, the Association's performance regarding securing an independent status for government in the social studies curriculum was vigorous. However, after political science surged as an established discipline in academia, the APSA's enthusiasm for pre-collegiate civic education dwindled, and some of its eminent leaders, such as Evron M. Kirkpatrick and Jeanne J. Kirkpatrick (1962), willfully encouraged political scientists to distance themselves from civic education in schools. More importantly, curriculum policymakers would benefit from learning why the APSA's Traditionalist conception remains intact even though its educational value for adolescents' civic competence has not been fully established.

Second, chronicling the history of social studies, curriculum historians, including Tryon (1935), Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977), Hertzberg (1981), and Jenness (1990) paid insufficient attention to the origins of ideas incorporated in the government course. Moreover, they make little or no distinction between the materials that were made available to students in government courses before and after the APSA's foray into the curriculum debate in 1908. Of course, the APSA's reports, especially those issued by the CIG (1908), CI (1916), and CIPS (1922), clearly drew a line of demarcation between the subject matter of government, its scope and sequence for high school curriculum, and what that they considered extraneous materials. The three reports refuted some textbooks and materials that were in use for government as well as for civics courses. The APSA's explicit proposals on the government course mirrored political scientists' state-centric and conservative ideological orientations about American democracy, citizenship and the

social order. One could argue that participatory democracy or what John Dewey (1916) calls “a mode of associated living” was hardly political scientists’ preferred agenda (p. 87). Surely, their teleological goal was state-building. Their educational goal was not the “personal development” of individuals; their goal was the creation of citizens (Dewey, p. 94). Traditionalists saw perceived man to be an instruments of the territorial state and not as “truly moral, rational, and free being” (Dewey, p. 95). In their Hegelian view, education, especially public education, was to be “carried on in the interests of the state, and that the private individual is of necessity an egoistic, irrational being, enslaved to his appetites and to circumstances unless he submits voluntarily to the educative discipline of state institutions and laws” (Dewey, p. 96). Such Hegelian, state-centric Traditionalist ideological framework never received the APSA’s fullest blessings after the Second World War, however. Neither was it eulogized in the aftermath of the Cold War. Nevertheless, the Traditionalist conception stressing the “nice, neat little acts of parliament,” persisted as the overarching theme of the course on government (Hodgetts, 1968, p. 24). Thus, it is vital for the social studies historians to be aware that, by itself, the title of a course has less significance than the theoretical and ideological orientation it embodies. Perhaps, one way to ascertain such orientation is to identify the political views of the authors of the textbooks for the course. Because the course on government is as inchoate as politics itself, it would be naïve to expect that all curriculum materials, including textbooks for the course, embody identical ideological orientations. Thus, it is necessary that social studies historians familiarize themselves with the antecedents of ideas in curricula that teachers teach and students learn in the social studies classroom.

Third, this study should have a special significance for the authors of textbooks on government. Textbook writers should clarify their position on whether their goal is to write textbooks concentrating on what Walter C. Parker (1998) calls the “structure of the disciplines” or what Roberta S. Sigel and Marilyn Hoskin (1991) calls Education for Democratic Citizenship (Parker, p.65).

The distinction between the two goals is vital for the social studies classrooms because eminent political scientists, including E. L. Ashley, W. B. Munro, and Edgar Dawson, who authored textbooks for the high school government course during the early period of the twentieth century, equated political science with civic education. Their state-centric tradition continued in textbooks and state curricula guidelines in succeeding decades. The early twentieth century authors defined their world from the perspective of the tradition of their academic discipline. Similarly, after the Second World War, i.e. in the Behavioralist phase, some textbooks on government reflected the Behavioralist framework. Nonetheless, the textbooks on government presented “a white, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon view of history and society” (Cox & Massialas, 1967, p. 324). Moreover, textbooks on government included “Statements about American democracy [were] often made with incredible naïveté” (Cox & Massialas, 1967, p. 324).

However, in several significant ways, the American society and its educational goals have metamorphosed ever since, and so has the global context in which young citizens now live. As educators Patricia Kubow, David Grossman, and Akira Ninomiya (1998) posit, the traditional conception of citizenship, as portrayed in conventional textbooks, may no longer be suitable. The authors of textbooks will serve the young

citizens better if they move away from political scientists' juridical and one-dimensional conception of citizenship toward "multi-dimensional citizenship" (p. 115). In her dissertation, political scientist Mary Jane Turner (1978) concluded, "There is simply more to citizenship education than learning concepts from the discipline or learning about American government" (p. 244). Thus, in the twenty first century, it seems imperative that we re-define citizenship and design curricula and instruction that meet the challenges of the time. The new concept of "multi-dimensional citizenship" may be a starting point in that direction.

Multi-dimensional citizenship encompasses personal, social, spatial, and temporal dimensions of a citizen's life (Parker, Ninomiya, & Cogan, 1999, p. 127). Its proponents claim that, "Multi-dimensional citizenship is a broadened notion of citizenship necessary to enable citizens to respond effectively to the challenges and demands of the 21st century" (Kubow, Grossman, & Ninomiya, 1998, p. 116; Parker, Ninomiya, & Cogan, 1999, p. 127). Indeed, as the current globalization trend renders the territorial boundaries of nation-states porous, the concept of juridical citizenship also loses its educational value. Hence, this study suggests that the authors of government textbooks may consider including materials and themes that are germane to the demands young American citizens encounter in a rapidly integrating global environment.

Fourth, the findings of the study should have significance for the teachers of the government course in high schools. Sadly, a reliable record on the academic qualification of teachers of the American government course is lacking. Nonetheless, this study may be useful for the teachers of government in that it traces the genealogy of theoretical

frameworks they teach about in their classrooms. It is necessary that the twelfth grade teachers of government know and are competent in explaining the ideological nuances embedded in textbooks on government. Mary Jane Turner (1978), for example, reviewed twelve textbooks on government. Each one of the textbooks she reviewed, contained a distinct theoretical framework for explaining American political life. It is therefore necessary that teachers using anyone of the textbooks are well informed about the underlying theory or ideological orientation being used as an intellectual tool for explaining the dynamics of politics. In a limited way, this study shows how some of those theories found their way into the curriculum.

Finally, this study may also have some degree of significance for political scientists in that it exposes cleavages in their ideas on citizenship and civic education. The three major cleavages are Traditionalism, Behavioralism, and Post-behavioralism. The proponents of all three hold distinct views on what knowledge was of most worth for citizenship. Hence, it is important to note that political scientists did not have a monolithic view on what a good citizen was or what children needed to learn in school to become good citizens. The disparate responses in the American Political Science Review, which the CAT report of 1951 elicited from the political science community illustrates this point.

More importantly, the study also discovered a strong sense of ambivalence among political scientists towards civic education in the pre-collegiate environment. Such ambivalence emanated partly from political scientists' experiential inadequacies and partly from the lack of synergy between political science professors in colleges and social

studies educators. Oddly enough, for an extended period, the two cultures remained apathetic toward one another. The problem of mutual estrangement did not go unnoticed in the political science profession, however. From time to time, political scientists recognized the urgency of the problem. For example, political scientist Howard White (1946) of Miami University suggested that, "College teachers of political science have moved on a different level from the teachers of social studies. Neither has been able to understand the problems of the other group. A closer association between them will do far more than a planned attempt to revolutionize without understanding the existing situation. [*And the time is now*]" (p. 967). White prodded political scientists by asserting that, "Political scientists needed to learn more about what the schools are doing in the teaching of government and citizenship" (p. 966). About three decades later, political scientist Mary Jane Turner (1978) validated White's concerns by concluding that, "Thus, the best minds from political science and education do not talk together, much less work together" (p. 41). In spite of the perennial nature of the problem, it appears that the two epistemic communities hardly took any noteworthy measures to cooperate with one another in civic education. That is why, there was no evidence to gather confirming a close collaboration between the APSA and the NCSS on teacher training and curriculum development during the last several decades of the twentieth century. Perhaps, one reason for this mutual isolation may be that the two camps pursue divergent goals. Therefore, a genuine common interest has not developed.

Two decades after Turner, political scientist Stephen Earl Bennett of the University of Cincinnati, attempted to make a case for bridging the gap between political

scientists in universities and social studies educators. Bennett (1999) argued that, "There are some important things that political scientists committed to civic education should do. We must include educators from pre-collegiate levels in our efforts" (p. 756). Bennett cautioned his colleagues that, "If we do not involve pre-collegiate educators in planning civic education projects, we ought not to be surprised if they [do not] 'buy in' to proposals we make" (p. 756). Aware of the APSA's past mistakes in the pre-collegiate civic education, Bennett noted, "Efforts at civic education will proceed with or without our involvement" (756).

White, Bennett, and Turner's voices about a perennial problem may not be addressed until there are incentives on the table to motivate political scientists. Nevertheless, the three show that in different historical periods, some APSA members considered social studies educators as equal partners in the enterprise of civic education. In their view, the work and experiences of schoolteachers in the area of civic education was not only valuable, it was worth emulating. For example, the CAT report of 1951 insisted that political scientists in universities needed to learn from schoolteachers. However, considering the research-oriented culture of the profession, such views rarely found popular support among political scientists. In general, it may be argued that most political scientists took the convenient route: they engaged in rhetoric rather than made tangible contributions to pre-collegiate civic education.

As the APSA's reports and other relevant literature indicate, for some arcane reasons, political scientists always issued their authoritative statements as though they were specialists on issues, such as adolescents' needs, the school environment, the

process of learning, diversity, teacher-student relations, curricula; not to mention that they invariably overlooked the findings of educational researchers in schools and classrooms. Indeed, by overlooking the key aspects of civic education in the pre-collegiate environment, i.e. pedagogy, the school culture, teachers' education, students' social, ethnic, gender, and cultural contexts, the majority of political scientists' recommendations were indicative of their peremptory attitude toward the education community.

Final Remarks

When I first began thinking about the APSA's activities in civic education in schools, I assumed that since political scientists generally considered themselves specialists on political socialization, they would have studied what adolescents needed to learn in schools to become democratic citizens. Therefore, I hoped to discover if American political scientists contributed to the schools' efforts in civic education. However, as I read the APSA's reports, recommendations and statements, political scientists' four major inadequacies became apparent. First, political scientists' knowledge about the pre-collegiate educational environment was limited. Second, the APSA's early activities were motivated more by self-interest rather than by altruism. Third, because civic education is an educational matter, political scientists were not prepared to answer most of the questions the social studies educators ask. Fourth, because political science was mainly concerned with theoretical research, its practitioners showed little respect for the applied field of education. Furthermore, what concerned me most was not political

scientists' inadequacies in pre-collegiate education but the realization that few APSA officials truly conceded to those inadequacies.

I agree with the views of those political scientists who straddle the domains of both schools and universities, including Mary Jane Turner and Cleo H. Cherryholmes, that civic education is more than the teaching and learning of disciplines. Turner and Cherryholmes are among a handful of conscientious political scientists in the APSA who genuinely understood the pivotal role of pedagogy in civic education in schools. In their view, the APSA's pronouncements on civic education was tantamount to rhetoric.

Turner and Cherryholmes do not suggest that the discipline of political science has nothing to offer to pre-collegiate civic education. Indeed, like any other social science, political science can contribute to a dynamic and ever-growing pre-collegiate civic education. Nevertheless, contrary to the Traditionalists' claims in the first four reports, by itself the government course does not encompass civic education. As a corollary, I wish to point out that the government course constitutes only one of the five sub-fields in political science taught in colleges and universities. Other sub-fields of political science, i.e. political philosophy, international relations, comparative politics, and public policy, evolved after the decline of the Traditionalist phase. But the APSA never promoted them among the social studies curriculum decision-makers and, therefore, they have had little or no presence in the social studies. Perhaps, if adequately incorporated in the curriculum, some of the ideas in the four sub-fields may have been useful for social studies education. For example, Jack Allen (1966) shows how political science may be used as an intellectual tool for teaching American and global history. Both

Abraham Yeselson (1966) and Vera Michael Dean (1966) suggest that the theories of world politics may be applied in the social studies classrooms to explain America's relations with foreign countries. Similarly, Douglas A. Chalmers (1966) suggests that concepts and methods developed in comparative politics may be used to explain the causes and effects of social, political, and economic changes in other societies, especially the non-Western societies.

In addition to the above list, I suggest that social studies education would benefit most from political science's sub-field of political philosophy. Because the main goal of social studies education has been the preparation of self-governing citizens in a culturally diverse society, I assert that self-governing citizens are also thinking citizens. In this context, social studies educator James P. Shaver (1965) posits that, "A commonly stated objective of instruction in the social studies is to teach students to think 'reflectively' or 'critically' so that they will be better able as adult citizens to make intelligent decisions about the crucial problems facing society" (p. 228). In support of Shaver, I argue that citizens in a democratic culture should be able to think and reflect on the choices they make and take responsibility for the consequences of those choices when they affect their lives and the lives of other human beings.

Philosophical discussion in the social studies classroom on issues, such as gender parity, human dignity, diversity, human rights, community power, virtue, justice, equality, liberty, ethics, morality, obligation, and the good life are germane to the education of a caring, thoughtful and democratic citizenry. These issues are related to values and value conflicts in public discourses and should be explicitly highlighted in the high school

course on government. Addressing this question, Richard G. Niemi and Jane Junn (1998) recommend, "Our first recommendation is based on the recognition that American government and politics is a controversial and contested territory. Indeed, the practice of democracy is often characterized by strong differences and contentious debate, and its teaching should reflect this reality" (p. 150).

In my view, contentious public debates are not only inevitable, they are desirable, because in a pluralist democracy citizens' competing values often clash over who gets what, when and how. Nevertheless, the Traditionalist curricula on government avoid discussion on value conflicts and, hence, present a naïve and overly optimistic view of American democracy. This problem can be addressed by introducing materials from political philosophy into the existing curriculum on government. The teaching of political philosophy also fulfills the requirements of "personal," "social," "spatial," and "temporal" aspects of "multi-dimensional citizenship" that Walter C. Parker, et al. (1999) have recently presented (p. 127).

Moreover, unlike the Traditionalist approach with emphasis on formalism, if adequately tailored to the adolescents' needs, political philosophy may perhaps be comparatively more effective in civic education because it would allow students to deliberate. In addition, the existing government course also stresses the procedural aspect of democracy, i.e., voting in elections. For example, in New York State, the twelfth grade course on government is called Participation in government. However, research findings of the last three decades show that the high school course on government neither contributes to students' political knowledge nor prepares them for active political

participation (Langston & Jennings, 1968; Neimi & Junn, 1998). In this regard, I argue that active participation in government should not be the major criterion for defining good citizenship. I think the Athenian model of citizenship has been inadequate for dynamic modern societies. Our problems and challenges are much more complex than the Athenians could have imagined. I therefore suggest that citizenship should be defined in terms of respecting and promoting human dignity. Moreover, participation and non-participation are questions that should be left to the discretion of citizens; citizens should be free to make their own choices about politics. To some citizens, non-participation may be a preferred choice. Indeed, their choice should be respected. In a pluralist system, citizens' non-participation in the political process or protest against oppressive public policies is also a form of participation. Voting in elections is but one form of participation: citizens may choose to express their voices through non-governmental organizations. Hence, curriculum and instruction in a government course should avoid emphasizing active citizenship skills. On the education of citizens, Turner (1978) posits that: "Citizenship education can be achieved, we believe, by self-consciously limiting the goal to citizen education and by disclaiming an attempt to promote active citizenship" (p. 259). In other words, the goal of civic education should not necessarily be the preparation of active citizens--the goal of civic education should be the preparation of thoughtful and caring citizens.

Some contemporary Post-behavioralist political scientists also realize that the formalist and juridical model of the government course has contributed little in preparing a thoughtful citizenry. That is why, in 1996, the APSA Task Force on Civic Education

for the Twenty First Century categorically refuted their predecessors' efforts in civic education. Thus, dissatisfaction among Post-behavioralists about the low level of "civic engagement" in American democracy indicates that the Traditionalist conception of citizenship and civic education was imprudent and myopic. Surely, political scientists missed the excellent opportunities offered by schools in preparing democratic citizens.

What future role the APSA may play in the pre-collegiate civic education will depend on three basic changes in the current status quo: (a) The Task Force on Civic Education must include social studies educators, (b) a radical transformation must occur in the political science profession pertaining to the existing reward and prestige system, and (c) a genuine cooperation and mutual respect between the cultures of political science and social studies education should develop. It is sad that at present, a scant attention is paid to this subject and, therefore, a wide gulf between the APSA's rhetoric on civic education and realities in schools exists. In brief, unless the APSA takes the instructional component of civic education seriously, it is unlikely that the Task Force for Civic Education in the Twenty First Century would be able to achieve its goal of strengthening "civic engagement" in America.

References

- Allen, J. (1966). Political science in the teaching of secondary school history. In Riddle, D. & R. Cleary (Eds.). Political science in the social studies (pp. 273-285). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- _____. (1993). Government and politics in social studies. In V. S. Wilson, et al. (Eds.). Teaching social studies: Handbook of trends, issues, and implications (pp.). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Almond, G. & Verba, S. (1963). The civic culture. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1990). A discipline divided: Schools and sects in political science. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- _____. (1996). Political science: the history of the discipline. In Goodin, R. E. & Klingemann, Hans-Dieter (Eds.). A new handbook of political science. Oxford University Press. New York:
- American Political Science Association. (1962). Political science as a discipline. American Political Science Review, 2, (Vol. 56), 417-421.
- American Political Science Association. Section on Instruction in Political Science. 1906. What do students know about American government before taking college courses in political science? Proceedings of the American Political Science Association. Baltimore: Waverly Press.
- American Political Science Association Committee of Five. (1908) Report of the Committee of Five of the American Political Science Association on Instruction in American Government in Secondary Schools. Proceedings of the American Political Science Association, 5, 219-257.
- American Political Science Association Committee on Instruction. (1916). The teaching of government. New York: Macmillan.
- American Political Science Association Committee on Instruction in Political Science. (1922). The study of civics. American Political Science Review, 1, (Vol. 16), 116-125.
- American Political Science Association Committee on Instruction. (1925). Report. Historical Outlook, 5, (Vol. 16), 207-211.

- American Political Science Association Committee on Cooperation with NCSS. (1939). Report. General Education Board Collection, 1-3. fol. GO32. Rockefeller Archives Center. Tarrytown, New York.
- American Political Science Association Committee for the Advancement of Teaching. (1951). Goals for political science. New York: William Sloane Associates. Inc.
- American Political Science Association Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education. (1971). Political education in the public schools: the challenge for political science. PS: Political Science and Politics, 4, 431-57.
- American Political Science Association. (1996). Civic education for the next century: A task force to initiate professional activity. PS: Political Science and Politics, 4, 755-758.
- _____. (1997). Statement of Purpose of the American Political Science Association Task Force on Civic Education. PS: Political Science & Politics, 4, 745.
- American Political Science Association Task Force on Civic Education in the next Century. (1998). Expanded articulation statement: A call for reactions and Contributions. PS: Political Science and Politics, 31, 636-637.
- American Political Science Association. (1998). Graduate faculty and programs in political science: APSA survey of graduate students, 16th ed. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Anderson, W. (1939). Political science enters the twentieth century. In Haddow, A. Political science in American colleges and universities: 1636-1900. New York: D. Appleton-century Company.
- Banks, J. (1997). Educating citizens in a multicultural society. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Barber, B. (1984). Strong democracy: participatory politics for a new age. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- _____. (1989). Public talk and civic action. Social Education, 6, (Vol. 53), 355-356.
- Barr, R. D., Barth, J. L., & Shermis, S. (1977). Defining the social studies. Arlington, VA. : National Council for the Social Studies.

- Beard, C. (1912). An economic interpretation of the Constitution of the United States. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- _____. (1932). A charter for the social studies in the schools. New York: Scribner's.
- Beard, C. A., & Beard, M. (1930). The rise of American civilization. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Bellah, R. et al. (1985). Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bennett, S. E. (1999). The past need not be prologue: Why pessimism about civic education is premature. PS: Political Science and Politics, 4, 755-757.
- Bensel, R. F. (1990). Yankee Leviathan: The origins of central state authority in America, 1859-1877. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Berelson, B., Lazarsfeld, P., & McPhee, W. (1954). Voting: a study of opinion formation in a presidential campaign. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bourque, S., & Grossholtz, J. (1974). Politics as an unnatural practice: political science looks at female participation. Politics and Society, 4, 255-66.
- Brennen, T. & Pateman, C. (1979). Mere auxiliaries to the commonwealth: women and the origins of liberalism. Political Studies, 27, 183-200.
- Brintnall, M. (1992). Affirmative action: Women and minorities in the profession. PS: Political Science and Politics, 1, 105-109.
- Brody, R. A. (1989). Political science. In National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools Curriculum Task Force. Charting the Course: Social studies for the 21st century, (pp. 59-63). Washington, DC: National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools.
- _____. (1994). Secondary education and political attitudes: Examining the effects on political tolerance of the *We the people*...curriculum. Calabasas, CA: Center for

Civic Education.

Brown, B. (1950). American conservatives: The political thought of Francis Lieber and John Burgess. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bryce, J. (1888). The American commonwealth. London, UK: Macmillan.

Burgess, J. W. (1882). The study of political science at Columbia College. International Review, 12, 346-57.

_____. (1891). Political science and comparative constitutional law. Boston: Ginn and Co.

_____. (1934). The reminiscences of an American scholar. New York: Columbia University Press.

Butts, R. F. (1977). Historical perspective on civic education in the United States. In Education for responsible citizenship: The report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education, (pp. 47-68). New York: McGraw-Hill.

_____. (1980). The revival of civic learning: A rationale for citizenship education. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Campbell, A. et al. (1960). The American voter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Carroll, S. J. & Zerilli, M. G. (1993). Feminist challenges to political science. In Finifter, A. W. (Ed.). Political science: The state of the discipline 2, (pp. 55-76). Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.

Carter, L. & Elshtain, J. (1997). Task Force on Civic Education: Statement of purpose. PS: Political Science and Politics, 4, (Vol. 30), 745.

Center for Civic Education. (1994). National standards for civics and government. Calabasas, California: Center for Civic Education.

Chalmers, D. A. (1966). The politics of emerging nations. In Riddle D. H., & Cleary, R. E. (Eds.). Political science in the social studies. Thirty-Sixth Yearbook, (pp. 107-125). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1990). Political scientists on civic education: A non-existent Discourse (Report No. So 020 785). East Lansing, MI: The center for the

Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 318669).

- Chesler, M. (1967). Values and controversy in secondary social studies: A critical review of the literature. In Cox, C. B., & Massialas, B. G. (Eds.). Social studies in the United States: A critical appraisal, (pp. 270-288). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Cogan, J. J. (1997). Crisis in citizenship education in the United States. International Journal of Social Education, 2, (Vol. 11), 21-36.
- Cox, C. B. & Massialas, B. G. (Eds.). (1967). Social studies in the United States: A critical appraisal. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Creraft, E. W. (1932). The place of government in the school curriculum. Education. (Vol. 52), 542-45.
- Crick, B. (1959). The American science of politics: Its origins and conditions. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Curti, M. (1959). The social ideas of American educators. Paterson, NJ: Pageant Books.
- Dahl, R. A. (1961). The Behavioral approach in political science: epitaph for a monument to a successful protest. American Political Science Review 55, 763-72.
- Dean, V. M. (1966). International relations. In Riddle, D. H., & Cleary, R. E. (Eds.). Political science in the social studies. Thirty-Sixth Yearbook. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education. New York: The Free Press.
- _____. (1918). Political science as a recluse. The middle works of John Dewey, 1899-1924. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- _____. (1929). Characters and events: Popular essays in social and political philosophy. New York: H. Holt & Co.
- _____. (1982). Reconstruction as affecting social philosophy. The middle works, 1859-1920 (Vol. 12: 1920), 187-201. Southern Illinois University Press.

- _____. (1983). Social purposes in education. The middle works, 1899-1924 (vol. 15: 1923-1924), 158-169. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dietz, M. (1998). Context is all: feminism and theories of citizenship. In Phillips, A. (Ed.). Feminism and politics. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Easton, D. (1968). Political science. International encyclopedia of the social science. New York: Crowell Collier & Macmillan.
- _____. (1969). The new revolution in political science. American Political Science Review, 63, 1051-1061.
- _____. (1991). Political science in the United States. In Eason, D., Gunnell, J. G. & Graziano, L. (Eds.). The development of political science. New York: Routledge.
- Elshtain, J. (1974). Moral woman and immoral man: a consideration of the public-private split and its political ramifications. Politics and Society, 4, 453-74.
- _____. (1979). Methodological sophistication and conceptual confusion: a critique of mainstream political science. In Sherman, J. & Beck, E. (Eds.). The prism of sex: essays in the sociology of knowledge. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____. (1981). Public man, private woman: women in social and political thought. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Engle, S. H., & Ochoa, A. S. (1988). Education for democratic citizenship: Decision making in the social studies. New York: Teachers College Press. New Jersey: Prentice-hall, Inc.
- Farr, J. & Seidelman, R. (Eds.). (1993). Discipline and history: political science in the United States. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Ferguson, P. (1991). Impacts on social and political participation. In Shaver, J. P. (Ed.). Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning. New York: Macmillan.
- Fesler, J. (1951). Goals for political science: A discussion. American Political Science Review, 4, (Vol. 45), 996-1001.
- Ford, H. J. (1905). The scope of political science. Proceedings of the American

Political Science Association, 2. 198-206.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). The end of history and the last man. NY: Free Press.

Goldstein, R. J. (Undated). The elementary school curriculum and political socialization. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science. University of Chicago.

Goodnow, F. (1904). The work of the American Political Science Association. Proceedings of the American Political Science Association. (Vol. 1). Baltimore, Maryland: Waverly.

Gottschalk, L. (1965). Understanding history: A primer of historical method. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Gunnell, J. G. (1990). In search of the state: political science as an emerging discipline in the United States. In Wagner, P., Whittrick, B. & Whitley, R. (Eds.). Discourses on society, vol. 15. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic.

_____. (1991). The historiography of American political science. In Gunnell, J. & Graziano, L. (Eds.). The development of political science: a comparative survey. New York: Routledge.

Haas, J. (1979). Where we were and where we are going? Social Education, 4, (Vol. 70), 147-154.

Haddow, A. (1939). Political science in American colleges and universities, 1636-1900. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.

Hahn, H. (1965). Teacher preparation in political science. Social Education, 2, (Vol. 29), 86-89.

Hahn, C. (1998). Becoming political: Comparative perspectives on citizenship education. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

_____. (1999). Challenges to civic education in the United States. In Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J., & Amadeo, J. (Eds.). Civic education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA civic education project. Delft, The Netherlands: Eburon Publishers.

Hartz, L. (1951). Goals for political science: A discussion. American Political Science Review, 4 (Vol. 45), 1001-1005.

- Hegel, G. (1949). Hegel's philosophy of right. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Held, D. (1987). Models of democracy. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hertzberg, H. W. (1981). Social studies reform 1880-1980. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.
- _____. (1989). History and progressivism: A century of reform proposals. In Gagnon, P. (Ed.). Historical literacy: The case for history in American education (pp. 69-99). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Hobbes, T. (1968). Leviathan. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hodgetts, A. (1968). What culture? What heritage?: A study of civic education in Canada. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Hollowell, J. (1951). Goals for political science: A discussion. American Political Science Review, 4, (Vol. 45), 1005-1010.
- Hopkins, A. (1993). Observations on gender, political science, and the academy. The Journal of Politics, 3, (Vol. 55), 561-568.
- Hoxie, R. G. et al. (1955). A history of the faculty of political science: Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hughes, R. O. (1922). Problems of American democracy. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Jenness, D. (1990). Making sense of social studies. New York: Macmillan.
- Jennings, M. K. & Niemi, R. G. (1974). The political character of adolescence: The influence of families and schools. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Joyce, B. R. (1967). The primary grades: A review of textbook materials. In Cox, C. B. & Massialas, B. G. (Eds.). Social studies in the United States: A critical appraisal, (pp. 16-36). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Karl, B. D. (1970). In Merriam, C. E. (Ed.). New aspects of politics. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kinzie, G. (1965). Historians and the social studies: a history and interpretation of the activities of the American Historical Association in the secondary

- school social studies, 1884-1964. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Nebraska.
- Kirkpatrick, E. (1962). The impact of the behavioral approach on traditional political science. In Ranney, A. (Ed.). Essays on the behavioral study of politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kirkpatrick, E. & Kirkpatrick, J. (1962). Political science. In High school social studies perspectives. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kliebard, H. (1986). The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kubow, P., Grossman, D., & Ninomiya, A. (1998). Multidimensional citizenship: Educational policy for the 21st century. In Cogan, J. J., & Derricott, R. (Eds.). Citizenship for the 21st Century: An international perspective on education. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Langton, K. & Jennings, M. K. (1968). Political socialization and the high school civics curriculum in the United States. American Political Science Review, 3, (Vol. 62), 852-67.
- Leonard, S. (1995). The pedagogical purposes of a political science. In Farr, J., Dryzek, J., & Leonard, S. (Eds.). Political science in history: Research programs and political traditions. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1999). "Pure Futility and Waste": Academic political science and civic education. PS: Political Science and Politics, 4, 749-754.
- Lieber, F. (1858). Inaugural address in Columbia College. (Ed.). Addresses of the newly-appointed professors of Columbia College. New York: Wynkoop, Hallenbeck & Thomas.
- _____. (1881). Miscellaneous writings. Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott.
- Lowi, T. J. (1972). The politics of higher education: The case of political science. In Graham, G. & Carey, G. (Eds.). The post-Behavioral era: Perspectives on political science. New York: David McKay.
- _____. (1993). A review of Herbert Simon's review of my view of the discipline. PS: Political Science & Politics, 51-52.
- Lynn, N. (1983). Self-portrait: Profiles of political scientists. In Finifter, A. (Ed.). Political science: The state of the discipline. Washington, DC: The

American Political Science Association.

Macridis, R. C. & Brown, B. E. (1990). Comparative politics: Notes and readings, 6th Ed. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Madison, J. (1961). Federalist No. 10. In Cooke, J. (Ed.). The federalist papers. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Manicas, P.T. (1987). A history and philosophy of the social sciences. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Mann, S. (1996). Political scientists examine civics standards: An introduction. PS: Political Science and Politics, 1. (Vol. 29), 47-49.

Massialas, B. G. (1967). American government: We are the greatest! In Cox, C. B. & Massialas, B. G. (Eds.). Social studies in the United States: a critical appraisal (pp. 167-195). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

McClenaghan, W. A. (1990). Magruder's American government. Needham, MA: Prentice Hall.

Mehlinger, H. D. & Patrick, J. J. (1972). American political behavior. Lexington: Ginn and Company.

Merriam, C. E. (1923). Progress report of the Committee on Political Research. American Political Science Review, 20, 1-13.

_____. (1925). New aspects of politics. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

_____. (1934). Civic education in the United States. New York: Scribner's Sons.

Merriam-Webster's Third New International Dictionary. (1993). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc.

Millett, J. D. (1955). The department of public law and government. In Hoxie, R. G. et al., (Eds.). A history of the faculty of political science: Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Press.

Morgenthau, H. (1948). Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Munro, W. B. (1928). Physics and politics—an old analogy revisited. American Political Science Review, 22, 1-11.
- National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools. (1989). Charting a Course: Social studies for the 21st century. A Report of the Curriculum Task Force of the National Commission of Social Studies in the Schools. Washington, DC: National Commission on Social Studies in the schools.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1994). Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- National Education Association. (1915). Report of the Special Committee of the Commission on the Reorganization of secondary Education. U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 23. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- National Educational Association Committee on Social Studies. (1916). The Social Studies in Secondary Education. Bulletin No. 28. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Nelson, M. R. (Ed.). (1994). The social studies in secondary education: A reprint of the seminal 1916 report with annotations and commentaries. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies /Social Science Education.
- New York State Education department. (1983). A look at our town: Village, city, county government. Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York.
- _____. (1996). Learning standards for social studies. Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York.
- _____. (1997). Toward civic responsibility. Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York.
- Newmann, F. (1963). Consent of the governed and citizenship education in modern America. School Review, 71, 404-24.
- Niemi, R. & Junn, J. (1998). Civic education: what makes students learn. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Noddings, N. (1991). The gender issue. Educational Leadership, 4, (Vol. 49), 65-

70.

- _____. (1992). Social studies and feminism. Theory and Research in Social Education. 20, 230-241.
- _____. (1992). Gender and the curriculum. In Jackson, P. W. (Ed.). Handbook of research on curriculum, 659-684. New York: Macmillan.
- Okin, S. M. (1998). Gender, the public, and the private. In Philips, A. (Ed.). Feminism and Politics (pp. 116-141). Oxford University Press.
- O'Leary, B. (1996). Political science. In Kuper, A. & Kuper, J. (Eds.). The social science encyclopedia (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Osborne, K. (1993). Political education and participant citizenship: Implications for school, curricula and pedagogy. In Conley, M. W. & Torres, C. A. (Eds.). Political education: North American perspectives. Hamburg, Germany: International Studies in Political Socialization and Political Education.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1996). Civic education for the next century: A task force to initiate professional activity. PS: Political Science & Politics, 4, Vol. 29, 755-757.
- Padover, S. (1942). Wilson's ideals. Washington, DC: American Council on Public Affairs.
- Page, G. T. & Thomas, J. B. (Eds.). (1977). International dictionary of education. NY: Nicholas Publishing Co.
- Parker, W. C. (1998). National case studies of citizenship education: The United States. In Cogan, J. J. & Derricott, R. (Eds.). Citizenship for the 21st century: An international perspective on education (pp. 64-74). London: Kogan Page.
- Parker, W. C., Ninomiya, A., & Cogan, J. (1999). Educating world citizens: Toward multinational curriculum development. American Educational Research Journal, 2, (Vol. 36), 117-145.
- Pateman, C. (1988). The sexual contract. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- _____. (1989). The disorder of women. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Patrick, J. J. (1971). Introduction. In Turner, M. J. Materials for civics, government, and problems of democracy: Political science in the new social studies, (pp. 1-7). Boulder, CO: American Political Science Association
- _____. (1976). Political socialization and political education in schools. In Renshon, S. (Ed.). Handbook of political socialization. New York: Free Press.
- Patrick, J. J. & Hoge, J. D. (1991). Teaching government, civics, and law. In Shaver, J. P. (Ed.). Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning. New York: Macmillan International. 436.
- People for the American Way. (1987). We the people: a review of U.S. government and civics textbooks. Washington, DC: People for the American Way.
- Pettersch, C. A. (1953). The teaching of government in the United States with special reference to secondary schools from 1861 to 1930. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Philips, A. (Ed.). (1998). Feminism and politics. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Prifold, C. (1962). A history of the American Political Science Association's activities in the field of Secondary Education in Government, 1904-1962. Mimeographed. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. Journal of Democracy, 1, (Vol. 6), 65-78.
- Quillen, I. J. (1966). Government-oriented courses in the secondary school curriculum. In Cleary R. & Riddle, D. (Eds.). Political science in the social studies. Thirty-Sixth Yearbook. (pp. 254-272). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Ravitch, D. (1990). Diversity and democracy: Multicultural education in America. American Educator, 16-48.
- _____. (1995). National standards in American education: A citizens' guide.

Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Reinharz, S. (1993). A contextual chronology of women's sociological work. 2nd ed. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Women's Studies Program. Working Papers Series, September.

Ricci, D. (1984). The tragedy of political science: politics, scholarship, and democracy. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Robert A. Taft Institute of Government. (1963). Citizenship education: A survey for citizenship among the 50 states. New York: Robert A. Taft Institute of Government.

Ross, D. (1991). The origins of American social science. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rossiter, C. L. (1950). Characteristics of the good democratic citizen. Social Education, 7. (Vol. 14), 310-313.

Sapiro, V. (1998). Feminist studies and political science—and vice versa. In Phillips, A. (Ed.). Feminism and politics. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schachter, H. L. (1998). Civic education: Three early American Political Science Association committees and their relevance for our times. PS: Political Science and Politics 31, 631-635.

Schaper, W. A. (1906). What do students know about American government before taking college courses in political science. Journal of Pedagogy, 18, 265-88.

Shafer, R. J. (1980). A guide to historical method. Homewood, Ill: The Dorsey Press

Shaver, J. P. (1965). Reflective thinking, values, and social studies textbooks. The School Review 73, pp. 226-253.

_____. (Ed.). (1991). Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning. New York: Macmillan.

Shaver, J. P. & Knight, R. S. (1986). Civics and government in citizenship education. In Wronski, S. P. & Bragaw, D. H. (Eds.). Social studies and social sciences: A fifty-year perspective. (pp. 71-84). Bulletin No. 78. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

- Sigel, R. S., & Hoskin, M. (Eds.). Education for democratic citizenship: A challenge for multi-ethnic societies. Hilldale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Singleton, H. W. (1980). Problems of democracy. Theory and Research in Social Education, 8, 89-103.
- Somit, A. & Tanenhaus, J. (1967). The development of American political science: From Burgess to Behaviorism. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Thornton, S. J. (1991). Teacher as curricular-instructional gatekeeper in social studies. In Shaver, J. P. (Ed.). Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning, (pp. 237-248). New York: Macmillan.
- Tickner, J. A. (1992). Gender in international relations. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tilly, C. (1975). Formation of national states in Western Europe. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tocqueville, A. (1945). Democracy in America. New York: Albert A. Knopf.
- Torney-Purta, J. (1992). Civic education. In Alkin, M. (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research (pp.725-728). New York: Maxwell Macmillan International.
- Tryon, R. M. (1935). The social sciences as school subjects. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Turner, M. J. (1978). Political education in the United States: History, status, critical analysis and an alternative model. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, Colorado.
- _____. (1981). Civic education in the United States. In Heater, D. & Gillespie, J. A. (Eds.). Political education in flux. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Van Dalen, D. (1973). Understanding historical research: An introduction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Waldo, D. (1975). Political science: Tradition, discipline, profession, science, enterprise. In Greenstein, F. I. & Polsby, N. S. (Eds.). The handbook of

- political science. (Vol. 1). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- White, H. (1946). Political science and the social studies. American Political Science Review, 60, 966-971.
- White, L. D. (1993). Political science. Mid-century. In Farr, J. & Seidelman, R. (Eds.). Discipline and history: Political science in the United States. (Pp. 223-228). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Wiley, K. (1977). The status of pre-collegiate science, mathematics, and social science education: 1955-1975. (Vol. 3). Boulder, Co: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
- Willoughby, W. W. (1904). The political science association. Political Science Quarterly, 19, 107-11.
- Wilson, J. Q. (2000). American government. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Wilson, W. (1885). Congressional government: A study of American politics. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- _____. (1987). The study of administration. Political Science Quarterly, 2, 197-222.
- _____. (1889). The state: elements of historical and practical politics. Boston: Heath and Co.
- Wolin, S. (1969). Political theory as a vocation. American Political Science Review, 4, (Vol. 63), 1062-82.
- Woolsey, D. (1877). Political science: Or, the state theoretically and practically considered. New York: Scribner, Armstrong.
- Yeselson, A. (1966). American foreign policy in the nuclear age. In Riddle, D. H., & Cleary, R. E. (Eds.). Political science in the social studies. Thirty-Sixth Yearbook. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Young, I. M. (1989). Polity and group difference: a critique of the ideal of universal citizenship. Ethics, 99, 250-274.
- _____. (1990). Justice and the politics of difference. Princeton: Princeton University Press.